

# PROMOTION & TENURE AD HOC COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT<sup>1</sup> AND RECOMMENDATIONS

29 December 2019

## BACKGROUND AND SCOPE

The ad hoc committee on promotion and tenure was formed by Provost Ann E. Cudd in Spring 2019. Committee members are listed in Appendix A.

After establishing the ad hoc committee, the Provost delivered her charge at a meeting on March 6, 2019. Following the meeting, on March 20, Provost Cudd summarized the charge in an email, asking the ad hoc committee to provide her with advice on two specific matters:

- (1) The establishment of a University-level faculty committee to review promotion and tenure dossiers and advise the Provost on whether the recommendations at the academic unit level are consistent with the criteria and standards of the University of Pittsburgh. The ad hoc committee was asked to recommend how such a University-level promotion and tenure committee should be constituted and operate, including length of members' terms, who would chair the committee, and the type of documentation (e.g., formal vote, report) that the committee would produce. The ad hoc committee was also asked to recommend the time period the committee would meet and the type of cases the committee would review.
- (2) Whether the University of Pittsburgh schools and regional campuses – other than the School of Medicine – should be allowed to extend the tenure clock for their tenure-stream (TS) faculty by 1-3 years beyond the current University 7-year clock. If the committee recommends moving forward in this manner, the committee was also asked for recommendations regarding:
  - whether the decision on the length of the tenure clock should be made at the school or regional campus level (versus at the department or division level)
  - whether faculty hired under the current tenure clock should be “grandfathered” to the tenure clock and processes that were in effect at the date of their hire
  - implications for initial contract length for new tenure-stream hires, as well as the timing of probationary review
  - process by which schools and regional campuses decide on tenure clock length (e.g., should a faculty vote be held? If so, which faculty should vote?)

---

<sup>1</sup> An interim report was submitted to Provost Ann Cudd on May 30, 2019. This final report includes the recommendations from the interim report, and presents additional recommendations.

The ad hoc committee met six times in Spring 2019 and twice in Fall 2019, with documents and draft reports circulated via email for review and comment. This report summarizes the deliberations of the ad hoc committee and presents its recommendations.

## EXTENDING THE TENURE CLOCK

The committee first took up the question of whether schools (other than the School of Medicine) and regional campuses should be allowed to extend the tenure clock for their tenure-stream faculty. In doing so, the committee reviewed the tenure clock at the University of Pittsburgh's School of Medicine, including the current 10-year clock for faculty with clinical responsibilities and the upcoming transition to a 10-year clock for all School of Medicine faculty. Vice Dean Ann Thompson explained the rationale for a 10-year clock at the School of Medicine and provided insight into the School's experience with both the 7-year and 10-year clocks.

Benchmarking data about tenure clocks from numerous public and private institutions was compiled (Appendix B) and distributed to the ad hoc committee.

The committee discussed pros and cons of extending the tenure clock. Advantages of allowing for an extended clock included more time to develop interdisciplinary research, longer lead time needed for publishing in top-tier journals, more flexibility among schools and disciplines for setting an appropriate tenure clock, and more time to develop external partnerships for research initiatives.

Potential disadvantages include junior faculty anxiety with a longer clock, possible perceptions of inequity if some schools have extended the clock while others have not, possibility of retaining poor performing faculty for longer periods of time, and the possibility of a position at Pitt being less desirable for faculty who are being recruited.

The committee also discussed the potential impact of extending the clock on school and university processes, such as the timing of the (now) third-year review process and Type A requests for temporary transfers out of the tenure stream. Finally, the committee members offered their opinions about the likely reaction of faculty in their units to extended tenure clocks.

Given the pros of allowing flexibility in the length of the tenure clock, but also recognizing the possible downsides of opening up the possibility of an extended tenure clock for any specific school or campus, the committee discussed the feasibility of allowing a school or campus to petition the Provost for a change in tenure clock, in much the same way that the School of Medicine did. This "opt-in" recommendation – as opposed to a recommendation that all schools and campuses determine the length of their tenure clocks – seems more consistent with faculty shared governance as it allows the petition to arise from the faculty body and does not force a discussion about possibly extending tenure clocks.

After engaging in these discussions and debates, the ad hoc committee agreed to the following specific recommendations:

1. The University implement a policy that any school/regional campus may petition the Provost to extend its tenure clock (an opt-in policy).
2. Schools or regional campuses, but not departments or sub-school/campus units, may petition the Provost to change their tenure clock.
3. Each school/regional campus should decide the process whereby their faculty will consider whether to propose an extension of their tenure clock, and that process should be explained and justified in the petition to the Provost requesting such an extension. The process should engage faculty opinion in a manner that is consistent with the governance structure of the school/regional campus including, at a minimum, providing all tenured/tenure-stream (T/TS) faculty with an opportunity to vote on the proposed extension.
4. The criteria for a Type A temporary transfer out of the tenure stream should be revised to include extraordinary planned or unexpected research trajectories that will unfold in an unusually lengthy time span, and allow transfers within the initial contract period in rare conditions.
5. If a school/regional campus petition to extend its tenure clock is granted, all current tenure stream faculty should have the option either to have their tenure clocks extended or retain the tenure clock that was operative when they were hired.
6. If a school/regional campus petition to extend its tenure clock is granted, the school/regional campus should work with the Office of the Provost to design the sequence of initial and subsequent pre-tenure contracts and the timing of probationary/pre-tenure review(s).

## ESTABLISHING A UNIVERSITY-LEVEL PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Having developed a set of recommendations about the possible extension of the tenure clock, the ad hoc committee turned its attention to the charge to establish a University-level promotion and tenure review committee. The co-chairs reiterated the Provost's belief that a University-level committee would ensure consistency in – as well as strengthen and elevate – the standards for tenure and promotion across the University. In addition, a University-level committee would serve to make the promotion and tenure process more transparent to the faculty, and be helpful in calibrating standards within the schools and campuses.

As background for the ad hoc committee, data from the Office of Provost about the number and timing of promotion and tenure cases at the University of Pittsburgh, as well as a summary of promotion and tenure activities and deadlines, were shared (Appendix C).

In addition, a benchmarking report (Appendix D) that Assistant Provost Nancy Tannery prepared about University-level promotion and tenure processes at other institutions was made available to the committee members. Finally, Vice Provost Nathan Urban attended a committee meeting to share his

knowledge and insight about the University-level committee at Carnegie Mellon University. Nathan spoke to his experiences as a CMU faculty member, department chair, and interim Provost. He provided an overview of the CMU process, the timing, the workload, as well as his opinion about the effectiveness of the University-level model.

As members reviewed material, the ad hoc committee discussions primarily centered on questions related to the scope of the University-level review committee's work, how the review committee would be constituted, the review process, schedule and workload, and timing of implementation. Each of these is addressed in turn.

**Scope.** The ad hoc committee discussed the types of cases that the review committee would consider, timing and volume of cases, and the potential impact of differences in norms and expectations across disciplines and academic units. The ad hoc committee agreed that a University-level review process should cover tenure and promotion cases for tenure-stream, tenured, and appointment stream faculty. It was suggested that the University-level committee be organized into a set of subcommittees to handle the volume and types of cases. The ad hoc committee unanimously agreed with this suggestion.

In discussing the scope of decisions, the ad hoc committee acknowledged two nuances of our current promotion and tenure processes. The first is that expectations and criteria for tenure and/or promotion are not necessarily uniform across the University of Pittsburgh. Specifically, promotion criteria for appointment stream faculty often differs from promotion criteria for tenure-stream and tenured faculty. In addition, promotion and tenure criteria and expectations for faculty at the regional campuses are similar across the regional campuses, but may differ from criteria and expectations for faculty on the Pittsburgh campus. The ad hoc committee accepted a proposal that separate subcommittees be established to handle cases involving decisions for tenure-stream and tenured faculty versus decisions for appointment stream faculty, and that separate subcommittees be established to handle cases involving decisions for faculty on the regional campuses versus decisions for faculty on the Pittsburgh campus.

The second nuance concerns the School of Medicine (SOM), where a high volume of cases is put forward throughout the year and where the timeline for coming up for tenure is much more fluid than that for the majority of faculty across the rest of the University. There was intense debate and discussion as to whether SOM cases would be included in the University-level review process. Some felt the SOM has sufficient internal reviews and that an extra level of review was unnecessary, but others felt that all cases should be considered by the University-level review committee and that there should not be an exception made for one school. Benchmarking of other institutions revealed more variety in how schools of medicine promotion and tenure cases are treated, as opposed to cases from other academic units within their respective universities (see Appendix D). It was suggested that, at Pitt, a subcommittee of the University-level review committee could review all Health Sciences cases, but others argued that having one subcommittee review the Health Sciences cases and one subcommittee review lower campus cases seems counter to the Provost's goal, lessening the value to the University community at large of a University-level review process. Because the SOM is the only school that has promotion and tenure cases throughout

the year, some members of the ad hoc committee argued that it might be difficult to get faculty to serve on the review committee if they had to convene every month. Based on the discussion and debate, it was then proposed that one subcommittee of the University-level review committee be created to review SOM cases, with discussion of subcommittee membership to be considered separately. A vote was taken, with 8 in favor of a separate SOM subcommittee and 1 opposed. The dissenting vote was based on the argument that handling the SOM cases in a separate subcommittee violates the Provost's goal of transparency in promotion and tenure reviews, and does not promote learning across the University community. However, the majority of the committee felt that a separate SOM subcommittee struck a reasonable balance: it would include the SOM in the University-level review process but allow for flexibility in handling the large volume of cases throughout the year.

The ad hoc committee next discussed whether promotion and tenure cases that have been denied by a dean or campus president should also be reviewed by the University-level review committee. The ad hoc committee agreed that it would be an unnecessarily time-consuming process for this review committee to re-examine cases that have been denied, given current processes at the University. It would also be inconsistent with current University policies and procedures regarding appeals.

In summary, the ad hoc committee recommends:

1. The University-level review committee will review promotion and tenure cases for tenure-stream (TS), tenured (T), and appointment stream (AS) faculty from all schools and regional campuses.
2. The University-level review committee will be organized into a set of subcommittees, with one subcommittee handling T/TS cases for the Pittsburgh campus (excluding SOM cases), a second handling AS promotions for the Pittsburgh campus (excluding SOM cases), a third handling T/TS/AS cases from the regional campuses, and a fourth subcommittee handling all School of Medicine promotion and tenure cases for TS, T, and AS faculty.
3. Collectively, all members of the four subcommittees will be known as the Provost's Advisory Council on Tenure and Promotion.
4. Promotion and tenure cases for TS, T, and AS faculty that have been denied by a dean or campus president will not be reviewed by the University-level promotion and tenure review committee. All other promotion and tenure cases for TS, T, and AS faculty will be reviewed by the University-level review committee.

**Constituting the Review Committee.** The ad hoc committee considered how members would be selected for the University-level review committee, what faculty ranks should be included, and who would chair the committee. After a brief discussion, there was consensus that associate professors, full professors, and AS faculty with relevant seniority should be represented on the appropriate subcommittees. The ad hoc committee then considered how to select the faculty to serve on the subcommittees. There was

general agreement that deans and campus presidents should be able to nominate potential members in accordance with their own faculty governance structures, allowing for the culture of each school and regional campus to be upheld. It was also agreed that the Provost should have discretion in appointing some members to supplement the nominations from the deans and regional campus presidents. The Provost appointees should help ensure disciplinary balance as well as account for the different volume of cases across the schools. The Provost could also ensure that all schools and regional campuses are represented across the set of four subcommittees. The ad hoc committee agreed with these proposals, specifically that the composition of each subcommittee would include both Provost-appointed and dean/president-nominated members, so as to appropriately balance their compositions. This agreement also addresses a recommendation by the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee that the SOM subcommittee includes broad representation.

The ad hoc committee discussed term lengths for subcommittee members. Several members advocated for a 2-year rolling terms to provide some continuity and to take advantage of the experience gained by subcommittee members. Others expressed concern about the time commitment of serving on the University-level review committee and suggested a one-year term. After a brief discussion, the ad hoc committee voted in favor of 2-year rolling terms, with 8 in favor and 1 opposed.

It was proposed that the Vice Provost for Faculty should be the non-voting chair of the University-level review committee to oversee and facilitate the process. The ad hoc committee agreed with this proposal.

In summary, the ad hoc committee recommends:

5. Tenured associate professors, tenured full professors, and mid-to-senior level appointment stream faculty will serve on the University-level review subcommittees, as appropriate for their ranks.
6. Deans and regional campus presidents will nominate faculty to serve on the University-level review committee for Provost consideration. Nominations by deans and regional campus presidents will be developed based on the norms and procedures within the unit. To constitute the University-level review subcommittees, the Provost will select from the nominations and appoint additional faculty to balance disciplinary expertise and representation across schools and campuses, and to account for the differences in volumes of cases across academic units.
7. Subcommittee members will serve on two-year rolling terms.
8. The Vice Provost for Faculty will chair the University-level review committee, known as the Provost's Advisory Council on Tenure and Promotion, and will be a non-voting member. The Vice Provost's role is to oversee and facilitate the review process.

**Process.** The ad hoc committee considered whether and how cases would be presented to the committee, and by whom. In discussing the range of cases that would come for review, members of the

ad hoc committee observed that some cases would likely be straightforward, with no need for additional information, while other cases may spark considerable discussion and raise questions. With respect to these latter cases, the ad hoc committee agreed that it would be important to have representatives from the schools and regional campuses attend the relevant meeting(s) of the review subcommittees. This then generated some discussion about the pros and cons of having deans and regional campus presidents present these particular cases. Pros include making deans and regional campus presidents accountable for their decisions, and ensuring they would be available to the review committee to answer questions and provide nuance and context to the cases. Cons include deans' or regional campus presidents' potential lack of in-depth knowledge that department chairs or others might have about particular cases, and the large time commitment, particularly for the Dietrich School and the School of Medicine, given the volume of their cases. A proposal was made to allow for flexibility in who presents the cases to the subcommittees, specifically, the deans and regional campus presidents will be available to the University-level review committee, but will retain discretion as to who would be the best person to present the case and answer questions. The ad hoc committee voted unanimously (7 in favor, 0 against) to adopt this recommendation.

The ad hoc committee also considered whether the review committee should vote on the cases before them or should issue a full report on each case. It was pointed out that the Distinguished Faculty Selection committee – as an example of an existing University-level faculty review process – does not provide full reports on each candidate but simply conveys their recommendations to the Provost. Since there is a full dossier prepared for each candidate, additional reports are not deemed necessary in the process of recommending faculty for distinguished appointments. After further discussion of the pros and cons of full reports versus conveying votes only, the ad hoc committee voted unanimously, 7 for to 0 against, in favor of having the committee vote on cases, but not generate reports.

In summary, the ad hoc committee recommends:

9. The University-level review committee has the discretion to either decide a case without consultation with representatives of the schools or regional campuses, or request the relevant dean or regional campus president (or their representative) to present the case to the appropriate subcommittee.
10. While deans and regional campus presidents should be available to the University-level review committee, they have discretion in deciding the most appropriate person to present individual cases to the relevant University-level review subcommittee.
11. The University-level review subcommittees will vote on individual cases, indicating whether they agree with the dean's or regional campus president's decision to recommend promotion and/or tenure. The results of the voting will be communicated electronically to the Provost at the conclusion of the subcommittee's deliberations. The review subcommittees will not generate any other reports or documentation.

**Schedule and Workload.** The ad hoc committee discussed the timing of the review subcommittee meetings, and how to handle off-cycle cases. There was general agreement on having set dates each year for the review subcommittees to meet, though the subcommittee reviewing School of Medicine cases may meet more frequently or on a different schedule to accommodate the flow of School of Medicine cases. It was also noted that, in cases involving tenure, there are strict deadlines that must be adhered to in order to ensure decisions are made by the end of the sixth (or ninth) year and that, in cases of denial of tenure, faculty are given adequate notification. With respect to off-cycle cases, many of these are a consequence of the timing of recruiting, particularly for senior hires. To address these issues, the ad hoc committee agreed unanimously with having set meeting times for the review subcommittees. It was also pointed out that our current University-level review process (i.e., the review by Vice Provosts) could be used if a review subcommittee is unable to review the case in a timely manner. This “fallback” process should only be used in rare and extenuating circumstances.

In summary, the ad hoc committee recommends:

12. Each subcommittee hold two separate blocks of meeting times in the Spring term – one in early Spring and one in late Spring – to accommodate the deadlines of the schools and regional campuses, particularly in tenure decision cases. The subcommittee reviewing School of Medicine cases may require different or additional meeting times.
13. In rare cases, there may be a need for a tenure or promotion review that cannot be accommodated by the University-level review subcommittees. In these cases, the current process may be used, in which multiple Vice Provosts review the case and forward a recommendation to the Provost.
14. To ensure transparency and accountability, each University-level review subcommittee and the Vice Provosts who have conducted tenure and promotion reviews will submit a report to the Provost’s Advisory Council on Tenure and Promotion summarizing the number of cases reviewed, and, for each case, the results of the vote and recommendation forwarded to the Provost.

There was also some discussion about anticipated workload. As an example of a similar University-level review committee, the Distinguished Faculty Selection Committee process was briefly described, including the time commitment. It was pointed out that the Distinguished Faculty Selection Committee meets twice a year (usually scheduling 2-hour meetings) to consider a significant number of cases. It was also observed that after gaining some initial experience with this new University-level review committee, all stakeholders would have a better idea of the expected time commitment of serving on this committee. Finally, it was suggested that the Council of Deans discuss this service expectation to increase awareness of the implications of this new process and to ensure equity in service assignments across the faculty.



**Timing of Implementation.** The ad hoc committee discussed the transition to a University-level review committee, and agreed that it makes sense to phase in the new process. Given the manageable volume of promotion cases from tenured associate to full professor (see Appendix C), members agreed that this group of cases could be considered the “pilot test” of the new process. It was also observed that these decisions do not affect individuals’ employment status, which might help ease any angst about being part of the initial year of review by a new University-level review committee. After the pilot test, an assessment of the University-level review process can occur, and adjustments can be made as needed to strengthen the process and ensure it is transparent, fair, consistent, and timely.

Finally, during this transition period to the University-level review committee and process, the ad hoc committee encourages the Council of Deans to simultaneously engage in discussions of promotion and tenure standards and expectations – for tenure-stream, tenured, and appointment stream faculty. These discussions could help inform the work of the future University-level review committee, providing some guidance and clarity to the review subcommittees.

Specifically, the ad hoc committee recommends:

15. The implementation of the University-level promotion and tenure review committee will be phased in, beginning with promotions from (tenured) associate professor to full professor during the 2020-2021 academic year.
16. During the phase-in period, the Office of the Provost, in collaboration with the Senate’s Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee and the Office of University Counsel, review University policies and procedures concerning appeals of tenure and/or promotion decisions to ensure protection of faculty rights, clarity of administrative roles and responsibilities, and alignment of processes.
17. Based on the results of the initial year, a plan for full implementation of the University-level promotion and tenure review committee will be developed. The expectation is that implementation will be completed during the 2021-2022 academic year but some adjustments may be required as experience is gained during 2020-2021.

## APPENDIX A: MEMBERS OF AD HOC COMMITTEE

### **Kathleen Blee, Co-Chair**

Bettye J. and Ralph E. Bailey Dean

Kenneth P. Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences and College of General Studies

### **Laurie J. Kirsch, Co-Chair**

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Development, and Diversity

### **William M. (“Chip”) Carter Jr.**

Professor

School of Law

### **Bruce Childers**

Senior Associate Dean and Professor

School of Computing and Information

### **Abbe De Vallejo**

Associate Professor

School of Medicine

Representative of the Senate’s Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee (TAFC)

### **Anthony Delitto**

Dean

School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

### **Lawrence Feick**

Professor

Katz Graduate School of Business

Interim President (2018-2019), University of Pittsburgh Bradford and Titusville

### **Valerie Kinloch**

Renée and Richard Goldman Dean

School of Education

### **Kirill Kiselyov**

Associate Professor

Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences

Representative of the Senate’s Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee (TAFC)

### **Anne M. Robertson**

Professor

Swanson School of Engineering

### **Ann Thompson**

Vice Dean and Professor

School of Medicine

## APPENDIX B: TENURE CLOCKS

Public Institutions	University/Provost Area	Medical School	Comments
Florida State University	6	6	
Georgia Tech	6		
University of Illinois	6	6	
University of Kansas	6	6	
Ohio State University	6	11 (with clinical responsibilities)	
Penn State University	6	9	
University of Maryland	6	8	
University of Michigan	University-wide maximum of 9 years. Each unit can determine clock within this timeframe.	10	Most units – 6
University of Minnesota	6	6	
University of North Carolina	6	6	
University of Virginia	7	10	
University of Wisconsin	6	6	
Virginia Tech	6	6	

Private Institutions	University/Provost Area	Medical School	Comments
Boston University	7	Tenure is not awarded to faculty at the Boston University School of Medicine	Tenure is not awarded to faculty at the Boston University School of Public Health and the Henry M. Goldman School of Dental Medicine.
Brandeis	7		
Brown	8	Could not find	
Carnegie Mellon	9		
Case Western	6, 7, 8 or 9 Arts & Sciences – 6	9	Each school has its own tenure clock
Columbia	7	Faculty without clinical responsibilities – 8 Clinical scientists who spend at least 20% of time in clinical work – 11	
Cornell University	6	9	Graduate School of Management - 8
Duke	8	Basic science – 8 Clinical – 10	

Emory	Arts & Sciences – 7	9	Each school has its own tenure and promotion policy
Harvard	8*	Basic and social science faculty in medical school – 11 Faculty in clinical and dental medicine are not subject to a tenure clock	*Only professor rank is tenured. Review for promotion to associate professor in year 4.
Johns Hopkins	7	“The word ‘tenure’ is not part of the lexicon of the school of medicine. Newly promoted or appointed full-time professors will normally be given a contract to retirement, following approval by the board of trustees. In exceptional circumstances, individuals whose promotion to professor is unlikely to occur but who have proved to be of tremendous value to the school of medicine can be given a contract ‘to retirement’ at the associate professor level.”	
MIT	8		
New York University	7	10	Dentistry, Nursing – 10 School of Business – 9
Northwestern	6	9	
Penn	7	Clinical faculty - 10	
Princeton	6		
Rice	8		
Rochester	6	7	
Stanford	7	7	
Syracuse University	6		
Tulane	7	7	
University of Chicago	6 or 7	Could not find	
University of Miami	6	8	
University of Southern California	6	Basic scientists – 7 Physician scientists with clinical assignments – 8	
Vanderbilt	7	9	School of Nursing – 9
Washington University	Arts & Sciences – 7	10	Each individual school or college may specify a probationary period not to exceed 10 years

## APPENDIX C: INTERNAL DATA AND PROCESS SUMMARY

FY16-FY19 Data: Number of Promotion and Tenure Actions at University of Pittsburgh

	<b>FY16</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>FY18</b>	<b>FY19 (Only July thru 4/22/19)</b>
Promotion to Associate Professor with Conferral of Tenure	45	55	45	45
Promotion to Full Professor (tenured)	28	46	39	25
Conferral of Tenure (as Associate or Full Professor)	15	10	8	3
Tenured Appointment (as Associate or Full Professor)	19	22	24	21
Probationary Appointment	12	15	9	6
Distinguished Faculty Appointment	13	7	6	0
Endowed Chair/Prof. Appointments	27	21	18	11
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Totals Excluding Distinguished, Endowed, Tenured, and Probationary Appointments</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>73</b>

Promotion and Tenure Caseload by Month and by Unit for FY19

**Promotion and Tenure Caseloads FY19**

<i>Data for July 1, 2018 until April 22, 2019</i>	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	TOTALS
<b>Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure</b>	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	20	2	1			<b>45</b>
<b>Conferral of Tenure (as Associate or Full Professor)</b>	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0			<b>3</b>
<b>Promotion to Full Professor (tenured)</b>	1	4	2	1	2	0	0	1	12	2			<b>25</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>			<b>73</b>

*Note: Numbers do not include tenured or probationary appointments, endowed chair/professorship appointments, or distinguished faculty appointments.*

Totals By Unit	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	TOTALS
<b>Arts and Sciences</b>					<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>			<b>22</b>
<b>Business</b>									<b>1</b>				<b>1</b>
<b>Computing and Information</b>	<b>1</b>							<b>1</b>					<b>2</b>
<b>Education</b>					<b>2</b>								<b>2</b>
<b>Engineering</b>								<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>				<b>10</b>
<b>Law</b>													<b>0</b>
<b>Public and International Affairs</b>							<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>				<b>3</b>
<b>Social Work</b>													<b>0</b>
<b>Bradford and Titusville</b>							<b>4</b>						<b>4</b>
<b>Greensburg</b>													<b>0</b>
<b>Johnstown</b>								<b>6</b>					<b>6</b>

Dental Medicine														0
GSPH				1	1				2	1				5
Medicine	2	2	3		2	2			2					13
Nursing	1	2												3
Pharmacy								1	1					2
SHRS														0

**Promotion and Tenure Actions  
Summary of Activities, Deadlines, and Comments**

Activity	Deadline	Units Affected	Action(s) Involved	Comments
List of expected promotion and tenure cases for current fiscal year submitted to the Office of the Provost	October 15	All units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotions to associate professor with tenure</li> <li>• conferrals of tenure on an associate professor or professor</li> <li>• promotions to full professor</li> </ul>	<p>Each school/campus is required to submit of all promotion and tenure cases that are expected to be submitted for Provost &amp; Chancellor review by Oct. 15.</p> <p>The lists submitted includes promotions to associate professor with tenure (both regular and early tenure reviews), conferrals of tenure, and typically includes promotions to full professor (already tenured), but not every school submits these. The lists do not normally include expected tenured appointments, probationary appointments, distinguished appointments, and endowed appointments.</p> <p>The Office of the Provost reviews the list of names submitted for promotions to associate professor with tenure and conferrals of tenure, to verify which cases are mandatory tenure reviews (i.e. the faculty member must be notified of the tenure decision prior to the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> year in the tenure stream or by 12 months prior to the end of the probationary appointment) or if they are early tenure reviews.</p>

Submission of dossiers to the Office of the Provost	February 1	Provost Area units only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotions to associate professor with tenure</li> <li>• conferrals of tenure on an associate professor or professor</li> </ul>	These actions are due to the Office of the Provost by Feb. 1 to allow for adequate time for review, in order to notify the faculty member of the tenure decision prior to the end of the 6 <sup>th</sup> year in the tenure stream, which is no later than April 30 (for faculty on 8-month contracts).
Submission of dossiers to the Office of the Provost	March 15	Provost Area units only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotions to full professor</li> </ul>	These actions are due to the Office of the Provost by Mar. 15. No deadline to notify faculty, since faculty are already tenured.
Submission of dossiers to the Office of the Provost	60 days prior to effective date of action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health Sciences units</li> <li>• “out of cycle” actions for Provost Area units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotions to associate professor with tenure</li> <li>• conferrals of tenure on an associate professor or professor</li> <li>• promotions to full professor</li> </ul>	These actions are due to the Office of the Provost by 60 days prior to the effective date of the action.
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Units Affected</b>	<b>Action(s) Involved</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Deadline for notification to faculty members of tenure decision (except for physician faculty members in the School of Medicine with clinical responsibilities)	Prior to the end of the 6 <sup>th</sup> year in the tenure stream	All units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotions to associate professor with tenure</li> </ul>	Faculty members (except for physician faculty members in the School of Medicine with clinical responsibilities) must be notified of the tenure decision by the end of the 6 <sup>th</sup> year in the tenure stream
Deadline for notification to faculty members who are physician faculty members in the School of Medicine with clinical responsibilities) of tenure decision	Prior to the end of the 9 <sup>th</sup> year in the tenure stream	School of Medicine only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotions to associate professor with tenure</li> </ul>	Faculty members who are physician faculty members in the School of Medicine with clinical responsibilities must be notified of the tenure decision by the end of the 9 <sup>th</sup> year in the tenure stream



<p>Deadline for notification to faculty members of tenure decision</p>	<p>12 months prior to the end of the probationary appointment</p>	<p>All units</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conferrals of tenure on an associate professor or professor</li> </ul>	<p>Faculty members must be notified of the tenure decision no later than 12 months prior to the end of the probationary appointment.</p> <p>For probationary appointments 3 years in length, the tenure decision would need to be no later than the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year in the tenure stream; for four years in length, no later than the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year in the tenure stream.</p>
--	---	------------------	---	---

## APPENDIX D: BENCHMARKING TENURE PROCESSES

### UNIVERSITY TENURE COMMITTEES

This benchmarking study sought to compare University Tenure Committees at 19 Association of American Universities (AAU) and Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) institutions.

The benchmarking institutions include:

Boston University	University of Maryland
Cornell University	University of Miami
Florida State University	University of Michigan
Georgia Tech	University of Minnesota
University of Illinois	University of North Carolina
University of Kansas	University of Southern California
New York University	University of Virginia
Ohio State University	University of Wisconsin
Penn State University	Virginia Tech
Syracuse University	

Institutional benchmarking occurred across a number of criteria:

- ❖ Number of University Tenure Committees
- ❖ Purpose of the committee
- ❖ Committee composition
- ❖ Committee chair
- ❖ Terms of service
- ❖ Tenure/tenure and promotion
- ❖ Number of cases reviewed/year
- ❖ Medical school separate

### KEY FINDINGS

1. Five of the 19 benchmarked institutions did not have a University Tenure Committee. These institutions were the University of Miami, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, New York University, and the University of Wisconsin Madison. This left 14 institutions for comparison.
2. Committee members are appointed by the Provost at Georgia Tech, University of Maryland and Virginia Tech. Members are representatives from various campus units at Florida State University, Ohio State University, Syracuse University, and University of North Carolina. Five institutions had some University Senate involvement in choosing members, either Senate representatives or Senate appointments -Boston University, Cornell University, University of Kansas, Penn State University and University of Southern California.
3. If specified, most noted the committee members were tenured or senior faculty. Boston University and Virginia Tech specifically noted the ranks of associate or full professors. The

University of Maryland, University of North Carolina and University of Southern California specifically noted their committee members were at the rank of professors. Virginia Tech and Georgia Tech's committees also included deans.

4. Four of the 14 committees are chaired by the Provost -Georgia Tech, University of Kansas, Syracuse University, and Virginia Tech. Committee members are chairs at 5 institutions- Boston University, University of Maryland, Penn State University, University of Illinois and University of North Carolina. A Vice President for Faculty at Florida State University, Vice Provost at Ohio State University and University of Virginia, Dean of the Faculty at Cornell University chaired the committees and the remainder didn't specify a chair.
5. The terms of service were either 2 or 3 years. Five of the 19 designated 2 years, 4 institutions designated 3 years with the remaining 5 institutions not specifying term limits.
6. Thirteen of the 14 benchmarked institutions had University level committees that advised on both promotion and tenure. (University of Maryland has separate committees for tenure and promotion) Cornell University's committee only advised on tenure cases.
7. Five of the benchmarked institutions -Boston University, University of Kansas, University of Maryland, University of North Carolina, and University of Southern California- publicize the number of promotion and tenure cases reviewed during a recent academic year.
  - The University Committee on Promotion and Tenure at University of Kansas reviewed 64, 62 and 70 cases during the last three years.
  - The University of Maryland's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee reviewed 86 cases in 2017.
  - At Boston University and University of Southern California, both committees reviewed approximately 200 cases over the two most recent academic years.
  - 144 dossiers required a vote by University of North Carolina's Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure Committee in 2017.
8. Six medical schools follow a separate tenure procedure. These are Boston University, Cornell University, Penn State University, University of Kansas, University of Maryland and Virginia Tech. Those included in the University's procedures are Florida State University, Ohio State University, University of North Carolina, and the University of Virginia. Georgia State, University of Illinois, Syracuse University and University of Southern California either do not have a medical schools or no specific information was available.

**INFORMATION BY INSTITUTION-AAU PRIVATE****BOSTON UNIVERSITY****Committee**

- 1) The University Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (UAPT) is comprised of 16 Associate or Full Professors selected by the University Provost and the Chair of the Faculty by mutual agreement.
- 2) The normal term of service is two years.
- 3) A committee member is selected to be the chair.
- 4) The UAPT Committee reviews the case and votes.
- 5) The UAPT Committee reviews individual cases submitted by the deans for tenure and/or promotion, as well as initial faculty appointments at the rank of Associate or full Professor, regardless of tenure status. \*\*The UAPT reviews promotions and senior appointments for faculty on the Charles River Campus only.\*\*

**Process**

The UAPT Committee reviews and votes on all tenure and tenure and promotion cases from each school participating in that particular tenure review year. 200 dossiers were reviewed over the two most recent academic years.

All tenure cases are reviewed by the UAPT, Provost and President in the Spring of each academic year. Therefore, all dossiers for these cases must be submitted by the School or College to the Provost's office by February 1, for consideration before the end of that academic year.

All promotions from Associate Professor to full Professor (for both tenured faculty and those with un-modified non-tenure track titles) are reviewed by the UAPT, Provost and President in the winter of each academic year. Therefore, all promotion dossiers for these cases must be submitted by the School or College to the Provost's office by November 15, for consideration before the end of that academic year.

The review of tenure and tenure and promotion cases by the UAPT Committee should be completed by April 15.

The UAPT Committee reviews and votes on all tenure and tenure and promotion cases from each school participating in that particular tenure review year. After the UAPT Committee prepares their report with a recommendation to the Provost for each candidate, it is added to the candidate's dossier.

**Medical School**

The medical school, dental school and public health follow a different procedure

## Relevant Links

Handbook

[www.bu.edu/handbook/appointments-and-promotions/tenure-and-promotion-on-the-charles-river-campus/](http://www.bu.edu/handbook/appointments-and-promotions/tenure-and-promotion-on-the-charles-river-campus/)

Template UAPT Committee report

[www.bu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/instructions/tenureguide/](http://www.bu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/instructions/tenureguide/)

The list of current UAPT Committee members

[www.bu.edu/provost/committees/2018-2019-uapt-membership/](http://www.bu.edu/provost/committees/2018-2019-uapt-membership/)

## CORNELL UNIVERSITY

### Committee

The Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appointments (FACTA) is established to advise the Provost on proposed promotions to tenure, as well as proposed denials of tenure by a dean after a positive recommendation from the department.

The committee will be composed of fifteen tenured faculty members, one elected by the professorial faculty in each college and five nominated by the University Faculty Nominations and Elections Committee and appointed by the Faculty Senate. The five faculty nominated will be selected in such a way as to achieve appropriate balance among the various schools, colleges, tenure-granting centers, disciplines, and job functions (including extension) to make the committee of fifteen representative of the diversity of the faculty of the University with due regard to race, gender and ethnicity. Members will serve for two years. No member of the committee will serve for more than 3 consecutive years. The Dean of the Faculty will be a non-voting, administrative chair of the committee. The chair will strictly refrain from taking part in the committee's decision making. The role of the chair will be limited to facilitating timely decision making and ensuring that the committee adheres to its charge and mandated procedures.

### Process

Four members of the committee chosen at random will read each file. Each member will independently prepare a written evaluation of the case not to exceed one page in length. If all four members are positive with no concerns or reservations, a positive recommendation will be sent to the Provost with copies of the four reviews.

If any one of the four has reservations, each member of the full committee will then write a brief, preliminary evaluation which in no case can exceed one page in length. After these have been circulated, the full committee will meet for discussion and a vote. Each committee member will vote yes or no on the issue of whether the tenure file presents convincing evidence (based on an

assessment of the strength of the candidate as summarized by prior substantive reviews) that the candidate has satisfied the requirements for tenure contained in the legislation or by-laws of the candidate's school or college. The committee's decision, including the individual evaluations, revised on the basis of the discussion as each committee member sees fit, will be sent to the Provost. Committee members must be present in order to cast a vote on a candidate. The committee will make its recommendations within four to six weeks of receiving a file.

All members of the full committee shall have access to all recommendations sent to the Provost. If the Provost rejects the Committee's recommendation, the faculty requests the Provost meet with FACTA to discuss the disposition of the case. This meeting should occur, if possible, prior to Trustee action.

If a dean reaches a preliminary decision to deny tenure to a non-tenured faculty member whose promotion to tenure has been recommended by his or her department, the dean will forward the file, together with an explanation for the preliminary decision to the Provost. If the Provost does not have any concern or reservation about the dean's proposed action, she or he will so inform the college dean. If the Provost does have any concern or reservation, she or he will forward the file to the committee, who will consider it at a meeting of the full committee, following the procedures used by the committee in cases following positive recommendations by the dean.

After receiving the committee's recommendation, the Provost will consult with the dean. The university level Appeal Procedure shall not commence until the dean's decision is final, and is not supplanted in any way by FACTA consideration.

FACTA handles cases four times a year, approximately mid-August, mid-October, late November, and mid-February. Dossiers are to the Office of the Provost. After they are "FACTA Ready" they are forwarded to the Office of the Dean of Faculty. That office is in charge of distributing the dossiers to the committee for review.

## **Medical School**

The medical school follows a different procedure

## **Relevant Links**

Handbook

<http://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/the-new-faculty-handbook/2-faculty-senate/2-2-standing-committees/14685-2/>

The list of current Committee members

<http://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/committees/standing-senate-committees/facta-current/>

## **SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY**

### **Committee**

The Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Advisory Committee) is a University-level review and advisory committee established to facilitate equivalent paths for the promotion and tenure process from the schools and colleges through the provost and to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.

The Advisory Committee includes representatives from twelve electorates with one representative from ten of the eleven academic schools and colleges. The College of Arts and Sciences has two representatives—one from humanities and one from the sciences. Each school and college elects a representative(s) who will be eligible to be called upon by the provost to review individual cases. Each representative serves a period of two years.

The Advisory Committee is chaired by the provost and includes the vice president for research (or another full professor designee of the provost) and the associate provost for faculty affairs, the latter of whom serves as convener of the Advisory Committee.

## **Process**

The Advisory Committee reads all candidate promotion and tenure files designated by the Office of Academic Affairs to contain substantive disagreements between any layers of recommendation and those files that have the strong possibility of a negative determination. The Advisory Committee's members engage in timely consultation with the provost, offer an advisory vote, but do not issue a formal report or consider appeals.

As needed, the associate provost for faculty affairs will convene seven members from the pool of twelve elected Advisory Committee members to review individual cases. Those seven members will be selected based on disciplinary closeness with that of the faculty member whose case is under review, but will not be a person who has had any prior role in the tenure or promotion review or recommendation relating to that particular case within a department, school, or college.

## **Relevant Links**

Handbook

<http://provost.syr.edu/about/provosts-advisory-committee-on-promotion-and-tenure/>

[Committee members](#)

<http://provost.syr.edu/about/provosts-advisory-committee-on-promotion-and-tenure/advisory-committee-structure-and-members/>

[provost.syr.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/AY17-18-PT-Provosts-Advisory-Committee-Notice-for-Election\\_A.pdf](http://provost.syr.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/AY17-18-PT-Provosts-Advisory-Committee-Notice-for-Election_A.pdf)

## UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

### Committee

University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (UCAPT)

- 1) UCAPT members are designated by the Provost after consultation with the Academic Senate leadership, on the basis of a record of distinguished scholarly or creative achievement and experience in evaluating dossiers, with consideration for the intellectual, disciplinary, and demographic diversity of the committee.
- 2) UCAPT generally consists of at least six panels of five to eight faculty members in related disciplinary areas.
- 3) UCAPT members are a rotating group of outstanding scholars, educators, and creative artists, diverse by field, intellectual approach, ethnicity, and gender. UCAPT membership has included colleagues whose achievements have been recognized by the Nobel Prize, University Professorships, Distinguished Professorships, National Academy memberships, and other marks of distinction.
- 4) Committee members hold the rank of full professor and have previous experience on school or division faculty promotion committees.
- 5) UCAPT also uses ad hoc members as needed to evaluate dossiers properly.
- 6) Individuals shall not be appointed to panels deliberating on files prepared by the specific units in which they serve.
- 7) At the end of each academic year, the University makes public the names of UCAPT members from the past two years.

### Process

For each dossier, written evaluations by individual UCAPT panel members, and notes on the panel's deliberation and recommendations, are reviewed by the Provost and are available to the President.

UCAPT seeks to ensure that there is consistency in standards across units, that candidates' performance meets the standards of peer institutions, and that the quality of a school's faculty progresses over time.

In addition to reviewing tenure dossiers, promotions for tenured faculty, and appointments at the associate professor or professor level, UCAPT also reviews candidates for Clinical Scholar and similar designations

### Relevant Links

[UCAPT Manual](#)

[policy.usc.edu/files/2017/04/170420\\_UCAPT-Manual-2017.pdf](http://policy.usc.edu/files/2017/04/170420_UCAPT-Manual-2017.pdf)

Includes sample evaluation form\*\*



Committee members

<https://www.provost.usc.edu/ucapt/>

## **INFORMATION BY INSTITUTION-AAU PUBLIC**

### **OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

#### **Committee**

The Provost's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee is appointed during the summer. The committee consists of nine faculty members from different colleges, Arts and Sciences divisions, or University Libraries. Faculty members serve a three-year term with a third of the committee cycling off in a typical year. The vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources serves as the non-voting convener of the committee.

#### **Process**

The Provost's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee reviews cases when:

- there is concern regarding the appropriateness of lower level recommendations
- there are unclear or inconsistent recommendations from the previous levels of review
- all previous recommendations are negative
- the candidates are from colleges without units and the University Libraries

The committee deliberates on each case and votes by secret ballot on a recommendation to the executive vice president and provost.

The voting options are:

- Strongly recommend approval of proposed action
- Weakly recommend approval of proposed action
- Weakly recommend disapproval of proposed action
- Strongly recommend disapproval of proposed action

The vice provost for academic policy and faculty prepares a written report of the committee's assessment and vote for inclusion in the dossier.

### **Medical School**

The medical school follows the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

### **Relevant Links**

Handbook

<https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/handbooks/policies-and-procedures/HB3.pdf>

## **PENN STATE UNIVERSITY**

### **Committee**

The University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall consist of eleven members. Seven of these members shall be elected by the Senate from a slate of nominees prepared by the Committee on Committees and Rules with provisions for nominations from the Senate floor. The election procedures as devised by the Senate shall be such that at least two members of the committee shall be from colleges other than University Park. The remaining four members of the committee shall be appointed by the President of the University. All tenured professors, librarians, and other faculty of equivalent rank holding full-time standing appointments are eligible for election by the Senate or for appointment by the President with the following exclusions: the President's immediate staff, the Executive Vice President and Provost's immediate staff, persons holding affiliate academic appointments, and deans.

The President shall appoint the chair of the committee from among the seven elected and the four appointed committee members. All members of the committee shall serve for two-year terms, staggered to provide continuity to the committee's deliberations. No person may serve more than two successive terms, and, after serving two successive terms, no person may be appointed or elected to the committee for the following two year (one-term) period.

No member of the committee may serve concurrently on the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure and/or the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

### **Process**

The University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall review those recommendations for promotion and tenure that have been received from the deans. The Committee shall consider peer review evaluations at the department, campus, college, and University Libraries levels, in light of University criteria, as well as the quality of documentation, equity, and procedural fairness. It shall forward its recommendations to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

On recommendation of the Executive Vice President and Provost, the President of the University may authorize the award of tenure or promotion in rank on behalf of the University, except that promotion to the rank of assistant professor may be made by the dean without review at the University level. Faculty members shall be notified in writing of tenure and positive promotion decisions by the President (see Section IV.13 C).

Each dean shall also forward through the Executive Vice President and Provost to the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee a summary of the general processes followed, the number of recommendations reviewed, and a summary of instances of differences in judgment. The University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee may also request from a dean such other information about particular cases that is deemed necessary to perform its function.

### **Medical School**

The medical school follows a different procedure

### **Relevant Links**

Handbook

<https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ac23>

Committee members

<https://www.vpfa.psu.edu/files/2018/10/2018-19-Promotion-and-Tenure-Committee-Updated-10.25.18-217cdum.pdf>

## **UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA CHAMPAIGN**

### **Committee**

The [Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure](#) charge is to act in an advisory capacity to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost in matters of promotion and tenure for members of the faculty. The committee is expected to consider policy questions, as well as the actual recommendations for promotion and tenure appointments.

### **Process**

The Provost will meet with the committee early in the spring semester in a preliminary session to discuss various matters pertaining to promotion recommendations and to answer any questions that the committee may have, particularly the new members. Vice Provost serves as staff support. The majority of the committee's work is done during the spring semester and normally involves five or six meetings to review recommendations received at the campus level. It may be necessary

for a subgroup of the committee to serve on special ad hoc committees to review materials received in response to a faculty member's appeal of the decision made in his/her case. This could involve one or possibly two meetings as late as June.

### [Campus Committee on Off-Cycle Promotion and Tenure](#)

This committee reviews tenure dossiers of candidates that units are considering for tenured faculty positions or faculty that units would like to tenure/promote off-cycle (for retention purposes for example). The review is performed entirely online. VP serves as staff support.

### **Relevant Links**

Committee members and charge

[provost.illinois.edu/files/2015/08/Campus-Promotion-and-Tenure-Charge-AY-2017-18.pdf](http://provost.illinois.edu/files/2015/08/Campus-Promotion-and-Tenure-Charge-AY-2017-18.pdf)

[provost.illinois.edu/files/2015/08/Off-Cycle-Promotion-and-Tenure-Charge-AY-2017-18.pdf](http://provost.illinois.edu/files/2015/08/Off-Cycle-Promotion-and-Tenure-Charge-AY-2017-18.pdf)

## **UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS**

### **Committee**

University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT) is composed of

- (1) the Provost, who shall serve as chair and who shall not vote;
- (2) one member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee selected by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee; and
- (3) nine members of the faculty who serve overlapping three year terms. The nine members of the faculty shall be selected by the Chancellor, who shall fill vacancies each year from a list of nominees prepared by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, which may not exceed twice the number of vacancies. No Dean, Assistant, Associate or Vice Dean, or department chair shall serve as faculty members of the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

It doesn't specifically state the rank of the faculty but all of the members on the current UCPT are Associate or Professor ranks.

### **Process**

UCPT members participate in an organizational meeting at the beginning of the fall semester. Members sign a document prior to the review period acknowledging their commitment to maintaining the confidentiality of all promotion and tenure materials and discussions.

During the fall semester, UCPT members also participate in an informational meeting during which each dean (or dean's designate) presents unit criteria for promotion and tenure and answers questions from UCPT about those criteria. Only deans from units with candidates for promotion and tenure that academic year attend this meeting.

UCPT members who perceive a conflict of interest in evaluating a candidate will recuse themselves from that candidate's review. If a candidate for promotion and/or tenure in a given academic year believes that a conflict of interest exists with a member of UCPT, the candidate may petition to have that member recuse himself or herself from consideration of the candidate's application

In conducting university level review, UCPT undertakes its own review of a candidate's record and makes its own recommendations concerning the award of tenure or promotion in rank. The UCPT neither affirms nor reverses recommendations resulting from initial and intermediate review, which remain part of the record that will be forwarded to the Chancellor for final decision.

UCPT meets in early February to discuss candidates and to provide a preliminary vote on their promotion and tenure recommendations. Members are required to vote on the recommendations for all candidates with whom they do not have a conflict of interest. A two-thirds majority is required to support a recommendation for promotion and tenure

The UCPT can request additional information from the dean through the Provost.

Final review and discussion are late February.

### **Number of tenure and promotions**

2018- 64 and 88 medical campus

2017- 62 and 77 medical campus

2016- 70 and 66 medical campus

### **Medical School**

The medical school follows a different procedure

### **Relevant Links**

Handbook

<http://policy.ku.edu/governance/FSRR#ArticleVI>

<http://policy.ku.edu/sites/policy.ku.edu/files/UCPT-standards-and-procedures.pdf>

## **UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA**

### **Committee**

Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure

- 1) Composed of twelve members of the faculty holding permanent tenure at the rank of professor.
- 2) Four members hold primary appointments within the College of Arts and Sciences, four hold primary appointments in the School of Medicine, and four hold primary appointments within professional schools other than the School of Medicine.
- 3) Members are elected by the voting faculty at large for three-year terms. Terms are staggered so that at least one term from each of the three constituencies expires each year. Elected members of the Advisory Committee, the Faculty Executive Committee, the Faculty Hearings Committee, and the Faculty Grievance Committee are not eligible to serve on the committee.

The committee is advisory to the provost in any faculty personnel matter deemed important by the provost or the committee, and particularly with respect to:

1. appointments, reappointments, and promotions that have the effect of conferring permanent tenure;
2. promotions to a higher rank of persons holding permanent tenure at the rank of associate professor or assistant professor;
3. appointments to distinguished professorships that are not restricted by the terms of the endowment to a particular school or department.
4. Review of school and departmental statements of criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure.

### **Process**

The committee holds regular meetings once each month throughout the calendar year. 144 dossiers were reviewed in 2017.

### **Medical School**

The medical school follows the University procedures

### **Relevant Links**

<https://facultygov.unc.edu/faculty-code/article-4/#heading-5>

Committee reports

<https://facultygov.unc.edu/committees/elected-committees/appointments-promotions-tenure-committee/>

## **UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND**

### **Committee**

A Third-level Review Committee shall be established in the following manner: The Provost shall appoint nine faculty members holding the rank of Professor, one from each of the eight large colleges (Agriculture and Natural Resources; Arts and Humanities; Behavioral and Social Sciences; Business; Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences; Education; Engineering; School of Public Health) and one from among the four small colleges (Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Information Studies; Journalism; Public Policy). Since this committee shall make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's high standards for tenure and/or promotion have been met, members of this committee shall have a track record of outstanding academic judgment along with sufficient intellectual breadth and depth to be capable of comparing and judging candidates from varied disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and professional backgrounds. The Provost should endeavor to ensure that the committee is diverse. No small college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once in every three terms. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from the Deans of the Colleges and Schools, from the Senate Executive Committee, and from the faculty at large. No one serving in a full-time administrative position may serve as a voting member of the committee. The Provost shall be a non-voting ex-officio member. A committee member who is entitled to vote in a lower-level review of a candidate shall not be present for the discussion of that candidate and shall not vote on that candidate. Appointments to the third-level review committee from the eight large colleges shall be for three years while the appointment from one of the four small colleges shall be for two years, with the terms staggered so that approximately one-third of the committee is replaced each year. No one may serve two consecutive terms. The third-level review committee shall elect its own Chair and alternate Chair. The committee members must maintain absolute confidentiality in their consideration of cases. Outside of the committee meetings, members of the third-level review committee shall not discuss specific cases with anyone who is not a member of the third-level review committee. The membership of the committee shall be made public at the time of the committee's appointment. Every member of the campus community must respect the integrity of the appointment, tenure and promotion process and must refrain from attempting to discuss cases with committee members or to lobby them in any way.

### **Process**

When questions arise regarding the recommendations from either the first- or second-level reviews or the contents of the dossier, the third-level committee shall provide the opportunity for the first-level unit administrator, the spokesperson for the first-level faculty review committee, the Dean of the college, and the Chair of the second-level review committee to meet with the third-

level committee to discuss their recommendations; the committee shall provide them with a written list of the committee's general concerns about the candidate's case prior to the meeting. The third-level review committee may also request additional information from the first and second levels of review.

The committee shall promptly transmit its recommendation and a written justification through the Provost to the President, along with all materials provided from the lower levels of review. The Provost and the President shall confer about the case, and the Provost shall transmit his or her recommendation and a written justification to the President. If the Provost's recommendation differs from that of the third-level committee or from that of the Dean, the Provost will meet with the committee and/or the Dean to discuss the review. After the President has made a decision, a report on the decisions reached at the third level of review shall be provided to the second-level administrator and faculty committee Chair, the first-level administrator and faculty Chair, and to the candidate.

The Third-level Review Committee and the Provost shall conduct an end-of-the-year review of appointment, promotion, and tenure. The Committee shall write a public Annual report, the purpose of which includes improving the understanding of faculty members and of academic units about appointments, promotion, and tenure. The report should include any recommendations for improvements in policy, procedures, or the carrying out of reviews of candidates. The Provost shall write a public report annually giving statistical information on the appointment, promotion, and tenure cases considered during the academic year.

### **Number of tenure and promotions 2017**

Each year, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs presents a report of the details of the APT Committee's work to the Provost and the Senate. In 2017, the committee reviewed 86 promotion and tenure cases.

### **Medical School**

The medical school seems to follow a different procedure that does not go through the Provost

### **Relevant Links**

<https://president.umd.edu/sites/president.umd.edu/files/documents/policies/II-100A.pdf>

### **Committee reports**

<https://pdc-svpaap1.umd.edu/policies/documents/APTReport2018.pdf>

## **UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA**



The Provost's Promotion and Tenure Committee is chaired by a Vice Provost. The Provost's Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews the files of promotion or a tenure candidate referred to the committee by the provost and discusses its review of cases with the provost.

Affirmative recommendations by the deans for promotion or tenure must be supported by adequate investigation, review, and written documentation. All affirmative recommendations will be reviewed with care in the provost's office. Those thought to warrant further discussion, whether on process or on substantive grounds, will be sent to the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Committee for further consideration and advice to the provost.

The provost will review all negative recommendations on promotion or tenure on process and substantive grounds. In addition, candidates may submit a written appeal within 30 days of being notified of the school's decision. The provost may refer such appeals to the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Committee for its consideration and advice.

## **Medical School**

The medical school follows the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

## **Relevant Links**

Handbook

<https://uvapolicy.virginia.edu/policy/PROV-017>

## **INFORMATION BY INSTITUTION-ACC**

### **FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY**

#### **Committee**

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee is composed of tenured faculty members only, with at least one elected representative from each college (the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement serves as ex officio member and chair). Deans are not eligible for election to the University Committee

#### **Process**

Committee members at each level will hold closed meetings during which they may ask questions for clarification about the record of a candidate as presented in the candidates' file but may not

discuss matters not contained in the file. The University procedures provide that there will be no advocacy (or disadvocacy) of any candidate and that only the record as presented in the file will be considered.

All binders (dossiers) are forwarded with the secret ballot votes of each individual committee member at each level to the next level committee, and ultimately to the President for a final decision

Timeline example-

- September 14, 2018 Send the name(s) of the college representative(s) who will serve on the University Promotion & Tenure Committee
- October 12, 2018 Colleges send a summary of actions (i.e., number of eBinders being submitted; number of withdrawals from consideration). Include each candidate's name, department, and category for consideration (promotion to associate professor only, promotion to associate professor and tenure, promotion to professor only, promotion to professor and tenure, and tenure only).
- October 19, 2018 Promotion & Tenure eBinders due to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement
- Mid October – 2018 Organizational meeting of the University Promotion & Tenure Committee
- November/December 2018 University Promotion & Tenure Committee will review binders
- December 10, 2018 University Promotion & Tenure Committee meeting to recommend promotion and tenure
- December – 2018 Advice from the University Promotion & Tenure Committee will be forwarded to the Provost and President for final action; candidates will be informed in writing of the Committee's advice (with copy to the department chair and dean)

The committee submits a narrative summary of its meeting.

**Example:**

**Summary of Meeting** The \_\_\_\_\_ Promotion and Tenure committee reviewed \_\_\_\_\_ for promotion (and/or tenure). A majority of the committee members expressed that the candidate's binder provided evidence that the candidate should/should not be granted promotion and/or tenure. Comments were made regarding the candidate's strength/weakness in the area of \_\_\_\_, as evidenced by \_\_\_\_\_.

**Medical School**

The medical school follows the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

## Relevant Links

Handbook

[fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/Promotion%20%26%20Tenure/PTM\\_emo2018.pdf](http://fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/Promotion%20%26%20Tenure/PTM_emo2018.pdf)

## GEORGIA TECH

### Committee

- 1) The Institute Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of the deans and senior faculty from the colleges. Except for the inclusion of the deans, which is specified in the Faculty Handbook, the Provost determines the composition of the committee.
- 2) It currently includes 14 members: six deans; one additional faculty member each from Architecture, Computing, Ivan Allen, and Scheller; and two additional faculty members each from Engineering and Sciences. The deans select the additional faculty to represent their colleges.
- 3) The Provost currently chairs the meetings of this committee and determines the order of cases and structure of discussion.
- 4) Anyone with a conflict of interest regarding a specific case is recused prior to and during the discussion and vote on that case.

### Process

The deans explain the appropriate criteria for the various fields represented and present the cases from their colleges.

The Provost may assign a member of the committee from outside the candidate's college to speak after the home dean. This person is referred to as the second speaker and speaks to whether the materials in the file support the recommended decision and whether the decision is consistent with the Institute's criteria.

When the vote is taken, anyone who voted at a previous level (either school or college) must abstain. Voting is by anonymous, electronic ballot. However, the vote totals are recorded on the coversheet.

All discussions and votes are confidential. All discussion about the candidates should be limited to the professional realm. There should be no discussion about personal matters, including, but not limited to, family and medical issues.

No minutes are taken of the meetings and the Provost's Advisory Committee does not write a letter for the file. However, the committee's votes are recorded on the coversheets.

The committee reviews promotion, tenure, and critical review cases. It also votes by electronic ballot on tenure-on-hire cases in a process.

## Relevant Links

Handbook

[http://www.faculty.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/images/rpt\\_guidance\\_10.14.17.pdf](http://www.faculty.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/images/rpt_guidance_10.14.17.pdf)

<https://www.news.gatech.edu/2018/03/15/faculty-members-earn-promotions-and-tenure-2017-2018>

## VIRGINIA TECH

### Committee

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed and chaired by the provost. The committee reviews the qualifications of the candidates recommended for promotion or tenure by each college dean. It also reviews those cases in which the dean does not concur with the college committee's positive recommendation.

The university committee consists of the college deans and tenured faculty members of the rank of associate professor or higher, one from each college and one faculty member-at-large. The selection of the faculty members should be based on demonstrated professional excellence.

All members of the committee hold voting privileges. Regardless of the size of the committee, the faculty must always have at least a majority of the potential votes. Consistent with the principle that participants at all levels of the promotion and tenure review process vote only once on an individual case, deans do not vote on cases from their own college. Similarly, faculty members serving on the university committee do not vote on any case they previously voted on, should this circumstance occur.

Some significant element of faculty choice should be part of the selection procedure; therefore, each college faculty, by means deemed suitable by them, nominates two faculty members for each vacancy, from which the provost selects one. The Faculty Senate nominates two faculty members for the at-large appointment, from which the provost selects one.

The faculty members of the committee hold rotating terms of three years.

The provost chairs the committee, but does not hold voting privileges.

### Process

All voting within the committee should be by written secret ballot; the division of any ballot must remain confidential.

The committee makes a recommendation on each candidate to the provost. The provost makes recommendations to the president, informing the committee of those recommendations, including the basis for any non-concurrence with committee recommendations. The provost informs the president of any variation between the provost's recommendations and those of the committee.

## **Medical School**

The medical school follows a different procedure

## **Relevant Links**

Handbook

[https://www.provost.vt.edu/who\\_we\\_are/faculty\\_affairs/faculty\\_handbook/chapter03.html.html#3.4.4.3](https://www.provost.vt.edu/who_we_are/faculty_affairs/faculty_handbook/chapter03.html.html#3.4.4.3)

[https://vtnews.vt.edu/articles/2018/06/unirel\\_promotions2018.html](https://vtnews.vt.edu/articles/2018/06/unirel_promotions2018.html)