

Tenure & Promotion Policy



Revised: May 19, 2010

Entities Affected by this Policy

All University Faculty excluding the College of Medicine

Issuing Office

Office of the Provost

Contents

I. Introduction	2
II. The Pre-Tenure Period	3
A. Appointments	4
1. Tenure-track Faculty Members	4
2. Appointment Letters	4
3. Faculty Members Engaged in Interdisciplinary Work	4
B. Length of the Pre-tenure Period	4
C. Hiring with Tenure	4
D. Prior Years of Service	5
E. Extension of the Pre-Tenure Period	5
F. Reviews during the Pre-Tenure Period	6
1. The Annual Performance Review	6
a) Interdisciplinary Faculty	6
2. The Mid-term Review	6
a) Interdisciplinary Candidates	7
3. The Mid-term Review Report Findings	7
III. The Tenure Review	7
A. Summary	7
B. Criteria of Evaluation for Tenure	8
1. Evidence of achievement in Teaching may include:	8
2. Evidence of achievement in Research may include:	9
3. Evidence of achievement in Service may include:	9

C.	Withdrawal from the Tenure Track _____	9
IV.	<i>The Promotion Review</i> _____	10
V.	<i>Review Committees and External Reviewers</i> _____	10
A.	Review Committees _____	10
B.	External Reviewers _____	11
1.	Overview _____	11
2.	Selection Process _____	12
3.	Selection Criteria for External Reviewers _____	12
C.	Provost Advisory Committee _____	13
VI.	<i>Reports</i> _____	13
VII.	<i>Termination of Tenured Faculty</i> _____	14
VIII.	<i>University and Academic Unit Policies</i> _____	14
IX.	<i>Confidentiality</i> _____	14
X.	<i>Reporting to the Board of Trustees</i> _____	15
XI.	<i>Appendix</i> _____	15
A.	Tenure/Promotion Dossier Organization to be submitted to the Office of the Provost _____	15
XII.	<i>Calendars</i>	16

I. Introduction

The Drexel University Tenure and Promotion Policy (the “Policy”) sets forth the University’s policies and procedures for tenure and the promotion of tenure-track and tenured faculty for all colleges and schools except the College of Medicine. Its purpose is to achieve high academic standards and to ensure a fair and comprehensive review of candidates for tenure and/or promotion.

The University recognizes that the expectations of various fields as represented by individual academic units vary considerably. The processes of tenure and promotion review will follow written policies and procedures in alignment with the respective disciplinary criteria and standards of respective academic units, provided these do not conflict with University-wide standards or this Policy.

The University intends to provide transparency to the process of evaluating tenure-track faculty members and the criteria for achieving tenure and/or promotion. However, all information associated with tenure and/or promotion review must be regarded as strictly confidential by any and all persons involved in reviews at any stage and in any capacity.

Tenure is a right granted by the University to a faculty member of continuing employment upon the successful completion of the pre-tenure period. Tenure is granted to a faculty member who is independently expert in his or her field(s) and is judged to meet appropriate national/international standards of excellence with the belief that tenure will further promote the professional development of the faculty member and raise the stature of the academic unit and the University. The judgment to grant tenure is based on a comprehensive review of the candidate's body of work. The review encompasses the candidate's research, scholarship and/or creative work (referred to collectively as "research"), teaching activities, and service to the University and to the academic field(s). Each tenure case is evaluated according to discipline-specific and professionally acknowledged standards of excellence.

Promotion to the next higher academic rank is evaluated using guidelines and standards similar to those used for tenure. Normally, consideration for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor occurs at the time of consideration for tenure. Criteria for promotion include a distinguished and continuing record of research, teaching, and service at a high level commensurate with the respective rank at highly regarded institutions. Professors at Drexel University are expected to have achieved appropriate national/international prominence within their field or discipline, demonstrated strong mentorship of students, participated in interdisciplinary activities, where possible, and provided vigorous leadership in significant University and professional service activities.

Drexel University's Board of Trustees, upon the recommendation of the President in consultation with the Provost, has the sole authority to grant tenure to a faculty member. Attainment of tenure can only occur through specific action by the Board of Trustees. The University President, in consultation with the Provost, has the sole authority to promote a faculty member.

Interdisciplinary research integrates elements of two or more traditional disciplines. This document provides that tenure and promotion cases of faculty engaged in interdisciplinary research that involve more than one department (or equivalent) or college (or equivalent) be evaluated appropriately by a broader community of peers.

II. The Pre-Tenure Period

A tenure-track faculty member should understand the criteria and procedures for tenure review from the outset of his or her appointment and take advantage of faculty development activities provided during the pre-tenure period. Each candidate for tenure will consult with and be advised by the Department Head (or equivalent) of his/her academic unit regarding the areas of performance that will be examined, other factors that have a material bearing on the tenure decision, the standards of performance that must be met, and the primary criteria that the academic unit uses in reaching a decision about the candidate's performance.

A. Appointments

1. Tenure-track Faculty Members

Tenure-track faculty members are appointed with appointment letters specifying terms up to three years with the expectation for renewal through the pre-tenure period upon successful evaluation at the mid-term review (see Section II-7b).

2. Appointment Letters

All appointment letters shall state the year in which the tenure review is scheduled.

3. Faculty Members Engaged in Interdisciplinary Work

Faculty members engaged in interdisciplinary work require a formal agreement between collaborating departments, schools, and/or colleges. If the appointment letter defines such expected interdisciplinary work, discussions should be arranged as early as possible with the dean (or equivalent) and/or department head of the participating departments, colleges, or schools as to the expectations for evaluation and independent accomplishment in research as well as in teaching and service. A faculty member interested in interdisciplinary work after their initial appointment must first obtain the permission of their home department and then formulate a formal written agreement defining the faculty member's expected interdisciplinary work and expectations for evaluation and independent accomplishment in research as well as in teaching and service.

B. Length of the Pre-tenure Period

The pre-tenure period is not to exceed six (6) years in a tenure-track position at the University. However, extensions may be granted during the pre-tenure period for exceptional circumstances as discussed in Section II-6.

Faculty appointments are typically effective September 1st. If an initial faculty appointment begins before March 1st, the pre-tenure period begins on the prior September 1st. If an initial faculty appointment begins on or after March 1st, the pre-tenure period begins on the subsequent September 1st.

C. Hiring with Tenure

The University may elect to waive the pre-tenure period and appoint with tenure a well-established candidate who may be tenured at a highly-ranked academic institution or come from a non-academic position but present equivalently strong credentials to the University. Such a candidate will be recognized by the University and the hiring unit as outstanding in his/her discipline and will be determined to have met or exceeded the University's standards for tenure. In order to determine standing, prior to the award of tenure, such candidates will be reviewed by a duly constituted tenure review committee of the tenured faculty of the department (or equivalent) to which the candidate is appointed, by the dean (or equivalent) of the college/school, and by the Provost. The tenure review

committee will review the complete dossier of the candidate, equivalent to that prepared for internal candidates, including external letters of reference from recognized experts. The granting of tenure will be based on the evaluations and recommendations of the tenure review committee, the department, college, Dean, Provost and President and ultimately, the approval by the Board of Trustees

D. Prior Years of Service

New candidates starting in tenure-track position may have accumulated prior years of service in a tenure-track or tenured position at another academic institution. At the time of their appointment, candidates may request in writing either (a) credit for their prior years of service or (b) a waiver of their prior years of service. Such requests must be approved by the respective Dean (or equivalent) and the Provost. If granted, such credit or waiver will be reflected in the candidate's appointment letter through the tenure review date. Once signed by the candidate, the waiver or credit becomes binding on the candidate and cannot be revised, unless extension(s) are granted (see Section II-6). Credit for prior years of service cannot exceed three (3) years. If a candidate makes no written request the University will consider any and all prior years of service to be waived.

E. Extension of the Pre-Tenure Period

Individual extensions of the pre-tenure period for up to three (3) years total may be granted to candidates in the event of exceptional circumstances that would materially interfere with the candidate's performance during the pre-tenure period. Such circumstances may include, but are not limited to, serious illness, family emergency, or extraordinary teaching or administrative assignments. In addition, a one-year extension of the pre-tenure period is automatically available within one (1) year after each live birth or after each adoption, for any candidate who will be the primary caregiver.

Candidates must submit their requests for extensions in writing to the Provost prior to the date on which the candidate's tenure dossier is required to be submitted for review by the department (or equivalent). If an extension request is approved by the Provost, a written response from the Provost will be sent to the candidate, the candidate's department head and dean with a revised appointment and tenure review schedule.

A candidate who receives an extension but later wishes to be considered early for tenure would follow the same procedures to apply for early for tenure review.

In cases of pre-tenure period extensions, there is no guarantee that tenure will ultimately be granted. Conversely, additional pre-tenure years shall not prejudice the candidate's tenure case, nor shall any review committee alter criteria or increase expectations beyond that required of candidates that have received no extensions and are being evaluated within the standard pre-tenure period.

F. Reviews during the Pre-Tenure Period

1. The Annual Performance Review

Every faculty member, including candidates for tenure, must undergo an annual performance review conducted by his/her Department Head (or equivalent). Each College (or equivalent) will have written procedures regarding the nature and scope of this annual performance review, subject to the policies and procedures of the Office of Human Resources that administers the review process. The candidate may express his or her comments to the evaluating Department Head (or equivalent) at the conference and is also permitted to respond to the annual performance review in writing. A written response to the annual performance review becomes a part of the personnel record of the candidate.

a) *Interdisciplinary Faculty*

For interdisciplinary faculty, the Department Head (or equivalent) of the home department will consult with the respective Department Head(s) (or equivalent) of the collaborating academic unit(s) regarding the progress of the candidate in his/her interdisciplinary work and the result of the consultation will be included in the written evaluation.

2. The Mid-term Review

Tenure-track faculty members are required to undergo a formal mid-term review in the year specified by the initial appointment letter or extension letter, in addition to the annual performance review during that year. The purpose of the mid-term review is formative and an assessment of the candidate's prospects for achieving tenure. In some cases, it provides recommendations for actions that may be expected to lead to a successful future outcome and in others, it may justify a terminal contract.

For those tenure-track faculty whose year of tenure consideration is in the sixth year, the mid-term review occurs during the third year of service. For tenure-track faculty with years of credit, the midterm review will occur during the second year of service.

The mid-term review employs the same categories and criteria of evaluation as the tenure review and is conducted with appropriate rigor. The process is managed by the Department Head (or equivalent) in consultation with the tenure and promotion review committee of the academic unit. Specific midterm review procedures and calendar dates may differ from unit to unit according to the written policy of the respective academic unit but must conclude within the University timeframe designated in the Mid-term Review Calendar.

Normally, the promotion and tenure committee of an academic unit performs the mid-term review according to the written policy of the academic unit. The mid-term review is typically an internal process, using internal reviewers from within the academic unit. In the event external reviewers are desired, at the discretion of the promotion and tenure committee, a maximum of two reviewers will be consulted. The candidate will be allowed to propose no more than five (5) reviewers and at least one (1) reviewer from the candidate's list will be consulted. The promotion and tenure committee will prepare a Mid-Term Review Report and submit it to the Department Head (or equivalent). The Department

Head (or equivalent) prepares the Department Head Mid-Term Review Report and then forwards it along with the Mid-Term Review Report to the candidate. The candidate may respond to the Department Head regarding either report in writing within fourteen (14) days of receipt. The Mid-Term Review Report, the Department Head Mid-Term Review Report and the candidate's response comprise the Mid-Term Review File, which is part of the personnel file of the candidate. The Mid-Term Review file will be forwarded to the dean/director and the Office of the Provost.

a) ***Interdisciplinary Candidates***

For interdisciplinary candidates, at least one member of each collaborating academic unit will have membership on the mid-term review committee of his or her home department.

3. The Mid-term Review Report Findings

The Mid-Term Review Report will conclude with one of the following findings:

- The candidate appears to be making satisfactory progress towards tenure. This finding is based on strong evidence that the candidate is likely to meet the standard of excellence demanded by a successful tenure review. In this case, the University's expectation is for continued professional development at the rate demonstrated in the first portion of the pre-tenure period and the candidate will continue with a contract through the end of the academic year of tenure review.
- The candidate appears to be progressing towards tenure and promotion with qualifications. Specific deficiencies will be elaborated for review by the candidate and Department Head (or equivalent). In such cases, it is imperative that appropriate actions by the candidate be taken to remedy deficiencies in the candidate's performance and the candidate must recognize that he/she will be evaluated on the established criteria at the time of the tenure review. The mere elimination of deficiencies, however, cannot alone assure the granting of tenure. The burden of responsibility for performance improvement rests with the candidate, though the Department Head (or equivalent) may provide reasonable assistance. The candidate will continue with a contract through the end of the academic year of tenure review.
- The candidate has not made sufficient progress towards tenure and is judged at this juncture not to be a viable candidate for tenure. In such cases, the candidate will be given a one-year terminal contract that extends through the following academic year.

III. The Tenure Review

A. Summary

Recommendations for the granting of tenure originate in an academic department (or equivalent).

The Office of the Provost distributes and confirms the list of candidates who must be considered for tenure for the following academic year according to their appointment letters and approved extensions.

The names of these candidates are forwarded to the Dean (or equivalent) of the respective academic unit. The list will be verified by the College Dean (or equivalent) by the date required by the Tenure and Promotions Calendar.

The Provost may approve the addition of other eligible candidates to the list for tenure review, with the written request of the candidates(s) and with the recommendation of their respective Deans (or equivalent). A candidate requesting early review must make that request in writing and must state in the request that he or she recognizes that the decision either (1) to grant tenure or (2) to deny tenure and terminate employment will be final.

By the time specified in the Tenure and Promotions Calendar, the Dean (or equivalent) appends to the list the names of tenured faculty that are to be considered for promotion in the next academic year.

All tenure and promotion review committees within the University will be constituted by the date required by the Tenure and Promotions Calendar for the following academic year.

B. Criteria of Evaluation for Tenure

The granting of tenure represents a prediction about the future contributions of a candidate based on a compelling body of evidence. Candidates for tenure are expected to have established a distinguished record of academic achievement that should be the foundation for an appropriate national or international reputation and be judged likely to continue that record. Each candidate should have a strong record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service and have demonstrated outstanding performance in either research or teaching. Each college (or equivalent) may further define specific criteria for a candidate's performance in these areas as appropriate to the discipline and consistent with University policy.

For interdisciplinary faculty the collaborating academic unit(s) will consider contributions in research, teaching, and service as they relate to the collaborations that have occurred across academic units as formally arranged.

The following examples provide a non-exhaustive list of sources of evidence to demonstrate a candidate's achievements in a particular category. The particular items listed after each category are offered as guidelines only, and the order in which they are listed is not indicative of any type of priority ranking. No item will be counted as either necessary or sufficient for purposes of demonstrating the quality of the candidate's work within a particular category.

1. Evidence of achievement in Teaching may include:

- Effectiveness in undergraduate and/or graduate teaching in the classroom, studio, clinical site and/or laboratory, as applicable to the discipline or interdisciplinary work based on criteria established by the academic unit(s).

- Contributions to the curriculum, such as substantial revisions of existing courses or academic programs, and development of new courses and techniques of teaching, including securing external funding for these purposes.
- Publications related to teaching in the candidate's discipline, such as most textbooks, aids, or manuals.
- Effectiveness as an undergraduate and/or graduate adviser and/or mentor, including dissertation, thesis, creative projects, or independent study advising.

2. Evidence of achievement in Research may include:

- As applicable to the discipline, quantity and/or quality of research, scholarship, artistic investigation and creative activity as evidenced by publications, presentations of papers (including invited presentations nationally and /or internationally), research reports, exhibitions, etc. (quantity not being a substitute for quality). Consideration will be given to papers and articles that are invited or subject to peer review. Consideration will also be given to publications related to the advancement of pedagogical theory and method in one's field.
- In appropriate disciplines, of the candidate's success in securing external funding
- Effectiveness in directing the research of graduate and undergraduate students.
- Originating, participating in, or directing research projects.
- Evaluation of scholarly or artistic accomplishment by recognized authorities outside of the University where appropriate.

3. Evidence of achievement in Service may include:

- Leadership and/or demonstrable contributions in faculty elective bodies and service on committees at program, department, college or school and University levels.
- Leadership and/or demonstrable contributions in national and/or international professional organizations.
- Service to individual students and/or student organizations.
- Promotion of the University through extramural activities, such as recruitment events, alumni affairs, etc.
- Other forms of service to the profession, external associations, etc.

C. Withdrawal from the Tenure Track

A candidate may decide to withdraw from his/her tenure-track appointment during the pre-tenure period. By withdrawing from the tenure-track in writing, a candidate has relinquished any subsequent consideration for tenure by the University but will be afforded the opportunity to complete the remainder of his/her tenure-track appointment. Each college (or equivalent) must establish in writing the deadline that candidates in their college (or equivalent) must submit written notice of withdrawal prior to the tenure review process. The date established by the college (or equivalent) must be prior to the submission of the tenure/promotion dossier to the Office of the Provost (see [Calendar](#)). The Office of the Provost will honor the deadline established by the College/School.

Under exceptional circumstances, a candidate who withdraws from the tenure-track may apply for and be hired in a non-tenure-track position at the University. Upon acceptance of a non-tenure-track position, a candidate's tenure-track appointment is terminated immediately. Non-tenure-track appointments end on the date specified without expectation of reappointment.

IV. The Promotion Review

A candidate wishing to be considered for promotion must declare to his/her Dean (or equivalent) their intention to stand for review according to the Tenure and Promotion Calendar for submission of the list of candidates to the Office of the Provost. In rare circumstances, exceptions to the deadline may be granted.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor typically accompanies the awarding of tenure; however, in some academic units, promotion to Associate Professor may occur prior to tenure consideration. Normally, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should have served no less than five years in rank as an Associate Professor. A tenure-track faculty member appointed as Associate Professor shall not seek promotion to the rank of Professor in the same year as consideration for tenure. Requests to be considered for early promotion or promotion to Professor at the time of tenure consideration must be approved by the Office of the Provost before the promotion process is initiated.

Categories of evaluation for promotion to the rank of Professor are the same three categories of evaluation for tenure. Criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor include further significant contributions to knowledge and teaching, a record of continued growth in research, scholarship and creative work, and further promise of achieving appropriate high national/international prominence, strong mentorship of students, and interdisciplinary activities, where possible.

A candidate reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor must be reviewed only by fellow faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. A candidate considered for promotion to the rank of Professor must be reviewed only by fellow faculty at the rank of Professor.

V. Review Committees and External Reviewers

A. Review Committees

Tenure and Promotion Committees

All departmental, program, school or college-based tenure and promotion review committees within the University will be constituted by the date specified in the [Calendar](#). The procedure for forming the initial tenure and promotion review committee is the responsibility of each academic unit as specified by its written policies. All departments, programs, schools and colleges are required to submit their tenure and promotion policies and procedures to the Office of the Provost for approval in accordance with the [Calendar](#). While it is understood that these policies and procedures may differ depending upon the

nature and function of the unit, each must be consistent with general University wide guidelines and standards and be approved by the Office of the Provost.

For interdisciplinary candidates, at least one member of each collaborating academic unit will have membership on the tenure/promotion committee of the home department and will participate in preparing the report.

When a tenure and promotion review committee is established, formal procedures must be followed. For tenure cases, only tenured faculty may participate in votes. General orderliness of record is important regarding dates and attendance of meetings, evidence considered, votes taken, manner of voting, and outcome. Once the review process has begun, candidates are not permitted to have access to any of the materials reviewed by the tenure and promotion review committee. At each level of the review (department/unit committee; department head; Dean) and before being forwarded to the next level, the report will be transmitted to the candidate. The candidate must respond in writing within seven (7) days of receipt. The response(s) of the candidate become part of the tenure review file.

New developments related to a candidate's research, teaching, and/or service occurring after the application is submitted for the tenure/promotion review process will be considered at the time such developments occur. Reconsideration of decisions or recommendations at earlier stages of the review process is not permitted; however, such developments may impact the review going forward. Further, in the event an allegation of misconduct arises during a candidate's review process, it is the University's policy to refer such allegation to the appropriate University office for investigation. Depending on the severity of the alleged misconduct and the timing of the tenure review process, the Office of the Provost reserves the right to suspend the review, including the awarding of tenure, until the investigation is completed.

B. External Reviewers

1. Overview

In determining a candidate's professional standing, the University looks to nationally- and/or internationally-recognized experts external to the University. There must be at least six external reviewers associated with each tenure and/or promotion case. Following the election or appointment of a committee chair for any tenure and promotion review committee, the first order of business is to identify and secure a sufficient number of qualified external reviewers. In the best of circumstances, external reviewers provide highly informed, candid, and comprehensive evaluations of the body of work under review. In effect, the external reviewer speaks to the University, regarding the number and quality of the elements that compose the candidate's body of work, its appropriateness within, and contribution to, the discipline or field (including interdisciplinary fields), and to the expectation that the University may reasonably hold in regard to future professional direction and probability of success. Accordingly, the selection of external reviewers is a matter to be taken most seriously. The following information is not intended to be exhaustive, but seeks only to establish what is minimally acceptable.

2. Selection Process

The majority of external reviewers will be selected by members of the initial tenure and promotion review committee from a list of potential reviewers generated exclusively by the tenure and promotion review committee. Two additional external reviewers will be selected by the tenure and promotion review committee from a list of six potential reviewers generated by the candidate. In order to ensure that external reviewers may respond in a timely manner, their selection will be completed by the time of submission of the tenure dossier by the candidate. The slate of proposed external reviewers must be approved by the Dean (or equivalent) of the academic unit. Brief biographies of all external reviewers must be included in the Tenure/Promotion dossier. Reviewers may be contacted in advance to ensure their availability. Responses by all external reviewers must be included in the report. In rare instances, there may be no response from an external reviewer who has agreed to provide a review; this is to be reported but no conclusions will be drawn regarding the lack of response.

3. Selection Criteria for External Reviewers

External reviewers will be nationally and/or internationally recognized experts in their respective disciplines or interdisciplinary fields and come from academic or research institutions of high stature, typically at or above the stature of the University. In some cases, an external reviewer may be affiliated with a highly regarded program at an institution not recognized to be at or above the stature of the University. In such a case, evidence must be provided that the choice of external reviewer is appropriate, for example, by demonstrating that the program of the institution or the work of a particular researcher is particularly important.

For tenure review, external reviewers will typically be members of the professoriate who hold tenure and, preferably, who hold the rank of “Professor,” although tenured Associate Professors may also be selected on some occasions. In addition, highly recognized individuals in non-academic positions may be consulted provided they can provide a perspective on the candidate and recognize the standards and implications of the granting of tenure.

External reviewers must be at “arms length” from the candidate. An external reviewer may not have served on the candidate’s dissertation proposal committee or dissertation committee. External reviewers will not be (or have been) co-authors of the candidate or co-PIs in the recent past (4-5 years). However, individuals co-serving with the candidate in positions such as in professional societies or editorial boards may provide reviews.

External reviewers will be asked and are expected to disclose any personal or business relationships with the candidate and state their ability to make an independent and unbiased judgment on his or her accomplishments.

Members of the candidate’s dissertation proposal committee or dissertation committee may write letters addressed to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee on behalf of the candidate. Current or former co-authors and co-PIs may write letters addressed to the Chair of the Tenure and

Promotion Committee on behalf of the candidate. These letters may supplement, but not replace the minimum of six letters from the external reviewers.

Cover letters to reviewers should provide information on the policies of the University and academic program regarding tenure and promotion as well as indicate the criteria on which the candidate is being considered. The main issues to be addressed are 1) the impact of the candidate's work on a field or fields and 2) the promise for future significant impact on the field or fields.

For interdisciplinary candidates, reviewers across disciplines should be engaged. In the cover letters, such reviewers should be made aware of the work on which they are being asked to comment.

C. Provost Advisory Committee

The Provost has the right but not the obligation to convene the Provost Advisory Committee, which shall present and discuss all tenure and promotion cases prior to the Provost Review. The proceedings of the Committee are advisory only. The function of the Committee is to discuss broad aspects of University tenure and promotion cases but not to make a formal vote on any candidate.

The Committee is composed of the Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Vice Provost for Research, Deans/Directors of each academic unit, three Senior Faculty (Tenured Full Professors) appointed by the Provost, and three Senior Faculty (Tenured Full Professors) elected by the Faculty Senate. The Faculty representatives will serve rolling two-year appointments.

VI. Reports

It is important that tenure and/or promotion reports cases articulate and incorporate the criteria employed and the basis of judgments regarding a candidate's work, including any reliance on the comments of external reviewers. In addition, reports should be complete, pointing out both strong and weak aspects of the case. Reports shared with candidates must not reveal the identity of reviewers and remain free from other identifiable comments or attributions of any sort.

Written reports shall be prepared at every level of the tenure and/or promotion process and should provide justification for the recommendation, whether positive or negative. Candidates will receive copies of these reports and may respond, in writing, to the reports of the department or unit committee, department head, and Dean. The responses of the candidate will become part of the candidate's tenure review file. After the Provost has decided upon his/her recommendation to the President, the Provost will report his/her recommendation, in writing, to the candidate. The Provost's report of his/her recommendation will include a statement of the rationale for the recommendation.

VII. Termination of Tenured Faculty

Termination of a tenured faculty member will be undertaken for compelling reasons only, such as (a) grave misconduct; (b) termination for cause that is related directly and substantially to the fitness of the faculty members in his or her professional capacities as an instructor or researcher; (c) termination due to extraordinary budget considerations in which a condition of financial exigency (as defined in the “Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure”) is demonstrable; (d) program discontinuation; (e) termination due to medical disability in which there is clear and convincing medical evidence that the faculty member, even with reasonable accommodation, is no longer able to perform the essential duties of the position; (f) release of tenure by virtue of voluntary retirement or voluntary resignation. Dismissal proceedings for tenured faculty members for any of the above reasons will be carried out under the standards approved by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) as outlined in the AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, Tenth Edition (2006).

VIII. University and Academic Unit Policies

Departments (or equivalent) and Colleges (or equivalent) may establish their own written standards and criteria for tenure, provided such standards and criteria are consistent with the policies of the University and are communicated to all tenure-track hires at the time of the initial appointment. Specifically, all departments, programs, schools and colleges are required to submit their tenure and promotion policies and procedures to the Office of the Provost for approval annually according to the Tenure and Promotions Calendar. While it is understood that these policies and procedures may differ depending upon the nature and function of the unit, each must be consistent with general University guidelines and standards and approved by the Office of the Provost.

IX. Confidentiality

All information associated with the review (i.e., materials submitted by the candidate or others for review, or generated by the review process) must be regarded as strictly confidential by any and all persons involved in reviews at any stage and in any capacity. However, within these guidelines of confidentiality, the overall promotion and tenure process will allow for feedback to each candidate at appropriate times and through appropriate channels to ensure that misunderstandings, misconceptions, and disagreements be confronted at the level at which they occur. . Members of promotion and tenure committees participate with the understanding that all matters related to their deliberations remain confidential. In addition, candidates under review are discouraged from approaching committee members at any time concerning the disposition of their review and will understand that inquiries of this type are deemed entirely inappropriate. Confidentiality of the promotion and tenure process is to be respected forever, not just during that particular year of review. Any exceptions to the requirement of confidentiality can only be authorized by the University’s Office of the General Counsel.

X. Reporting to the Board of Trustees

The Office of the Provost maintains a rolling analysis of the University's staffing and tenure projections, with particular attention to the aggregate number of tenured and tenure-track appointments. The Provost forwards a report yearly to the President to be contained in the report to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at its May meeting at which tenure is approved for tenure-track faculty.

XI. Appendix

A. Tenure/Promotion Dossier Organization to be submitted to the Office of the Provost

1. Cover Letter from Dean/Director
2. Candidate Acknowledgement of Receipt of Dean's Report with optional written response
3. Dean/Director Report
4. College Committee(s) Recommendation to Dean/Director
5. Department Head Letter to Dean/Director
6. Candidate Acknowledgement of Receipt of Department Head Report with optional written response
7. Department Head Report
8. Candidate Acknowledgement of Receipt of Department Tenure and Promotion Committee Report with optional written response
9. Department Tenure and Promotion Committee Report and Recommendation to Department Head
10. Candidate Dossier
11. Personal Statement – Research, Teaching, Service
12. CV
13. External Reviewer – Letters
14. Copy of Letters to External Reviewers
15. Brief Biographies of Reviewers
16. Summary of Internal Process
17. Membership of College Tenure and Promotion Committee(s)
18. Membership of Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee
19. Support Documentation (optional and brief)

* Note: Colleges/Schools may require more extensive information of the candidate such as publications, portfolios, and other evidence of achievement.

XII. Calendars

Calendars for Midterm Reviews and for Tenure and Promotions applicable to all Colleges and Schools (except the College of Medicine) for the next two academic years are posted every January 1st.

Visit the [Academic Calendars](#) webpage for the latest Midterm Review and Tenure and Promotion calendars.