

P&T PROCESS EDITS BY SENATE
March 20, 2016

University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPT):

The following paragraphs regarding UPT may be added to Section 12.8 or Section 8 of the Handbook:

In carrying out its charge the University Promotion and Tenure Committee shall: have each committee member indicate his or her relationship (professional and personal) to the candidates, including actual or potential conflicts of interest; recuse any committee member from the same department as a candidate during deliberations and votes over that candidate; ensure that all discussions are based only upon the evidence presented in the candidate's dossier and avoid bringing new evidence from personal or professional knowledge of the candidate; have each committee member present for every discussion, except in the case of a recusal; and maintain complete confidentiality of all emails, discussions and votes during and after the deliberations. At the end of its deliberations the committee will hold an open vote for each candidate, indicating those non-recused committee members in favor of tenure and or promotion, those against tenure and or promotion, and those abstaining. The final vote tally will be communicated to the Provost.

In selecting the UPT the Provost will supply Senate with an accurate list of faculty members eligible for service on UPT and who have not previously served on UPT, and may include recommendations for people to serve. The Senate will nominate from that list twice number of faculty needed for current appointment to the UPT, if possible, and the Provost will select the requisite number of appointees from that list.

The following paragraphs regarding bias should be added to Section 8 of the Handbook, probably in new section.

National data show that **implicit bias** [Office1] may be an issue in evaluating candidates with respect to race and gender. For example, letters of recommendation for men often are longer and refer more to a candidate's publications, research or other career achievements, while letters for women may make reference to their personalities, personal lives or other irrelevant data, and contain fewer descriptors about the quality of their work. Similarly, scholars from other countries may have different cultural expectations for the length and style of letters, which may be shorter than American letters with fewer effusive adjectives. Likewise, research suggests that minorities are often evaluated lower, even for the exact same resume, and that supposedly neutral, quantitative data may be evaluated by reviewers differently for majority and minority candidates. Promotion and Tenure Committees should consider these elements when looking at internal and external letters of recommendation for faculty.

SECTION 8 PROMOTION AND TENURE

8.1.2 Criteria for Tenure[Office2]

Tenure establishes a long-term contractual relationship between CSM and a faculty member. The granting of tenure represents acknowledgement by CSM that a tenure candidate has convincingly demonstrated the capability for making substantial and important contributions to the goals of CSM throughout the remainder of his or her career. Since the tenure decision is based on a tenure candidate's potential for long-term contribution to the goals of the department and CSM, progress toward tenure is reviewed as a part of each tenure-track faculty member's annual evaluation. As departmental and CSM goals change, so, too, will the criteria for the granting of tenure. The factors that shall be considered by CSM in making a tenure decision are detailed in the CSM Procedure's Manual "P&T Guidelines [insert exact title]" section XXX[Office3]. Any substantive changes to these guidelines must be approved by the CSM Faculty Senate and include a process for faculty comment and input on any substantive changes.

....

8.1.6 Tenure Review Process

A. Tenure-Track Faculty

The following is a general outline of the tenure review process for tenure track faculty at CSM:

- A. For tenure consideration, candidates must prepare and submit to their Department Head a tenure review package, also referred to as a dossier. Academic Affairs shall disseminate the required format of the tenure review package, and the submission and tenure review process deadlines prior to the close of each Spring semester.
- B. The Department Head shall convene the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee as defined in section 8.1.3, transmit the tenure application package to the committee, and appoint a committee member to chair deliberations.
- C. The Department Head, or the Department Head's delegate, shall solicit external evaluations of the candidate's credentials thus far in their career and whether or not the candidate would be tenured and/or promoted at the letter writer's institution as documented in sections XXX [Office4] of the application package. Candidates and the Departmental Promotion and

Tenure Committee will each supply the Department Head with 5-6 names for letter writers. The candidate may also request that certain individuals not be contacted for reviews; this request should be honored unless the Department Head and Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee determine there are good reasons not to do so. In consultation with the Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Head will then request external letters. The file should contain 5-7 letters, with a balance between names suggested by the candidate, the Department Head, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the file shall include a notation indicating which reviewers were selected by whom. At least 1/3 of the requested letters should be from reviewers recommended by the candidate. External reviewers should be independent of the candidate and Ph.D. advisors should be avoided. Reviewers should primarily be Professors affiliated with peer and aspirational peer programs. Associate Professors and/or reviewers from other institutions may be acceptable when it is clear that they are nationally recognized, possess pertinent expertise, and understand P&T norms at peer and aspirational peer institutions. The DH must make the University and Department expectations clear to the external letter writers when requesting the letters. An example request letter is available in the Procedures Manual. Candidates should not discuss the review with potential reviewers, lest this be viewed as attempting to influence their independence of judgment. Likewise, neither the Department Head nor the Promotion and Tenure Committee should reveal their views or assessments about the candidate (including annual evaluations) in communicating with letter writers. When at least half of the requested letters have been received, the Department Head shall forward those letters together with the dossier to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee to begin its review. The committee must review each letter from all external reviewers before making a final assessment.

- D. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall examine the package, prepare a written tenure report containing a recommendation, and forward the package and report to the Department Head. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall hold an open vote denoting the number of members for and against the candidate's tenure and/or promotion to include in the report. Committee members should not abstain from voting in difficult and/or contentious cases. Committee members should disclose conflicts of interest to other members of the committee. In the event of serious conflicts of interest (e.g., a family relative or a previously formal academic advisor) a committee member may, in consultation with the committee chair, recuse himself or herself from deliberations about that specific case. The committee's report should communicate the vote tally and number of faculty who were recused from the deliberations. In the case of a split vote, an additional letter summarizing the dissenting view also must be submitted so that all

relevant information about the case is transparent and shared with subsequent parties to the review process. Throughout and following the process, the content of the deliberations and the individual recommendations and votes of committee members must be kept in the strictest confidence. The committee letter(s) shall be so written as to protect confidentiality.

- E. The Department Head shall prepare a written recommendation and share that letter together with the letter of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee with the candidate. The Candidate may respond to correct errors in fact that materially affect the outcome of the recommendation[Office5]. If the Candidate chooses to respond, the response must be provided within three (3) business days. The proponent(s) of the negative recommendation(s) will then have three (3) business days to consider this information and, if they so choose, respond. Their response may include a revision of the initial vote or judgment. After these responses have been received, they shall be included in the dossier before being forwarded to the next level for review.
- F. The Department Head shall forward the package, including all letters of recommendation and responses, to the Dean(s) of the Candidate's college or colleges in the event of split appointment. The Dean(s) of the Candidate's college(s) shall prepare a written recommendation or recommendations and forward the package to the Provost, who shall convene the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, defined in Section 12.8, for continued review.
- G. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee shall conduct a thorough and entirely independent review of all tenure applications received during the relevant time period. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee shall hold an open vote denoting the number of members for and against the candidate's tenure and/or promotion. Committee members should not abstain from voting in difficult and/or contentious cases. Committee members from the candidate's department should recuse themselves from deliberations about that candidate's case. In addition, committee members should disclose conflicts of interest to other members of the committee. In the event of serious conflicts of interest (e.g., a family relative or a previously formal academic advisor) a committee member may, in consultation with the committee chair, recuse himself or herself from deliberations about that specific case. Throughout and following the process, the content of the deliberations and the individual recommendations and votes of committee members must be kept in the strictest confidence. Following this review, the University Committee shall submit recommendations, including the vote tally and the number of faculty who recused themselves from the deliberations, to the Provost.
- H. The Provost shall review the dossiers, the recommendations, and other information submitted for each candidate, and submit his or her

recommendations to the President. In assessing the dossiers, the Provost may also, at his or her discretion, confer with any other parties who may have relevant information or viewpoints on a pending application.

- I. The President shall provide the Board of Trustees with recommendations, both positive and negative, on all tenure cases.
- J. The Board shall have the final authority to grant or deny tenure for each candidate.
- K. If a need for clarification arises at any stage of the process, any of the parties reviewing the package (Department Head, Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, etc) may contact the candidate to request more information, which shall be included in writing in the dossier before proceeding to the next step of the review process. In addition, a reviewing party may request clarification from any previous reviewer who has evaluated the package. This request should come from the committee chair, when applicable, and be included together with the response in the package.
- L. The Provost or President shall provide written notification to each applicant of the results of his or her tenure application. Positive tenure decisions shall be reflected in the official records of CSM at the beginning of the next academic year. However, newly tenured faculty may begin professional use of their new status immediately.
- M. In the case of an unfavorable decision, an applicant may appeal the decision pursuant to the Promotion and Tenure Decision Appeal Procedure set forth in subsection 8.5 below.