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Sequential Stages of Review. Decisions about tenure and promotion are reached through the comprehensive and rigorous peer review of achievements and promise. The review process begins in the candidate’s home department. Each case moves through a sequence of reviews, from the candidate’s department, to the school and then the campus.

Split Appointments. In the case where a candidate holds appointments in multiple units/departments and a department in SPH-B has been designated as the home department for promotion and tenure purposes (P&T home), the candidate will be reviewed based on standards established in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU will have been signed at hiring by the candidate and the heads (the chair of the SPH-B department and the chair of the other department, or the dean, if a non-departmentalized school). The MOU identifies the P&T home department; outlines the candidate’s responsibilities in each department; provides information on teaching and service obligation, thus preventing excessive service and teaching obligations for the candidate.

At the time of review for tenure, the department not serving as the P&T home will be asked to write a report, which may be in the form of a letter written either by the chair or by a committee comprised of rank eligible faculty members from the department. This report will be placed in the dossier early so it is available to the P&T home department in their deliberations.

Review Committees. Two (2) separate faculty review committees will be constituted at each level of review in the school; that is, two separate committees at the department level and two separate committees at the school level. To be specific, within the department there will be a review committee constituted for reviewing candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor, and there will be a separate committee constituted for evaluating candidates seeking promotion to the rank of full professor. Likewise, at the school level there will be a committee constituted for evaluating candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor, and separate committee constituted for evaluating candidates seeking promotion to the rank of full professor.

The department faculty committee that reviews candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor will be comprised of all tenured faculty members holding the rank of associate or full professor in the candidate’s department. The department faculty committee that reviews candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor will be comprised of all tenured faculty members holding the rank of full professor in the candidate’s department. Both of these committees that review the candidate will write a substantive report evaluating the candidate’s performance in Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, and Service/Engagement as well as reporting the votes for the committee’s recommendation.
The committee shall appoint a chair from among their members to facilitate the review process and to call for the secret ballot when the time seems right. The Chair of the department shall serve as *ex officio* member of the departmental committees for the purpose of information sharing only and another member of the committee shall serve as the committee Chair; the departmental Chair would not participate in the discussion of cases and would refrain from offering any information that would influence the committee members’ evaluation of the case.

For departmental committees, all eligible faculty in the department must vote excluding the department Chair (not committee Chair) and if relevant, the Dean. The departmental Chair and Dean will register their votes later in the review process in the form of their evaluative letters. Associate Deans must vote within their home departments.

If, for any reason, the department has fewer than three rank-eligible faculty members, additional faculty member(s) will be identified from within the school by the Executive Associate Dean in consultation with the department Chair in order to bring the committee size up to the minimum required number of three rank-eligible faculty members. The Chair and Executive Associate Dean will recruit the identified faculty member(s). Upon their agreement to serve on the committee, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be drafted by the Executive Associate Dean. The candidate will be asked to approve/accept the choice(s), and this agreement is reflected in the MOU. The candidate may reject a choice only for cause. The MOU is to be signed by the candidate, the Chair, and the recruited faculty member(s). Each party will receive a copy of the MOU and the original will be secured in a locked cabinet in the Office of the Dean.

Following the department committee review, the department Chair provides a separate substantive evaluation and recommendation.

At the school level, two committees (one for consideration of promotion and tenure cases, and one for consideration of cases for promotion to the rank of full professor) will be constituted. Each committee will include representatives from each of the five departments in the school and the composition of the committee should be composed to reflect the diversity of the school’s faculty. These members will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the department Chairs and Associate Deans. Full professors who serve on the promotion review committee also may serve on the School promotion and tenure review committee. The committee is to be composed of two members from each of the five academic departments; however, in the case(s) where a department has fewer than two rank-eligible tenured faculty members, the Dean may choose to name only one.

As with the departmental committees, only tenured associate and full professors may serve on the committee reviewing candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor; likewise, only tenured full professors may serve on the committee reviewing candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor. The Executive Associate Dean will serve as *ex officio* chair of the school committee to facilitate the process and will not direct the outcome. The school committee reviewing the candidate will write the school report including the votes on the recommendation.

Any and all representative(s) on the school committee from the home department of the candidate will have voted at the department level and therefore are required to abstain from engagement in the deliberations and will recuse themselves from voting at the school level.
Committee Reports. Committee reports, at both the department and school level, are to capture the range of assessments expressed during the deliberations (minority reports of individual committee members are not allowed), while also providing an evidence-based rationale for the chosen recommendation. Independent evaluations by individual faculty members may not be included in tenure or promotion dossiers, with the exception of their serving as observations on collaborative projects or as peer assessments of teaching. All committee members must have access to all dossier materials assembled by the chair and candidate, including external letters and (in the case of the school committee) the recommendation from the department committee and chair. All oral deliberations by review committees are strictly confidential.

Eligibility and Voting. Eligibility is guided by the principle of rank-appropriateness: only tenured faculty within a unit may vote on tenure cases; only tenured full professors may vote on candidates seeking promotion to full. Faculty are responsible to be “materially engaged” in the review process, by familiarizing themselves with the dossier and by attending committee meetings where the case is discussed and voted upon. No proxy voting is allowed; a faculty member who will be absent from a vote may not authorize another to cast a vote on his or her behalf. Absentee ballots are allowed, if the faculty member will be unable to attend the meeting, has fully acquainted him/herself with the dossier and submits an anonymous ballot, in a sealed envelope, to the department Chair prior to the meeting at which candidate’s case is to be discussed. Faculty may recuse themselves for good cause, which removes them from involvement in consideration of the individual case for which they are recused. Eligible faculty may vote only once per case; faculty members who have already voted at an earlier stage may not be involved in the deliberations or voting at a later stage. At all stages of review, all eligible faculty must vote on all performance areas using the evaluative ratings provided on the ballot, and also for the overall recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. Comments may not be written on the ballot, which allows only for checked-box voting. Votes for all eligible faculty members must be reported in the dossier, and all absences and abstentions accounted for, by the Chair (department committee) or the Executive Associate Dean (school committee). Voting is by secret ballot. Ballots are to be stored in a locked cabinet in the Dean’s Office, and are to be retained for a minimum of 12 months, after which they are to be shredded.