

**University Procedures for Departmental Review of Candidates  
for Tenure and/or Promotion**

These procedures are based on Section 3.4.4.2 of the Faculty Handbook and replace all prior procedures. The annual “Target Dates for Tenure and Promotion Review” document lists specific dates for the process (found on the [Evaluation, Reappointment & Promotion](#) page of the Provost’s website).

During the last week of April, the department provides the dean with the names of two external reviewers selected by the department who have agreed to serve.

In the fall, the chair shall invite all tenured members of the department to participate in a departmental review of the strengths and weaknesses of a candidate for promotion or tenure. Each tenured faculty member is expected to read the candidate’s file, participate in the departmental discussion, and submit an evaluation letter that includes a whole number score (0-5). A tenured faculty member on sabbatical or other leave may choose not to participate in the rank and tenure process. A faculty member who chooses not to participate shall not be involved in any part of the process. The tenured faculty, acting collectively or through the chair, shall identify two outside referees to be contacted for an evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly or artistic work. The chair shall schedule a meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s petition. This meeting should be scheduled so that all tenured faculty members who are not on sabbatical or other leave are able to participate. A written summary of the departmental discussion will be signed by all participants. **No vote is taken at this meeting.**

Each tenured faculty member who participates in the departmental discussion, including the department chair, shall write a letter of evaluation that includes a recommendation with a whole number score (0-5). A tenured faculty member who is unable for good reason to participate in the departmental discussion may write such a letter if they have reviewed the candidate’s file. In this case, the letter must explain why the faculty member could not participate in the departmental discussion. Those faculty who are members of a rank and tenure committee, either at the school or university level, are expected to write an evaluation letter and assign a numerical evaluation at the department level. They do not assign a numerical evaluation at the committee level.

All participating faculty shall submit their evaluation letters to the department chair (this can be done on Google Drive in a folder restricted to participating faculty). If there is a compelling reason to seek an exception to this rule, the faculty member must have approval of the Provost.

In addition to writing an individual letter of evaluation, the department chair or another faculty member designated by the chair and approved by the dean shall write a contextual summary letter. This letter is addressed to the dean and shall summarize the individual faculty letters and provide a context to the candidate’s petition and to the faculty letters. It shall contain the

numerical evaluations found in the individual letters. For example, in a department of 7 tenured faculty where all 7 were participating, the letter might say “the individual votes are 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 3, 3.” This letter may include information about the field of research or creative endeavor, disciplinary practices of evaluation and publishing, or other items of relevance that may not be known outside the discipline. If a faculty member submits a letter but did not participate in the departmental discussion, the chair should note this in the letter. The contextual summary letter shall not be reviewed by other members of the department as part of the departmental deliberation.

The chair shall forward the case to the College or School Rank & Tenure Committee in Interfolio by the specified date, having uploaded the contextual summary letter, the summary of the departmental discussion, and all evaluations and recommendations that have been received from tenured members of the department, together with their own individual recommendation.

The chair informs the tenured faculty members of the numerical votes, without attribution, reminding them that this information is confidential and may not be shared with anyone.