

## **Recommendations for Procedures to Attain Tenure: A Proposal to the Senate Assembly**

**Endorsed by Senate Assembly on January 24, 2000**

*The Tenure Committee consists of Charles F. Koopmann, Jr. (Chair), Susan Alcock, Stan Berent, Lewis Kleinsmith, James Mulay, Robert Strieter, John Volakis, York-Peng Yao, and Ted Zellers.*

The attached material is a proposal from the Tenure Committee to the Senate Assembly for a revision of the Standard Practice Guide section entitled "Guidelines Related to Tenure Reviews and Reappointment Reviews" (Number 201.50).

Wording of the current policy which has been retained is designated by small, italic font. Wording which is part of the new document which has already been approved by the previous or current Tenured Committee is in standard font. Wording which was added or altered at the Dec. 14, 1999 Tenure Committee meeting is in bold, enlarged font.

In general these recommendations have been made in view of three considerations: (1) Variations in procedures in the light of unit differences should be maintained, but more standardization than is currently the case should be enacted; (2) Procedures should be adopted, in addition to those now in operation, to protect the rights of faculty being considered for tenure; (3) The role of **tenured** faculties in tenure decisions should be strengthened.

We have spent almost three academic years on an extensive review of the written procedures of most units, as these were made available to us, and on generating the recommendations that are presented in the accompanying report.

It should be noted that our recommendations are divided into six sections:

Evaluation Process; B. Faculty Involvement; C. Candidate Involvement; D. Timing; E. Documentation and Record Keeping; F. Appeals.

## Recommendation to Grant or Deny Tenure

*Because the University is large, decentralized, and heterogeneous, the views and needs of its various units differ; therefore, considerable latitude in procedures and criteria for tenure and reappointment review is desirable. Nevertheless, in the interests of all concerned, there are common principles that should be respected. What follows are recommendations related to procedures followed in making decisions to grant or deny tenure and to reappoint or not reappoint certain non-tenured regular instructional staff members with the rank of full-time instructor<sup>1</sup> or higher<sup>2</sup>. Each unit is strongly encouraged to develop and make known procedures that are consistent with the guidelines presented below. Each unit's procedures and criteria should be made known clearly, in writing, to each faculty member at the time of initial appointment.*

1 "Full time": is defined in the "Rules concerning Acquiring the Protection of Regents: Bylaw 5.09 by Accumulating Years of Service (Regents' Proceedings, September 1985, and SPG 201.13)

2 These recommendations are not intended to preclude consideration of bona fide needs and financial concerns in making such decisions.

### A. Evaluation Process

#### Principle:

The candidate being considered for tenure will be evaluated objectively with respect to his/her scholarship, teaching, and service.

#### Recommendations:

A-1. The expectations of performance and the relative importance ascribed to each of the three review criteria in the tenure decision, as established by the faculty of each department (unit<sup>3</sup>) should be made known to the candidate **in writing** at the outset if his/her entering the tenure track.

A-2. A faculty committee comprising tenured faculty from within the candidate's unit or department should be responsible for the tenure review process.

A-3. The candidate should be apprised annually in writing of his/her progress toward achieving tenure. It is encouraged that within 3 to 4 years a detailed review will be completed and the results presented in writing to the faculty member.

A-4. Requests by the candidate for **an early** tenure review prior to the seventh year will be granted at the discretion of the Department Chair or Dean **according to the policy of the unit.**

A-5. To assist the tenure decision, the candidate should submit documentation about his/her

scholarly productivity and its significance, teaching record and evaluations, and service activities within the University and in external organizations.

A-6. The tenure review will consist of a careful evaluation of the candidate's performance both internally and externally. An initial list of potential external reviewers will be created by the faculty committee. The candidate will be given the opportunity to suggest names for, as well as provide comments on, this initial list. The final list will be chosen by the faculty committee and will be asked to submit written evaluations of the candidate's performance and future promise as a tenured faculty member at the University of Michigan.

A-7. The external reviewers should be competent to evaluate the quality of research (scholarship) demonstrated by the candidate. Documentation of each external reviewer's competence should be provided. The relationship of the external reviewers to the candidate should be described in enough detail to allow for a judgement of their appropriateness and objectivity.

A-8. Each external reviewer should submit a written opinion of the candidate's scholarship and provide the basis for a reasoned recommendation for granting or denying tenure. The external reviews and internal reviews should be considered collectively.

A-9. Recommendations to grant or deny tenure must be based on a formal review process as outlined herein and must be based on an assessment of all input obtained as part of this process.

A-10. Recommendations by the faculty committee to grant or deny tenure will be forwarded, along with all documentation, to the Department Chair (for units with chairs). The Chair, in collaboration with his/her elected faculty executive committee, should then review the recommendation and documentation and pass their recommendation on to the Dean. The candidate should be informed of the recommendation in a timely manner.

A-11. The Dean, in collaboration with his/her associated elected faculty executive committee, should then review the recommendation and documentation, and pass their recommendation on to the Provost. The candidate should be informed of the recommendation in a timely manner.

A-12. The Provost should review the documentation and recommendations and pass his/her recommendation for granting tenure on to the Board of Regents in accordance with Regents' Bylaws Section 5.08. The candidate should be informed of this recommendation in a timely manner.

A-13. The candidate has the option of withdrawing her/his name from tenure consideration at any time.

## B. Faculty Involvement

Principle:

The faculty of the unit has primary responsibility for establishing the criteria for achieving tenure, evaluating each candidate against these criteria, and making recommendations to grant or deny tenure.

Recommendations:

B-1. The **tenured and tenure-track** faculty of each unit should establish criteria for achieving tenure. Such criteria must be formally endorsed by the **tenured** faculty and should be reviewed periodically.

B-2. The tenured faculty (or an elected subgroup) are responsible for evaluating each candidate, making recommendations to grant or deny tenure, and ensuring adherence of the process to the guidelines set forth in this document.

B-3. At the time of the candidate's initial appointment the candidate will be informed of the expectations of performance and the relative importance of scholarship, teaching, and service in the eventual tenure decision.

B-4. The tenured faculty (or **their** elected subgroup) will ensure that the candidate is informed of the substance of negative reviews and **that** the candidate is given the opportunity for rebuttal before the recommendation is made at each unit level.

B-5. The **tenured** faculty (**or their elected** subgroup) will forward the tenure recommendation to the Department Chair (or to the next higher level within the unit). At any of the higher levels within the unit the faculty (subgroup) will participate in discussions about tenure that differ from the original recommendation.

B-6. If the Provost disagrees with the unit's tenure recommendations a faculty advisory committee should be created (perhaps through consultation with SACUA) with which the Provost will consult prior to the final decision. Rebuttal from the unit and/or the candidate should be permitted.

B-7. With the candidate's consent, units should also report to the Provost, with supporting documentation, when the decision is to not recommend tenure. Should the Provost disagree with the unit decision **then** procedures in (B-6) should be followed.

B-8. Tenured faculty (or **their** elected subgroup) should be involved in pre-tenure review decisions to not reappoint the candidate.

B-9. Tenured faculty (or **their** elected subgroup) should have the responsibility to make recommendations for the appointment of a new faculty member with tenure.

### C. Candidate Involvement

Principle:

The candidate should have the opportunity to provide input to the review process, be apprised of decisions in a timely manner, and have the opportunity to appeal decisions.

Recommendations:

C-1. The candidate should ensure that he/she understands the criteria upon which tenure decisions are made in his/her unit at the time of hiring, including expectations of performance and the relative importance of each of the three review criteria in the tenure decision, as established by the governing faculty of each unit.

C-2. The candidate may request a formal tenure review prior to the seventh year.

C-3. The candidate should provide documentation to inform the review process, including documentation of his/her scholarly productivity and its significance, teaching record and evaluations, and service activities.

C-4. The candidate should suggest potential internal and external reviewers who are qualified to critically and objectively evaluate his/her record of performance since entering the tenure track. The candidate's relationship to the potential reviewers should be described in enough detail to allow for a judgement of their appropriateness and objectivity.

C-5. The candidate should be provided a summary of any substantive negative reviewer comments and have the opportunity to respond to such comments prior to the recommendation to grant or deny tenure being made by the faculty committee, Department Chair, Dean, or elected executive committee. Any written rebuttal provided by the candidate should be included in the tenure review documentation.

### D. Timing

Principle:

The tenure review should be initiated no later than the end of the first semester of the candidates seventh year of University appointment. The review process shall proceed according to a

predetermined schedule.

#### Recommendations:

D-1. *When there is to be a tenure review, it should be initiated not later than the end of the first semester of the faculty member's seventh year of University appointments<sup>4</sup>. If September 15<sup>th</sup><sup>5</sup> of the seventh year of appointments has passed without the faculty member being advised in writing that he or she will not be reappointed after the seventh year<sup>6</sup> or October 31<sup>7</sup> of the seventh year of appointments has passed without the faculty member being advised in writing that he or she will not be reappointed after the eighth year<sup>8</sup>, the unit is obliged to conduct a tenure review during the seventh year.*

D-2. *The chair or dean or a duly authorized elected or appointed faculty committee may initiate a tenure review at any time before the seventh year. A review prior to the first semester of the seventh year requires the specific concurrence of the faculty member unless standard unit procedure expressly provides for an earlier review.*

D-3. The current provisions of the Standard Practice Guide with reference to "stopping the tenure clock" (SPG 201.92-1-A) should continue to be in force.

4 Years of appointment are counted according to "Rules Concerning Acquiring the Protection of Regents' Bylaw .09 by Accumulating Years of Service" (Regents: Proceedings, September 1985, and SPG 201.13).

5 If the terminal year expires at a time other than the end of Term II, the notice must be given no later than a date which would provide nine months advance notice of the termination date (Standard Practice Guide 201.88.).

6 this must include notice of non-reappointment in accord with Standard Practice Guide 201.88.

7 If the seventh year of appointment expires at a time other than the end of Term II, the notice must be give no later than a date seven months prior to the termination date of the seventh year.

8 See note 6.

#### E. Documentation and Record Keeping

##### Principle:

All documents related to the tenure review process should be maintained for at least five years and decisions should be documented in writing.

##### Recommendations:

E-1. Recommendations to grant or deny tenure by the faculty (**or its designated** subgroup),

Department Chair, Dean, associated executive committees, and Provost should be documented in writing and placed in the candidate's tenure review file.

E-2. All the documents related to the evaluation process should be placed in a file in the home unit of the candidate. The tenure review file should be maintained for at least five years after the decision to grant or deny tenure is made. The Dean's office or its designate is responsible for maintaining this file.

#### F. Appeals

Principle:

Procedures should be established that allow a candidate to file a formal appeal when the decision is made not to grant tenure.

Recommendations:

F-1. The **tenured and tenure-track** faculty of each unit should establish a formal appeals process to be followed by candidates who are denied tenure and who wish to appeal the final decision.

F-2. Candidates who wish to file an appeal should be provided with a written summary of the contents of the promotions file materials that were used by the various University groups that were involved in making the initial decision regarding the denial of tenure.