

Principles and General Guidelines for Promotion Decisions (Vice Chancellor and Provost's Guidelines)

The process for selecting the membership of department and School/College (tenure and) promotion committees should be set out clearly in the department/School/College bylaws. Those bylaws should respect three principles:

- a. The deliberative bodies should be independent across levels (i.e., no individual should actively participate or vote in two levels of the process, such as at both the department and School/College level, for any single individual).
- b. Committees for promotion should exclude individuals with potential conflicts of interest. In these committees, potential conflicts of interest occur when individuals who may directly or indirectly derive a personal benefit are in a position to influence a decision (e.g., promotion of a spouse or partner). Individuals may also recuse themselves from service in cases in which participation or voting might pose a substantial conflict with the performance of their primary duties in the University.
- c. The process of evaluation, deliberation, and voting leading to academic unit recommendations regarding promotion to the rank of professor is the responsibility of the faculty appointed at that rank. At the departmental and school/college level, such a voting body(ies) should be comprised only of full professors. If a supplemental voting body needs to be assembled (because tenured associate professors serve on the tenure and promotion committee and there are not sufficient tenured faculty at the professor level to comprise a reasonable body), the school/college must provide clear rules and/or guidelines about assembling a sufficient voting body of tenured professors to carry out these responsibilities with fairness to the candidates for promotion.

It is the responsibility of the appropriate unit head to fulfill all established professional responsibilities appropriate to the position for all promotion candidates, including helping the candidate to make the strongest possible case for promotion, given accomplishments to-date. It is the candidate, however, who bears responsibility for providing information about his/her academic accomplishments using the [Form A document](#) which includes two parts: (1) Outline of Professional Experience and (2) Candidate's Professional Statement.

The appropriate unit head (department/School/College) is responsible for providing a detailed executive summary of the evaluative processes and statements made by individuals and committees. The unit head (even if not of sufficient rank to have a vote) should then include his or her own evaluative comments, addressing and clarifying any conflicts in materials presented; adding information that would be helpful in subsequent evaluative processes; and addressing any negative aspects of the candidate's record or the external reviews— explaining any mitigating factors that should be considered.

The use of external evaluators and critics is an essential feature of a thorough review process where the University is assessing accomplishment and impact on a field or discipline or profession. At least **five** reviewers should be secured from the relevant publics and audiences for the candidate's achievements. Reviewers should be of sufficient rank, status, and accomplishment to make the judgments asked of them. Those qualities should be assessed by such factors as institutional affiliation, academic rank, prestige in a non-academic enterprise, or membership and knowledgeable participation in a relevant community of experts. Outside reviewers will be selected as appropriate to, and in accordance with, the conventions of the candidate's discipline(s) and School/College(s). Generally, reviewers' programs or departments should be of at least comparable quality to the candidate's program/department. The reasons for selecting all reviewers should be explained in the dossier, and any divergence from the conventions of the academic discipline should be explained. The candidate should be given the opportunity to nominate external reviewers, and that list should include sufficient names to allow choice for the committee and anonymity for the final roster of reviewers. The committee should nominate its own separate list of potential reviewers, and the final roster of outside evaluators should feature a majority of reviewers from the committee's list. At each level in the promotion process, all information generated by the appropriate evaluative bodies, including any formal votes, should be transmitted to subsequent evaluators.

The outcome of the votes at each level should be made available to candidates for promotion to professor, and candidates may withdraw, without prejudice, from the promotion process at any time.