

The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

PROPOSAL 7-00

TENURE, PROMOTION, AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

A well-designed tenure and promotion system attracts capable and highly qualified faculty, strengthens the university by enhancing faculty members' institutional loyalty, and encourages academic excellence by retaining and rewarding the most able scholars and researchers. Tenure and promotion imply selectivity and choice; they are awarded for academic and professional merit, not merely for longevity.

Tenure, promotion, and reappointment should also contribute to academic excellence. An equitable and widely-understood tenure, promotion, and reappointment system ensures that considerations of academic quality will be the basis for academic personnel decisions.

Procedures must be open, within considerations of individual privacy, and equitable. The general policies and procedures to be used should be widely known within departments, schools, and colleges. Regular review of faculty members will help to ensure openness of tenure and promotion processes, and provide feedback crucial to faculty development and growth.

A formal statement of criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion is necessary, but not sufficient, for the task. The wide variety of academic and professional fields, and the broad range of programs within Michigan Technological University ("the University"), make the development of detailed criteria that are equally applicable to all fields an impossible task. Rather, general and broad guidelines will permit the exercise of skilled professional and academic judgment.

All persons involved in the tenure, promotion, or reappointment processes shall be attentive to professional ethics and individual rights to privacy.

Faculty members and administrators share an important responsibility in providing evaluations of merit that guide decisions about academic tenure, promotion, and reappointment. This responsibility involves the application of academic and professional judgment, in a framework of shared authority, among various levels of review and between faculty and administrative bodies. All reviews should be given serious consideration in all tenure, promotion, and reappointment recommendations. Peer reviews by knowledgeable colleagues should be understood to be a critical feature of all tenure and promotion cases.

All tenure-track faculty members at MTU are to receive, at the time of their initial tenure-track appointment, a statement of the policies and procedures under which they will be considered for tenure.

It is likely that the specific expectations for granting of tenure, for reappointment, and for promotion will differ among academic units⁽¹⁾. Also, the University standards for tenure, promotion, or re-appointment may change with time. Within an academic unit, expectations shall be consistent for contemporaneous cases, except for cases involving early granting of tenure. (See Sec. 3.6., "Early Tenure.") Standards will be higher for early tenure than for tenure in the mandatory year.

A faculty member holding the academic rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, and with an appointment of fifty percent of full-time or greater, is eligible for tenure, provided the applicable letter of appointment specifies the position as "tenure-track." Only those members of the Michigan Tech faculty who are either (i) tenured, or (ii) whose appointments are specified as "tenure-track" are covered by these procedures.

1. Responsibilities of Each Academic Unit

Each academic unit defines its internal procedures for formulating tenure, promotion, and reappointment recommendations. Such procedures are part of the academic unit's charter and must be consistent with the policies and procedures of the University.

Each academic unit's procedures must, at a minimum, address the following issues:

i. **A personnel committee responsible for tenure, promotion, and reappointment recommendations.** Each academic unit must have a single committee for consideration of all three decisions (reappointment, promotion, and tenure).

ii. **The membership of the personnel committee.** The eligibility, terms of office, method of selection, and number of members must be defined. Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the committee.

iii. **The role of the academic unit's chair (dean) and faculty in the recommendation process.** The chair/dean may not serve on the personnel committee. The procedures must specify the role of the academic unit's faculty in re-appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

iv. **The criteria for recommendations.** Each academic unit's procedures must identify the operative factors in the tenure, promotion, and reappointment processes. The factors must include instructional quality, contribution to the MTU educational mission, independent research, and other scholarly activities, professional service (both internal and external to the University) and other activities consistent with the University mission. Normally, the procedures will not state expected levels of performance, but only what accomplishments in each category will be considered in formulating recommendations. Within an academic unit, consistency is expected in the application of the criteria.

v. **Letters of Appointment.** Letters of appointment address issues such as particular duties and criteria for performance, start dates in title, and the start of the tenure probationary period. Letters of appointment shall be consistent with academic unit charters and with University policies and procedures concerning tenure, promotion and reappointment. In cases where letters of appointment are inconsistent with academic unit procedures and/or University procedures, academic unit and University procedures override.

vi. **External Evaluations.** For cases involving tenure and/or promotion, academic units shall use evaluations solicited from scholars external to the University. (Such evaluations would not normally be obtained for reappointment decisions, excepting those involving the granting of tenure.) The academic unit's procedures must identify whether any or all such evaluations must be included in a candidate's file. The manner of selection of any reviewers must be defined.

vii. **Annual Progress Evaluations.** It is essential that all probationary faculty receive frequent and frank assessments of their progress toward tenure. Each non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member must receive, at least annually, a written evaluation of individual progress toward tenure. This evaluation shall be based, in part, on an assessment by the personnel committee. It is the responsibility of the chair or dean of the candidate's principal academic unit to provide this written evaluation. The faculty member acknowledges receipt of a copy of the evaluation by signing and dating the original. The acknowledgment should not indicate or suggest agreement with the evaluation. Each academic unit determines its own internal procedures for administering the annual progress evaluations.

2. Reappointment

"Reappointment" is the offer of a new contract (other than a terminal-year contract) to a current, non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member during the tenure probationary period.

Reviews of tenure-track faculty members who are within the probationary period are mandatory prior to a decision on re-appointment. This does not preclude consideration for tenure prior to the mandatory year. (See Sec. 3.6., "Early Tenure.")

Within the probationary period, reappointment is based on individual performance as defined by the academic unit. Offers of reappointment may be constrained by financial exigencies of the University, or major, long-term shifts in programmatic emphasis that materially diminish the faculty member's ability to contribute to the goals of the unit.

2.1. Timetable

Initial probationary appointments of tenure-track faculty are for two academic years. A tenure-track faculty member joining the University prior to November 1 is deemed to have begun service at the beginning of the same academic year. A faculty member whose initial appointment commences on or after November 1 is considered to have begun service with the start of the subsequent academic year, unless it is specified otherwise in the applicable letter of appointment. In no case will the probationary period start later than the beginning of the subsequent academic year. Successive appointment renewals, up to the mandatory time for tenure consideration, normally are for two academic years.

2.2. Academic Review

Consideration for reappointment begins with a peer review which focuses on professional and scholarly judgments of the candidate's academic work. That review is performed by a personnel committee of the academic unit where the candidate's principal academic appointment resides (i.e., the department or school where the candidate holds an appointment of fifty percent or more of full-time). The committee sends its evaluation of the candidate to the chair or dean of the academic unit; the chair or dean also makes a recommendation on reappointment of the candidate.

2.2.1. College of Sciences and Arts, College of Engineering

The department personnel committee's recommendation and the department chair's recommendation go to the dean of the college. The dean formulates a separate recommendation on reappointment and sends it, along with the department committee's and chair's recommendations, to the Provost.

The dean's statement must clearly indicate whether reappointment is recommended. Simultaneously, the dean is to inform the candidate, in writing, of the substance of the statement sent to the Provost (i.e., whether reappointment is recommended). In cases where the recommendation is against re-appointment, the dean will, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative recommendation, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

2.2.2. School of Forestry and Wood Products, School of Business and Economics, School of Technology

The school committee's recommendation and the dean's recommendation on reappointment go to the Provost. The dean's statement must clearly indicate whether reappointment is recommended. Simultaneously, the dean is to inform the candidate, in writing, of the substance of the statement sent to the Provost (i.e., whether reappointment is recommended). In cases where the recommendation is against reappointment, the dean will, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative recommendation, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

2.3. University Review

Following receipt of the dean's recommendation on reappointment, the Provost recommends to the President either (i) a one-year (terminal) appointment, or (ii) a two-year reappointment. The President

will decide on the reappointment recommendation to the Board of Control.

The President will inform the Provost of the recommendation to be presented to the Board of Control. The Provost will promptly notify the candidate of the recommendation. In cases where the recommendation is a one-year, terminal appointment, the Provost will, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the recommendation, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

3. Tenure

Tenure is a status granted a faculty member after a probationary period and appropriate review. Tenure may be conferred only by the Board of Control.

The status of being tenured is one form of protection from summary dismissal. In addition, tenure is designed to protect those rights associated with academic freedom. A tenured faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of demonstrable incompetence, neglect of duty, or misconduct of such a nature as to indicate the individual is unfit to continue as a member of faculty (e.g., scientific misconduct, conflict of interest or commitment.)

In an academic community, tenure should serve to safeguard the right of free expression and risk-taking inquiry, and the integrity of academic decision-making. Both tenure and academic freedom are bound to an implicit social compact which recognizes they serve important purposes and provide fundamental benefits to society.

There are three sequential levels of review: academic unit, college or inter-school, and university. All levels of review shall be concerned in some measure with both substance (e.g., teaching, scholarship, service) and procedure (consistency, adequacy and equity). Participants at each level of review have as their primary responsibility evaluation of the qualifications of each candidate for tenure, exercising professional judgment regarding the accomplishments and productivity of the candidate.

A faculty member must be either a citizen or a permanent resident of the United States to be eligible for tenure.

3.1. Tenure Probationary Periods/Mandatory Tenure Review

The tenure probationary period for a faculty member initially appointed at the rank of **Assistant Professor** is six years, unless it is extended according to Sec. 3.1.1 of this policy. A faculty member whose initial appointment is at the rank of Assistant Professor and who is reappointed after six years of service receives tenure automatically, unless notified by the chair or dean of the academic unit prior to May 31 of the sixth academic year that the following year will be the terminal year or unless the tenure probationary period has been extended under the provisions in Sec. 3.1.1, "Extension of the Probationary Period."

The tenure probationary period for a faculty member initially appointed at the rank of **Associate Professor** is four years, unless it is extended according to Sec. 3.1.1 of this policy. A faculty member whose initial appointment is at the rank of Associate Professor and who is reappointed after four years of service receives tenure automatically, unless notified by the chair or dean of the academic unit prior to May 31 of the fourth academic year that the following year will be the terminal year or unless the tenure probationary period has been extended under the provisions in Sec. 3.1.1., " Extension of the Probationary Period."

The tenure probationary period for a faculty member initially appointed at the rank of **Professor** is two years, unless it is extended according to Sec. 3.1.1 of this policy. A faculty member whose initial appointment is at the rank of Professor and who is reappointed after two years of service receives tenure automatically, unless notified by the chair or dean of the academic unit prior to May 31 of the second

academic year that the following year will be the terminal year or unless the tenure probationary period has been extended under the provisions in Sec. 3.1.1, "Extension of the Probationary Period."

For purposes of these tenure procedures, periods of continuous appointment as a tenurable faculty member are included in the total period of service for the tenure probationary period. This generally includes unpaid periods such as summer quarters and certain leaves of absence within otherwise continuous employment and service. Periods of service under non-tenure-track appointment at Michigan Tech are excluded for the probationary period.

The tenure probationary period for a faculty member joining the University prior to November 1 is deemed to have begun with the start of the same academic year. The tenure probationary period for a faculty member whose initial tenure-track appointment commences on or after November 1 is considered to have begun with the start of the subsequent academic year, unless it is specified otherwise in the applicable letter of appointment. In no case will the probationary period start later than the beginning of the subsequent academic year.

A faculty member who is in the final year of the tenure probationary period is to receive a complete tenure review, encompassing reviews at the levels of the academic unit, college or inter-school, and the University. This does not preclude consideration for tenure prior to the final year of the tenure probationary period. (See Sec. 3.6 "Early Tenure.")

3.1.1. Extension of the Probationary Period

Exceptional circumstances may sometimes effect a prolonged disruption of professional responsibilities during the tenure probationary period, requiring extensive sick leave, unpaid leave, or substantial formal reduction of professional responsibilities. A faculty member encountering such circumstances may request a one-year extension of the tenure probationary period. The Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment considers all such requests and makes a recommendation to the Provost on each.

This request should be made during or immediately following the period of exceptional circumstances, and in no case after November 15 of the final year of the tenure probationary period. It should be accompanied by a recommendation from the cognizant department chair and the dean of the college, or from the dean of the cognizant school. The request should clearly demonstrate that both of the following conditions are satisfied:

- i. the exceptional circumstances requiring the extension were such that normal conduct of professional responsibilities could not reasonably be expected.
- ii. exclusive of the period of exceptional circumstances, the faculty member had made substantial progress toward achieving tenure.

3.2. Promotion at Time of Tenure

Granting of tenure at the Assistant Professor level carries with it promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, except for cases in the School of Technology, where tenure may be granted at the Assistant Professor level.

At the Associate Professor level, tenure may or may not be coincident with promotion to the rank of Professor.

3.3. Review by the Academic Unit

For cases of tenure consideration occurring in the mandatory year, an initial review must focus on professional and scholarly judgments of the candidate's academic work. That review is performed by the

personnel committee of the academic unit where the candidate's principal academic appointment resides (i.e., the department or school where the candidate holds an appointment of a least fifty percent of full-time). The personnel committee sends its completed review to the chair or dean of the academic unit, who prepares a separate appraisal of the candidate's qualifications for tenure. Both the committee's review and the chair's (dean's) appraisal are to be transmitted to the corresponding College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or to the Inter-school Promotion and Tenure Committee.

For cases involving early tenure (i.e., consideration prior to the mandatory year), the review process is the same as in the mandatory year, except when the personnel committee of the candidate's academic unit chooses not to advance the file. (See Sec. 3.6, "Early Tenure.")

Each academic unit's tenure procedures must specify how external letters will be solicited and considered in the tenure review process.

A candidate who does not hold an appointment of a least fifty percent of full-time in any one academic unit or who holds two appointments of fifty percent of full time in two different academic units, must have it specified, at the time of initial tenure-track appointment to the MTU faculty, the academic unit

which will consider the tenure application(s). Under no circumstances will an individual be considered, either simultaneously or sequentially, for tenure by more than one academic unit.

3.4. Review by the College or by the Inter-school Committee

Reviews at the college or inter-school level and at the administrative level bring broader faculty judgments to bear and will monitor general standards of quality, equity, and adequacy of procedures. Consultation among review levels, by committees and academic administrators, should take place when there is a need to clarify differences that arise during the review process.

3.4.1. College of Sciences and Arts, College of Engineering

Within each college, each department selects one representative to serve as a member of the respective College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each department establishes the procedure for selecting its representative. All members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee must hold tenure.

3.4.2. Inter-School Committee

Each school (School of Forestry and Wood Products, School of Business and Economics, School of Technology) selects two representatives to serve on the Inter-school Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each school establishes the procedure for selecting its representatives. All members of the Inter-school Promotion and Tenure Committee shall hold tenure.

3.5. Review Sequence - Tenure Recommendations

3.5.1. College of Sciences and Arts, College of Engineering

3.5.1.1. Department review. Recommendations on tenure come from the department personnel committee and from the department chair. The committee formulates a recommendation on the granting of tenure for each faculty member in the department who is in a mandatory tenure review year. The personnel committee may also consider tenure recommendations for candidates prior to their mandatory tenure review year (See Sec. 3.6 "Early Tenure.") The personnel committee's recommendation is to be delivered to the department chair. The chair will then make a separate, written recommendation for each case and deliver it, along with the department personnel committee's intact recommendation, to the college promotion and tenure committee. Both the department personnel committee's recommendation and the chair's recommendation become part of the candidate's tenure application file.

3.5.1.2. College review. The college promotion and tenure committee considers all tenure applications submitted by the departments and develops recommendations on each. The promotion and tenure committee's recommendation on each tenure application is added to the candidate's tenure application file and forwarded to the dean of the college.

The dean will formulate a separate statement on each case, to be presented to the Provost. In formulating a recommendation, the dean may seek clarification of issues and advice only from the candidate, members of the department personnel committee, the chair of the department, members of the college committee, or external referees. The dean shall maintain a written record of such communications.

The dean's statement must clearly indicate whether the granting of tenure to the candidate is recommended. Simultaneously, the dean is to inform the candidate, in writing, of the substance of the statement sent to the provost (i.e., whether the granting of tenure was recommended). In cases where the recommendation is against the granting of tenure, the dean will, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative recommendation, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

3.5.1.3. University review. The candidate's tenure application file, including the dean's recommendation statement, is transmitted to the Provost. The Provost examines the tenure application file for adequacy and consistency of review, and determines whether a recommendation for granting of tenure will be forwarded to the President. The President decides whether a recommendation for tenure will be presented to the Board of Control, and transmits that decision to the Provost.

The Provost notifies the candidate promptly as to whether the granting of tenure will be recommended to the Board of Control. In cases where the granting of tenure is not recommended, the Provost will, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative decision, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

3.5.2. School of Forestry and Wood Products, School of Business and Economics, School of Technology

3.5.2.1. School review. Recommendations on tenure come from the school personnel committee. The committee formulates a recommendation regarding the granting of tenure for each faculty member in the school who is in a mandatory tenure review year. The personnel committee may also consider tenure recommendations for candidates prior to their mandatory tenure review year. (See Sec. 3.6., "Early Tenure").

The candidate's tenure application file is then transmitted to the dean of the school for completion, after which the completed file is sent without comment to the inter-school tenure committee.

3.5.2.2. Inter-school committee review. The Inter-school Promotion and Tenure committee considers all tenure applications submitted by each of the schools and develops a recommendation on each case. The Inter-school Promotion and Tenure committee recommendation on each tenure application is added to the candidate's tenure application file and forwarded to the dean of the cognizant school.

3.5.2.3. Dean's recommendation. The dean formulates a separate statement on each tenure application from the school. The statement is added to the candidate's tenure application file and presented to the Provost. In formulating a recommendation, the dean may seek clarification of issues and advice only from the candidate, members of the school personnel committee, members of the inter-school committee, or external referees. The dean shall maintain a written record of such communications.

The dean's statement must clearly indicate whether the granting of tenure to the candidate is recommended. Simultaneously, the dean is to inform the candidate, in writing, of the substance of the statement sent to the Provost (i.e., whether the granting of tenure was recommended). In cases where the recommendation is against the granting of tenure, the dean will, upon the request of the candidate,

provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative recommendation, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

3.5.2.4. University review. The candidate's tenure application file, including the dean's recommendation statement, is transmitted to the Provost. The Provost examines the tenure application file for adequacy and consistency of review, and determines whether a recommendation for granting of tenure will be forwarded to the President. The President decides whether a recommendation for tenure will be presented to the Board of Control, and transmits that decision to the Provost.

The Provost notifies the candidate promptly as to whether the granting of tenure will be recommended to the Board of Control. In cases where granting of tenure is not recommended, the Provost will, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative decision, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

3.6. Early Tenure

A faculty member may be considered for tenure prior to the mandatory year. Consideration for early tenure will require an exemplary record of accomplishments. In early tenure cases, the University does not have the normal amount of time for assessing a candidate's qualifications. Thus, standards for early tenure cases may be higher than those used in the mandatory year.

The following procedures are used for early tenure cases:

- i. The candidate begins the early tenure process by submitting the appropriate tenure documents to the personnel committee of the academic unit.
- ii. To be considered for tenure prior to the mandatory year, a candidate must receive a 2/3-approval vote from the entire personnel committee of the academic unit.
- iii. In the event of a 2/3-majority vote of the personnel committee in favor of early tenure for the candidate, the committee forwards the recommendation to the chair or dean of the academic unit. If fewer than 2/3 of the members of the personnel committee vote in favor of early tenure for the candidate, the candidate is notified of the vote and the process stops for that academic year. No further action or appeal is possible during that academic year.
- iv. Once a candidate has been approved by the personnel committee in the academic unit, the process, including appeals, is exactly the same as it is in the mandatory year.

A faculty member is not limited in the number of times he or she may be considered for early tenure by the academic unit's personnel committee. However, beyond the departmental or school personnel committee, a faculty member may go through the early tenure process at most once. Thus, a faculty member will receive full tenure consideration (beyond the department or school level) at most twice: once prior to the mandatory year and once during the mandatory year. (Exception: See Sec. 5.3, "Powers of the Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion and Re-appointment.")

4. Promotion

Academic promotion refers to an elevation in academic rank, either from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, or from Associate Professor to Professor. Academic promotion may be conferred only by the Board of control. Academic Promotion may or may not be simultaneous with the granting of tenure. (Exception: See Sec. 3.2 "Promotion at Time of Tenure.")

Academic promotion coincident with the granting of tenure (i.e., from Assistant Professor without Tenure to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure, or from Associate Professor without Tenure to the rank of Professor with Tenure) is considered under the procedures in Sec. 3., "Tenure." Other cases of academic

promotion (i.e., from Assistant Professor without Tenure to Associate Professor without Tenure, or from Associate Professor with Tenure to Professor with Tenure) are considered under the procedures in this section.

There are three sequential levels of review: academic unit, college or inter-school, and university. Primary responsibility for evaluation of the academic qualifications of candidates for promotion rests with the faculty. It is the responsibility of participants at each level of review to exercise careful professional judgment of the accomplishments and productivity of each candidate.

4.1. Review by the Academic Unit

Peer review focuses on professional and scholarly judgments of the candidate's academic work. That review is performed by the personnel committee of the academic unit where the candidate's principal academic appointment resides (i.e., the department or school where the candidate holds an appointment of more than 50% of full-time). The personnel committee sends its completed review to the chair or dean of the academic unit, who prepares a separate appraisal of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. Both the personnel committee's review and the department chair's appraisal (where applicable) are to be transmitted unchanged to the corresponding College Promotion and Tenure Committee or to the Inter-school Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4.2. Review by the College or by the Inter-school Committee

Peer review at the college or inter-school level and at the university level bring broader faculty judgments to bear and will monitor general standards of quality, equity and adequacy of procedures used. Consultation among review levels, by committees and academic administrators, should take place when there is a need to clarify differences that arise during the review process.

4.3. Review Sequence - Promotion Recommendations

4.3.1. College of Sciences and Arts, College of Engineering

4.3.1.1. Department review. Recommendations on promotion come from the department personnel committee. The committee formulates a recommendation regarding the promotion of each faculty member requesting consideration. That recommendation becomes part of the candidate's promotion application file. The personnel committee's recommendation is to be delivered to the department chair. The chair will then make a separate, written recommendation for each case and deliver it, along with the department personnel committee's intact recommendation, to the college promotion and tenure committee. Both the department personnel committee's recommendation and the chair's recommendation become part of the candidate's tenure application file

A faculty member may request promotion consideration by the department's personnel committee in any year. The decision to pursue consideration, beyond the department level, should be made by the candidate faculty member, in consultation with the department's personnel committee and the chair of the department. A candidate faculty member is entitled to seek review at the college and university levels against the advice of the department's personnel committee and/or the chair of the department. However, neither the personnel committee nor the chair of the department are under any obligation to endorse the case.

4.3.1.2. College review. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee considers all promotion applications submitted by the departments and develops a recommendation on each. The committee recommendation is added to the applicant's promotion application file and forwarded to the dean of the college.

The dean will formulate a separate recommendation statement on each case, to be presented to the Provost. In formulating this recommendation, the dean may seek clarification of issues and advice only

from the candidate, members of the department personnel committee, the chair of the department, members of the college committee, or external referees. The dean shall maintain a written record of such communications.

The dean's recommendation statement must clearly state whether promotion of the candidate is recommended. Simultaneously, the dean is to inform the candidate, in writing, of the substance of the recommendation statement sent to the Provost (i.e., whether promotion is recommended.) In cases where the recommendation is against promotion, the dean will, upon request, provide the candidate with the reason(s) for the negative recommendation.

4.3.1.3. University review. The candidate's promotion application file, including the dean's recommendation statement, is transmitted to the Provost. The Provost examines the file for adequacy and consistency of review, and determines whether a recommendation for promotion will be forwarded to the President. The President decides whether a recommendation for promotion will be presented to the Board of Control, and transmits that decision to the Provost.

The Provost notifies the candidate promptly as to whether promotion will be recommended to the Board of Control. In cases where promotion is not recommended, the Provost will, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative decision, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

4.3.2. School of Business and Economics, School of Technology, School of Forestry and Wood Products

4.3.2.1. School review. Recommendations on promotion come from the school personnel committee. The committee formulates a recommendation regarding the promotion of each faculty member requesting consideration. That recommendation becomes part of the candidate's promotion application file. The candidate's promotion application file is to be transmitted to the dean of the school for completion, after which the completed file is sent without comment to the Inter-school Promotion and Tenure Committee.

A faculty member may request promotion consideration by the school personnel committee in any year. The decision to pursue consideration, beyond the school level, should be made by the candidate faculty member, in consultation with the school personnel committee and the school dean. A candidate faculty member is entitled to seek review at the inter-school and university levels against the advice of the school personnel committee and/or the school dean. However, neither the school personnel committee nor the school dean are under any obligation to endorse the case.

4.3.2.2. Inter-school committee review. The Inter-school Promotion and Tenure Committee develops a recommendation on each promotion application submitted by each school. The committee recommendation is added to the promotion application file and forwarded to the dean of the cognizant school.

4.3.2.3. Dean's review. The dean formulates a separate recommendation statement on each promotion application from the school. The statement is added to the candidate's promotion application file and presented to the Provost. In formulating a recommendation, the dean may seek clarification of issues and advice only from the candidate, members of the school personnel committee, members of the inter-school committee, or external referees. The dean shall maintain a written record of such communications.

The dean's recommendation statement must clearly state whether promotion of the candidate is recommended. Simultaneously, the dean must inform the candidate, in writing, of the substance of the recommendation statement sent to the Provost (i.e., whether promotion was recommended). In cases where the recommendation is against promotion, the dean will, upon request, provide the candidate with the reason(s) for the negative recommendation.

4.3.2.4. **University review.** The candidate's promotion application file, including the dean's recommendation statement, is transmitted to the Provost. The Provost examines the file for adequacy and consistency of review, and determines whether a recommendation for promotion will be forwarded to the President. The President decides whether a recommendation for promotion will be presented to the Board of Control, and transmits that decision to the Provost.

The Provost notifies the candidate promptly as to whether promotion will be recommended to the Board of Control. In cases where promotion is not recommended, the Provost will, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative decision, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

5. Appeals

Candidates who are not reappointed, or who are denied tenure or promotion, may appeal, in writing, to the Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment. Appeals must be filed with the Committee in a timely manner, normally within fifteen business days after notification by the Provost of a negative recommendation to the President. **No other route of appeal is provided.**

5.1. Bases for Appeals

Appeals of negative recommendations for reappointment, tenure or promotion are based on allegations of either:

- i. failure of a recommending party to follow established policy or procedure; or,
- ii. violations of the candidate's academic freedom; or
- iii. inadequate consideration by one or more recommending parties.

The term "inadequate consideration", as applied here, refers to procedural rather than merit issues; i.e.⁽²⁾

- a. Was the decision arrived at conscientiously?
- b. Was all available and appropriate evidence bearing on the relevant performance of the candidate sought out and considered?
- c. Was there adequate deliberation by the department over the importance of the evidence in the light of the relevant standards?
- d. Were irrelevant and improper standards excluded from consideration?
- e. Was the decision a *bona fide* exercise of professional academic judgment?

5.2. Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment

The committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment is an autonomous committee, independent of the University Senate and the administration. All appeals of negative recommendations on tenure, promotion or contract renewal of tenure-track faculty, and negative recommendations on promotion of tenured faculty, are under the jurisdiction of the Committee. The Committee also considers requests for extension of the mandatory tenure probationary period.

5.2.1. Eligibility for service

Members of the faculty who hold tenure at Michigan Tech are eligible to serve on the Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment, with the following exceptions:

- i. members of the faculty who hold administrative appointments. Administrative appointments are considered to include department chairs, deans, directors, the Vice Provost, the Provost, vice-presidents, and the President.
- ii. members of the faculty who are on leave-of-absence (including sabbatical leave).
- iii. faculty members who hold *emeritus* status
- iv. faculty members who have served on the Committee (other than as designated alternates) for more than two years of the immediately preceding four-year period.

All questions regarding eligibility for service on the Committee are referred to the Executive Committee of the University Senate. The ruling of the Executive Committee is final.

5.2.2. Composition and Terms

The Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment consists of five (5) members of the faculty of the University, each serving a two-year term. Committee members are selected as follows:

- i. three members elected by secret ballot of the tenured and tenure-track faculty; election to be administered by the University Senate, as specified in Sec. 5.2.3;
- ii. two members appointed by the President

Terms of service on the Committee are staggered, as follows:

Terms expiring August 15, 2001 and bi-annually thereafter:

- i. one member elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty;
- ii. one member appointed by the President.

Terms expiring August 15, 2002 and bi-annually thereafter:

- i. two members elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty;
- ii. one member appointed by the President;

A vacancy on the committee due to a resignation is filled by a designated alternate (appointed by the Executive Committee of the University Senate) until such time as the seat can be filled by its regular mechanism (election, or appointment by the President). A designated alternate must meet the same eligibility criteria as a member of the Committee.

5.2.3. Method of Election by Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The University Senate will conduct an election by the tenured and tenure-track faculty annually during spring Term to fill the regularly-expiring term(s). In the event of a vacancy in a remaining faculty-elected term, there will be a simultaneous election to fill the un-expired portion of that term.

The Senate will solicit nominations from within each department and school. No department or school may nominate more than one person for a given vacancy. All nominees must meet the stated eligibility criteria.

The election will be by secret ballot of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the University. The nominee receiving the largest number of valid votes will serve on the Committee.

5.2.4. Designated Alternates

Members are excused from the service when the Committee is considering appeals of cases emanating from their home academic unit, or when the member's participation may represent a significant conflict of interest. In those situations, or any other cases where fewer than five members are available to consider an appeal, vacancies are filled by eligible designated alternates, to be appointed by the Executive Committee of the University Senate.

5.3. Powers of the Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment

The Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment considers all appeals of negative recommendations for tenure, promotion or reappointment within the probationary period. The Committee is a fact-finding body that can order specific actions in cases where it finds substantive merit to an appeal. The Committee cannot grant tenure, cannot grant a promotion, and cannot offer an appointment.

In cases where the Committee finds substantive errors or omissions on the part of one or more recommending bodies participating in a promotion, tenure, or reappointment review, it can require a new review, beginning at the appropriate level or stage of review as determined by the Committee. In such cases, the Committee will convey an explanation of the specific errors or omissions noted to the appropriate recommending bodies and to the candidate.

The review might not be completed until sometime during the candidate's originally specified terminal year. A second review which does not result in the granting of tenure does not affect the candidate's terminal year status. Candidates who are not granted tenure subsequent to a second review are not entitled to an additional "terminal year" of employment.

In the case of an applicant for early tenure who receives a negative recommendation and whose appeal is consistent with the policy on early tenure, the Committee may also order a new review of the candidate. Such a review does not constitute a second consideration for tenure under Sec. 3.6 ("Early Tenure.")

In addition to ordering a new review, the Committee may recommend other appropriate remedies to the Provost and the President.

All deliberations, communications and recommendations of the Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment are confidential except to the extent that dissemination may be required by law. The Committee's report on each appeal is delivered to the Provost, the President, the candidate, and to any affected recommending bodies.

6. Disclosure

6.1 Disclosure of Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Decisions

Each year, after final tenure, promotion and reappointment decisions have been made by the Board of Control, the Provost shall report to the academic faculty:

- i. the number of individuals granted tenure;
- ii. the number of individuals who applied for tenure and were subsequently denied tenure;
- iii. the number of individuals promoted.

6.2 Disclosure of Decisions Concerning Appeals

Each year, upon completion of consideration of all appeals, the Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment shall report to the academic faculty:

- i. the number of tenure, promotion, or reappointment appeals received by the Committee;
- ii. the number of tenure, promotion, or reappointment appeals in which the Committee ordered a new review.

6.3 Disclosure of Route of Appeal

Each year the committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment shall report to the academic faculty:

- i. the membership of the committee;
- ii. the mechanism for submitting appeals.

This information is to be reported to the academic faculty no later than March 1 of each academic year.

7. Revisions and Amendments

Revision of the procedures on tenure, promotion and reappointment may be initiated by any member of the faculty, including administrators holding faculty appointments. All proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing to the President of the University Senate. The proposed amendment(s) will be forwarded to the Academic Policy committee of the University Senate for review and/or revision. The Academic Policy committee will provide a copy of the proposed amendments to the Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment. The Academic policy committee will submit its recommendations to the University Senate.

Revisions to the procedures on tenure, promotion and reappointment must be in the form of a Senate proposal. Adoption of any revision shall require approval by the University Senate, approval by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty voting in a university-wide referendum, such vote to be conducted by the University Senate, and approval by the Provost and the President.

¹ "Academic unit" refers to academic departments and to the School of Forestry and Wood Products, the School of Business and Economics, and the School of Technology.

² Adapted from AAUP "Policy Documents and Reports, 1990", pp. 19.20

Adopted by the Senate: 26 April 2000

Approved by Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty: May 2000

Rejected by Administration: September 2001

See BOC Policy Manual and Faculty Handbook