Michigan Tech
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { TO: } & \text { Richard Koubek, President } \\ \text { FROM: } & \text { Andrew Starer, Provost \& Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs }\end{array}$
DATE: April 11, 2023
SUBJECT: Senate Proposal 1-23

Attached is Senate proposal 1-23, "Process for Joint Appointment Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Review," and a memo stating the proposal passed in the Senate during their February 15, 2023 meeting and through a referendum vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty as of April 5, 2023. I have reviewed this proposal and recommend approving the proposal as follows.

Section a. under Proposed Action in this Senate proposal should be modified so the parenthetical statement reads "see suggested text in Senate Procedure 712.1.1" rather than "see below." Once this revision is complete, Section 5.4.1 of Appendix I in the Faculty Handbook will be updated to reflect the language titled "Proposed Action" in this Senate proposal.

The suggested language for the majority chair to use in requesting the minority chair's letter is reflected in Senate Procedure 712.1.1 and will not become part of the Faculty Handbook.

I concur_X_d do not concur___ with the provost's recommendation as stated in this memo.


Richard Koubek, President
4/11/23
Date

## University Senate

DATE: April 5, 2023
TO:
Richard Koubek, President
Michael Mullins
University Senate President
SUBJECT: Proposal 1-23
COPIES: Andrew Storer, Provost \& Senior VP for Academic Affairs

At its meeting on February 15, 2023, the University Senate approved Proposal 1-23, "Process for Joint Appointment Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Review" and as of April 5, 2023, the changes have been approved by the tenured and tenure track faculty through a referendum. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

# University Senate of Michigan Technological University 

Proposal 1-23

## (Voting Units: Academic)

Process for Joint Appointment Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Review Introduced by: Academic and Instructional Policy Committee Submitted to the Senate by: The Office of the Provost

## Background:

Senate policy indicates that "Under no circumstances will an individual be considered, either simultaneously or sequentially, for tenure by more than one academic unit."
(Appendix I, Section 5.4.1). Jointly appointed faculty have a majority appointment (more than $50 \%$ ) in the majority unit, and a minority appointment in the minority unit.

Proposed Action:
To provide consistency in joint appointment promotion procedures, the following process is proposed based on guidance received from the CATPR in 2019:
a. The majority unit TPR committee, in writing, asks the chair of the minority unit for a letter with specific topics the letter should address, and with specific topics the letter should not address (see below).
b. The chair of the minority unit should seek and obtain input from the minority unit TPR committee and take that input into account when preparing the letter.
c. The minority chair submits the letter, addressing the topics and adhering to the constraints, to the majority unit TPR committee for their consideration.
d. The majority unit will provide the minority unit with a minimum of two weeks to prepare and submit their letter to the majority unit. This deadline should be timed no later than two weeks before the TPR recommendation is due to the Dean or majority unit Chair.
e. The letter is not placed in the dossier; it is only reviewed by the majority unit TPR committee and used by that committee to inform their recommendation.
f. In addition to the letter request, the majority unit is encouraged to solicit referees from the faculty member and minority unit that can speak to the body of work contributed to the minority unit.

Below is text that the majority chair would use to request the minority chair's letter.
Senate policy indicates that "Under no circumstances will an individual be considered, either simultaneously or sequentially, for tenure by more than one academic unit." (Appendix I, Section 5.4.1). Prof. X, with a joint appointment between our two units, is being considered this year for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, with tenure. I am writing to seek your input to the evaluation process, in your position as the chair of the minority unit.

As part of our evaluation process, the [majority unit name] would appreciate your answers to the following questions:

1. What is your epinion assessment regarding Prof. X's teaching quality and/or effectiveness?
2. What is your opinion assessment of the quality of Prof. X's scholarly contributions pertaining to the discipline of the minority unit? [Please do not comment on Prof. X's overall scholarly output]

What is your opinion of the quality of Prof. X's scholarly contributions? Please do not comment on Prof. X's overall scholarly output while at Michigan Tech.
3. What is the nature and quality of Prof. X's university service contributions in [minority unit name]?
4. What is your opinion assessment of Prof. X's external professional service contributions, both nationally and internationally, pertaining to the discipline of the minority unit? [Please do not comment on Prof. X's overall external professional service contributions]

What is your opinion of Prof. X's external professional service contributions, both nationally and internationally? Please do not comment on Prof. X's overall<br>-external professional service contributions while at Michigan Tech.

The [unit name] and I appreciate your contribution of time and effort on Prof. X's behalf, and thank you in advance for your well-considered opinions. We recognize that the four questions place significant restrictions on the nature of your comments. Nevertheless, we feel that a more open-ended response would effectively amount to "simultaneous consideration" by more than one unit, which is not allowed under the university tenure and promotion policy.

Again, many thanks for your help.

