BAUER
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

1. GENERAL

1.1 Promotion and tenure embody earned rights, privileges, and obligations that are vested in recognition of the achievement of excellence in scholarship and leadership in the candidate's discipline. The assessment of quality and the nomination to rank and tenure status is a faculty function and represents the ultimate responsibility in the concept of faculty governance.

1.2 Promotion and tenure are awarded on the basis of the cumulative contributions that have been made to the institution and the profession and on the basis that there is every expectation of future such contributions. The rank of Full Professor is reserved for those who have achieved scholarly distinction and a national reputation for excellence.

1.3 Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor carries tenure and is a decision typically made in the sixth year of a faculty member's probationary appointment. University policies governing Time in Rank govern exceptions.

1.4 Unless otherwise stipulated in the offer letter at the time of hire, a faculty member who begins employment in January shall be reviewed for promotion and tenure in the sixth complete academic year of employment (i.e., after five and one-half years of a probationary appointment) unless an earlier review is requested.

1.5 Tenured Associate Professors may request a review for promotion to Full Professor in any year, provided the request is made by the date specified later in this document. Untenured Associate Professors may request a concurrent review for promotion to Full Professor at the time of a tenure review.

1.6 Other documents governing promotion and tenure include the University of Houston *Faculty Handbook* concerning grievances and the Office of the Provost's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* concerning the reconsideration of a decision. Should College and University policies conflict, University policies shall prevail.

1.7 This document also describes College procedures for annual reviews during a faculty member's probationary appointment.

1.8 The Bauer College Associate Dean for Academic Affairs shall no later than May 10 each year prepare a schedule of all dates relevant to the review processes described in these policies, basing those dates on the Provost's Policies schedule distributed for the coming review period. Each individual and group involved in any review process is responsible for conforming to those dates. This schedule will be accessible on the faculty portal.

1.9 At every stage of the review process, within five working days of receipt of a recommendation, candidates may update their portfolios before the materials are forwarded to the next level of review. Within the same time span, candidates also have the right to correct factual errors before any recommendation is forwarded to the next level of review. The review body that prepared the recommendation may respond to such updates or corrections, but a response is not required.

1.10 At every stage of the review process, each review body shall have access to all materials considered by any review body earlier in the process, including all prior recommendations and materials related to any reconsideration requests.

2. PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

2.1 General

2.1.1 As stated in the Office of the Provost's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines,* promotion is "a privilege conferred by the institution; it is not a right". Reviewing committees and individuals, as set forth in this document, shall recommend it when, in their judgment, the candidate has served the institution well and will likely continue to be an important "human asset" of the University, College, and Department. Promotion to Full Professor is one of the highest accomplishments in a University and is reserved for those clearly demonstrating national visibility and scholastic and academic leadership in their respective disciplines. The promotion to Full Professor shall be regarded as a mark of major contribution and scholarship in teaching, research, and service.

2.1.2 Similarly, the award of tenure is a privilege and not a right. To be tenured, a candidate shall have achieved an acceptable record of teaching, research, and service as judged by the reviewing committees and individuals. Achieving an acceptable record is a necessary condition for the granting of tenure. However, its achievement should not be construed as a sufficient condition for the granting of tenure. University policies prevent colleges from establishing any such set of sufficient conditions. Rather, reviewing committees and individuals must assess not only the individual's progress in meeting the minimum standards relating to teaching, research and service but also the overall contribution of the individual to the University, the College, the Department, and the academic discipline. Of course, the hope of the College is that every new faculty member will become successful, respected, valued, and accomplished and will receive tenure.

2.1.3 The criteria that follow are sufficiently flexible to accommodate differences among departments within the College and differences among individuals within those departments. Departments within the College may develop policies that specify unique criteria provided they are consistent with those contained in this document and consistent with the general guidelines and policies of the University.

2.1.4 In what follows, some requirements to meet the necessary conditions for promotion and/or tenure are described as "essential" and others are described as "desirable". Meeting desirable criteria shall not substitute for meeting essential criteria.

2.1.5 Reviewing committees and individuals shall recommend whether the privilege of promotion and/or tenure be extended to an eligible candidate. In no case shall a favorable recommendation be made if acceptable standards of teaching, research, and service have not been achieved by the candidate in the judgment of those committees and individuals. Candidates must demonstrate significant scholarship and academic achievement.

2.1.6 New employment appointments that would result in an individual's being given tenure for the first time will be reviewed as required by these regulations. While external letters will be solicited using a process as similar as possible to the process for other promotion/tenure candidates, including the university requirement of arms-length external reviewers, the timetable will be expedited to the extent possible.

2.2 **Research and Publications**

2.2.1 Refereed Journal Articles

Publications that make a significant contribution to the candidate's field are essential for promotion and/or tenure. Publishing articles in prestigious, peer-refereed journals provides the best evidence of such contributions. Publication quality shall be judged by peer evaluations both from within and outside of the College where appropriate. A manuscript fully and unconditionally accepted for future publication, but not yet appearing in print, shall be treated as a published article in the journal for which it is accepted.

2.2.2 Books/Monographs

The scope and overall contribution of any book or monograph shall determine its weight in the promotion and/or tenure process. Edited books or edited proceedings shall be given minimum weight. Special consideration shall be given to books/monographs that extend the frontiers of knowledge. In general, books/monographs are desirable but not essential for promotion and/or tenure.

2.2.3 Other Evidence of Research Productivity

Sponsored research grants can be considered in the P&T review process if they are competitive and from an external entity, such as a governmental agency, foundation, or

corporation. The prestige and selectivity of the funding entity and the funding amount obtained will determine the weight of a grant in the process, with special consideration given to principal investigator roles. The presentation of competitive professional papers at nationally recognized academic conferences carries some weight in the promotion and/or tenure review process, especially if published in proceedings of those conferences. However, that weight is small and such papers are certainly not a substitute for refereed journal articles. Technical reports and research in progress but not yet submitted for publication are typically not considered in the promotion and/or tenure review process. Other types of publications (e.g., chapters in research annuals) may be considered in the review process, their weight determined by the quality and distinctiveness of the specific contribution. The above are desirable but not essential for promotion and/or tenure.

2.3 Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Contributions

2.3.1 The demonstration of effective teaching performance and of a contribution to the overall quality of instructional effort is an essential but not a sufficient condition for promotion and/or tenure. The elements to be considered shall include, but are not necessarily limited to:

(a) course development and teaching innovations
(b) course load and range of teaching competencies at all levels of instruction (i.e., undergraduate, MBA, and doctoral)
(c) student evaluations
(d) general facilitation of student development, including significant contributions on doctoral advisory and dissertation committees, facilitation of doctoral student publications, participation in curriculum development, maintenance of high academic standards, fair and equitable treatment of students, advisement of student organizations, etc.

2.3.2 The reviewing committees and individuals shall examine both quantitative and qualitative evidence of teaching effectiveness. Classroom performance is especially important in an evaluation to promote from Assistant to Associate Professor and to award tenure. In addition to classroom performance, facilitation and direction of doctoral student research is an important factor in an evaluation to promote to Full Professor.

2.3.3 In the event of prior teaching experience, instructional contributions and evidence of teaching effectiveness at the University of Houston shall be emphasized by the reviewing committees and individuals. An exception shall be made if the candidate can demonstrate that a prior contribution (e.g., a developed course) has benefited or may benefit the University of Houston.

2.3.4 At the discretion of reviewing committees and individuals, instructional contributions and teaching effectiveness during the period of the current rank of the candidate at the University of Houston may be weighted more heavily than instructional contributions and teaching effectiveness prior to that current rank.

Service

2.3.5 Department. College. and University Contributions

Service to the Department, the College, and/or the University is essential for promotion and/or tenure. The reviewing committees and individuals shall evaluate the individual's service contributions on the basis of degree of participation and on the quality of those contributions. The contributions shall include but not be limited to:

(a) significant committee assignments
(b) program and curriculum development
(c) generation of funds
(d) administrative service for which release time was granted

Although service contributions are not sufficient for promotion and/or tenure, candidates for Full Professor shall be carefully evaluated on the basis of their service to the Department, College, and University and the leadership roles they have assumed in those service activities.

In the event of a prior academic appointment, institutional service at the University of Houston shall be emphasized by reviewing committees and individuals.

2.3.6 Professional Contributions

Service to business and professional organizations related to the candidate's academic discipline, including refereeing activity, shall be considered by the committees and individuals that review an individual for promotion and/or tenure.

Membership in a professional organization, by itself, is not deemed a service contribution in this category. Active participation and leadership roles through offices held, speeches given, committee assignments, journal editorial assignments etc., do represent a service contribution in this category. Professional contributions are desirable at all levels of promotion, but shall be considered more important for promotion to Full Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor.

2.3.7 Community Contributions

Community service shall be considered desirable in a promotion/tenure review, it being more desirable in a decision to promote to Full Professor. Since the scope of community service is broad, the reviewing committees and individuals shall have discretion in determining the relevance and importance of community service activities. Included among the more important activities are serving on working committees and boards of directors of significant community groups, unpaid consulting to community organizations, and public service volunteerism to local/national governmental agencies. For community service to be considered in a promotion and/or tenure decision, that service must have specifically resulted because of the faculty member's academic

expertise or because of the person's affiliation with the College or University. Excluded is service that is unrelated to the individual's academic expertise or faculty role.

3. DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

3.1 General

Each department shall have a Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee to evaluate each candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure and to make a recommendation regarding that action.

3.2 Composition of Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees

3.2.1 The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of five tenured faculty members. The department chairperson and other tenured faculty holding college or university administrative positions may not serve on this committee. If a department is unable to provide five qualified faculty, then the qualified members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee must select qualified members from other departments in the College.

3.2.2 The committee shall be constituted by the required date. Three of the five members of the committee shall be elected by the tenured faculty members of the department. The remaining two members shall be appointed by the department chairperson. In the event that the department chairperson is a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean shall appoint the two members. At least two of the five members shall have served on the committee the previous year. Should the elected members not provide for this requirement, the chairperson's appointments shall be constrained to ensure that two members shall have served the previous year.

3.2.3 Each committee member shall serve a two-year term. (Initial formation of a committee shall have some members serving one-year appointments in order to ensure staggered terms.) There is no maximum number of consecutive terms a member may serve. In the event that a committee member resigns or is unable to serve out their term, a replacement shall be selected to meet the conditions of Section 3.2.2. The replacement may be elected or appointed to serve out the original member's term or be elected or appointed as an interim replacement for a semester or a year.

3.2.4 Tenured faculty of lesser rank shall not review and shall not vote on requests for promotion to higher ranks. A minimum of three full professors is required for evaluating requests for promotion to the rank of full professor. When the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee does not have at least three full professors, then members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee must select additional qualified full professors from the department, to reach the minimum of three. If such full professors are not available, then the committee must select full professors from other College departments to reach the minimum of three. Individuals selected will serve temporarily to

evaluate only the case(s) for which their selection was necessary.

3.2.5 At the first committee meeting in January of each year, a committee chairperson shall be elected to serve for that calendar year.

3.3 Departmental Committee Review

3.3.1 Faculty shall notify their department chairperson in writing that they wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. This notification shall be submitted by the required date. If a tenure review is mandatory because of the approaching end of the probationary appointment (e.g., April of the fifth year in a normal seven-year probationary appointment) this requirement for notification is waived. Such a review shall proceed as required unless the chairperson receives a letter of resignation from the candidate.

3.3.2 Faculty to be reviewed shall electronically submit to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee: (1) a list of six appropriate external evaluators generated in accordance with Section 3.4 of this document, (2) a sample of the candidate's published research to be reviewed by external evaluators, (3) a current curriculum vitae, and (4) a brief (no more than three pages) statement. The statement should describe the candidate's program of research, how published work and work in progress advance it, and the candidate's contribution to each co-authored article. Faculty may describe how their research is integrated with teaching and service, or discuss achievements in teaching, research, and service separately. This material shall be submitted by the required date. The chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee may ask the candidate's co-authors to prepare statements about the candidate's contribution to the respective joint articles. To the extent allowed by law, these contribution statements shall be confidential and are intended to be read only by reviewing committees and individuals and eligible voting faculty, excluding the candidate for promotion.

3.3.3 The candidate shall electronically submit a complete dossier of promotion and tenure materials to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee chairperson by the required date. This dossier includes the items described under 3.3.2, all teaching evaluation results, including student comments, as well as all internal recommendation letters from the third-year and/or fourth-year review (in the case of promotions to Associate Professor with Tenure) or from the candidate's tenure review (in the case of promotions to Full Professor), if such reviews took place at the University of Houston. It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that these materials are complete and in the format prescribed by the Office of the Provost's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*.

3.3.4 The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall prepare its written recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure by the required date. That recommendation may be reflected in the results of a secret ballot vote of the committee, but it is not required to be reflected in that manner.

3.3.5 In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate may ask, within five working

days of receipt of the committee's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the committee's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the committee members. The request must be made in writing to the committee chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing and (at the discretion of the committee) in person, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The committee shall respond in writing. A record of the response of the committee shall be forwarded to the next level of evaluation.

3.3.6. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee chair shall provide to the full voting faculty of the department its recommendation and any reconsideration by the required date.

3.4 Procedures for External Evaluations

3.4.1 External evaluations shall be solicited for every promotion and/or tenure review. In order to make appropriate decisions at each level of the review process, it is important that external evaluations be solicited from well-qualified and objective scholars outside the College. To the extent allowed by law, external evaluations shall be confidential and are intended to be read only by reviewing committees and individuals and eligible voting faculty, excluding the candidate for promotion.

3.4.2 As required by the Office of the Provost's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*, external reviewers shall meet UH criteria regarding "arm's length" referees. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall determine if each prospective external reviewer meets the "arm's length" test.

3.4.3 The list of prospective external academic reviewers shall be assembled in the following manner: (1) the candidate shall submit to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee chairperson a list of six appropriate external evaluators. (2) the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall independently prepare a list of six external reviewers.

3.4.4 The candidate for promotion and/or tenure shall provide in his or her materials a brief description of the qualifications of each external reviewer on the candidate's list; this shall include the name, title, rank, position, institutional affiliation, and contact information (including email and webpage) of the external reviewer in accordance with the Provost's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*. These descriptions shall be subject to the approval of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.

3.4.5 At least six external reviewers shall be selected in the following manner: (1) names appearing on both the candidate's list and the committee's list shall be selected, (2) the candidate shall be allowed to eliminate (i.e., strike) at most one remaining name from the list of six prepared by the committee, and (3) the committee shall then select the

necessary additional reviewers from the names remaining on each list, ensuring that at least three names from each list are selected. A name selected because it appears on both the candidate's list and the committee's list shall be counted as one from each list**.**

3.4.6 The Dean shall write to the selected external reviewers asking their assistance. Upon receipt of the external review, the Dean shall also write the necessary letter of acknowledgement and appreciation to the reviewer.

3.4.7 All external reviews that are received shall be placed in the candidate's dossier. If fewer than three are received from the initial mailing of six, the Dean shall solicit reviews from the additional names from the two lists until a minimum of three reviews are received.

3.5 Departmental Vote

3.5.1 All promotion and tenure materials and any materials used by the committee in the evaluation and any materials used in a reconsideration by the committee shall be made available for review by the voting faculty.

3.5.2 Eligible "voting faculty" are those faculty members within the department who have attained tenure in the Bauer College of Business at the University of Houston. In the case of a promotion involving a tenured professor, the candidate is ineligible to vote and is excluded from the voting faculty for that recommendation. In addition, tenured faculty of equal or lesser rank shall not vote on candidates for higher ranks. For example, only persons having achieved the rank of full professor shall vote on persons requesting promotion to the rank of full professor.

3.5.3 Each eligible member of the voting faculty shall have the opportunity to vote a recommendation for or against the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate. The vote shall be by secret ballot and the process shall be initiated and supervised by the chairperson of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each member of the voting faculty must vote at the lowest level possible, and persons involved at multiple levels of the review process shall recuse themselves from all subsequent votes occurring at higher levels. As such, in those departments where the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee votes, members of that committee shall not vote during the general departmental vote. The department chairperson and the Dean of the Bauer College of Business shall not cast a vote at the department level. The actual vote count shall be recorded on the face sheet in the candidate’s dossier. A favorable recommendation requires a strict majority of total votes cast by all those voting in the department, at the committee level or beyond. Abstentions do not count as cast votes, but the number of abstentions shall be reported.

3.5.4 In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate may ask, within five working days of receipt of the departmental vote, for a reconsideration of the department faculty’s decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the department faculty. The request must be made in writing to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure

Committee chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The department faculty shall respond in writing. A record of the response of the department faculty shall be forwarded to the next level of evaluation.

3.5.5 The chairperson of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall communicate the results of the vote and any reconsideration to all eligible voting faculty.

3.5.6 The chairperson of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall forward the committee's written recommendation, the results of the departmental vote, and any materials related to a reconsideration to the department chairperson by the required date.

3.6 Department Chairperson Recommendation

3.6.1 Subsequent to the departmental vote and any reconsideration, the chairperson of the department shall prepare a letter to the Dean containing a recommendation for or against the candidate's promotion and/or tenure. The chairperson shall be permitted to provide this recommendation for all cases, including those for persons being considered for equal or higher ranks, except if the chairperson is the candidate. In the latter case the chairperson of a different department, selected by the Dean, shall provide a recommendation.

3.6.2 In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate may ask, within five working days of receipt of the chairperson's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the chairperson's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the chairperson. The request must be made in writing to the chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The chairperson shall respond in writing.

3.6.3 The chairperson's recommendation and any materials related to a reconsideration shall be forwarded to the Dean by the required date.

4. COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

4.1 General

A College-wide committee shall independently evaluate all promotion and/or tenure candidates and make recommendations to the Dean. Subsequently, the Dean shall prepare a recommendation for the Senior Vice President and Provost regarding each candidate.

4.2 College Promotion and Tenure Committee Membership

4.2.1 The seven members of this committee shall be chosen in the following manner: (1) the

tenured members of each academic department shall elect one member, and (2) the Dean shall select two "at-large" members.

4.2.2 The committee shall be comprised of only tenured Full Professors. In no event shall: (1) more than two members from any academic department be on the committee, and (2) nor shall any college or university administrator be on the committee.

4.2.3 The term of appointment is three years, with terms staggered so as to provide continuity of membership. There is no limit to the number of consecutive terms that can be served. In the event that a committee member resigns or is unable to serve, a replacement shall be elected, or, in the case of an "at-large member" selected to meet the conditions of Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2. The replacement may be appointed to serve out the original member's term or be elected or, in the case of an "at-large" member, selected as a temporary replacement for a semester or a year.

4.2.4 At the first committee meeting in January of each year, the committee chairperson shall be selected by vote of the committee to serve for that calendar year.

4.3 College Committee Recommendation

4.3.1 The committee shall have access to the promotion and tenure materials and all prior recommendations forwarded by the departments to the Dean.

4.3.2 By secret ballot, the committee shall vote for or against the promotion and/or tenure of each candidate. Each member of the committee must recuse him/herself from voting on any case which involves a candidate from the member's own department. The actual vote count shall be recorded, and a favorable recommendation requires a strict majority of total votes cast. Abstentions do not count as cast votes. The recommendation, as reflected by the vote count, shall be accompanied by comments by the committee supporting that recommendation.

4.3.3 In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate may ask, within five working days of receipt of the committee's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the committee's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the committee members. The request must be made in writing to the committee chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing and (at the discretion of the committee) in person, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The committee shall respond in writing.

4.3.4 Subsequent to the vote and any reconsideration, the chairperson of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall communicate the recommendation and any materials associated with a reconsideration to the Dean by the required date.

4.4 Dean's Review

4.4.1 Subsequent to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee's vote and any reconsideration, the Dean shall prepare, by the required date, a letter to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost containing a recommendation for or against the candidate's promotion and/or tenure.

4.4.2 In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate may ask, within five working days of receipt of the Dean's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the Dean's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the Dean. The request must be made in writing to the Dean. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The Dean shall respond in writing.

4.4.3 All recommendations generated by the policies set forth in this document and any materials associated with any reconsideration shall be added to the promotion and tenure materials and this dossier shall be forwarded to the Provost by the required date.

5. ANNUAL REVIEWS DURING THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

5.1 General

5.1.1 During the probationary period of employment, the University reserves the right not to renew the appointment of any faculty member. Non-renewal of appointment refers to a situation in which the faculty member is not offered the next successive contract for employment at the end of a stated employment period (see the University of Houston *Faculty Handbook*).

5.1.2 Annual reviews of faculty serving probationary appointments shall be conducted in accordance with this section.

5.2 Annual Reviews Except that of the Third Year of a Probationary Appointment

5.2.1 Faculty serving a probationary appointment shall electronically submit to the chairperson of the department a curriculum vitae and published research products, submitted manuscripts, descriptions of work in progress, and, at the option of the faculty member, a research plan, no later than the required date. This shall be in addition to any documents required at the same time for the merit review process.

5.2.2 The department chairperson shall prepare by the required date a letter to the Dean recommending continuation of employment or non-renewal of appointment. This letter shall discuss the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure.

5.2.3 In the event of a recommendation of non-renewal of appointment, the candidate may ask, within five working days of receipt of the chairperson's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the chairperson's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new

evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the chairperson. The request must be made in writing to the chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The chairperson shall respond in writing.

5.2.4 In the event of a department chairperson recommendation of non-renewal of appointment, all materials shall be formally considered by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. A letter of recommendation to the Dean shall be prepared by this committee no later than the required date.

5.2.5 In the event of a negative committee recommendation, the candidate may ask, within five working days of receipt of the recommendation, for a reconsideration of the committee's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the committee members. The request must be made in writing to the committee chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing and (at the discretion of the committee) in person, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The committee shall respond in writing.

5.2.6 In the event of a department chairperson recommendation of non-renewal of appointment, the materials and prior recommendations, including the departmental committee letter, shall be considered by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. A letter of recommendation to the Dean shall be prepared by the required date.

5.2.7 In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate may ask, within five working days of receipt of the committee's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the committee's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the committee members. The request must be made in writing to the committee chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing and (at the discretion of the committee) in person, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The committee shall respond in writing.

5.2.8 In the event of a department chairperson recommendation of continuation of employment with which the Dean concurs, no further action shall be required.

5.2.9 In the event that the Dean recommends non-renewal of appointment, the candidate may ask, within five working days of receipt of the Dean's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the Dean's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the Dean. The request must be made in writing to the Dean. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The Dean shall respond in writing.

5.2.10 In the event that the Dean recommends non-renewal of appointment, by the required date this recommendation shall be communicated to the faculty member and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for review in accordance with University policy.

5.3 Review in the Third Year of a Probationary Appointment

5.3.1 The third-year review is intended to be more extensive than reviews in other probationary years. Third year reviews shall: (1) require a Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation in all cases; (2) require a department chairperson recommendation in all cases; (3) require a College Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation in all cases; and (4) require more extensive documentation from the faculty member under review. The letters generated as part of this review become part of any subsequent mandatory tenure review portfolio.

5.3.2 Faculty serving the third year of a probationary appointment shall supply to the chairperson of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee a dossier of materials similar to that required of candidates for promotion and/or tenure by the Office of the Provost's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*. However, no external letters of recommendation are required. This packet should also include brief (no more than three pages) statement, as described in 3.3.2. The candidate also shall supply copies of letters from editors regarding publications under revision. The chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee may ask the candidate's co-authors to prepare statements about the candidate's contribution to the respective joint articles. To the extent allowed by law, these contribution statements shall be confidential and are intended to be read only by reviewing committees and individuals and eligible voting faculty, excluding the candidate for promotion.

5.3.3 The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall prepare its written recommendation regarding continuation in the tenure track or non-renewal of appointment by the required date. That recommendation may be reflected in the results of a secret ballot vote of the committee, but it is not required to be reflected in that manner.

5.3.4 In the event of a recommendation of non-renewal of appointment, the faculty member under review may ask, within five working days of receipt of the committee's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the committee's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the committee members. The request must be made in writing to the committee chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing and (at the discretion of the committee) in person, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The committee shall respond in writing.

5.3.5 The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall forward its recommendation and any materials associated with a reconsideration to the department chairperson by the required date.

5.3.6 Subsequent to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation, and any reconsideration, the department chairperson shall prepare a letter to the Dean containing a recommendation regarding continuation in the tenure track or non-renewal of appointment.

5.3.7 In the event of a recommendation of non-renewal of appointment, the faculty member under review may ask, within five working days of receipt of the chairperson's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the chairperson's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the chairperson. The request must be made in writing to the chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The chairperson shall respond in writing.

5.3.8 The chairperson's recommendation and any materials associated with a reconsideration shall be forwarded to the Dean by the required date.

5.3.9 Subsequent to the department chairperson recommendation and any reconsideration, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall prepare a letter to the Dean containing a recommendation for or against the candidate's promotion and/or tenure. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have access to the third-year review materials and all prior recommendations forwarded by the departments to the Dean.

5.3.10 By secret ballot, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall vote for or against the faculty member's continuation in the tenure track. Representatives of the candidate's department must recuse themselves from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee vote. The actual vote count shall be recorded, and a favorable recommendation requires a strict majority of total votes cast. Abstentions do not count as cast votes. The recommendation, as reflected by the vote count, shall be accompanied by comments by the committee supporting that recommendation.

5.3.11 In the event of a recommendation of non-renewal of appointment, the faculty member under review may ask, within five working days of receipt of the committee's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the committee's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the committee members. The request must be made in writing to the committee chairperson. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing and (at the discretion of the committee) in person, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The committee shall respond in writing.

5.3.12 The chairperson of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall communicate the recommendation and any materials associated with a reconsideration to the Dean by the required date.

5.3.13 Subsequent to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee's vote and any reconsideration, the Dean shall make a recommendation regarding continuation in the tenure track or non-renewal of appointment. If the recommendation is for continuation in the tenure track, no further action is required. If the recommendation is for non-renewal of appointment, the Dean shall prepare a letter to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost with this recommendation.

5.3.14 In the event of a recommendation of non-renewal of appointment, the faculty member under review may ask, within five working days of receipt of the Dean's recommendation, for a reconsideration of the Dean's decision, to rebut assertions made or to offer new evidence for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the Dean. The request must be made in writing to the Dean. The rebuttal and/or new evidence must be presented in writing, and must be considered within five working days subsequent to the receipt of the request for reconsideration. The Dean shall respond in writing.

5.3.15 If after the reconsideration the Dean's recommendation is non-renewal of appointment, all review materials and materials related to a reconsideration shall be forwarded, by the required date, to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for review in accordance with University policy.

5.3.16 At the discretion of the Dean, in exceptional circumstances, a continuation in the tenure-track recommendation may carry the stipulation that the faculty member under review undergo a fourth-year review under the more extensive requirements of the third-year review (as contained in this section) rather than under the normal requirements as contained in Section 5.2.

Amended: 05/04/1995
Amended: 08/22/1995
Amended: 12/07/1995
Amended by the Faculty of the Bauer College of Business: 04/29/2008
Amended by the Faculty of the Bauer College of Business: 04/22/2016
Amended by the Faculty of the Bauer College of Business: 01/12/2017
Amended by the Faculty of the Bauer College of Business: 12/14/2021
Amended by the Faculty of the Bauer College of Business: 05/09/2022