
1. Clearer rules are needed on situations in which a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee may need to recuse himself/herself from a discussion and vote about a candidate. First, we need to consider whether a faculty member who is from the same department as a candidate, should get to have a voice on the promotion twice, once as a department member and once as a Promotion and Tenure Committee member. Second, there are situations with blatant conflict-of-interest, for example, when the candidate a spouse or ex-spouse.

2. Annual training of chairs and deans on the promotion and tenure process would lead to better compliance with the process and eliminate many appeals.

3. Since following the proper process is of great importance in promotion and tenure decisions, promotion and tenure guidelines should require departments to describe in detail the process that was followed at the department level, including both what was done and when. This description should be provided to the candidate, since promotion and tenure appeals can only be based on procedural grounds.

4. A mechanism should be developed to address procedural problems during the promotion process. Currently the only avenue available to candidates is to wait and launch an appeal after a promotion decision has been reached by the president. This mechanism should also allow for other parties, for example, faculty members, to raise procedural issues during the promotion process.

5. Policies on annual review of faculty members (Policies 201 and 214) should be reconciled. The proposed policy of annual written reviews should be carefully considered in the context of the overall promotion and tenure process. It may open the door to appeals that would be based on an inconsistency between the set of pre-promotion reviews and a negative promotion decision. Given that the promotion process itself is quite opaque from the candidate point of view, making the pre-promotion period more transparent, without changing the opaqueness of the promotion and tenure process itself may lead to problems. (See next point.)

6. We may want to add more transparency to the promotion and tenure process. After a department reaches a promotion decision, the candidate is informed, but the reason is typically given in a very terse manner. Other institutions require departments to offer candidates a detailed rationale for the departmental decision, and enable candidates to submit a response to the departmental decision for inclusion in the dossier.

7. The current process for mid-term termination is very lean, leaving the decision to the department. We may want to flesh out this process, specifying in greater detail the departmental process, and considering adding layers of oversight by the dean and by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
8. The guidelines are not clear on what happens when a department makes a negative promotion decision and the dean concurs. The guidelines should be explicit in stating that all Promotion and Tenure dossier must be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The guidelines should also spell out the role of Promotion and Tenure Committee for dossiers that arrive with negative recommendation from the department and the dean.

9. The guidelines allow the candidate to submit a two-page research statement, two-page teaching statement, and one-page service statement. We should consider allowing more generous page limit, to let candidate feel that they were given ample opportunity to describe their contributions.

10. The guidelines should explicitly prohibit informal communication between the department and external reviewers. Currently, the guidelines allow for "preliminary requests" to be sent out, which, in effect, may allow for "shopping for the right reviewers."

11. The guidelines require deans to express an opinion on promotion and tenure candidates. In practice, deans have sometime delegated this role. The guidelines need to be clear on this, and perhaps spell out the circumstances under which this important role can be delegated.