

Promotion in Rank

NUMBER: 1412
APPROVED: September 26, 2013; Revised June 9, 2016 (eff. 7/1/16);
Revised June 6, 2017 (eff. 7/1/17); Revised June 14, 2018 (eff. 7/1/18); Revised June 13,
2019 (eff. 7/1/19); Revised June 18, 2020 (eff. 7/1/20); Revised June 17, 2021 (eff. 7/1/21)
SCHEDULED
REVIEW DATE: June 2026

and to provide corroborating evidence (e.g., web links, complete citations, grant numbers, etc.) for all claimed accomplishments. The evidence should address the quality of the journals and the reputation of book and other such publishers. Fraudulent or non-valid claims can lead to faculty sanctions, including denial of promotion. The chair should work with promotion candidates to ensure the completeness and accuracy of their portfolios. The chair and the department promotion and tenure committee as a part of the regular review process should verify the accuracy of portfolio elements that are central to the promotion case. Should concerns be raised about the validity of a candidate's claims by external or internal reviewers, it is the chair's responsibility to verify those claims. The promotion process will be paused while the chair verifies those claims.

B. External evaluation of the faculty member's research and scholarly activity by nationally recognized experts in the field of specialization will be required.

1. The responsibility for initiating the external review, securing the reviewers, and forwarding complete review files to the dean, provost and vice president for academic affairs, and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee belongs to the department chair. If the department chair does not have the rank of full professor, all chair responsibilities for promotion to full professor will be delegated by the dean to a full professor in the department or from another department within the same college who will assume all of the chair's responsibilities described below. This appointed full professor, acting in the role of chair, cannot take part in any deliberations or votes of the departmental, college or University promotion committees while the promotion case is being considered. In promotion of department chairs, the responsibility belongs to the dean.
2. External reviewers with academic positions must hold the same rank or higher than the promotion rank for which the faculty member is being considered; exceptions should be justified by the dean. The department tenure and promotion committee and the candidate will prepare separate lists of potential reviewers. The candidate will review both lists and will document personal and professional relationships with all potential reviewers, including potential conflicts of interest. This documentation will become part of the promotion file. The chair (or designee, see 1 above) will select three reviewers from the candidate's list and three reviewers from the department tenure and promotion committee's list; the chair (or designee) will provide the list of reviewers to the dean. The dean will submit an agreed upon list to the provost and vice president for academic affairs for final approval prior to initiating the review process. The final list of external reviewers, together with the documentation of personal and professional relationships by the candidate (as outlined above), should be included as part of the application package for all internal reviewers. External reviewers should not be close collaborators or (former) mentors of the candidate. In general, co-authors on publications should also be excluded as external reviewers, except as permissible under the departmental statement on evaluation of research (see the Policy on the Evaluation of Scholarly Activity and Research). The selection of potential external reviewers must be completed before the end of the semester prior to the submission of credentials for promotion.
3. External reviews will be confidential; reviewers will be so advised. Requests for exception to the confidentiality of external reviews should be made directly to the provost and vice president for academic affairs before the reviewers are asked to submit evaluations. If an exception is approved, candidates for promotion will be allowed access to the substance of external reviews, but the authorship of specific external reviews and other identifying information contained therein will remain confidential. All external reviewers will receive a standard letter sent by the chair but prepared by the provost and vice president for academic affairs in consultation with the deans and a copy of the policy on external reviews so their responsibilities will be clear.
4. A curriculum vitae will be required of each external reviewer. Each reviewer will be asked to describe any personal or professional relationship with the candidate. It is the responsibility of the chair to include a curriculum vitae of each reviewer. For promotion of department chairs, the responsibility belongs to the dean.
5. External reviewers will be asked to evaluate all submitted material mailed to them. Candidates for promotion are responsible for the preparation of the research portfolio and curriculum vitae to be sent to external reviewers. In the case of the arts, reviewers may be asked to consider works of art or performances. External reviewers will be asked to evaluate: a) the quality of the scholarship or creative work under review; and b) the scholarly reputation (regional, national, international) of the candidate.
6. All candidates for promotion to full professor will be required to have their scholarship evaluated by no fewer than four external reviewers. If fewer than four reviews are

10. The faculty member under consideration is informed whenever a committee is considering promotion and is given an opportunity to submit a statement (in electronic form) to the Provost's Office in support of their promotion case, or to correct any factual misinformation in previous recommendations. The Provost's Office will add such statements to the candidate's file.
- 11.

votes or votes submitted by non-secure means (e.g., email or communication accessible to a third party) are not permitted. Members who are eligible to vote on a specific candidate's promotion application are defined in section II.C.6. In instances of a non-unanimous vote of all eligible voting members, the minority opinion must be included in the committee recommendation and the minority must be given the option to write the minority opinion.

- I. On the basis of all the evaluations and recommendations presented, and after consultation with staff, the provost and vice president for academic affairs makes a decision concerning promotion for the coming year. If the recommendations of the committees and administrators that have previously considered the case have not been in agreement with one another, or if the provost and vice president for academic affairs disagrees with the recommendations that have been in agreement with one another, the provost and vice president for academic affairs shall consult with the chair, the dean, and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee before reaching a final decision. The decision of the provost and vice president for academic affairs will consist of one of the following:
 1. promotion
 2. deferral
 - J. If the decision of the provost and vice president for academic affairs is for promotion, the faculty member will receive the higher rank in the subsequent academic year. The decision of the provost and vice president for academic affairs will be reported to the president.
 - K. The faculty member may request that the president review a negative decision by the provost and vice president for academic affairs. The decision of the president is final.
 - L. All promotions are reported by the president to the Board of Visitors.
 - M. Copies of the recommendations by all committees, chairs, deans and the provost and vice president for academic affairs shall be provided to the faculty member being considered for promotion. The faculty member will be provided opportunity to correct any factual misinformation in such recommendations by placing a letter in his or her promotion file at any stage, or up until April 1, to the provost and vice president for academic affairs.
 - N. The above procedures at the department and college level may be suitably adapted for faculty members who hold interdisciplinary or interdepartmental appointments. The adapted procedures should be recommended by the promotion and tenure committee of the college or colleges involved and approved by the dean or deans and the provost and vice president for academic affairs. Procedures above the college level will be the same as those designated above in all cases.
- III. Research Faculty
- A. Promotion to the rank of research professor from the rank of research associate professor and promotion to the rank of research associate professor from the rank of research assistant professor shall be upon the recommendation of the department, chair, college promotion and tenure committee, dean and University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the provost and vice president for academic affairs. If the provost and vice president for academic affairs decides against the promotion, the person may request a review by the president. The decision of the president is final.
 - B. The process for promotion to the rank of research professor and promotion to the rank of research associate professor will require external evaluation of the quality of the faculty member's research performance from nationally recognized experts in the faculty member's field; procedures for the external review process can be found in section II.B. of this policy.
 - C. For those research faculty who only have appointments in one of the University-level research centers, the following promotion policy will apply. Research centers will establish a promotion committee to review faculty promotions and make recommendations to the center director. Appointments to this committee will follow the guidance of section II.C. of this policy pertaining to departments. This promotion committee should include at least one member from the academic department(s) most closely aligned to the center to ensure promotion considerations are being applied equitably between the faculty assigned to that department and those assigned to the

president review a negative decision by the provost and vice president for academic affairs. The decision of the president is final.

IV. Clinical Faculty

- A. Promotion to the rank of clinical professor from the rank of clinical associate professor and promotion to the rank of clinical associate professor from the rank of clinical assistant professor shall be upon the recommendation of the department promotion and tenure committee, department chair, college promotion and tenure committee, dean and University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the provost and vice president for academic affairs. If the provost and vice president for academic affairs decides against the promotion the person may request a review by the president. The decision of the president is final.
- B. The process for promotion to the rank of clinical professor and promotion to the rank of clinical associate professor will require external evaluation of the quality of the faculty member's scholarly activities from nationally recognized experts in the faculty member's field; procedures for the external review process can be found in section II.B. of this policy. The schedule for review will follow that for clinical faculty seeking promotion in rank.
- C. The above procedures at the department and college level may be suitably adapted for clinical faculty members who hold interdisciplinary appointments.
 1. In the case of the interdisciplinary schools, an interdisciplinary school review committee will be formed for each school. Each will be responsible for conducting department-level promotion reviews of non-tenure track faculty assigned to the interdisciplinary school. Following guidance offered in Policy 1412 (Promotion in Rank, II.C.2) describing situations when academic units do not have enough tenured faculty to conduct reviews