Appendix D: Possible Configurations of Promotion and Tenure Process

Based on current plans for academic organization as well as the Faculty Handbook Working Group’s inquiry into similar COPLAC and Virginia institutions, the following models are recommendations for UFAC to investigate for adaptation and/or implementation. The final recommendation based on the models presented below should be made to UFC at its October 2024 meeting.

Depending on the model recommended, next steps will vary. If college-level promotion and tenure committees remain, then UFAC would oversee changes to the college-level committees to bring them into alignment with the updated *Handbook* and Academic Affairs organization. If a university-level committee is recommended, this would become a new University standing committee. According to §2.3.2.6 (university committees), proposals for new University-wide *standing* committees, or elimination of current *standing* committees, must be developed in consultation with each college’s governing bodies. Such proposals must be approved by majority votes of the faculties of each college, through procedures to be determined in each college, before being submitted for approval as revisions to the University Faculty Handbook.

If UFAC proposes any additional modifications to §§6 and/or 7, as specified in §1.12, §§1-7 generally require recommendations from either the UFC (approved by a majority vote of UFC members), the President, or a vote of the general faculty (“if reconsidering an action on an amendment that was passed by the UFC and voted on but not approved by the faculties in the colleges as stipulated in §§2.3.2.4 [UFC] and 2.3.2.6 [University standing committees]”). Legal counsel will also review the proposed changes, and the BOV will vote to adopt proposed changes before they become final.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Model 1: Maintain current 3-college structure.**  | **Model 2: Consolidate into one university-wide P&T committee.**  |
| Pros: * Least “disruptive” of status quo.
* A few survey responses strongly support this model.

 Cons: * Adjustments of college P&T would still need to be made in COE and COB, as now their units will include other units formerly within CAS.
* Would impact COE/COB the most.

 Next Steps if Chosen: * Modify P&T procedures/criteria in COE & COB to be more inclusive of new units.
* COB/COE would have the most impact, but are smaller units. Consider how to equitably consider feedback requests.
* Would a university-level check/appeal in cases of disagreement be needed? Separate committee or combine with University Faculty Appeals & Grievance?
 | Pros: * Would reduce redundancies in committee structures.
* CAS already reviews cross-discipline dossiers.
* Adjustments of college P&T would need to be made anyway in COE and COB, as now their units will include other units formerly within CAS.
* Most survey responses support this model.

 Cons: * Would impact COE/COB the most.
* Would be the most disruptive model to the status quo.

 Next Steps: * Consider how to equitably staff combined P&T committee. 1 representative per school (CAS) or college (COE and COB)? Break into sub-committees and assure candidates that one reviewer will be from their school/college?
* Possible structures: 6 (1/unit, but even number; however, small number of individuals to consider large # of files); 12 (2/unit, but still even number); **9 (1/unit, 3 at large)**. Note: If Business expands into two schools, that would increase these numbers accordingly.
* Consider that to be on P&T committee, must be tenured. In new COE&HS, only education faculty are currently eligible for tenure, which again puts undue burden on education.
* Rewrite P&T criteria/rubrics for all three colleges to be more specific (CAS) and more inclusive (COE/COB).
* COB/COE would have the most impact, but are smaller units. Consider how to equitably consider feedback requests.
* Process at other schools: individual --> department -->school (if applicable)-->university
* If at the department level, how would this work in smaller departments with low numbers of tenured people?
* Would single committee still report recommendations to relevant college dean?
 |
| **Model 3: Department-Level Committee** Pros: * Department has most insights about candidate’s performance and whether they have met expectations.
* Would eliminate both college and university-level P&T committee.
* Workload would be lighter/more distributed.

 Cons: * Regulation of all departmental plans/procedures would be a logistical nightmare. Most schools that do this have a separate Personnel Policy Committee that reviews these.
* Would require localized peer review committees for every department (could be challenging for smaller departments; would need to bring in external tenured individuals at times).

 Next Steps if Chosen: * Would a university-level check/appeal in cases of disagreement be needed? Separate committee or combine with University Faculty Appeals & Grievance (i.e., TCNJ)?
* Would need to institute procedures for small departments to ensure a minimum size for departmental committees (several of the schools we looked at had procedures for this)
* What happens to peer letters, if those peers are now likely on the committee? Would this privilege large departments who have enough people to separately write letters and be on the committee? Perhaps # within university (could be department peers), # external to university.
* Consideration of how to standardize expectations if locally decided.
 | **Model 4: Combination of Committees (i.e., Department + University)** Pros: * Double level is thorough.

 Cons: * Does not streamline. Instead, work in university committee only “as needed” (i.e., disagreement in committee/Dean).

 Next Steps if Chosen: * The Faculty Handbook Working Group did not think this model would meet UMW’s needs but wanted to share it as an option that some institutions utilize. If there is interest, implementation considerations would need to be developed.
 |