Tenure and Promotion – Adjudication Guideline

The Tenure and Promotion Adjudication Guideline is designed to serve as an administrative tool to assist Adjudicating Committees (AC) in their discussion and documentation of applications for tenure and/or promotion, based upon the suggestions of the Senate Review Committee (SRC) in its review and feedback of tenure and promotion files. Items below are listed with the intent of provoking clarity and transparency into the adjudication process and the subsequent AC report, as it is considered by the SRC to be the most germane aspect of the file.

Tenure and Promotion Standards
❑ Is there extensive use of the Unit (draft) standards and/or the University *Policy, Criteria, and Procedures* (June 2007) in interpreting the evidence in the file and supporting the overall recommendation to approve, delay, or deny tenure and/or promotion?

Teaching, Professional Contribution & Standing, and Service
❑ Has a thorough discussion of the recommended rankings (competence, high competence, excellence) been fully captured in each of the three sections?
❑ Has more significant weight been given to one or more referees over another? If so, has a rationale for this weighting been thoroughly captured in the AC report?
❑ Has consideration been given to teaching referees, evaluations, *and* pedagogical accomplishments?
❑ Have teaching referees addressed anything other than their class visit?
  ❑ If not, has the AC discussed the implication on the candidate's evaluation, and has that discussion been documented in the AC report?
❑ Have teaching evaluation scores been interpreted and contextualized by the AC?
❑ Does the file include negative comments from student, colleague, or external referees? If so, are such comments discussed and contextualized in the AC report?

AC Membership
❑ Do any members of the AC have a professional relationship with the candidate? (i.e. co-author, co-applicant for grants)
  ❑ If so, how did the AC account for the impact of these relationships in its evaluation of the file? Has the discussion been summarized in the AC report?

Voting Patterns
❑ Have all voting patterns been accurately captured and documented in the AC report? Did every member vote?
❑ In the event of a split vote for tenure and promotion, have divergent views been clearly articulated in the AC report?
❑ Were any AC voting members not present for the vote or any part of the vote? Has this been documented and explained in the AC report?
❑ Does the AC report rationalize the attendance of non-voting members, if such members attended?
❑ For each of the three sections (PCS, Teaching, Service):
  ❑ When the voting pattern was not unanimous, does the AC report reflect the arguments raised in the AC's discussion of the various rankings for that section? (i.e. were the arguments for each recommendation documented in the AC report)
  ❑ In the event of a narrow majority vote, has the AC taken extra effort to present a complete summary of its discussions in order to provide a clear explanation as to the recommended ranking?

Adjudicating Committee Report
❑ Is the AC report dated and copied to the candidate? (F.3.2.3.b)
❑ Have concerns regarding file preparation impacted the AC's discussion of the file in any of the three sections? If so, has the discussion been summarized in the AC report?