



UNIVERSITY
OF WYOMING

Office of
Academic Affairs

Office of Academic Affairs
Dept. 3302 • 1000 E. University Avenue
Laramie, WY 82071
(307) 766-4286 • (307) 766-6476 • fax (307) 766-2606
www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs

May 2, 2022

Re: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion-Ad hoc Committee

Dear Colleagues,

I am very grateful for your willingness to serve on the ad hoc committee to review policies and practices relative to RTP. Over 30 folks volunteered to serve on this committee, which is very gratifying and perhaps indicative of the need for this discussion!

In the interest of efficiency, we are asking the following individuals to serve on the committee:

Barbara Rasco, Agriculture and Natural Resources
Andrew Kniss, Agriculture and Natural Resources
Teena Gabrielson, Arts and Sciences
Doug Russell, Arts and Sciences
Mark Clementz, Arts and Sciences
Ronn Smith, Business
Scott Thomas, Education

Dave Bagley, Engineering and Applied Sciences
John Koprowski, Haub School
Tristan Wallhead, Health Sciences
Klint Alexander, Law
Cass Kvenild, Libraries
Mike Borowczek, Faculty Senate representative
Thomas Grant, Faculty Senate Representative

Attached please find a list of questions that we have compiled that I would like you to discuss and provide feedback on. The list is offered to provide some structure to your deliberations, but you may well have other RTP-related matters that you would like to add. My only request is that you keep your discussions focused on the mechanics of the RTP process and how they might be modified to serve us better. There might understandably be the temptation to get into discussions regarding the criteria for promotion and tenure (e.g., how teaching, research, and engagement are evaluated and weighted). Those are indeed important questions, but I want to engage with them through a separate process.

For those of you who are not being appointed to the committee, I would welcome your thoughts on the RTP process and how it can be improved and will share any suggestions that you forward with the committee.

We will be organizing a meeting soon to get you started on this important dialogue.

Regards,

Kevin R. Carman, Provost and Executive Vice President

T&P Revisions

1. External reviewers

a. Number

Question: Should there be a minimum number of external reviewers? If so, what is the appropriate number? Should there be a maximum number of external reviewers? If so, what is the appropriate number?

UW Policy: The candidate and the department/unit head/chair shall each make a list of at least six possible reviewers. The candidate may delete up to one-third of the names on the department/unit list. The department/unit shall choose an equal number from each list (excluding the names deleted by the candidate) for a minimum of four potential reviewers. Many departments solicit six or more, both to make sure that the final packet contains at least four and to gain a broad professional perspective. Unit heads should exercise diligence in soliciting enough letters. Failure to do so jeopardizes the candidate's case

b. R1

Question: Should there be an expectation regarding inclusion of reviewers from R1 universities? If so, what should be expected?

*UW guidelines: A tenure or promotion packet should contain at least four letters from referees who have **no personal connection to the candidate**. Examples of personal connections are serving as a dissertation advisor or advisee, previous or pending co-authorship, sharing of research funding, and family relationships. Avoid selecting academic referees who are not tenured and/or who do not hold rank at or above Associate Professor or Professor.*

c. Recommended by candidate

Question: Should there be guidelines regarding the proportion of reviewers that are recommended by the candidate? If so, what is the appropriate proportion?

UW policy and guidelines: The candidate and the unit head shall each make a list of at least six possible reviewers. The candidate may delete up to one-third of the names on the department/unit list. The unit shall choose an equal number from each list (excluding the names deleted by the candidate) for a minimum of four potential reviewers. In the event that the unit head is the candidate, the dean shall identify a delegate to complete this process.

d. International

Question: Should there be guidelines on limiting the number of reviewers that come from non-U.S. institutions? If so, what should the limit be?

UW guidelines: Not addressed

e. COI

Question: Should there be guidelines regarding disclosure of conflict of interest, e.g., current or former collaborator, former graduate mentor or thesis advisor, co-author, reviewers at the institution where the candidate earned their terminal degree or performed postdoctoral research.

*UW guidelines: A tenure or promotion packet should contain at least four letters from referees who have **no personal connection to the candidate**. Examples of personal connections are serving as a dissertation advisor or advisee, previous or pending co-authorship, sharing of research funding, and family relationships. Avoid selecting academic referees who are not tenured and/or who do not hold rank at or above Associate Professor or Professor.*

f. Rank

Question: Should there be a requirement that external reviewers hold a professorial rank that is equivalent to or above the candidate?

UW guidelines: Not addressed

g. Institution

Question: Should multiple reviewers from a single institution be allowed?

UW guidelines: Not addressed

2. Voting privileges

a. Choice of candidate

Question: Should the candidate be allowed to determine which faculty vote on their T/P case?

UW Policy: Tenure-track members of the department who do not hold tenure vote on a case by-case basis if the candidate provides expressed written approval. Additional members of the peer group vote, on a case-by-case basis, if a candidate who provides written approval for tenure-track faculty to vote also provides written approval for this additional group

b. Above rank

Question: Should voting on T/P cases be limited to faculty who hold a higher rank (e.g., Associate and Full Professors vote on T&P for assistant professors, Full Professors vote on promotion of Associate Professors)

UW Policy: For purposes of reappointment, tenure and promotion, each department must establish protocols by majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty to form a peer group that must include but is not limited to all tenured and tenure track members of the department. The peer group may include a group composed of additional members of the department who hold appropriate academic qualifications considering rank, academic degree, or job description.

3. Interviews

a. Interviews with candidates/deans/heads

Question: Should candidates be interviewed by department heads, deans, committees?

UW Policy: The candidate may present a written and/or oral statement about the case to the [College & University RTP) committee. If the candidate chooses to appear before the committee the department chair/head and dean shall be requested to appear also to answer any questions that the committee may have about the case. Should the committee wish to discuss the case with the dean or the department chair/head, the candidate shall have the right to be present and to respond to any presentation made by the dean or the department chair/head.

4. Timeline

Question: Should the review process be completed by the end of the fall semester?

UW Regulation: The Provost shall have the authority to establish the calendar for the submission of reappointment, tenure and promotion materials, the meetings of the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee to consider the candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

5. RT&P committees

Question: Should there be separate university committees for tenure-track and instructional faculty?
UW policy – The University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee is a standing committee of Faculty Senate. Composition and membership is determined by Faculty Senate bylaws and/or policies. NOTE: Current UW policy allows the individual candidate to determine if the peer group includes at rank or lower. This can have implications if the university committee includes faculty at a rank or in a position not approved by the candidate.

6. TT probationary reviews and reappointments

Questions: (1) Should probationary reviews be reviewed at the institutional level (Provost or UW committee)? (2) Should Year 1, Year 2, and Year 4 reviews be forwarded to Academic Affairs or maintained at the college/school level? (3) Should Year 5 review be required?

UW Regulation – First year review requires department faculty, department head, and dean review be submitted to the Provost. If conflicted, college and university level review required. Mid-probationary (typically year 3) and year 6 requires department faculty, department head, college T & P, and dean review. If conflicted or early promotion, the University committee must review before the Provost makes final determination. Annual reviews are required in years 2, 4, and 5.

7. Scope of the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Questions: (1) Should the university committee review all tenure and promotion cases and provide a summary report/recommendation to the Provost? (2) Should the review all fixed-term rolling contract and promotion of non-tenure track faculty cases be reviewed by the university committee, conclude at the college level or be reviewed by a separate committee? (See #5).

UW Regulation and Policy: The university committee reviews all conflicted cases (1st yr, mid-probationary, tenure, promotion, fixed-term rolling contract), early tenure and promotion cases, and any additional cases requested by the Provost.

UW Resources

UW Regulation 2-7 ([Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Fixed-Term](#))

Policy and Procedural Document (previous in regulation) – [Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review](#)

Academic Affairs Instructional Guides

[Guide for Candidates Seeking Tenure and Promotion](#)

[T & P Guide for Unit Heads](#)

[T & P Guide for Deans and Directors](#)

[Guidelines for Peer Group and Voting Protocol](#)

[T & P guide for College Tenure and Promotion Committees](#)

[FAQ on External Reviews](#)

Additional Materials

[Annual RTP-FT Instructional Memo](#)

UW External Referees Coversheet (see attached)

Chair External Reviewer Form – UNR (see attached)