

Procedural Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion
Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
University of Denver
Approved November 14, 2008

- I. General Information – These guidelines are to supplement the University of Denver Faculty Personnel Guidelines Relating to Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (hereafter referred to as the APT document), revised in 2001 and approved by the Board of Trustees on June 8, 2001. The relevant sections of the Faculty Personnel Guidelines should be consulted prior to starting any tenure/promotion process.
- a. Timing
- i. Tenure (APT document section 5.5): Consideration typically begins no later than the start of the 6th year of academic service, for notification before September 1 of the 7th year. Early tenure decisions are possible, but highly unusual **and necessitate the prior approval of the dean and provost** (APT document section 5.5.8).
 - ii. Consideration for promotion to professor will be determined by the candidate's qualifications. The normal career would span approximately 15 years of increasing academic responsibility (APT document section 4.5) or 8 years past tenure. The department should submit a memo of intent to the dean's office (before August 1) prior to the academic year that promotion is to be considered.
 - iii. Procedural timing (recommended)
 1. Summer: compile candidate's materials
 2. September: send candidate's materials to external reviewers requesting a response before the end of November.
 3. November/December: review documents and begin to prepare the departmental committee's recommendation.
 4. January: finalize the department recommendation, share tenure/promotion documents with the department chair (unless the chair is the candidate), and finalize the chair's recommendation.
 5. February 1: submit the tenure/promotion package (described in II. below) to the dean's office.
 6. February: the NSM tenure and promotion committee meets to review the candidate portfolios and prepares their recommendation to the dean.
 7. March 1: the NSM tenure and promotion committee submits their final report to the dean.
 8. April 1: the dean prepares and submits a recommendation to the provost.
- b. Committee membership
- i. Departmental committees:
 1. Departmental tenure committees must have a minimum of three tenured faculty (APT document section 5.4.2). Committee membership will be based on departmental policy. Non-tenured tenure-track faculty may serve

as non-voting members. Under certain circumstances, and after consultation with the dean, the committee may include members of other departments.

2. Departmental promotion committees (for consideration of promotion to the rank of professor) must have a minimum of three tenured faculty (APT document section 4.4). Committee membership will be based on departmental policy. Non-tenured tenure-track faculty may serve as non-voting members. Under certain circumstances, such as in the case of faculty with an interdisciplinary research focus, and after consultation with the dean, the committee may include members of other departments.
3. NSM tenure and promotion committee will be composed of one tenured member from each of the five departments in NSM. The process of selection is up to the department.

II. Tenure and/or Promotion Materials (to be submitted as the original plus 5 copies, all in binders with tabs, and presented in the following order:

| Tab | Contents |
|-----|---|
| 1. | Table of Contents (items 2-16 below) |
| 2. | Chair's recommendation with signature |
| 3. | Departmental committee report and recommendation with signature page |
| 4. | Curriculum vitae |
| 5. | Research statement |
| 6. | Teaching statement |
| 7. | Teaching record; course syllabi |
| 8. | Service record |
| 9. | Selected reprints |
| 10. | Annual reports and Chair's reviews |
| 11. | Report of pre-tenure committee (for tenure packages only) |
| 12. | Biographies or CVs of external reviewers |
| 13. | Sample letter to outside reviewers, waiver statement signed by candidate, list of reviewers indicating who recommended (committee or candidate?) and the request status (declined to respond, did not respond, letter received) |
| 14. | External review letters |
| 15. | Sample letter to student reviewers, waiver statement signed by candidate, list of reviewers indicating who recommended (committee or candidate?) and the request status (declined to respond, did not respond, letter received) |
| 16. | Student review letters |

III. Descriptions of Tenure and/or Promotion Materials

- a. Department chair's statement should:

- i. Start with nature of the recommendation (if for tenure, indicate whether tenure is recommended; if for promotion, indicate both present and recommended rank).
 - ii. Address the candidate's teaching, research/scholarship, and service activities, as a separate recommendation from that of the departmental tenure and promotion committee.
 - iii. Address the candidate's level of distinction and promise for continued professional growth.
 - iv. Explain how the candidate's teaching and research/scholarship contributes to the department's program.
 - v. Compare the qualification of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion with the qualifications of other individuals who might be available to the department (as per APT document section 5.1, page 22)
 - vi. End with a summary of the rationale for the recommendation.
- b. Departmental tenure and/or promotion committee's statement (this should include information on each of the following points):
- i. Nature of the recommendation (if for tenure, indicate whether tenure is recommended; if for promotion, indicate both present and recommended rank). Include the final tally of the secret ballot vote.
 - ii. Evaluation of candidate's teaching. Include the standard teaching load for the candidate as well as that of the department.
 - iii. Evaluation of candidate's research and scholarly activity. This should include a summary of the external evaluation of the candidate's work and should address such matters as its quality, originality and significance.
 - iv. Evaluation of the candidate's contributions of an administrative or service nature to the Department, to the University, and to the profession.
 - v. Description of how the candidate contributes to the Department's program and what his/her special role is. Description of the candidate's level of distinction and promise for continued professional growth.
 - vi. Any other relevant information.
 - vii. Summary of reasons for departmental recommendation.
 - viii. Signatures of all committee members
- c. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (up-to-date; prepared according to the following format)
- i. Personal data (name, home address, business address)
 - ii. Education and training, with degrees and dates
 - iii. Professional experience (list most recent position first)
 - iv. Professional associations/society memberships
 - v. Scholarly activities
 1. Refereed publications: books and articles published, accepted for publication, or submitted for publication (all jointly published material should distinguish between primary and secondary authorship. Publications that involve the candidate's students as co-authors should be indicated. Publications resulting from scholarly activity while employed at DU should be indicated. Please specify any conventions in your

discipline with respect to the manner in which authors are listed on publications).

2. Non-refereed publications: articles, books, reviews, published abstracts (in the same format as above).
3. Professional presentations
 - a. Invited presentations, conference/symposium participation, lectures, panel participation, roundtable participation, etc.
 - b. Contributed papers, talks, or posters presented at conferences.
4. Other professional contributions
 - a. Memberships on editorial boards and/or funding panels (e.g., NSF, NIH, USDA, or for private foundations). Include dates served.
 - b. Official positions in professional societies, conference organization committees, etc. Include roles and dates served.
 - c. Manuscript/grant or proposal reviewing.
 - d. Consulting activities.
5. Research proposals, grants and contracts
 - a. Extramural funding: (title of proposal; agency, date submitted; budget amount; duration; was proposal funded or not and, if so, at what level)
 - b. University of Denver funding (include sources, e.g., proposal preparation funds, venture funds, ARC, international travel grants, etc.)
6. Miscellaneous: awards, honors, etc.
- vi. Service Activities: departmental, divisional, and university committees (list types and dates) and other service (e.g., professional, community).
- vii. Optional: A one-page (maximum) statement from the candidate addressing any matter(s) the candidate believes relevant.

d. Candidate's Research Statement:

- i. Briefly describes the candidate's research area
- ii. Explains how the candidate's research/scholarship activity fits into the department's program and into the candidate's field of study.
- iii. Projects how the research/scholarship activity is expected to develop over the next few years.

e. Candidate's Summary of Teaching Record:

- i. Complete list of courses taught each year, with course numbers, titles, and quarter in which taught. Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor need only list courses taught since attaining the rank of associate professor.
- ii. Graduate and undergraduate theses, projects, etc., supervised.
- iii. Course and curriculum development.
- iv. Teaching evaluations: summaries of student evaluations for each class should be presented in tabular form (based on current evaluation forms). Department division and/or Foundations/Core averages should be provided for comparison.

- v. Other evaluations of teaching are also appropriate (for example, reports of class visits by other department faculty).
- f. Service Record
 - i. List of all service contributions (include start year and end year)
 - 1. University committees
 - 2. Divisional committees
 - 3. Departmental committees
 - 4. Professional service
- g. Selected Reprints: include reprints of publications representative of the candidate's research.
- h. Annual Reviews of Faculty Performance: These are usually written by the department chair as a result of the annual review conference with the faculty member (APT document section 3.3). Copies of these reports should be obtained from the department chair, shared with the departmental tenure/promotion committee (as per APT document section 3.3.4) and included as part of the documents submitted to the dean's office. For those candidates up for promotion to the rank of professor, only annual faculty reviews at the rank of associate professor need be submitted. In cases where the faculty member has provided a written response to an annual review, it should be attached to the annual review and submitted.
- i. Report of the Pre-Tenure Review Committee (for tenure packages only): The report produced as a result of the Pre-Tenure Review (APT document section 5.2) should be included.
- j. Biographies or CVs of External Reviewers: It is very helpful to provide brief biographical statements about the outside referees so that their qualifications, stature in their field, etc., will be evident to the faculty tenure and promotion committee. Reviewers should be asked to attach an abbreviated Curriculum Vitae to their letters.
- k. External Reviews:
 - i. Relevant questions to ask in the letter of request for evaluation include "To what extent does the candidate's scholarly work demonstrate a significant and original contribution to the field?" "How would you compare the candidate's work and professional reputation to those of others in the field at a similar stage in their careers?" "Does the candidate's work demonstrate the potential for continued professional growth and scholarly productivity?" "What is your view of the recognition achieved by the candidate thus far, and what is your view of her/his future potential?" Please ask the external reviewers to state their relationship to the candidate (e.g., professional colleague, but does not know candidate personally; dissertation advisor, co-author, etc.).
 - ii. Selection of reviewers: The NSM division recommends that departments target at least ten external reviewers and strongly encourages departments to forward six

external reviews with the candidate's tenure/promotion materials (the APT document requires three). Ideally, half should come from reviewers suggested by the candidate and half should come from reviewers identified by the committee. All external reviews received should be included in the final packet. All reviewers should be recognized as significant figures in the candidate's field and ones whose appraisal would be of value in the University's deliberations. Additional guidelines are below.

1. Both the candidate and the committee (and/or department chair) should submit names of possible external reviewers, in writing, to the chair of the committee. The chair of the committee will discuss these names with all members of the committee and the committee will arrive at a final list of names.
 2. The committee has the right to limit the candidate's suggestions to no more than one-half of the final list of possible reviewers.
 3. The committee shall share the final list of possible reviewers with the candidate. The candidate has the right to indicate reviewers with potential conflicts of interest and explain the basis of the conflict.
 4. The committee should ensure an adequate representation of external reviewers not personally or closely-associated with the candidate. Dissertation/postdoctoral advisors are acceptable reviewers, but should be identified as such.
 5. Prior to soliciting letters from external reviewers, the candidate should sign a waiver letter relinquishing all rights to view the letters of evaluation.
 6. The letter requesting the external evaluation should come from the committee or the department chair, not the candidate. The solicitation letter should include the statement that the candidate has waived all rights to see letters of evaluation.
 7. Material sent to the external reviewers may include published and unpublished material submitted by the candidate as deemed appropriate by the committee.
 8. Faxed and/or Emailed external reviews should ultimately be accompanied by a personally signed and dated letter, if possible.
-
1. **Student Letters:** Students should be solicited for letters of evaluation of the candidate (in the specified context of the tenure/promotion process). The target number for student letters should be 10-12 and represent a mixture of undergraduates and graduate students. Half of the letters should come from students suggested by the candidate and the other half should come from students identified by the committee (and/or department chair). All letters received should be included in the final packet. Students should be asked to explain the context in which they know the candidate and provide an evaluation of the candidate's teaching. The solicitation letter should include the statement that the candidate has waived all rights to see letters of evaluation.

IV. General Procedures

a. Department Level:

- i. All committee votes must be taken by secret ballot.
- ii. All committee deliberations must remain confidential in all respects (with exceptions granted only by the provost).
- iii. The departmental recommendation (*i.e.*, a general statement regarding the nature of the recommendation, but not the full committee report as described in III.b. above) shall be communicated to the candidate in writing. If the recommendation is negative, the candidate may (within 15 days of being given the departmental recommendation) request a written memo stating the specific reasons for the recommendation (APT document section 5.4.7).
- iv. The department chair's recommendation (*i.e.*, a general statement regarding the nature of the recommendation, but not the complete chair's statement as described in III.a. above) shall be communicated to the candidate and the departmental tenure/promotion committee in writing. The candidate and/or the departmental tenure/promotion committee shall have the opportunity to respond (APT document section 5.4.8).

b. Divisional Level:

- i. The NSM Constitution defines the role of the divisional tenure and promotion committee (NSM Constitution, Sec. IV.)
- ii. All committee deliberations must remain confidential in all respects (with exceptions granted only by the provost). The committee member from the candidate's department may be requested to leave the room for a brief period of time during the discussion.
- iii. All committee votes must be taken by secret ballot. The dean may choose to attend the NSM committee meetings, but does not vote. If present, the dean will collect the secret ballots, tabulate the results, and announce the outcome to the committee.
- iv. Following the vote, a separate recommendation for each candidate will be written by a member of the committee outside the department of the candidate and reviewed by the NSM committee. The recommendation will include the vote tally, and all members of the committee will sign each recommendation which will be sent with the rest of the tenure/promotion package to the provost.
- v. The dean will make a separate recommendation, interpreting, at his or her discretion, the substantive evaluation of the candidate by the department chair and both committees.
- vi. Once the final tenure/promotion package is finished (including the dean's recommendation), the dean will contact the candidate and the candidate's chair with news of the divisional committee's and dean's recommendations.