

Final “Subcommittee” Promotion & Tenure Committee Model

University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC), November 2025

Melissa Wells, Chair (Associate Professor, Education; New COE representative)
Brad Lamphere, Secretary (Associate Professor, Biological Science; at-large representative)
Nicole Crowder (Professor, Chemistry; CAS representative)
Ian Finlayson (Associate Professor, Computer Science; at-large representative)
Smita Jain Oxford (Senior Lecturer, Management & Marketing; New COB representative)

Context

In AY 2024-2025, UFC asked UFAC to formulate recommendations for promotion and tenure (P&T) policies that would account for the academic reorganization that took effect in AY 2025-2026. These policies specifically impact (1) tenure-track faculty wishing to be tenured; (2) tenure-track or tenured faculty wishing to be promoted to the rank of associate professor or professor; or (3) renewable term appointed (RTA) faculty wishing to be promoted to the rank of senior lecturer. UFAC was unable to make recommendations in the timeline required for implementation in AY 2025-2026, and all three colleges agreed to a “bridge motion” that allowed departments to follow the P&T guidelines established in their respective colleges in AY 2024-2025 during AY 2025-2026 while conversations continued.

In April 2025, UFAC circulated a survey to all full-time instructional faculty to gather feedback on two proposed models: forming a university-wide P&T committee or retaining three college-level P&T committees. In May 2025, UFAC invited stakeholders from UFC and college-level P&T committees to discuss models and survey results. These findings were sent to all full-time instructional faculty in May 2025. One new model, the “Subcommittee Model,” emerged during discussions at the May meeting.

As of the drafting of this proposal, new names for the non-CAS colleges have not been proposed or accepted. Therefore, the working title of one college will be the “New College of Education” and the other will be the “New College of Business.”

Rationale

This “subcommittee” committee model incorporates multiple aspects that emerged as important during the feedback process, including uniform/equitable standards,

efficiency/reduced service load, and balancing of division representation and interdisciplinary review.

Uniform Standards

Discussions highlighted the importance of transparent, consistent standards as part of a rigorous and equitable P&T process. Conversations with all three college P&T committees in AY 24-25 revealed that some P&T members strongly objected to managing multiple sets of criteria (i.e., from each separate department). Therefore, separate revisions to Section 7 are being proposed that would include universal **criteria** in the areas of teaching, scholarly and professional activity, and service, which would then be contextualized within departmental **guidelines** for how to meet these standards. Each department would craft its own guidelines, which would be used to (1) guide the candidate's file assembly, (2) inform letter writing from peers and external reviewers, and (3) guide the department chair's letter. While the P&T committee would use the universal **criteria** in their review, the departmental **guidelines** will show exactly how each discipline meets the universal **criteria**.

Efficiency/Reduced Service Load

The proposed "Subcommittee Model" would create one university-wide P&T committee consisting of 9 people. Currently, there are three college-level committees with 19 total members: 5 in COE (3 internal, 2 external), 5 in COB (5 internal, with external members replacing internal members if staffing requires), and 9 in CAS (8 internal, 1 external). Therefore, this model would reduce the current P&T staffing requirements by 50%. While the "Subcommittee Model" will involve reviewing more files (from all three colleges), having fewer service roles to fill should lighten service load overall (for example, a member could serve only on a university-wide P&T committee instead of a college-level P&T committee and another university committee, which is frequent current practice in COE and COB).

Balancing of Division Representation and Interdisciplinary Review

Finally, the proposed "Subcommittee Model" incorporates feedback related to division representation and interdisciplinary review. Subcommittees would be created to allow each file to be reviewed by at least one committee member from the candidate's division (i.e., e.g. School of the Arts, New College of Business, humanities departments), as well as additional committee members from beyond the candidate's division. Therefore, intentionally-composed subcommittees allow for simultaneous attention to division representation and interdisciplinary review.

Summary of Feedback on Proposed Model

UFAC received feedback on the proposed model from various stakeholders, including (1) faculty via UFC representatives and (2) college-level P&T committee members. At the September 17 UFC meeting, department representatives shared feedback from their faculty. The UFAC Chair attended this meeting to take notes and followed up individually with departments who were not present or did not express feedback in the meeting. At the UFAC meeting on 9/17 (directly preceding the UFC meeting), representatives from each college P&T committee discussed feedback from their perspectives.

The table below summarizes key feedback and how it was addressed in the final revised Subcommittee P&T Model. Overall, the UFC meeting discussion highlighted the tension between streamlining workload and maintaining thoroughness in the P&T process.

Feedback	Revisions to Model
Consideration #1: A more thorough review is desired, while also streamlining workload. Options presented at UFC: Option 1: Everyone on the committee looks at rationale, letters (chair's, peers', or all?), and/or FAAR to determine if a subcommittee or entire committee should complete review. (Some concerns about workloads with including FAAR; some concern about rationale only for lack of context/perspective.) Option 2: Subcommittee could first do a pre-screening and vote on if the file should be reviewed within the subcommittee or if it should be sent to the whole committee. Option 3: Double-layer review: 3 people read the entire files (primary team), 3 people read letters and rationale (secondary team), 3 people read nothing for each file. Option 4: The entire P&T committee reviews all files.	UFAC incorporated Option 1 into the model. The entire P&T committee would first “screen” selected materials to determine if the group agrees that a subcommittee review would be sufficient. If concerns arise, the entire committee would review the file. The screening materials would include: • Promotion to senior lecturer or associate professor: Rationale, chair letter • Promotion to full professor: Rationale, chair letter, required external letters • Tenure would follow the same category listed above (i.e., if seeking tenure at the associate level, the first set of documents would be screened).
Consideration #2: To preserve institutional knowledge, a certain number of full	UFAC updated committee membership to require the 3 at-large members to be full professors. The core division members

professors should be required in the committee membership.	could also be full professors, but this would not be a requirement.
Consideration #3: Requiring at-large members to be from departments not already represented on the committee may be overly restrictive, especially if some units have more faculty able and willing to serve on the committee than others.	UFAC updated the language to indicate a <u>preference</u> for at-large members to be from departments not already represented on the committee. This would allow for flexibility if needed.
Consideration #4: Since any P&T committee member could potentially review any faculty member's file, consider how election procedures should be organized.	UFAC updated the model to reflect that all committee members would be elected in campus-wide elections.
Consideration #5: Determine if sub-committee membership is confidential or open, since the content area member would be known at all times.	UFAC recommended that subcommittee membership remain confidential.
Consideration #6: Clarify the proposed criteria for evaluation, and the difference between criteria and departmental guidelines.	The terms "criteria" and "departmental guidelines" were more explicitly defined in the proposed subcommittee model. Additionally, UFAC is proposing changes to Section 7 that introduce specific university-wide criteria for teaching, scholarly and professional activity, and service. If approved by UFC, these changes will stand regardless of if a university-wide or college-level P&T process is approved.
Consideration #7: Instead of saying "a few weeks" in Step 1 of the proposed P&T timeline, change this to a specific number of weeks.	UFAC changed the wording in Step 1 to "peers would have <u>two</u> weeks on contract to review and write letters evaluating their peer's file," in alignment with the proposed timeline in Appendix B.
Consideration #8: Onboarding and institutional knowledge are vital. Clarify that chair letters incorporate both the chair's own perspectives from working with the candidates <u>and</u> synthesis of peers' letters. Chairs would benefit from explicit support to write letters.	UFAC added clarification about the letter-writing process, specifying that the chair letter should incorporate both the chair's own perspectives from working with the candidates <u>and</u> synthesis of peers' letters. Additionally, while beyond the scope of the current proposal, UFAC agrees that training chairs in writing high-quality letters is vital and will work with units to address this if the model passes.

UFAC recognizes the importance of AACSB accreditation; therefore, multiple stakeholders with AACSB expertise (including informational meetings with Dean Tabak, the primary source documents from AACSB, and direct email correspondence with the Senior Manager of Accreditation at AACSB) were consulted during the development of this model but did not proffer an endorsement on the final model. While this research was done with due diligence, UFAC does not claim to be an expert in AACSB accreditation, as this is beyond the charge of the committee. AACSB standards apply only to AACSB-accredited programs. Two key considerations within AACSB are as follows:

1. **Shared governance.** On p. 18 of the [2020 Guiding Principles and Standards for Business Accreditation](#), it states: “The school promotes shared governance and active participation by a cross-section of faculty in university and college service.” Additionally, the [2020 Interpretive Guidance](#) states on p. 6, “Shared governance in [strategic planning] is particularly important, and faculty play an integral role at all stages” and “Within the broader university environment, it is important that the accredited school’s strategic plan aligns with and supports the university’s or parent organization’s plan.” While this language is more focused on the program’s strategic plan than promotion/tenure specifically, the importance of faculty involvement and alignment with the university’s plan is reiterated.
 - a. Shared governance is embedded in the proposed “Subcommittee Model” in the following ways: (1) it would be approved by majority votes of each college; (2) department/discipline guidelines would be developed by each department and approved by UFAC to align with universal criteria; (3) all committee members would be elected by the entire UMW faculty; and (4) a cross-section of faculty will review every file.
2. **Transparent expectations.** On p. 36 of the [2020 Guiding Principles and Standards for Business Accreditation](#), it states: “Faculty expectations, evaluation, promotion, and reward processes are systematic, transparent, and support the school’s mission.” Additionally, the [2020 Interpretive Guidance](#) states, “The school should be able to produce upon request promotion and tenure policies (if applicable) for the various units of the school, as well as annual evaluation policies. One question of interest to the peer review team is whether such policies are clearly communicated and understood by the faculty and staff” (p. 21) and that teaching effectiveness is of particular import: “Specific documents, governance, resources, or processes related to teaching effectiveness that may be reviewed are... promotion and tenure standards related to teaching” (p. 39).
 - a. Transparent expectations are embedded in the proposed “Subcommittee Model” in the following ways: (1) Section 7 would include universal criteria

for all departments/disciplines; (2) individual departments would craft department/discipline-specific guidelines for how these criteria are enacted; (3) these departmental guidelines would be approved and posted in a digital location where candidates can easily access them; and (4) departmental guidelines would be shared with letter writers and peers to inform the letter writing and/or peer review process.

Additionally, direct email correspondence with Maria Baltar, Senior Manager of Accreditation at AACSB, yielded the following information:

The standards and interpretive guidance do not prescribe a specific structure for promotion and tenure committees (for example, college-level versus university-wide). What AACSB emphasizes is that governance processes—whether at the university level or within business school—should demonstrate shared governance, transparency, and consistently applied.

From an accreditation standpoint, what matters most is that:

- *The process is clearly defined, documented, and applied consistently across faculty;*
- *Faculty have meaningful input into decisions that affect their evaluation, promotion, and reward structures; and*
- *The model continues to support the distinct mission and strategic priorities of the College of Business within the broader institution.*

If the university-wide committee model maintains those principles and provides appropriate representation and engagement from business faculty, it will be consistent with AACSB expectations. (M. Baltar, personal correspondence, 10/10/25)

Core principles of AACSB guidelines—including shared governance and transparent expectations—are best practice and should be incorporated in a P&T process, regardless of AACSB accreditation.

Description of “Subcommittee Model” for P&T Committee

Committee Composition

The “Subcommittee Model” would create one university-wide P&T committee (pending approval of all three colleges as a new university standing committee). The committee composition is recommended to be 9 members elected to 3-year terms, as follows:

- 4 core division members from CAS

- 1 representative from the School of Arts: Departments (4) of Music; Studio Art; Theatre & Dance; and Historic Preservation
- 1 representative from the School of Science: Departments (3) of Biological Sciences; Earth & Environmental Sciences; and Chemistry & Physics
- 1 representative from the humanities departments (4): English & Linguistics; Modern Languages & Literatures; Communications & Digital Studies; and Cultural & Philosophical Inquiry
- 1 representative from the social sciences departments (4): Psychological Science; History & American Studies; Geography; and Political Science & International Affairs
- 1 core division member from the New College of Education
 - Departments (3) of Education; Nursing; and Athletics, Health & Physical Education
- 1 core division member from the New College of Business
 - Departments (4) of Computer Science; Management & Marketing; Mathematics; and Accounting, Economics, & Finance
- 3 at-large members, all at rank of full professor
 - Preference for representation from departments not already represented by core division members (as outlined above)
 - Note: An option was explored to see if reserving one at-large spot for a faculty member from an AACSB-accredited program would align with AACSB guidelines. While this option was not of interest when shared with faculty in the New College of Business, an adjustment such as this could be made in the future if interest/need arises. Due to current lack of interest, it is not being incorporated into the current proposed model.

All members (the core division members and the at-large members) would be elected by the entire university faculty. UFOC would run two election cycles: the first for core division members, and the second for at-large members.

At the May 2025 meeting, discussion emerged about adding one RTA member who would be elected to a one-year term in years where RTA files are being reviewed. UFAC reviewed this idea and is not recommending inclusion of an RTA member in this model for several reasons: (1) the service burden on RTA faculty; (2) the logistics of managing multiple RTA applications across divisions (i.e., Appendix A's 2022-2023 data, where there were 5 RTA applications from 3 different divisions and 4 different departments); and (3) past precedent that RTA faculty are not eligible to serve on faculty committees that “specifically require tenure and/or senior academic rank for membership (e.g., the Promotion and Tenure Committee)” (§3.3.3.1).

Subcommittee Formation

The P&T Committee Chair would create subcommittees of 3 members each, which meet to review a subset of submitted files. Therefore, applicants would have their files reviewed by a sub-committee with at least one member from the applicant's division (e.g. School of the Arts, New College of Business, humanities departments). Subcommittee membership would not be published beyond the P&T Committee.

Appendix A models how this “Subcommittee Model” would have worked with data from actual files received in the past three academic years across colleges.

Proposed P&T Process with the “Subcommittee Model”

Set-Up Considerations

- Section 7 would be enhanced in the *Faculty Handbook* and aligned with Section 6.
 - Some procedural information currently in Appendices I, J, and K would be moved to Section 7 for consistency and clarity. Some department-/discipline-specific information currently in Appendices I, J, and K would be moved to another accessible location (i.e., Provost’s website, college website, and/or department website).
 - Section 7 would include specific **criteria** detailing expectations for candidates of all ranks for promotion and/or tenure related to teaching, scholarly and professional activity, and service.
- Because the university-wide P&T committee would become a new standing committee, each college will have to vote to approve the creation of this committee, which would then be added to Section 2 of the *Faculty Handbook*.
- UFC and the BOV would approve changes to Section 2 and Section 7.
 - The goal is to obtain BOV approval no later than February 2026, so policies can be updated and committees/candidates can be onboarded no later than April/May 2026.
- Departments will create **guidelines** for department/discipline-specific considerations for demonstrating how candidates meet the university-wide **criteria** for teaching, scholarly and professional activity, and service.
 - These guidelines would be reviewed (by UFAC, the dean, or another similar leadership role) and then posted in an accessible location (i.e., Provost’s website, college website, and/or department website) for candidates to use as they prepare the file. The review process would ensure that documents are created in alignment with Section 7.

- Guidelines could be shared with letter writers and peers in addition to the candidate as an illustration of how the candidate's specific department/discipline addresses the **criteria** outlined in Section 7. The P&T Committee would use the universal **criteria** in Section 7, not the departmental **guidelines**, during their review.
- This proposed model also adds in a peer-review process for departmental peers, which some, but not all, departments/units currently implement. The timeline for files being due would be adjusted to allow time for departmental peer review.
 - Peer review will be important in a university-wide P&T model as peers have nuanced understandings of the field and how criteria for teaching, scholarly and professional activity, and service may translate into specific departments/disciplines. Some timeline adjustments did take place for AY 2025-2026.
 - See Appendix B for a proposed P&T timeline that incorporates peer review and the P&T "subcommittee" model of review.

Step 1: Candidate completes their file and departmental peer review occurs.

- Candidates would complete their files (except for the letters of recommendation), then tenured departmental peers would have two weeks on contract to review and write letters evaluating their peer's file.

Step 2: Chair writes a letter that incorporates their own perspectives and synthesizes peer review to make a departmental recommendation.

- Chair letter should incorporate both the chair's own perspectives working with the candidates and synthesis of peers' letters.
- Chair letter reflects the specific department guidelines that have already been approved (by UFAC, the dean, or another similar leadership role) and how these connect to the **criteria** in Section 7.
- Chairs will receive specific training on best practices for writing these letters to convey department/discipline-specific considerations to the P&T committee.
- As in the past, candidates would have an opportunity to review letters of recommendation and to submit a letter of exception or explication if needed.

Step 3: Entire file goes to University P&T Committee for review.

First, the entire committee screens selected documents to determine if they would be eligible for review by subcommittees: (1) the rationale and chair letter for promotion to

senior lecturer or associate professor (or tenure at the associate professor level); (2) the rationale, chair letter, and required external letters for promotion to full professor (or tenure at the full professor level). Applications that raise concerns are reviewed in full by the entire P&T Committee, and applications that do not raise concerns are reviewed in full by the assigned subcommittee. All materials will be reviewed against the relevant **criteria** established in Section 7.

If a file is deemed to be eligible for subcommittee review, the P&T Committee Chair creates subcommittees of 3 members each with at least one member from the applicant's organizational unit (e.g. School of the Arts, New College of Business, humanities departments; see Appendix A for an example). The subcommittee will write the recommendation letter that is sent to the dean. Others on the committee do not need to do further review, as they already participated in the initial screening that determined the file was eligible for subcommittee review.

Step 4: The committee's recommendation then goes to Dean, Provost, BOV, as is current practice.

1. The appeals process remains the same.

UFAC Recommendation on the Subcommittee Model and Next Procedural Steps

UFAC recommends to UFC that the "Subcommittee Model" proposal be sent to all full-time instructional faculty on continuing contracts for a vote. §2.3.2.6 states that UFC oversees and monitors university-level committees, but that "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 (see §§ 1.12.1 and 2.1)." After consulting with Debra Schlee, UFAC recommends that Qualtrics be used for the vote due to its capability to efficiently distribute individualized, anonymized voting links pre-connected with individuals' college affiliation. Qualtrics would allow only eligible faculty to vote one time, anonymously, while still sorting results by college, as required in §2.3.2.6. UFAC recommends that this vote be open for five business days, ideally Dec. 3-7. Debra Schlee would share the results with UFAC, which would then share results with all faculty. Depending on the outcome of the vote, two pathways of next steps are possible. Tentative next steps and a timeline are included for

each pathway as an illustration. Note that approval at the February BOV meeting is the target, which would allow for onboarding in the second half of the spring semester.

1. Pathway 1: The vote passes, and a new standing committee is formed for a college-level P&T committee utilizing a subcommittee model.
 - a. January 2026: UFAC proposes updated language to Section 2 for the creation of a new university-wide P&T standing committee and Section 7 to align with university-level P&T. UFC approves at January meeting. UFAC meets with BOV Academic Affairs sub-committee.
 - b. January-March 2026: UFAC formulates specific operational policies for university-wide P&T (*likely including departments creating discipline-specific guidance/guidelines for candidates and letter-writers*)
 - c. **February 5, 2026: Materials due to BOV**
 - d. **February 19-20, 2026: BOV Meeting**
 - e. March 2026: UFOC populates new university-wide P&T committee
 - f. April-May 2026: Onboarding/workshop for next year's committee and candidates
2. Pathway 2: The vote does not pass, and P&T remains in college committee structures. **Colleges will assume responsibility for updating their committee procedures to align with recent changes in academic organization.**
 - a. January 2026: UFAC proposes updated language to Section 7 to align with college-level P&T. UFC approves at January meeting.
 - b. January-March 2026: Colleges formulate specific operational policies for college-level P&T. (Note: Since these will not reside within Section 7, they will not be approved by the BOV.)
 - c. **February 5, 2026: Materials due to BOV**
 - d. **February 19-20, 2026: BOV Meeting**
 - e. March 2026: UFAC approves college-level P&T processes.
 - f. April-May 2026: Onboarding/workshop for next year's committee and candidates

Appendix A: “Subcommittee Model” Applied to Actual P&T Files Received in Past Three Academic Years

In this document, the “Subcommittee Model” is mapped onto actual data of P&T files received in the past three academic years. The former Art & Art History department is counted under ARTS; Sociology & Anthropology is counted under AACPR/C&PI; COB is counted under MG&MK.

2024-2025 Files

CAS: School of Sciences	CAS: School of Arts	CAS: Humanities	CAS: Social Sciences	New COE	New COB
BIOL: 1	THEA:	C&PI: 1	H&AS: 1	EDUC: 1	MG&MK: 1
CHPH: 1	MUSC:	MDLL:	PSIA	NURS:	MATH:
EESC: 1	ARTS:	ENLI: 1	PSYC: 1	AHPE: 1 RTA	CPSC: 1
	HISP:	CMDS: 1	GEOG: 1		AE&F:
Total: 3	Total: 0	Total: 3	Total: 3	Total: 2 (incl 1 RTA)	Total: 2

13 total files across 3 sub-committees yields 4-5 files per sub-committee.

2024-2025 Example Subcommittees

Hypothetical at-large members were elected from School of Sciences, New COB, and Social Sciences.

P&T Subcommittee Members	Reviewing Applications From...
Subcommittee 1: 5 files 1. School of Sciences Rep 2. New COB Rep 3. At-large rep: New COB	• BIOL (1) • CHPH (1) • EESC (1) • MG&MK (1) • CPSC (1)
Subcommittee 2: 4 files 1. Humanities Rep 2. School of Arts Rep 3. At-Large Rep: Social Sciences	• C&PI (1) • ENLI (1) • CMDS (1) • H&AS (1)
Subcommittee 3: 4 files 1. New COE Rep 2. Social Sciences Rep 3. At-Large Rep: School of Sciences	• EDUC (1) • AHPE (1) • PSYC (1) • GEOG (1)

2023-2024 Files

CAS: School of Sciences	CAS: School of Arts	CAS: Humanities	CAS: Social Sciences	New COE	New COB
BIOL: 1	THEA:	C&PI: 1	H&AS:	EDUC:	MG&MK:
CHPH:	MUSC: 1	MDLL: 1	PSIA	NURS:	MATH:
EESC: 2	ARTS:	ENLI: 1	PSYC: 1	AHPE: 2 RTA	CPSC: 1
	HISP:	CMDS:	GEOG		AE&F:
Total: 3	Total: 1	Total: 3	Total: 1	Total: 2 RTA	Total: 1

11 total files across 3 sub-committees yields 2-4 files per sub-committee.

2023-2024 Example Subcommittees

Hypothetical at-large members were elected from School of Sciences, New COB, and Social Sciences.

P&T Subcommittee Members	Reviewing Applications From...
Subcommittee 1: 4 files 1. School of Sciences Rep 2. School of Arts Rep 3. At-Large Rep: School of Sciences	• BIOL (1) • EESC (2) • MUSC (1)
Subcommittee 2: 4 files 1. Humanities Rep 2. Social Sciences Rep 3. At-Large Rep: Social Sciences	• C&PI (1) • MDLL (1) • ENLI (1) • PSYC (1)
Subcommittee 3: 3 files 1. New COE Rep 2. New COB Rep 3. At-Large Rep: New COB	• AHPE (2) • CPSC (1)

2022-2023 Files

CAS: School of Sciences	CAS: School of Arts	CAS: Humanities	CAS: Social Sciences	New COE	New COB
BIOL:	THEA: 1	C&PI: 3 (incl 1 RTA)	H&AS:	EDUC: 3	MG&MK: 4 (incl 1 RTA)
CHPH:	MUSC: 1	MDLL: 1 RTA	PSIA	NURS:	MATH:
EESC:	ARTS: 2	ENLI: 2	PSYC	AHPE: 2 RTA	CPSC:
	HISP: 1	CMDS:	GEOG		AE&F:
Total: 0	Total: 5	Total: 6 (incl 2 RTA)	Total: 0	Total: 5 (incl 2 RTA)	Total: 4 (incl 1 RTA)

20 total files across 3 sub-committees yields 6-7 files per sub-committee.

2022-2023 Example Subcommittees

Hypothetical at-large members were elected from School of Sciences, New COB, and Social Sciences.

P&T Subcommittee Members	Reviewing Applications From...
Subcommittee 1: 6 files 1. Humanities Rep 2. School of Sciences Rep 3. At-Large Rep: Social Sciences	• C&PI (3) • MDLL (1) • ENLI (1)
Subcommittee 2: 7 files 1. School of Arts Rep 2. New COB Rep 3. At-Large Rep: School of Sciences	• THEA (1) • MUSC (1) • ARTS (2) • HISP (1) • MG&MK (2)
Subcommittee 3: 7 files 1. New COE Rep 2. Social Sciences Rep 3. At-Large Rep: New COB	• EDUC (3) • AHPE (2) • MG&MK (2)

Appendix B: Proposed P&T Timeline for Peer Review and “Subcommittee” Model of Review

Tenure and Promotion Action <i>Items in italics apply to the new CAS process for electronic submission of Promotion & Tenure files</i>	Timeline Currently in Section 7 (<i>Faculty Handbook</i> , 2025)	Timeline Currently on Provost’s Website (updated 7/8/25)	Proposed Timeline (using 25-26 dates)
Faculty member’s tenure and/or promotion request in writing to department chair and to dean <i>Candidates will have access to the Canvas course template where they can build their credentials file. From this date until the close of the file, the candidate can completely control who has access to the file. They will be a “teacher” in the Canvas course with the power to enroll others (e.g., dept. chair, mentors, dept. colleagues, etc.).</i>	May 1	May 1	May 1
Deadline for candidate’s APR to be completed	August 15	August 22	August 15
Candidate’s promotion and/or tenure file due in dean’s office. <i>– At 5 PM, the Dean’s office admin will change the candidate’s role in the course to that of a “student” thereby leaving them with read only access to the credentials file. The Dean’s office admin will then enroll the candidate’s departmental peers in the course as students, allowing them to read the credentials file. The Dean’s office admin will also enroll the department chair into the course as a teacher, thereby allowing them access to upload letters of recommendation later.</i>	n/a	n/a	August 20
Deadline for peer-review process and all solicited letters to be received by chair (from tenured members of the department, institutional colleagues, and external reviewers when relevant).	August 22	August 29	September 5

<i>Department chair uploads letters of recommendation by next business day.</i>			
Deadline for chair and candidate to review chair's written evaluation. Candidate then has until one week after this deadline to review materials and to write letter of exception or explication.	August 25	September 5	September 12
Letter of exception or explication due, if written. File closed to candidate and made available to P&T Committee – <i>At 5 PM, candidates and their chair are removed from the course by the Dean's office admin. Members of the CAS P&T Committee are enrolled in the course as students, allowing them to read the credentials file.</i>	September 7	September 19	September 19
Initial full-committee screening completed to determine if individual files will be reviewed by a subcommittee (if no major concerns noted) or the full committee (if major concerns noted)	n/a	n/a	October 15
P&T Committee Recommendations to dean – <i>At 5 pm, members of the P&T Committee are removed from the Canvas course, and the Dean is enrolled as a "student".</i>	January 5	January 12	January 12
College dean notifies candidates of P&T Committee's recommendations	January 10	January 19	January 19
Deadline for candidates to file appeals to college dean	January 17	January 26	January 26
Deadline for college dean to establish tenure and/or promotion appeal advisory committee(s) – <i>When applicable, Dean's office admin enrolls members of the appeal committee as "students" in the appellant's Canvas course, and also grants access to the files of candidates applying for the same promotion.</i>	January 24	February 2	February 2
Recommendation(s) of appeal advisory committee(s) to college dean	February 20	February 23	February 23

– <i>Appeal committee is removed from the relevant Canvas courses, thereby leaving access only to the Dean.</i>			
College dean informs appellants of the recommendations of the appeal advisory committee(s)	February 24	February 27	February 27
College dean makes recommendations to the Provost with copy to faculty member and his or her chair – <i>Provost is added to the relevant Canvas courses.</i>	March 10	March 6	March 6
Deadline for candidate to appeal to the Provost	March 17	March 13	March 13
Provost makes recommendations to the President with copy to faculty member, his/her chair, and the College Dean – <i>President is added to the relevant Canvas courses.</i>	April 1	March 20	March 20
Deadline for candidate to file appeal to President and Board of Visitors	April 8	March 27	March 27
Candidates notified of Board of Visitors' final decision	May 15	May 15	May 15