



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

[www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs](http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs)

**To:** Academic Deans and Associate Deans, Directors, and Department Heads  
**From:** Tami Benham Deal, Senior Vice Provost  
**Date:** August 3, 2022  
**Subject:** Reappointment, Tenure, Fixed Term and Promotion Procedures  
**Copies:** University Tenure and Promotion Committee, Provost and Executive Vice President Kevin Carman, President Ed Seidel, General Counsel Tara Evans, Faculty Senate Chair Renee Laegreid

This memo lists key dates, procedures, guidelines for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and fixed term decisions for faculty and academic professionals. Please read the document carefully – some items have been modified for the upcoming academic year. I have highlighted some important changes for the upcoming year below.

The decisions at issue are the most important that the university makes, and your role is pivotal. In accordance with university regulations, candidates for reappointment, fixed term, tenure, and promotion are evaluated on the academic functions they are expected to perform. The needs, directions and priorities of the University will also be considered in reappointment, fixed term, and tenure cases.

Department/College Expectations: Departmental and college expectations for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and fixed term should be consistent with duties and workload distributions outlined in candidates' job descriptions. Performance evaluations will appropriately recognize the proportion of time and effort allocated and expected for the particular functions by the candidates at each rank. If job descriptions were adjusted temporarily due to the pandemic (per the 9-21-20 Statement on Career Progress), unit expectations should include a temporary statement about COVID-related accommodations.

University Restructure: The reorganization of colleges will have some impact on this year's reappointment, tenure, fixed term, and promotion review processes. Department reviews will continue according to department protocols and policies. However, college-level reviews for faculty in departments moving to the College of Engineering & Physical Sciences and the College of Agriculture, Life Sciences, & Natural Resources will be completed by the new dean and tenure and promotion committees.

As the leader of your unit, it is imperative that you emphasize the importance of reappointment, tenure, fixed term, and promotion reviews being grounded in the academic merit of the case. Candidates should not be held to a different standard because they are in a unit that is moving to a new college. Colleges that have college-level expectations must work with the new departments to develop a transition plan for aligning these expectations. Any change in expectations should be implemented in a manner, including

timeline, that is fair and equitable to faculty who are new to the college.

WyoFolio: All reappointment, tenure, fixed term, and promotion reviews will be completed using the WyoFolio online platform. You can access it from the WyoWeb by clicking on the link to WyoFolio.

For assistance with WyoFolio: Aneesa McDonald is available to answer questions, provide training, and assist staff to learn (or review) how to use the system. Questions from department faculty, staff, and department heads should be directed to the College WyoFolio Administrator. (Check with your Dean's office to identify who to contact.)

Important Resources: You can find a number of helpful resources on the Academic Affairs website for [academic personnel](#), including instructional guides for administrators, the candidate, review committees and external reviewers. (See screen shots below.) Please, take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with these resources. Please note we are in the process of updating documents on the website that may have outdated dates.

Step 1:



Step 2:



## External Reviewers

A brief note about external reviewers. A tenure or promotion packet should contain **at least four letters** from reviewers 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, shared research funding, and family relationships. Avoid selecting reviewers who are not tenured and/or who do not hold rank at or above Associate Professor. 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 and in monitoring receipt of those letters. Failure to do so can jeopardize the candidate's case.

It is also helpful if candidates read their external reviews prior to the department review meeting. (Note: if candidates have waived their right to see the external review letters, all identifying information should be redacted, including references to the university/institution. Please remind your faculty to not identify the external reviewers in their comments. Similarly, identifiers should not be included in department head or dean review letters/comments.

More details about external reviews can be found on the [Academic Affairs website](#). Please take a moment to read through the FAQs for External Reviewers.

A Final Word About Promotions: As the leader of your unit, it is your responsibility to work with and counsel a candidate who would like to be considered for promotion. This is especially important in cases involving promotions that are not tied to a specific timeline (e.g., promotion to full professor). Consistent with past practice and [policy](#),

..... An individual may initiate candidacy for promotion with the written concurrence of the majority of a group in the academic unit composed of both tenured faculty members and those who hold the same or higher rank to which the individual is to be considered.

This process allows you and the candidate to take the pulse of the faculty to determine the level of support for promotion and increases the odds that there will be no surprises at the department level once the formal review begins.

### KEY DATES

Consistent with UW Regulation 2-7, the Provost shall have the authority and responsibility for establishing the calendar for the submission of reappointment, tenure, and promotion materials, and the meetings of the University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee to consider the candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The table below lists important dates. **Hard deadlines are in boldface font in the ‘Event’ column.** All other dates are provided as suggestions. Colleges may set their own internal deadlines. Please note that Academic Affairs recommends first-year reappointment reviews occur after fall semester course evaluations have been completed so that they may be included in department-level deliberations. Many departments complete these reviews during finals week or during J-term before spring classes begin.

Candidates and their unit heads are responsible for preparing clear, concise, and convincing cases. It is not too soon for unit heads and candidates to begin assembling the case file for the coming year’s decisions.

Date	Event
Summer through August	Create case(s) in WyoFolio for faculty requiring external review (work with college Dean’s office to determine who will be responsible for setting up the cases)
<b>August 15, 2022</b>	<b>Colleges and college-like units shall submit names of all candidates for tenure and promotion (including promotion to Professor) to Aneesa McDonald. Deans/Directors: Please submit ASAP if you have not already done so.</b>
August 15, 2022	Worksheets distributed for reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases
No later than September 1, 2022	Complete protocol for determining external reviewers
No later than September 1, 2022	Faculty and departments upload required documents for external reviewers in WyoFolio case.
No later than September 9, 2022	Solicit external letters of reference. Send notification from WyoFolio to external reviewers. Set a deadline for submission. Reviewers should be given at least 4-6 weeks to complete the review.
Throughout summer/fall	Regularly check WyoFolio for receipt of letters. There is no automated notification when letters are uploaded.
No later than October 10, 2022	All letters of reference for tenure and promotions should be received well in advance of (preferably at least 4 weeks prior to) the scheduled department review/meeting. Please note: Colleges may require external letters for fixed term reviews depending on college and department policy.
December 16, 2022	Fall semester exams end.

January 2, 2023	Forward all non-first year cases to the Dean's office (College's may have earlier deadlines for some of these cases.)
No later than mid-January 2023	Complete all department-level deliberations for first-year reappointments.
January 17, 2023	Spring classes begin
January 23, 2023	Forward all first-year reappointment case files to college deans.
January 17, 2023	Notify Academic Affairs of cases likely to be considered by the University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee. This category of cases includes those with conflicting recommendations from different levels of review, cases receiving negative recommendations from all levels of review, and early cases. Note that the Provost may refer other potentially problematic cases to the University R, T, & P committee as well.
January 30, 2023	<b>All mid-probationary, tenure, fixed term, and promotion reviews must be completed. Deans forward cases in WyoFolio to Academic Affairs.</b>
February 13, 2023	<b>Forward all first-year reappointment case files to Academic Affairs.</b>
March 6-7, 2023	<b>University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee meets to review conflicted cases, early cases, and cases recommended by the Provost.</b>
March 2023	<b>Provost recommendations for 1<sup>st</sup> year reappointments submitted to President. (Date to be determined.)</b>
April 2023	<b>Provost recommendations for mid-probationary and 3-year fixed term with rolling contracts cases to President. Academic Affairs notifies candidates of recommendation to the President and/or Board of Trustees.</b>
May 2023	<b>Trustees vote on all cases involving tenure, 5-year fixed term with rolling contracts, and promotion during May 2023 Board meeting.</b>

### PREPARING FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

We highly recommend all faculty and administrators read regulations and procedural documents pertaining to the reappointment, tenure, and promotion review processes prior to the review meeting. The relevant documents include:

1. UW 2-7 (Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Fixed term),
2. UW 2-4 (Guidelines for Establishing Academic Professionals - for those academic professionals who are still on extended term appointments),
3. Standard Administrative Policy and Procedure (SAPP) – Procedures for Implementing and Evaluating Rolling Contracts (2.7.1).
4. (Temporary SAPP) Criteria and Sources of Information for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review
5. (Temporary SAPP) Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review

These documents can be found at: [http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/academic-personnel/reviews/tp\\_regulations.html](http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/academic-personnel/reviews/tp_regulations.html).

All university regulations pertaining to academic personnel are posted on the General Counsel website at <http://www.uwyo.edu/regs-policies/>.

## PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

The following suggestions may help avoid misunderstandings in the department-level discussions and voting.

**FACULTY RECOMMENDATIONS.** Faculty members should read the following statement (in *italics*) before they meet at the department and college level to discuss reappointment, promotion, tenure, or fixed terms.

*Recommendations on matters of reappointment, promotion or tenure constitute what is arguably the most important element of faculty governance. Please approach the review and recommendation in a professional manner that safeguards the rights of the individual being reviewed and rigorously advances the academic stature of the University. The process must permit faculty and others with voting privileges to comment honestly and freely.*

*A written rationale must accompany each vote or recommendation. It is the persuasiveness of these written recommendations that counts the most, not the numerical vote tally. The lack of thoughtful, factually based rationale weakens a recommendation, whether it is for or against the candidate under review. It is also important to provide brief, factual reasons for abstentions, so that subsequent reviewers interpret them correctly. A family connection is a valid reason for an abstention. Timidity, failure to read the case, or failure to schedule adequate time to review the case files are not valid reasons for an abstention.*

*Reviewers who abstain should provide written reason (e.g., voted at another level, conflict of interest, etc.). However, reviewers who abstain may not submit evaluative comments.*

*Department staff members who collect and transcribe votes and recommendations for the candidate's case—or an appropriate faculty designee—will omit any evaluative remarks that accompany abstentions.*

*Legally, recommendations and comments may not be privileged information, even if they are anonymous when collected. There have been court cases where faculty members were asked to identify their comments, and in some cases have been asked to explain them. It is awkward to explain baseless attacks, cowardly abstentions, or ill-informed support to a skeptical audience. The best way to avoid legal exposure is to perform one's responsibility, which is to make reasoned, academically based judgments based on professional expertise and facts.*

**GUIDELINES FOR MEETINGS.** Departments should adhere to the following guidelines for conducting meetings to discuss candidates' cases for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or fixed term.

***Review/Meeting Schedule:*** Departments should hold at least one meeting specifically for reviewing reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and fixed term decisions, with no other business on the agenda. Please allow ample time for full review of all candidates. Complete case files should be available to voting members sufficiently in advance (e.g., 1-2 weeks) of the meeting(s) so that a thorough review may be done by the voting members. (All materials, including any documents or reviews pertaining to joint or SER appointments, must be included in the case files before the department review and meeting.)

***Peer Group/Voting Protocol.*** A procedural document for conducting reappointment, tenure, and promotion can be found on the Academic Affairs website ([http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/files/docs/tp\\_peer\\_group\\_voting\\_protocol.pdf](http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/files/docs/tp_peer_group_voting_protocol.pdf)). Included in this document are instructions for establishing protocols for establishing peer groups. These instructions are consistent with the call from faculty senate in 2008-09, for each department to establish a standing protocol to form a peer group for the purpose of voting and making written recommendations on faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases. Any departments that do not currently have voting protocols in place should establish them as soon as possible and prior to reviewing any reappointment, tenure, or promotion cases. (Department faculty should discuss this in advance of the review meeting.) All voting members of the department must be invited to participate in the department meeting described in (1) above and must have the opportunity to review the candidate's case. **Each academic unit must have a written copy of the voting protocol on file as well as documentation indicating how the protocol was established (e.g., by faculty vote and date). Where appropriate, voting protocol involving joint appointments should be articulated in the document.**

***Participation in Meetings by Non-Voting Members.*** Department custom may allow for participation in departmental meetings on faculty cases by department members not explicitly specified in the voting protocol. Alternatively, department heads and deans may solicit input on reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations from non-voting academic personnel familiar with aspects of the candidate's job duties, on a case-by-case basis, as he or she deems appropriate. Departments and colleges must be judicious in meeting protocol regarding participation in discussions when a faculty member votes at a different level.

***Role of Department Head/Dean in Meeting.*** The department head may or may not be present at the department meeting, depending upon departmental customs and the wishes of the faculty. In any case, another faculty member should preside over the meeting. Since the head is responsible for making an independent recommendation, the head's role at the meeting should be limited to providing procedural information and factual clarification. At the college level, the chair of the college RT&P committee should preside over the meeting. Since the dean is responsible for making an independent recommendation, he or she need not be present. The dean's role at the meeting, if any, should be limited to providing procedural information and factual clarification. Similar considerations apply to deans' designees.

***Role of College and University Tenure and Promotion Committee Members in the Department Review.*** Participation in department review discussions should be guided by the role faculty play on other tenure and promotion committees. For example, members of the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee participate in department-level review discussions because they **vote** at the department level. The custom of the university committee has been to have a member recuse themselves from discussion on a case if the candidate is from their home department. This action is consistent with the expectation that each faculty member has one vote. Departments should have protocols for participation in review discussions when faculty vote at the college level to avoid any (real or perceived) undue influence and/or appearance of voting twice.

***Meeting Attendance.*** Attendance at the meeting by a voting department member is not a prerequisite for making a recommendation. For example, employees away from the university on sabbatical or professional-development leave **should vote** if otherwise eligible, unless it is highly impractical to do so. All eligible voters, however, should have an opportunity to review cases **before** the department meeting, even if they are unable to be present at that meeting. All case files shall be available to eligible voters via Wyofolio.

***Abstentions.*** Abstentions are only occasionally appropriate. For example, faculty members must abstain in cases involving relatives, spouses, or domestic partners. (See [Employee Handbook](#) for a more complete list of those who must recuse themselves from decisions affecting reappointment, tenure and promotion.) In general, however, faculty members have a duty to stay informed about their colleagues' work and to cast meaningful RT&P votes. **Abstention should not be a vehicle for ducking difficult judgments or shrinking from disagreement.** This behavior effectively cedes power to administrators, who cannot abstain. Also, it is inappropriate to include with an abstention any evaluative comments about a candidate's performance. Such comments shall be omitted from the case files.

## TIMING OF REVIEW

Tenure-track faculty will be reviewed at the unit, college, and university levels three times: (1) 1<sup>st</sup> year review (no earlier than the end of the fall semester), (2) mid-probationary review (generally in year 3), and (3) tenure review (generally in year 6). Annual (unit-level) performance reviews will occur during the other years of the probationary period. Unit heads should monitor and provide feedback on progress toward tenure during these annual reviews.

During the probationary period, non-tenure-track faculty eligible for fixed term rolling contracts will be reviewed at the unit, college, and university levels two times: (1) 1<sup>st</sup> year review (no earlier than the end of the fall semester) and (2) 3<sup>rd</sup> year review (to determine if a rolling contract will be granted). Annual (unit-level) performance reviews will occur during the 2<sup>nd</sup> year. Unit heads should monitor and provide feedback on progress toward the fixed term rolling contract. Academic professionals who are in the 5<sup>th</sup> year of an extended term will be reviewed for consideration of a fixed term rolling contract. If granted, the new fixed term rolling contract will begin in AY 24-25/FY25, following the last year of the extended-term appointment (AY23-24/FY24).

All non-tenure-track faculty being considered for promotion in rank must go through the unit, college, and university level reviews.

## VOTING

***Voters for Tenure-Track and Promotion Cases.*** In reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases for faculty, depending on department protocol, the following department members should submit recommendations:

- All tenured faculty members.
- All non-tenured tenure-track faculty, with the candidates expressed approval.
- All other members of the department's voting protocol, with the candidates expressed approval.

The case file should include an acknowledgment from the candidate clarifying his or her wishes in the matter of voting by non-tenured faculty and other academic personnel included in the department's voting protocol. A candidate who wishes to approve voting by non-tenure-track academic personnel (as defined in UW 2-1) included in the voting protocol may not at the same time exclude the non-tenured tenure-track faculty from voting on his or her case.

Votes should be recorded by faculty category; however, exceptions to this provision may be made when confidentiality of votes would be compromised.

***Voters for Fixed-Term Track, Extended-Term Track, Fixed Term, and Promotion Cases.*** Voting members for reappointment, fixed term, and promotion cases may vary based on position classification.



**Ballots.** Until voting is done in WyoFolio, departments should use the standard forms posted on the Academic Affairs [website](#) to gather votes.

**Voting Timeline.** Per the Academic Affairs procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion document, voters should have ample time to complete and submit thoughtful recommendations. Generally, ballots should be cast within 72 hours of the end of the meeting, excluding weekends and holidays.

**Reporting/Transcribing Results.** When transcribing the results of departmental and committee recommendations, please *clearly indicate which reasons are linked to affirmative recommendations, negative recommendations, and abstentions*. Comments alone do not always make the voter's intent clear.

**Candidate Verification.** Candidates should have the opportunity to review the votes and comments after each level of review. They must provide a written acknowledgement that they have read the comments prior to moving the case forward in WyoFolio. They may also insert a written response to each level of review.

### CASES REVIEWED BY UNIVERSITY RT&P COMMITTEE

The University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee will conduct an additional review of reappointment, tenure, fixed term, or promotion cases in which one or more of the following conditions apply.

- A disagreement on the recommendation occurs between the department faculty (or alternative peer group), department head (or direct supervisor), college committee, or dean.
- The faculty member is recommended for denial of reappointment, tenure, fixed term, or promotion.
- The Provost requests consideration of a particular case.
- The faculty member seeks an early decision for tenure, promotion, or fixed term.

College deans are asked by the Provost to identify and recommend cases for review by the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

### MATERIALS

Please find the following materials on the Office of Academic Affairs website. It is important to use the most current forms. Please avoid using previous forms you have saved from past reviews as some of the information has changed. <http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/academic-personnel/reviews/ballots.html>

- 1. Tally Spread Sheets (will be sent electronically to college or unit August 15, 2022).** Each Dean's or Director's office will receive electronic tally spread sheets listing the employees who will be reviewed. Please update (if needed) and return these to Academic Affairs with all applicable case materials no later than
  - a. 5:00 p.m., February 13, 2023, for first-year cases;
  - b. 5:00 p.m., January 30, 2023, for all other cases.

For each candidate for reappointment and tenure, please indicate the review year. For example, write "2" for a candidate undergoing a second-year review. UW Regulations 2-4 and 2-7 contain more details about review schedules for probationary academic professionals and faculty. If there are additions or corrections to the tally sheets, please contact Aneesa McDonald in Academic Affairs



(6-4287 or aneesamc@uwyo.edu) as soon as possible. *Academic Affairs uses the tally sheets in preparing the recommendations to the President and the agenda for the Trustees' votes, so accuracy is essential.*

2. **Vote Tallies.** In cases involving both tenure and promotion, please record the votes for promotion and the votes for tenure separately. All votes should be accompanied by comments. In the case of votes accompanied by no comment, please write “[no comment].” Abstentions should be accompanied by brief reasons, such as “the candidate is my partner.”
3. **Evaluation Sheet.** Please use the percentages of effort assigned in formal job descriptions for the year under review to describe individuals’ expected time commitments. This form is now built in to WyoFolio and should be completed within that system. All other versions of the form will not be accepted.
4. **History Sheet.** Units/colleges should complete the history sheet. This information will enable the University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee to review a faculty member’s history. Please use one sheet for each candidate load it in the internal case section of the case. There is no hard deadline for cases involving promotion to Professor, so the history sheet should not list one until the case is advanced. Current forms can be found on the Academic Affairs website: <http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/academic-personnel/reviews/ballots.html> **It is important that you use the most current forms.**
5. **External Referee Coversheet.** Supervisors must complete the external referee coversheet and upload it into WyoFolio under the External Evaluations section. Reviewer CVs are no longer required to be uploaded into WyoFolio. The external referee coversheet may be downloaded here [http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/academic-personnel/reviews/tp\\_reviewers.html](http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/academic-personnel/reviews/tp_reviewers.html)
6. **Past reviews.** All past review materials must be uploaded in WyoFolio. Please talk with your college WyoFolio administrator to determine who will upload these items. These materials include all annual reviews; past year(s) vote tallies and comments from all levels, including any formal reviews from the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee; and recommendations from the academic unit head and dean. If faculty member reports to another administrator (e.g., SER, Science Initiative, School of Computing, ORED), please make certain review letters from those units are included. Materials should also include previous narratives and CVs. All documents should be in separate PDF documents by year and uploaded in sequential order.