To: Academic Deans and Associate Deans, Directors, and Department Heads  
From: Tami Benham Deal, Vice Provost  
Date: July 25, 2019  
Subject: Reappointment, Tenure, Extended Term, and Promotion Procedures  
Copies: University Tenure and Promotion Committee, Provost Kate Miller, President Neil Theobald, General Counsel Tara Evans, Faculty Senate Chair Ken Chestek

This memo lists key dates, procedures, guidelines for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and extended-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, extended 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, extended term and tenure cases.

Departmental and college expectations for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or extended-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.

Note: A list of frequently asked procedural questions and answers, as well as voting materials, can be found on the Academic Affairs web site: http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/faculty-resources/tenure_promotion.html.

ALL IN for 2019-20 RTP Review - No more paper packets! This year all reappointment, tenure, fixed-term and promotion reviews will be completed using the WyoFolio online platform, the same system used last year for sabbatical submissions and annual performance reviews. A big thanks to the College of Business, College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, and the UW Libraries for helping us pilot the RTP module during last year’s review. I am happy to report that there were few problems – the majority of the issues resulted from human error (mostly related to signing on) and not system specific issues. We have worked with Interfolio and UWIT to provide a single sign on process, which means faculty and administrators will only have to sign in using UW log in process. You can access it from the WyoWeb by clicking on the link to WyoFolio.

For assistance with WyoFolio: Aneesa McDonald has been providing training and assisting staff in each college and college-like unit learn 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.) Questions from College WyoFolio Administrators can be directed to Aneesa.
No more paper ballots? Voting in WyoFolio: We anticipate that Interfolio will be rolling out a new option for voting in the system sometime in mid- to late-September. We are still exploring some of the features of this feature and will notify you of its availability as soon as it is released. If your department review meetings occur before this feature becomes functional, you will need to access the 2019-20 RTP evaluation forms and ballots from the Academic Affairs website (http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/academics/faculty-resources/tenure_promotion.html). These forms have been modified, so please do not use old templates that you may have saved to your files.

Quick Reference Guides: Quick reference guides (QRG) will be available for faculty soon. Department heads should work with the dean’s office regarding cases and setting up case files.

KEY DATES

The table below lists important dates, including both suggested target dates and hard deadlines. The **hard deadlines are in boldface font in the ‘Event’ column.** Candidates and their department heads are responsible for preparing clear, concise, and convincing cases. It is not too soon for department heads and candidates to begin assembling the case file for the coming year’s decisions.

As many have noticed, the deadlines for first-year reappointment cases are quite early. This fact is a consequence of national guidelines established by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The AAUP condones dismissal of a first-year candidate without a "grace year," provided the candidate receives notice early enough. If you wish to dismiss a first-year employee but miss this deadline, you may have to retain the employee for an extra year. Viewed in this light, the deadline is an opportunity to avoid undesirable "grace years," not simply another administrative headache.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 27, 2019</strong></td>
<td>Colleges and college-like units shall submit names of all candidates for tenure and promotion (including promotion to Professor) to Aneesa McDonald.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preferred by August 8, 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 1, 2019</strong></td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(at the latest)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 1, 2019</strong></td>
<td>Complete protocol for determining external reviewers**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 1, 2019</strong></td>
<td>Solicit external letters of reference. Send notification from WyoFolio to external reviewers. Set a deadline for submission. A Quick Reference Guide (QRG) will be provided prior to August 1, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 8, 2019</strong></td>
<td>Faculty and departments upload required documents for external reviewers into WyoFolio case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Throughout September, 2019</strong></td>
<td>Regularly check WyoFolio for receipt of letters. There is no automated notification when letters are uploaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 1, 2019</strong></td>
<td>Receive all letters of reference for tenure and promotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(at the latest, 4 weeks prior to scheduled department review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 2019</td>
<td>Worksheets distributed for reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 20, 2019</td>
<td>Fall semester exams end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late December 2019/Early January 2020*</td>
<td>Complete all department-level deliberations for first-year reappointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2020</td>
<td>Forward all first-year reappointment case files to college deans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2020</td>
<td>Spring Semester classes begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2020</td>
<td>Forward all non-first year cases to the Dean’s office (A&amp;S has earlier deadlines for some of these cases.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2020</td>
<td>Forward all first-year reappointment case files to Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17, 2020</td>
<td>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, &amp; P committee as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2020</td>
<td>All mid-probationary, tenure, fixed-term and promotion reviews must be completed. Deans forward cases in WyoFolio to Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>Provost recommendations for 1st year reappointments submitted to President. (Date to be determined.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6-8, 2020</td>
<td>University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee meets to review conflicted cases, early cases, and cases recommended by the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Provost recommendations for mid-probationary cases to President. Trustees vote on all cases involving tenure, 5-year fixed-term with rolling contracts, and promotion. Date yet to be determined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Academic Affairs recommends that review of first-year reappointments occur after fall semester course evaluations have been completed so that they may be included in department-level deliberations.

**Colleges may require external letters for fixed-term reviews depending on college and department policy.

**PREPARING FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW**

While most of us can probably think of nothing more boring than reading university regulations—and I understand that sentiment—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 regulations are UW Regulations 2-7, governing reappointment, tenure, and promotion for tenure-track faculty and 2-4 governing academic professional appointments. 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.

More details about external reviews can be found on the Academic Affairs website. All university regulations pertaining to academic personnel are posted on the General Counsel website at [http://www.uwyo.edu/regs-policies/](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. The Office of Academic Affairs has insisted on the removal of evaluative remarks by abstainers in past cases and will do so, if necessary, in the future.

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 extended term.

1. Review/Meeting Schedule: Departments should hold at least one meeting specifically for reviewing reappointment, tenure and promotion, and extended term decisions, with no other business on the agenda. Schedule several meetings if one is not enough. Avoid dates and times when faculty are not able to attend. Please allow ample time for full review of all candidates. Complete case files should be available to voting members sufficiently in advance 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.)
2. **Peer Group/Voting Protocol.** A procedural document for conducting reappointment, tenure and promotion can be found on the Academic Affairs website (XXXXX). 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 well 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.**

3. **Participation in Meeting 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 discussion when a faculty member votes at a different level.

4. **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.

5. **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.

6. **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.

7. **Abstentions.** Abstentions are only occasionally appropriate. For example, faculty members must abstain in cases involving relatives, spouses, or domestic partners. (See UW Regulation 5-2.I. for a more complete list of those who must recuse themselves from decisions affecting reappointment, tenure and
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 do not 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/SKIP YEARS – IMPLICATIONS OF CHANGES TO UW 2-7

In the past, UW Regulation 2-7 mandated reviews in years one, two, four, and six. At any level, including Academic Affairs, a majority vote by faculty or by department head/dean in favor of a third- or fifth-year review suffices to mandate it. Otherwise, the review would be ‘skipped’.

With the July 1, 2019 revision to the regulation, tenure track faculty will be reviewed three times: (1) 1st year review (at the end of the fall semester), (2) mid-probationary review (year 3), and (3) tenure review (generally in year 6). For faculty who received notification in spring, 2019 that their 3rd year review would be ‘skipped’, the mid-probationary review will occur in AY20-21 (i.e., during their 4th year of their probationary period.

Academic Professionals will continue to follow the review schedule outlined in UW 2-4 until which time it is modified or it has been sunset.

VOTING

1. 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.

2. Voters for Extended Term Track and Promotion Cases. Voting members for reappointment, extended term, and promotion cases may vary based on position classification (e.g., Extension Educator, Lecturer, Research Scientist, Archivist, Librarian). See UW Regulations 2-4, 2-400 and 2-409 for details.

3. Ballots. Until which time voting is done in WyoFolio, departments should use the standard forms posted on the Academic Affairs website to gather votes. (http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/faculty-resources/tenure_promotion.html)
4. **Voting Timeline.** Per UW Regulation 2-7, voters should have ample time to complete and submit thoughtful recommendations. The regulation stipulates that the ballots be cast within 72 hours of the end of the meeting, excluding weekends and holidays)

5. **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.

6. **Candidate Verification.** Candidates should have the opportunity to review the votes and comments, and must acknowledge having read them prior to moving the case forward.

**CASES REVIEWED BY UNIVERSITY RT&P COMMITTEE**

The University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee will conduct an additional review of reappointment, tenure, extended-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, promotion, or extended term.
- The Provost requests consideration of a particular case.
- The faculty member seeks an early decision for tenure, promotion, or an extended term.

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

**MATERIALS** (The following materials are available on the Academic Affairs website at: [http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/faculty-resources/tenure_promotion.html](http://www.uwyo.edu/acadaffairs/faculty-resources/tenure_promotion.html).

1. **Tally Spread Sheets (will be sent electronically to college or unit November 18, 2019).**
   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 3, 2020, for first-year cases;
   b. 5:00 p.m., February 24, 2020, 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.

4. **History Sheet.** Departments 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.