Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion
Peer Group/Voting Protocol

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. All voting members of the department must be invited to participate in the department meeting and must have the opportunity to review the candidate’s case.

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.)

Participation in Meeting by Non-Voting Members (including peers who vote at a difference level). 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.

Role of Unit Head/Dean in Meeting. The unit 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 a dean’s designees.

Role of College and University Tenure and Promotion Committee Members in the Department.
Participation the department view 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 the 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 candidates 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. However, units are encouraged to arrange for faculty to participate through web conferencing or teleconferencing. Employees away from the university on sabbatical or professional-development leave must vote if otherwise eligible, unless it is highly impractical to do so. All eligible voters must 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 UW Regulation 5-2.I. 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 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.

Reference: University Regulation 2-7 (Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Fixed-Term)

Standard Administrative Policies and Procedures: Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (coming soon)

Links: http://www.uwyo.edu/regs-policies/section-2-academic-affairs/academic-personnel.html