

Reappointment and Promotion
Notes for May 13, 2020
DBFox

Preparation Begins in the Department

Faculty members will typically have a required or recommended review date outlined in their initial hiring contract. Adjustments to this timeline may occur based on individual circumstances, e.g., the birth or adoption of a child.

The reappointment or promotion review begins at the department level, usually prompted by the annual Faculty Activity Report meeting between the candidate and the chair. The department will offer an initial readiness review of the candidate's record, indicating whether the review process should launch in subsequent months. Department faculty involved in this step must hold the rank/status that is "at or above" the rank/status being sought by the candidate. Candidates should prepare an initial professional statement and updated CV for this purpose, sharing it with the department chair and the department assistant.

The overall schedule and organization of the review is managed by the department chair and the department's office assistant. Typically, the candidate, chair, and assistant will then meet together with the Senior Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs to analyze a proposed timeline and determine any adjustments to the schedule for the case, which may be impacted by summer schedules and availability.

The department assistant is responsible for moving the candidate's materials into the web-based platform and will assist the department chair (or designee) in sending and compiling the required letters for the case.

The department assistant is also responsible for creating the final casebook that includes all of the letters, CV, professional statement, the Student Opinion Surveys, and materials submitted by the candidate (see Table of Contents for a more complete listing).

Reviewers Involved in the Case

The department offers a "readiness" read of the candidate; the "appropriate faculty" are involved at the initial step and then again, when the full case is developed. Only appropriate faculty have access to Student Opinion Surveys in this review process.

Reviewers at multiple levels are identified, invited, and instructed about how to conduct their reviews and prepare their letters for the case. Sample letters for these procedures are included in the guidelines.

- Two categories of *internal and appropriate* faculty write for reappointment cases.
- Three categories of *external, internal, and appropriate* faculty write for all other cases.

Appropriate faculty are required to prepare letters for the case. They must vote on the outcome, and this vote must be reported in the final summary letter written by the department chair. Departments have developed slightly different internal procedures for this voting step in the process; some allow colleagues to read each other's letters and then present their final letters to the chair for the case.

The department chair prepares a letter summarizing the process used in creating the review and forwards all materials to the Academic Affairs Office. At this point if a tenure case is involved, the Faculty Affairs Administrator in Eastman's AA Office notifies the Provost's Office that a tenure case is being assembled. This will prompt that office to form an ad hoc committee for the individual case.

The Senior Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs prepares a letter to the Dean, outlining the overall process of the review.

In the case of reappointment, for either a 3rd year review of a tenure-eligible candidate or a penultimate year review of a term appointment, the case goes directly from the Senior Associate Dean to the Dean for review. There is no committee beyond Eastman; this is an internal-only review. A final letter with comments from the Dean is developed as part of the subsequent annual contract letter to the candidate.

From Eastman to the Provost's Office

In the case of promotion to Associate Professor without Tenure, the case goes to the Dean for his letter, and then the full case is forwarded to the Provost's Office from Academic Affairs. At that level, a Standing Committee of faculty from across the Humanities areas of the University will review the case. Eastman has one representative to this Standing committee. The department chair will be invited to attend a meeting to answer questions about the case and the candidate. A final recommendation from the Standing Committee goes directly to the Provost. If approved, the promotion decision will be placed on the Board's agenda for approval.

In the case of promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, the case goes to the Dean for his letter, and then the full case is forwarded to the Provost's Office from Academic Affairs. At that level, the Provost appoints the 3-person ad hoc committee, confidential to all involved with the case. The committee receives a charge from the Provost in a formal meeting, and then meets separately from the Provost to review the case. During this step in the process, additional questions may arise or additional materials may be requested from the department presenting the case. After deliberating on the review, one member of the ad hoc committee prepares a letter for all to sign, and this is delivered to the Provost's Office. The Provost reviews the recommendation, and if approved, the promotion decision will be placed on the Board's agenda for approval.

In the case of promotion to Full Professor, the case goes to the Dean for his letter, and then the full case is forwarded to the Provost's Office from Academic Affairs. At that level, only the Provost reads the case. If approved, the promotion decision will be placed on the Board's agenda for approval.

Board of Trustees Action on Reviews and Promotions

The Board meets at regular intervals (October, March, May) as a full on-site board, and an executive committee manages agenda items through mail or email during interim months between meetings. The final meeting of the year is in early June.

Recent discussions about acceptable faculty conduct has resulted in a new required step in the review process prior to the Board receiving an agenda item to vote on a faculty promotion. Each promotion candidate will have a background check to insure there are no pending charges of misconduct against that individual. This step will add some time to the original promotion timeline and stated deadlines may be adjusted in the future to recognize this.

The Academic Affairs Office at Eastman will be notified by the Provost's Office when a case has been approved and is ready to be placed on the Board agenda. The primary meeting date has been the May in-person Board meeting, but on occasion an earlier or later meeting of the executive committee of the Board may include this agenda item. The candidate will receive a formal written notice of the Board action; this has been a document rather than a letter; the notice is sent to the candidate's home address.

Internal Reviewers

DEFINITION

Internal reviewers are colleagues at the Eastman School of Music or other units of the University of Rochester, whose experience or expertise is outside the primary discipline of the candidate. The academic rank of internal reviewers should be at or above the rank being sought by the candidate.

For a Full Professor review in the academic areas, internal reviewers should be professors who already hold the rank of Full Professor.

For a Full Professor review in the performance areas, internal reviewers may include colleagues with years of professional expertise and a career that represents the highest standard of musical achievement in the field.

SELECTION

A minimum of 8 internal reviewer letters is required in a promotion case. The candidate may provide up to 50% of the names of potential reviewers, and the department must provide the other 50%. When invited to provide potential reviewer names to the department, a candidate should present no more than 5-6 names; this number will allow the department to have some flexibility should an invited reviewer be unable to write for the case.

The case record must indicate which reviewers were selected by the candidate and which reviewers were identified by the department. The case record must indicate which reviewers were selected by the candidate and which reviewers were identified by the department. Candidates should discuss possible internal reviewers with the department chair, bringing attention to both School-wide and University-level connections with colleagues from outside the department. This discussion could happen annually as part of the Faculty Activity Report meeting with the chair. The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate will be stated in the reviewer's letter.

External Reviewers

DEFINITION

External reviewers are professionals in a candidate's field who are knowledgeable about the discipline and who have the depth of experience/expertise to comment on the level of review being requested.

For a Full Professor review in the academic areas, external reviewers should be professors who already hold the rank of Full Professor at peer institutions. In some cases, e.g., international schools, this system of ranking and appointment titles is not parallel and may not use the same terminology. In those cases, the biography of the reviewer must provide a context for the stature of the reviewer.

For a Full Professor review in the performance areas, external reviewers may include professionals at peer institutions or professional organizations that represent the highest standard of achievement in the field.

SELECTION

A minimum of 8 external reviewer letters is required in a promotion case. The candidate may provide up to 50% of the names of potential reviewers, and the department must provide the other 50%. When invited to provide potential reviewer names to the department, a candidate should present no more than 5-6 names; this number will allow the department to have some flexibility should an invited reviewer be unable to write for the case.

The case record must indicate which reviewers were selected by the candidate and which reviewers were identified by the department. While the candidate may choose individuals with close professional connections, it is important that the case also include reviewers with little or no close personal connection to the candidate. The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate must be described in the case materials; this is usually stated in the reviewer's letter and may also be identified or categorized within the Table of Contents for the case.

APPROPRIATE FACULTY for a promotion/review case

DEFINITION

Appropriate faculty for a promotion case are those faculty members who are at or above the rank being sought by the candidate.

For tenure-eligible candidates, appropriate faculty reviewers must be in the tenure-eligible category. They must have passed the review being considered for the candidate, e.g., past the 3rd year review, now in the second stage of Assistant Professor rank.

Commentary from other faculty who are not in the tenure-eligible category may be appropriate in certain reappointment cases, e.g., the reappointment of a term faculty member.

REQUIRED LETTER

Appropriate faculty in a department are required to prepare a substantive letter of review, demonstrating that they have read the materials and prepared an assessment based on their review of the materials provided by the candidate. This letter should not be simply a personal comment on the candidate and should not be based singly on experience or interactions.

CONSIDERING THE STUDENT OPINION SURVEYS

The materials provided with the case must include recent Student Opinion Surveys, and appropriate faculty are expected to offer insights about these submitted documents. Only the appropriate faculty in a department will have access to the Student Opinion Surveys for their colleague.

**CONTENTS OF (Reappointment or Promotion/Tenure) CASE FOR
(NAME OF CANDIDATE)**

**TO RANK OF (Assistant Professor; Associate Professor without tenure; Associate
Professor with tenure; Full Professor)**

1. Letter from Dean
2. Letter from Senior Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs
3. Letter from Department Chair
4. Curriculum Vitae
5. Candidate's Statement of Future Plans
6. External Reviewers
 - a. Reviewer information (name, title, affiliation); indicate which names were selected by the candidate and which names were selected by the department
 - b. Sample letters of invitation and instruction to external reviewers
 - c. Biographical material on external reviewers
 - d. Letters from external reviewers in alphabetical order
7. Internal Reviewers
 - a. Reviewer information (name, title, department); indicate which names were selected by the candidate and which names were selected by the department
 - b. Sample letters of invitation and instruction to internal reviewers
 - c. Letters from internal reviewers (outside the department) in alphabetical order
8. Appropriate Faculty
 - a. Letters from appropriate faculty within the department (at or above the rank being sought) in alphabetical order
9. Teaching Documentation
 - a. Course syllabi, studio handbooks
 - b. Student opinion surveys; student feedback
 - c. Peer comments, alumni comments, community members
 - d. Other (specify)
10. Documentation of Scholarship/Artistic Work included in the case; list by individual title
 - a. Articles or reprints
 - b. Manuscripts
 - c. Books (indicate if photocopied material or actual book)
 - d. Compositions (indicate if related audio/video materials are included)
 - e. Recordings/Videos
 - f. Concert and recital programs (organize by year)
 - g. Other (specify)
11. Service Record (if not already included in the Curriculum Vitae)

Appendix

Table 1

Checklist of Tasks and Deadlines for Promotion to Associate or Full

Update by DBFox on 05-12-2020

Suggested Dates	Activity or Tasks to be Completed—Possible timeline taking advantage of summer months for external/internal reviewers required	Planned Completion Date if revised
April-May	<p>April/early May: FAR meeting with department chair; candidate provides CV and professional statement to the department</p> <p>May:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate and chair meet with Senior Associate Dean and department assistant for planning the timeline • Candidate offers external/internal names; Department identifies external and internal names • Chair sends messages of invitation and confirms reviewer roster 	
By June 15	Candidate provides updated CV, statement, and selected review materials to Chair for EXTERNAL and INTERNAL reviewers; posted to the web by department assistant	
By July 1	Chair distributes review material to EXTERNAL and INTERNAL reviewers (notify of availability on web or send paper copy)	
September 1	Candidate provides FINAL case materials to the Chair	
September 15	Chair receives all EXTERNAL and INTERNAL letters of evaluation	
October 1	Case available to appropriate faculty for on-site reading	
November 15	<p>Letters due from appropriate faculty to the Department Chair</p> <p>December: Department discussion and vote. Chair writes review letter for the case</p>	
January 5	Case to the Senior Associate Dean	
January 31	Case to the Dean	
(January 31)	(Notify Provost if need for <i>ad hoc</i> committee)	NA for Full Professor
March 1	Case to the Provost Office	
March -- May	Committee review scheduled by Provost Office, standing or <i>ad hoc</i> ; only Provost for Full Professor	
May or June	Notification of outcome; requires Board of Trustees action	