

Promotions Committee: Procedures & Norms

This document refers to discussions of candidates for Promotion to Full

General structure

- Two candidates' files are discussed per meeting (order/pairs randomly assigned); note that each file is assessed separately.
- One lead reader assigned to each case (ideally someone close to the candidate's area of expertise/ type of work)
- First meeting: 1 hr allotted for each file, but 3 hrs total are reserved in case more time is needed
 - This meeting is tightly structured so that we are sure to stick to evidence in the file and are comprehensive, equitable, and unbiased in our review. At the end of the meeting, PC may decide that all members should revisit certain aspects of the file before the second meeting. The committee then has a break of a few days to allow for further file review. This structure encourages committee members to reflect on and filter the thoughts/issues that are relevant to the case.
- Second meeting: 1 hr allotted to revisit each file, but 3 hrs total are reserved in case more time is needed. This meeting is minimally structured. PC formulates and sends questions for ADOF/DOF.
- Dean's meeting: follows second meeting
 - ADOF/DOF attend to present and discuss the case
 - ADOF/DOF gives responses to questions that PC has provided (clarification about Department policies, specific candidate situations that the file is unclear about, etc.)
 - Afterwards, they leave and PC can either vote, or choose to return to the case(s) for an additional meeting
- Option to revisit: if didn't vote after Dean's meeting
 - Further discussion and vote on candidate(s)

Norms:

- Ground rules¹:
 - Listen respectfully, without interrupting.
 - Listen actively and with an ear to understanding others' views. (Don't just think about what you are going to say while someone else is talking.)
 - Avoid assumptions about any committee member or generalizations about social groups. Do not ask individuals to speak for their (perceived) social group.
- The chair is responsible for timekeeping and moderation. This includes flagging any inappropriate comments, and moving the meeting along as needed.
 - When chair is leading a case, moderation and timekeeping duties passed off to a volunteer.
- During the first meeting, follow the structure closely. It's there for a reason (see rationale above)!

¹ Adapted from: <https://crlt.umich.edu/examples-discussion-guidelines>

- Discuss only evidence from the file. Do not bring in knowledge that you may have about the candidate from other contexts. This is to ensure equity across candidate discussions—PC does not have the same relationship with each candidate, and so we do not want to be able to provide “extra” information for some candidates and not others. If there are questions/ambiguities about a case, this can be a question for the Dean’s office.
 - You can bring in your own general pedagogical/research/service expertise into a review, but if there is any concern about whether it is appropriate to introduce additional information, check with the PC chair. It may be more appropriate for the question to go to the Dean instead.
- While we discuss both strengths and weaknesses, resist the urge to find weaknesses just to have something to say. Resist the urge to repeat a point that is already made; you can say instead “I agree with X”.
- It is okay to “pass” if you have nothing to add.

Meeting procedures

First meeting:

1hr allotted for each candidate, with specific times for each phrase listed below. Note that if discussions are shorter, the full hour does not need to be used, as long as everyone gets a chance to speak about each aspect of the file. The discussion can also go on longer if the committee agrees to extend time. The discussion should include reflection on bias, method of file review, and perspective.

0. Intro: lead reader presents overview of the case (relevant dates, departmental context etc.)
1. **Teaching:**
 - a. Lead reader presents the **teaching** aspect of the case (5 minutes timer)
 - i. Following the rubric to make sure that narrative sticks to handbook criteria.
 1. First discuss strengths, then discuss weaknesses
 2. It may help to label each strength/weakness as major or minor
 - b. Structured committee discussion (15-minute timer, but can be shorter if everything is addressed in a shorter amount of time, or longer if the committee agrees to extend)
 - i. Teaching strengths: Each additional committee member speaks, in counterclockwise order from lead reader
 1. Each committee member, one at a time, has the opportunity to either reiterate or add strengths, and can note whether there is disagreement in whether a strength is minor or major
 - ii. Teaching weaknesses: Same order as strengths discussion
 1. Each committee member, one at a time, has the opportunity to either reiterate or add weaknesses, and can note whether there is disagreement in whether a weakness is minor or major
2. **Scholarship/creative work:**
 - a. Lead reader presents the **scholarship/creative work** aspect of the case (5 minutes timer)
 - i. Following the rubric to make sure that narrative sticks to handbook criteria.
 1. First discuss strengths, then discuss weaknesses
 2. It may help to label each strength/weakness as major or minor
 - b. Structured committee discussion (15-minute timer, but can be shorter if everything is addressed in a shorter amount of time, or longer if the committee agrees to extend)
 - i. Scholarship/creative work strengths: Each additional committee member speaks, in counterclockwise order from lead reader
 1. Each committee member, one at a time, has the opportunity to either reiterate or add strengths, and can note whether there is disagreement in whether a strength is minor or major

- ii. Scholarship/creative work weaknesses: Same order as strengths discussion
 - 1. Each committee member, one at a time, has the opportunity to either reiterate or add weaknesses, and can note whether there is disagreement in whether a weakness is minor or major
- 3. **Service:**
 - a. Lead reader presents the **service** aspect of the case (5 minutes timer)
 - i. Following the rubric to make sure that narrative sticks to handbook criteria.
 - 1. First discuss strengths, then discuss weaknesses
 - 2. It may help to label each strength/weakness as major or minor
 - b. Structured committee discussion (15 minute timer, but can be shorter if everything is addressed in a shorter amount of time, or longer if the committee agrees to extend.)
 - i. Service strengths: Each additional committee member speaks, in counterclockwise order from lead reader
 - 1. Each committee member, one at a time, has the opportunity to either reiterate or add strengths, and can note whether there is disagreement in whether a strength is minor or major
 - ii. Service weaknesses: Same order as strengths discussion
 - 1. Each committee member, one at a time, has the opportunity to either reiterate or add weaknesses, and can note whether there is disagreement in whether a weakness is minor or major

Second meeting:

1hr allotted for each candidate, with specific times for each phrase listed below. Note that if discussions are shorter, the full hour does not need to be used, as long as everyone gets a chance to speak about each aspect of the file.

- 1. Revisit each aspect of the file
 - a. Teaching (10 minutes, but can cut short if nothing needs to be discussed)
 - b. Scholarship/creative work (10 minutes, but can cut short if nothing needs to be discussed)
 - c. Service (10 minutes, but can cut short if nothing needs to be discussed)
- 2. If needed, allot another 10 minutes to one or more of the three aspects of the file
- 3. Chair records list of questions to send to ADOF in preparation for Dean's meeting
 - a. These should be sent RIGHT after the meeting, so the ADOF has time to look into questions as needed

Meeting with the DOF:

This meeting is attended by the DOF/VPAA and ADOF for Faculty Affairs. All PC members can ask questions/ follow-up questions as needed.

- After both candidates' cases are discussed with the ADOF and DOF and they leave, PC chair asks if the committee is ready to vote on each case. Votes are submitted anonymously, and results are reported out by the Chair and recorded.
 - Paper votes – circle yes or no
 - Afterwards, voting slips sealed in an envelope with name of candidate and date on the outside
- If any committee member is not ready to vote, PC will use the following meeting to revisit the case (following procedures from second meeting listed above; PC may choose to pass on sections if no one wants to discuss that aspect of the file). The vote must happen at the end of that meeting.
- At any time before votes are submitted to the ADOF/DOF and President, any member of PC can anonymously call for a revisit & revote on any case.