

PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS

TO: Academic Deans, Chairs, and Directors

FROM: Tim Greene, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

DATE: September 3, 2009

The promotion review process is described in Article 18, Promotion Policy and Procedures, of the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement (this can be found on the web at <http://www.wmich.edu/acb>). Other articles in the Agreement, such as evaluation of faculty (Article 16) and faculty records (Article 11), also contain material that pertains to promotion reviews. In addition, department policy statements may have material relevant to promotion reviews. It is important to review any such materials prior to conducting promotion reviews. The promotion timetable requires the department chair/director to notify faculty of promotion eligibility by last January 15, and to convene the first meeting of the department promotion committee by October 15, 2009. The promotion timetable also requires that faculty members submit their review materials to the respective department office no later than October 15, 2009. Please note that eligible faculty must always be informed of their eligibility, even if they have expressed a desire to not seek promotion.

In the case of joint appointments, please review Article 18.§4.2, as there is an additional deadline by which the secondary department committee and chair forward reviews to the primary department.

The attached Promotion Review Summary Sheet and Promotion Recommendation Checklist will assist you in preparing and submitting promotion recommendations. Please make copies of these forms available to the department and college committees for their use in the review process.

The following general principles apply to reviews conducted by department promotion committees, chairs/directors, college promotion committees, and deans:

1. Reviews will state the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate, referring specifically to the candidate's performance in the areas of professional competence, professional recognition (except faculty specialists), and professional service. The reviews will include evaluations of the candidate's record in each of these areas, using (as appropriate) the terms specified in Article 18§3.6-3.7 of the Agreement. Reviewers at all levels must clearly state whether the review is positive (grant promotion) or negative (deny promotion). Each review should be an independent review, based on the reviewer's assessment of the candidate's record.
2. Reviews for candidates who are not recommended for promotion must include reasons for the negative recommendation. These reviews should also advise the candidates, in general terms, of what they should accomplish for a positive recommendation at some future time. However, reviewers should not set specific standards or promise promotion if those standards are met.
3. Candidates may appeal promotion recommendations before the recommendations are forwarded to the next reviewer, as specified by the timeline in the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement (Article 18§8) and updated on the Academic Collective Bargaining web page.

C: President
WMU-AAUP
Academic Collective Bargaining