

## **PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS**

TO: Academic Deans, Chairs, and Directors

FROM: Dr. Christopher Cheatham, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

DATE: September 2022

The promotion timetable requires that faculty members submit their review materials to the respective department office no later than October 17, 2022. The promotion timetable also requires the department chair/director to convene the first meeting of the department promotion committee by the same date: October 17, 2022. Also, please note that the schedule for promotion eligibility for faculty specialists is different than the schedule for traditionally-ranked faculty (see Article 18.§11.1).

The promotion review process is described in Article 18, Promotion Policy and Procedures, of the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement. (The Agreement can be found on the web at [2021-2026 WMU/WMU-AAUP Agreement \(wmich.edu\)](https://www.wmich.edu/2021-2026-WMU-AAUP-Agreement)). 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.

In the case of joint appointments, please review Article 18.§6.4, and Appendix F, as there are additional deadlines for (a) the secondary department committee and chair to forward reviews to the candidate, (b) the candidate to file appeals of reviews, and (c) the secondary department committee and chair to forward reviews to the primary department.

The attached Promotion Review Summary Sheet and Promotion Process Checklist for Chairs, Directors and Deans shall be used 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 shall include evaluations of the candidate's record in each of these areas, using (as appropriate) the terms specified in Article 18.§3.7 of the Agreement. (Note the importance of both the terms and the weight of each performance area, and the criteria for promotion to full professor.) For example, after review of each area, the review should include a statement that the candidate's work in that area is judged to be unsatisfactory, satisfactory, significant, substantial, or outstanding. Reviewers at all levels must clearly state whether the overall review is positive (grant promotion) or negative (deny promotion). Each

review should be an independent and comprehensive 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.§6.10 and Appendix F). Please note that should an appeal result in a revised recommendation, the original recommendation and the candidate's request for an appeal will be removed from the promotion file. In cases where the appeal does not result in any change, the appeal materials remain a part of the promotion file.

C: President  
WMU-AAUP  
Academic Labor Relation