

Promotion and Tenure 2024-2025 Personnel Committee Letter Guidance

The below is offered as advice to ensure that committee letters are complete. For questions, contact pandt@uml.edu.

Please use department or college letterhead, depending on the committee, if possible.

Whether using letter or memo format, **address the letter to the next review level:** for DPCs the department chair, for CPCs, the dean.

Paragraph 1

- Identify committee by department (DPCs) or college/division (CPCs).
 - Identify eligible voting members by name and rank, note any ad hoc membership.
- Include meeting date.
- Specify candidate name, department and rank sought.

Paragraph 2

- Specify the details of the vote:
 - Note the number of voting committee members.
 - Indicate each area of evaluation that was considered, based on the ballot structure for the promotion type.
- **DO NOT take an “overall” vote for ranks other than promotion to full tenured professor.**
- For promotion to full tenured professor, which is a single holistic yes/no vote, record the vote in the format (#voting yes -#voting no-#abstaining).
- Conclude this paragraph with a summarizing sentence of the outcome:
e.g., *"The DPC voted that Professor Smith is excellent in research and teaching, and strong in service, and recommends them for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure."* or
"The DPC voted that Professor Smith is excellent in both teaching and service, and recommends them for promotion to the rank of associate teaching professor."

Paragraph 3

- Briefly introduce the candidate’s background.

Paragraphs for each area of evaluation (as applicable to the promotion sought)

- Use a separate paragraph for each area of evaluation relevant to the candidate.
- Use the terms “excellent” and “strong” only in the contractual sense related to the vote.
- CPCs may wish to make references to previous campus review letters.
- Summarize the committee’s discussion of accomplishments.
- If any concerns were raised, regardless of the results of the vote, be sure to note those. **FOR ANY NON-UNANIMOUS VOTE, the letter must include both comments made in favor and comments made against recommendation.**
- If Research & Scholarship is a relevant criteria: as desired, include any insights from external reviewers in this section. **BE SURE to refer to the writer only by their reviewer number** and do not offer any information that might reveal the reviewer’s institution.
- **Conclude the paragraph with an explicit reiteration of the vote tally for that criteria and the committee’s conclusion** (excellent, strong, or less than strong). **For each relevant area of evaluation, note the vote tally as follows:**
Area of Evaluation (#voting excellent-#voting strong-#voting less than strong-#abstaining).
e.g., *"The committee voted (4-1-0-0) and concludes that Dr. Smith has achieved excellence in teaching."*
- Ensure that all vote counts tally accurately for the number of eligible members.

Conclusion:

- Indicate that the final decision was made on the basis of the above reasoning.
- Include a final statement that states clearly whether the committee is recommending or not recommending the candidate.

- Reiterate the level achieved as determined by the committee for each area of evaluation with the necessary details:
- The committee **<does not recommend>** **<recommends>** that **CANDIDATE** be promoted to **RANK SOUGHT** in the Department of **XXX** (CPC would note department & college). It is our opinion that they **<have achieved excellence>** **<have achieved strength>** **<have not achieved strength>** in **<RELEVANT AREAS OF EVALUATION>**.
- In the case of a split vote, whether in an area of evaluation or in a yes/no vote for Promotion to Professor: Provide the tally as noted above; state explicitly that the vote was split; and include evidence to support both sides of the vote. Please note when a split vote occurs regarding the required level of achievement in area of evaluation, the letter **cannot be considered a recommendation**.
- **DO NOT INCLUDE AN OVERALL VOTE** for candidates of any rank other than tenured professor.
e.g.: *“The DPC of the Department of History recommends that Dr. Smith be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure on the basis of their excellence in research and teaching, and strength in service.”*
or: *“The CPC of the Kennedy College of Sciences recommends that Dr. Smith be promoted to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor in the department of Mathematics and Statistics. It is our opinion that they have achieved excellence in both teaching and service.”*

Closing:

- Include a list of names & ranks of all committee members. (No need to leave signing spaces, the signature sheet will be separate.)
- CPCs should include departments of all committee members.
- Note the reason for any non-voting status or special standing for the case:
 - Rank ineligibility
 - Absence
 - Ad hoc membership
 - For CPC, the representative from the candidate’s department should be marked as (non-voting; member of candidate’s department).
- For committees with multiple cases, be sure to align the eligibility notes with the specifics of the candidate’s rank sought.
- Note any ad-hoc standing and note home department of ad hoc faculty.
- **Ensure that the number of voting members listed matches the number of votes indicated in the letter.**
e.g., the below list would reflect a DPC with three voting members voting on a promotion to full:
 - Dr. First Member , Professor and DPC Chair*
 - Dr. Number Two, Associate Professor (not eligible to vote on this case)*
 - Dr. Nothree Persona, Teaching Professor*
 - Dr. Four Ismissing (absent, non-voting)*
 - Dr. Adam Hawk, Professor (ad hoc member from the Department of History)*