

**I-40**  
**PROMOTION TO TENURE OR SECURITY OF**  
**EMPLOYMENT**  
(Revised 4/24)

The principal criterion for promotion to tenure in the Professorial series is succinctly stated in the following passage from APM 210-1 d:

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.

The other criteria for review must be given due consideration in the Professor series, but they can never be considered sufficient in and of themselves to justify promotion to tenure. Superior intellectual attainment in teaching and in research or other creative achievement as noted above are essential for promotion to tenure.

The principal criterion for promotion to security of employment in the Teaching Professor series is stated in APM 210-3 c:

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced particularly in excellent teaching (and mentoring) and secondarily in professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to security of employment.

Professional and/or scholarly achievement and University service must be given due consideration in the Teaching Professor series, but they can never be considered sufficient in and of themselves to justify promotion to security of employment. Superior intellectual attainment in teaching is essential for promotion to security of employment.

In attempting to make the phrase "superior intellectual attainment" operational, it is to be recognized that a particular intellectual discipline or subject-area (in the case of interdisciplinary programs), as represented in a local department or program together with the larger national and/or international context of the discipline or area, provides the most informed evaluation of outstanding or superior performance. The most useful critical assessment of "superior intellectual attainment" in research or other creative achievement must come primarily from those who are established figures in the field, primarily from colleagues in the department as well as faculty in comparable departments and programs nationally and internationally. (In making this connection, departments may wish to provide an operational interpretation of the phrase "superior intellectual attainment" which they consider appropriate to the particular discipline or subject-area). Candid, thorough, well-documented and concise assessment on this level is clearly essential if reviewing agencies are to perform their proper analytical and evaluative task. Furthermore, it is essential that a candidate's performance be measured by the highest standards of excellence that are currently recognized by a given intellectual discipline or subject-area.

The most useful critical assessment of "superior intellectual attainment" in teaching must come primarily from those familiar with the methods and approaches in teaching that are appropriate in a given candidate's area of expertise. In many instances, the assessment of a candidate's performance in teaching is most satisfactorily carried out and documented by the Chairperson of the department in consultation with other faculty departmental colleagues, utilizing course evaluations, peer evaluation, extramural letters from former students, reports from colleagues concerning a candidate's performance in public lecture contexts, seminar discussions, and documentation of new substantive developments in the field or new and effective techniques of instruction. Further evidence of teaching performance may be obtained from extramural assessments, based on analyses of a candidate's performance in seminars or panels at national or regional professional meetings. Again, it is essential that a candidate's performance be measured by the highest standards of excellence that are currently recognized by a given intellectual discipline or subject-area in the area of teaching. See Red Binder I-75 section V, for additional information on evidence in support of assessment of teaching and mentoring.

It must also be stressed that the department's responsibility in the matter of promotion to tenure or security of employment begins long before the final assessment and recommendation. This is to say, in the normal course of events, a working environment that provides opportunity for developing a high quality program of research and teaching should be cultivated by the department. In addition, the teaching assignments of junior faculty should provide opportunity for a candidate to demonstrate how their expertise will contribute in significant ways to the department's graduate and undergraduate educational programs. It is also the department's responsibility to apprise junior faculty early (and regularly) of the standards for qualification for tenure or security of employment and the bases for assessment.

When the time arrives for final evaluation for promotion to tenure or security of employment, it should be remembered that the recommendation should be based primarily on academic grounds as have been specified above. Such matters as resource limitations should not be at issue in making such a recommendation. If, after rigorous review (department and extramural), significant and credible doubts about a candidate's academic performance persist, then a candidate should not be recommended for promotion to tenure/SOE.

In view of this policy which stresses the highest standards of intellectual excellence that can be attained only by candidates of unquestioned ability, an important corollary should be set forth. If, after careful academic review, a department should choose not to recommend a candidate for promotion to tenure/SOE; and if that recommendation is sustained, the FTE vacated because of the termination will normally be retained by the department.

Promotion to tenure or security of employment review will normally take place by the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> year of service or after two years of service at Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor IV. The review may occur sooner if justified by the record. The review may also be deferred into the 7<sup>th</sup> year. Deferral beyond the 7<sup>th</sup> year will not be considered.