

A sub-committee of the University Faculty Council was created to review the function and operation of UCoPT and to make recommendations as needed. The sub-committee members included Christopher White, Peter Beltemacchi, Michael Young, David Williams, and Howard Chapman. Carlo Segre was the chair of UCoPT this academic year, and as such, was also consulted. After careful deliberation and thoughtful discussion, the committee has drafted the following recommendations. It is our intention that the UFC approve these recommendations, which can then be forwarded to the offices of the President, Provost, Deans, and AU Chairs, and upon her/his nomination, the incoming chair of UCoPT.

Recommendations

1. The tenured faculty of each Academic Unit should determine the Standards for promotion and tenure; UCOPT should not be involved in this process. The Provost should approve the establishment of and modifications to these Standards, as specified in Appendix C of the faculty handbook. The Standards, which should be accessible to every member of the faculty, should be reviewed and updated regularly. The Dean must provide a copy of the Standards to a new faculty member at the time of appointment.
2. The Provost should work with the academic units to establish a uniform procedure for adopting, reviewing, revising, and vetting the Standards. The Standards will vary among academic units, but the process of establishing the Standards should be consistent for all Academic units.
3. The existing 4-tier voting system (Very Highly Qualified, Highly Qualified, Qualified, Not Qualified) is not interpreted consistently by the AU, CAMCoPT and UCoPT. The committee recommends the University Faculty Council consider adopting a 2-tiered (Yes/No) voting system to replace the existing 4-tier system. Alternatively, the meaning and use of the current ranking system must be clearly understood and universally applied at all levels. The President the Provost should explain how they interpret these votes when evaluating the candidates.
4. The administrative reviews and the faculty reviews should be independent from each other. Deans should not participate in the faculty's deliberations.
5. UCoPT must base its recommendation on the AU and CAMCoPT's reports and should not make an independent investigation of the candidate's portfolio. For this reason, advocates should not be permitted to address UCoPT. UCoPT will review the AU and CAMCoPTs reports to make sure the appropriate processes were complied with and the recommendations were based on the published Standards. UCoPT may remand the portfolio to the appropriate committee if it finds deficiencies in the file.
6. UCoPT members from a candidate's AU do not have to recuse themselves during UCoPT's deliberations.
7. A standard format should be adopted for the AU and CAMCoPT reports, which includes a point-by-point evaluation of the candidate based on the applicable Standards.