**New A&P Voting Process: Guidelines from the Provost’s Office 11-2017**

A concern from the Provost’s Office is the small number of votes at every level in the SoM professoriate (MCL, NTL, UTL) A&P process. It has been requested that we revise our process to increase the number of votes. After discussion with the Provost and the Ad Board, we have agreed upon this approach.

Departments may choose either option A or B. The first level of review provides more content expertise, and then a broader representation of faculty in the department review the action and vote. Departments may decide whether voting is open or done confidentially, and this practice should be followed consistently. It is best practice to have confidential voting especially at the local level (evaluation committee, division).

OAA will provide educational material on the importance of integrity and confidentiality of the A&P process that can be shared with all faculty who will be involved in A&P reviews.

A) Larger Departments with Divisions:

1. For all appointments, reappointments and promotions, the Division Chief will form an Evaluation Committee of at least 3 faculty (members may be from other divisions and departments) who will review the candidate’s publications, clinical work, and teaching record, and then recommend that letters of evaluation be solicited (or not) for reappointment or promotion. Best practice is to have faculty members with no relationship (mentor or collaborator) to the candidate. The Evaluation Committee will gather the evidence for the long form and assemble it. The Evaluation Committee will not vote, but they will present the file to the Division faculty. For searches, the search committee will present the top candidate to the Division faculty. The evaluation sections of the long form narrative will be finalized after the Division vote.

[See below for more information on composition of the Evaluation Committee.]

1. At the Division level, all eligible faculty members will review and vote on the appointment, reappointment, and promotion files for UTL, MCL, and NTL faculty before the action is moved to the Department A&P Committee. The voting should occur not less often than once a month, and more frequently if necessary so that the review process is not delayed. Faculty may vote by email once they have reviewed the long form, but it is best practice to have the majority of the faculty present for the discussion. Divisions may consider using Zoom for video conferencing to include faculty at other sites. Email or absentee votes should be tabulated separately in the vote summary. [For CE candidates, the Evaluation Committee, rather than the entire faculty, may review the packet after the letters of evaluation have returned.]
   1. All UTL, MCL, and NTL faculty can vote on University long forms. [CE faculty can only vote on CE actions; emeritus faculty cannot vote.]
   2. Full Professors may vote on all actions, but Associate Professors can only vote on Assistant Professor appointments, reappointments, and promotions, and appointments of Associate Professors.
   3. Assistant Professors may only vote on Assistant Professor appointments.

2B. Alternative approach for larger departments:

Instead of an evaluation committee and a vote by the Division, one larger Evaluation Unit may perform both of these tasks. An Evaluation Unit is created with 6 to 9 faculty with content expertise who are able to judge the accomplishments of the candidate. These faculty members may come from the same division or from other divisions and departments. They will collect the evidence for the long form and assemble it. They will review the evidence and vote. This will substitute for a divisional vote. It is best practice for all members to be present for the discussion and vote, but absentee votes will be allowed. Email or absentee votes should be tabulated separately in the vote summary of the long form.

[See below for more information on composition of the Evaluation Unit.]

1. The Department A&P Committee may be split into two committees, one for professoriate actions and one for CE actions or a single committee can review both groups. For the professoriate files, there must be a minimum of 9 voting members present at each meeting, and this needs to be a majority of the committee members. Email or absentee voting is not allowed. All voting committee members must be at or above the level of the candidate. (In practice, this likely means that the A&P committee consists of full professors.)

B. Smaller departments:

For most of these departments, there is likely no change because they already follow this process:

1. An Evaluation Committee of at least 3 faculty is formed. The members may be from other departments. The Evaluation Committee will review the candidate’s publications, clinical work (if applicable), and teaching record, and then recommend that letters of evaluation be solicited (or not) for reappointment or promotion. Best practice is to have faculty members with no relationship (mentor or collaborator) to the candidate. The Evaluation Committee will gather the evidence for the long form and assemble it. Usually the Evaluation Committee will vote on the action.

[See below for more information on composition of the Evaluation Committee.]

1. All faculty members in the department at or above the proposed level of the candidate read the file and vote. Best practice is to have the majority of the faculty members participate in the discussion, but email or absentee votes are allowed, if necessary. Absentee votes are tabulated separately in the vote summary of the long form.

Evaluation Committee and Evaluation Unit Guidelines:

* Evaluation Committees are comprised of 3 to 5 faculty with content expertise, primarily from the candidate’s department but outside members are encouraged; Evaluation Units are comprised of 6 to 9 faculty with involvement of faculty with relevant content knowledge, inclusion of faculty from other divisions and departments is encouraged
* If the candidate has a joint appointment, at least one member should be from the joint department
* The Evaluation Committee (or the Evaluation Unit) should be chaired by someone who has no mentoring or collaborative relationship with the candidate
* Best practice is that all members of the Evaluation Committee (or the Evaluation Unit) have no mentoring or collaborative relationship with the candidate
* It is important that the Evaluation Committee or the Evaluation Unit taken as a whole does not have a conflict of interest with the candidate, but at the same time, the committee does need to include faculty who know the candidate’s area
* In some cases, involvement of a mentor or collaborator on the Evaluation Committee or Evaluation Unit may be unavoidable or preferable to other alternatives—in these cases, please consult with OAA and the Vice Dean
* Any collaborative or mentoring relationship of a committee member with the candidate must be disclosed in the long form

Solicitation of Referee and Trainee Letters:

It is important that there is no appearance of bias in the solicitation of referees and trainees for letters. Solicitation letters should be signed by a faculty member who is independent of the candidate. These letters should not be signed by the Division Chief or Department Chair because they make the decision on the action at either the Division or Department level.