

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** University Faculty  
**From:** Ronald M. Berkman, Executive Vice President and Provost  
**Date:** February 26, 2007  
**Subject:** Final Version of the Tenure and Promotion Manual

The Tenure and Promotion Manual to be used for evaluation of cases starting in the 2007 – 2008 academic year has been posted on the Provost's web page (<http://academic.fiu.edu/docs/provost.htm>). All amendments discussed at the February 20, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate were considered in finalizing this document. The following changes have been made in the document in response to the Senate discussion.

Please reference the Faculty Senate web site for a list of the amendments. The way in which they have been considered is summarized below.

- (1)(I). Accepted.
- (1)(II). Accepted as posted on the Senate web site (on the Senate floor it was noted that the amendment should have placed an “and/or” before the final clause dealing with service to the department, college or university). Providing service to FIU at some level should be a requirement for promotion.
- (1)(III). Accepted.
- (2). Accepted in spirit. The time line was added but instead of two weeks before the end of the Spring semester, the current policy of posting the schedule by the end of January was put in the document. Also in response to a request from the Senate floor, a January date has also been added under the responsibilities of the dean. The manual already had the establishment and announcement of a college schedule as one of the responsibilities of the dean. A time line for this action has been added.
- (3). Not accepted.
- (4). Not passed by the Senate.
- (5). Not accepted, but an additional bullet was added which reads:  
The Provost may consult with the chair of the department tenure and promotion committee, the department chair, the chair of the college tenure and promotion committee, the dean, or other individuals whose advice could assist the Provost in making a decision.
- (6). Not passed by the Senate.
- (7). Not passed by the Senate.
- (8). Not accepted.
- (9). Accepted. A sentence added that the candidate needs to explain why she or he struck a potential external reviewer.

**Office of the Provost**

- (10). Not passed by the Senate.
- (11) Not accepted, but this amendment caused a review of this section of the document and we found that that standards for teaching and research, as well as the service component identified in the amendment, needed to be clarified. The qualifications at each level were appropriate, but the expectation that these qualifications would be met for appointment at, or promotion to, that level was unrealistic. The preface to this section has been rewritten as follows:

The following position descriptions define the expectations at each rank. Appointment to a rank requires sufficient evidence in all categories to sustain an expectation that the candidate will successfully meet the requirements of a holder of that rank.

The criteria for promotion shall include substantially exceeding expectations at the rank currently held, showing an increased skill in teaching, knowledge in the field of specialty, recognition of creative work, recognition as an authority in the field and, potential for professional growth.

- (12) Accepted. Metrics of mentoring appropriate to the discipline will be discussed with the deans and included in the annual reviews. Hence the discipline appropriate measures will be in the annual evaluations at the time the file is reviewed.
- (13) Not accepted.

Thanks to all faculty who participated in this process. The document posted on the Provost's web site is the official document to be used in all new tenure and promotion applications.