

Johns Hopkins University
Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure (FACT)

Final Report

December 2019

Executive Summary

In April 2019, President Daniels, in consultation with Provost Kumar and the university's deans, convened an advisory committee of senior faculty to explore the merits of establishing a university-level advisory committee to provide input to the president in executing his duties in the Johns Hopkins University tenure process. This committee — the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure (FACT) — was charged with researching and assessing the value of university-level faculty involvement in the tenure process, consulting widely with faculty colleagues from across the university's tenure-granting schools, and considering options and best practices among peer institutions.

In the intervening months, the FACT conducted extensive consultations and research, meeting with numerous faculty colleagues, including every school-level body involved in tenure at the university, as well as relevant committees of the Board of Trustees. The FACT also contacted two dozen faculty and university leaders at Ivy Plus peers regarding their respective approaches to and experiences with university-level tenure review. The FACT then discussed at length the advice and input received, weighing the benefits of a university-level faculty committee providing input to the President — such as improved institutional stewardship through collegial review, assurance of university-wide perspectives, and enhanced faculty feedback — against potential concerns — such as delay, uncertainty, or insufficient disciplinary expertise.

After careful study and deliberation, the FACT issued a draft report in September 2019 that was circulated to all faculty for their feedback, with a request for comments by the end of November. All comments received were discussed by the Committee. These have led to revisions in the articulation of the Committee's thinking, and to several substantive modifications of its original recommendations.

As set forth in this report, the FACT finds that a university-level faculty advisory committee would enhance the president's ability to execute his role in the tenure process, by providing input from senior faculty from across the university, experienced in tenure review. This would add greater depth and breadth of faculty perspectives at a critical stage in the tenure process.

Therefore, the FACT herein recommends to the president and provost that Johns Hopkins university establish a standing faculty-led Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC) for the purpose of advising the president in his/her role in the tenure process.

In brief, the FACT envisions that the TAC would be composed of a diverse group of senior full professors from across the university's tenure-granting schools familiar with the

promotions processes in their own schools. By design, the TAC would include two to three seats for faculty from each of the larger and more disciplinarily diverse tenure-granting schools: three each from Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, or KSAS (one each from the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences) and School of Medicine (SOM); two each from Bloomberg School of Public Health (BSPH) and the Whiting School of Engineering (WSE); and one seat for faculty members from each of the other tenure-granting schools (Carey Business School (CBS); School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS); and School of Nursing (SON)).

To be eligible to serve on the TAC, these faculty members will have been elected or otherwise named to their own school's school-level tenure review body (or, in the case of the Homewood schools, HAC) and will have served at least one full term. Prior to formally commencing work on the TAC, all members will be acculturated to the appropriate standards for tenure for all the tenure-granting schools at Johns Hopkins.

The TAC would be charged with reviewing the material contained in the school-level recommendations for tenure and advising the president either that: (1) it supports the recommendation for tenure; or (2) it does not support the recommendation for tenure. In practice, because of the rigor of the overall tenure processes at the schools, the FACT expects that the TAC's advice (which is not binding on the president) would diverge from the schools' recommendations in only a very small number of instances, as is the case at peer institutions. To assure an efficient and effective process, the FACT recommends that the TAC and its subcommittees meet frequently, and that the full TAC deliberate about only those candidates' dossiers not unanimously supported by the three-member subcommittee to which it is first assigned.

The FACT further recommends that this committee be instituted for three years and then be rigorously evaluated before being made permanent. An initial three-year period will allow for inaugural members to complete their terms of service and for a staggered appointment model to be implemented. The FACT anticipates that, with experience, the TAC may well recommend alterations to its composition and the procedures by which it operates.

Contents

I.	Overview of the JHU Tenure Process	1
II.	Committee Charge and Composition	2
III.	Faculty Consultations and Peer Benchmarking.....	3
IV.	Assessing the Value of a University-Level Tenure Committee.....	5
V.	Recommendations	10

Appendix A: Membership of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure

Appendix B: Faculty Tenure Review Committees at JHU's Tenure-Granting Schools

Appendix C: School-Level Tenure Review Committees at JHU's Tenure-Granting Schools

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

Appendix E: Faculty Receiving Tenure Per School, Years 2009-2018

I. Overview of the JHU Tenure Process

“The glory and the activity of a university depend on the professors.” So said Daniel Coit Gilman, Johns Hopkins University’s first president, in his foundational essay, “The Idea of the University.”¹ Gilman understood that a university’s excellence is defined by its faculty, who establish its culture, generate its contributions to the world of knowledge, and prepare the scholars of tomorrow. Johns Hopkins’ success has always depended on its exceptional community of professors, who have inspired their colleagues, students, and trainees to pursue new areas of inquiry, reach for new frontiers in understanding, and embrace the research ideal upon which our university was founded.

The central instrument the university has to cultivate and maintain its exceptional professoriate is the tenure process. To award tenure is to make a deep professional, collegial, and financial commitment to support an individual professor’s lifelong membership in, and contribution to, the university community. Before making that commitment, our faculty and administrators work sedulously to ensure that a tenure candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service meet the standards expected of her or his discipline, school, and the university as a whole.

Johns Hopkins, like most of its peer universities, grants the power to confer tenure at the first stage with departmental faculty, that is, those close to the candidate and her or his work.² Departments make the threshold tenure recommendation, which the dean then forwards to a standing or ad hoc committee of faculty peers from multiple departments within the school for review and recommendation.³ Those candidates who are recommended for tenure by their faculty peers are then reviewed by a separate school-level faculty body (e.g., school advisory/academic boards).⁴ At the Homewood schools, the school-level faculty body combines elected faculty from the KSAS and the WSE. At the BSPH and SOM, recommendations of the initial “school-level” body goes to a school-level advisory board that includes chairs, others in senior academic positions, and often deans of other JHU schools. If the highest school-level faculty body recommends tenure, the candidate proceeds to a university-level step, at which the president reviews the dossier and the faculty body’s conclusions, and makes a final determination regarding whether to recommend tenure to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees by its bylaws then makes tenure appointments on the president’s recommendation.⁵

Among other objectives, this arrangement allows for each reviewer in the tenure process to be assured that prior evaluation steps were conducted with appropriate rigor. The president, as final reviewer, has a special obligation in this regard to the entire university faculty and to the Board of Trustees. As the AAUP has declared:

¹ Daniel C. Gilman, “The Idea of the University,” *The North American Review*, Vol. 133, No. 299 (Oct. 1881).

² The School of Medicine uses a tenure equivalent referred to as a contract to retirement.

³ See Appendix B: Faculty Tenure Review Committees at JHU’s Tenure-Granting Schools.

⁴ See Appendix C: School-Level Tenure Review Committees at JHU’s Tenure-Granting Schools.

⁵ Article III, Section 4 of the Bylaws of the Johns Hopkins University Board of Trustees.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice.⁶

In addition, this sequencing of review – from departmental faculty to school-level faculty and administrators to the president – provides for consideration of each candidate’s dossier through successively wider apertures.

Yet, among Ivy Plus peers, the president is often aided in this post-school, university-level step by an advisory body of tenured faculty, to ensure consistency over time and across the institution and to provide a wider field of vision than any subset of departments or schools can offer.⁷ This approach is similar to the one Gilman himself sketched out for Johns Hopkins. In his “Draft of a Plan for Organization of Johns Hopkins University,” he envisioned an academic council that would include faculty from multiple schools by design.⁸ That vision partially lives on in the Homewood Academic Council (HAC), which today combines professors from the KSAS and the WSE, all of whom are elected by their faculty peers. The question here is whether and, if so, how best to advance further the vision of university-wide shared governance through additional university-level faculty input on tenure matters.

II. Committee Charge and Composition

In April 2019, President Daniels, in consultation with Provost Kumar and the university’s deans, convened an advisory committee of senior faculty to explore the merits of modifying the post-school, university-level step in the Johns Hopkins tenure process. The Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure represents a cross-section of tenure-granting schools and disciplines, and its members bring deep experience with school- and department-level tenure processes. It was chaired by Alfred Sommer, Dean Emeritus and Professor of Epidemiology and International Health at the Bloomberg School of Public Health, and Ophthalmology at the School of Medicine. The full membership of the FACT can be found at Appendix A.

President Daniels charged the advisory committee with researching and assessing the value of a university-level tenure committee, consulting widely with colleagues across the university’s tenure-granting schools as well as with colleagues at peer universities, and considering options and best practices among peers with regard to the role and potential form of such a committee. If the FACT were to recommend establishing a university-level body, it was further charged with advising on its composition and procedures. The president also specifically requested that the advisory committee to the president address “how the process of evaluation by this body could be designed to ensure expeditious consideration of cases,” so that its assistance would not lengthen the university-level stage in the tenure process.⁹

⁶ AAUP, “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities,” in *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11th ed. (2015), pp. 117-121.

⁷ See Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers.

⁸ Hugh Hawkins, *Pioneer: A History of the Johns Hopkins University, 1874-1889* (1960), p. 36.

⁹ President Ronald J. Daniels, Message to the Community, April 2, 2019.

Note that the advisory committee was *not* asked to evaluate the processes by which the schools currently conduct their department- and school-level reviews and make their decisions on the recommendation of tenure. The committee's charge was limited to whether and how the president might receive additional advice on the tenure recommendations that are received from the university's schools.

III. Faculty Consultations and Peer Benchmarking

In the course of its work, the FACT met with the president and the provost to discuss its charge, consulted with every school-level body involved in tenure, sought input from additional faculty groups and individuals, and sought the perspectives of peer universities.

School-level consultations included meeting with the following:

- Homewood Academic Council (for the Krieger and Whiting Schools);
- Carey Academic Board;
- SAIS Academic Board;
- Advisory Board of the Medical Faculty;
- School of Nursing Academic Council; and
- Bloomberg School of Public Health Advisory Board.

In addition, FACT members met with representatives of the Homewood Faculty Assembly and attended meetings of the Krieger School and Whiting School chairs. Committee members also gathered input from the deans of all the tenure-granting schools and from the relevant committees of the university Board of Trustees.

When the Committee reached its initial recommendations, it distributed its draft report to, and solicited comments from, all faculty, providing two months for responses. It received 148 comments from individual faculty across the university, as well as written comments from the Bloomberg School of Public Health Faculty Senate, the Carey Academic Board, and the Homewood Faculty Assembly (whose letter collected and analyzed 60 of the 148 individual comments).¹⁰ Nearly two thirds of the comments – 90 out of 148 – were from the Krieger School, with an additional 32 coming from the Whiting School. The Committee was grateful to also receive feedback from the Vice Provost for Faculty, who met with most of the chairs (or their representatives) of the Homewood schools to hear their views on the draft recommendations.

Common themes that emerged from these many discussions and the comments received included concerns regarding potential prolongation of the tenure review process and uncertainty about where decision-making authority – as opposed to advisory input – lies. The most common issues and questions raised are described and examined at length in Section IV.B below.

¹⁰ Where departments or other groups submitted letters with signatories, all signatories were counted individually. Some faculty provided identical comments via multiple channels, e.g., the comment website and the Homewood Faculty Assembly survey. Duplicate comments, where identified, were not counted twice.

To better inform the FACT’s assessment of the issues involved in potential university-level tenure review, Committee staff studied reports and information regarding university-level tenure practices at peer institutions and interviewed department chairs, deans, and other university officials involved in university-level tenure determinations at all 12 Ivy Plus peers (see Section III.A and Part IV below; Appendix D). The FACT also studied data on tenure awards at Johns Hopkins’ tenure-granting schools (see Appendix E) and reviewed relevant external publications, including several brought to our attention by interested faculty, such as *Good Practices in Tenure Evaluation*, jointly produced by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group, and the AAUP’s *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, contained in the AAUP “Redbook.”¹¹

Lastly, the Committee reviewed previous evaluations of Johns Hopkins tenure processes, particularly as they relate to the Homewood divisions, given their unique structure. It fully endorses the 2013 Bryan-Naiman report’s assessment of the Homewood faculty’s contributions and expectations of excellence, as well as its recognition of how the Homewood tenure and promotion process fits within the overall university process: “The By-laws of the Academic Council make clear that its role regarding tenure and promotion decisions is, de jure, advisory to the President (who in turn makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees).”¹²

A. Design of University-Level Tenure Committees at Peer Institutions

While recognizing the limitations of peer benchmarking with respect to tenure processes, the FACT nonetheless found useful context and an opportunity to probe direct experience with university-level tenure review entities among Johns Hopkins’ Ivy Plus peer group.

Of note, nearly all members of this research university peer group – 11 of the 12 – use a university-level faculty led committee process to advise the president or provost on

¹¹ AAUP, ACE, and United Educators, *Good Practices in Tenure Evaluation* (2000); AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11th ed. (2015), pp. 117-121.

¹² As it states in its preamble:

The Johns Hopkins University’s Homewood campus embodies the tradition of vigorous and unfettered inquiry, which occurs in a community of independent scholars. Independent inquiry is valued as an intrinsic good and as the best means of training young scholars. Essential to this tradition is the participation of the faculty in the affairs of the university, and the recognition that each member is responsible for excellence in research and teaching. This tradition is incorporated in academic governance by the Homewood Academic Council (HAC), a body consisting of Deans and elected faculty members, and chaired by the President, with the Provost substituting as Chair when the President is unable to attend. This body was created at the university’s inception and it has been charged to advise on matters of importance to the academic mission of the university, in particular, in making tenure, appointment, and promotion decisions.

The substantive portion of the Bryan-Naiman report deals with ways in which the Homewood Academic Council might enhance its appointment and promotions processes.

recommendations for tenure forwarded from the schools.¹³ Nine of the 11 employ a standing university-level advisory committee, composed of distinguished tenured faculty from across the university, with the provost sitting ex-officio and often serving as chair.

Two others, Harvard University and the University of Chicago, employ ad hoc university-level advisory committees (unrelated to any ad hoc processes used earlier in the tenure process) composed of distinguished tenured faculty from across the university and, in Harvard's case, top scholars from outside the university as well. These committees submit their review and advice to the university's senior administrators (president and/or provost) responsible for recommending the granting of tenure to their university's board of trustees (or equivalent).

Faculty serving on peers' university-level advisory committees are selected by appointment, election, or both.¹⁴ At four peers, the president or provost appoints faculty to serve on the committee.¹⁵ At two others, faculty on the committee are selected through a mixture of appointments by senior administrators and election by other faculty.¹⁶ And at three others, faculty on the committee are elected by other faculty.¹⁷ To be eligible for election, peers require faculty members to be tenured professors (three limit membership to full professors in institutions where tenure is granted at the associate level).

Most peers have designed their advisory committees to ensure wide representation of disciplines, either through a broad mandate for disciplinary diversity or an apportionment of seats to particular disciplines. For example, at Dartmouth, Princeton, and Stanford, the committee is required to include some faculty from the humanities, some from the social sciences, and some from the natural sciences and engineering (Brown also uses a variation of this requirement). Several also include in their design a requirement that the various graduate and professional schools have faculty or decanal seats on the committee (e.g., Duke and U. Penn.).

A summary of Ivy Plus university-level tenure review models is attached at Appendix D.

IV. Assessing the Value of a University-Level Tenure Committee

A. Potential Benefits

In reviewing alternative approaches to university-level tenure review and consulting with Ivy Plus peers, the Committee gained insight into a number of benefits of the faculty advisory committee model that most peers use.

¹³ The twelfth, Yale University, uses a series of school-level bodies that advise the provost, who makes the final tenure recommendations to the Yale Corporation.

¹⁴ MIT's and U. Penn's university-level bodies do not include faculty, apart from those serving in vice provost or associate provost positions. Instead, they are composed of a mixture of deans, vice provosts and associate provosts, and other senior administrators.

¹⁵ These are Columbia University, Duke University, Harvard University, and the University of Chicago.

¹⁶ These are Cornell University and Dartmouth College.

¹⁷ These are Brown University, Princeton University, and Stanford University.

For one, most peer interviewees said these university-level faculty committees provide a valuable final check by respected individuals who are detached from the earlier, school-centric processes. They do this by ensuring that nothing is amiss with the candidate dossier and that departmental and school-level standards for tenure have been applied consistently. Missteps can occur in even the best run processes, and a university-level committee can catch them better than a single university official can.¹⁸

Peers pointed out that a university-level committee also can offer a more neutral look, not being steeped in the particularities of any one school- or campus-level culture. This neutrality is also a helpful counterweight to any biases or “clubbiness” that may creep into a school process; one interviewee noted, for example, its value in counteracting the potential impact of gender stereotypes on assessing productivity in certain disciplines.

Several interviewees stressed the value of having multiple faculty voices beyond those at the one or two schools forwarding the tenure recommendation to the president. As one put it, this ensures each case is “examine[d] from various different angles” rather than by a “clique of tightly unified disciplines.” When asked how these bodies account for differences in disciplinary expectations for tenure (e.g., a book versus multiple articles), some noted that their university requires each department to articulate its criteria for tenure in writing, which helps guide the university-level committee.

Lastly, many interviewees stressed that including faculty voices at the university-level step allows faculty to have greater representation in the overall tenure decision-making process, improving shared governance.¹⁹ This improvement runs in two directions: helping both the president as a participant in the tenure process and the faculty as participants in the shared governance of the university. As one interviewee observed, “Rotating through this [university-level] committee . . . is a really valuable way for faculty to think of themselves as citizens of the university and not just their departments.” It helps faculty to see particular tenure cases from a university-level perspective, and enables them to share that university-level perspective with colleagues upon returning to service on departmental or school-level tenure reviews.

B. Potential Concerns

In its review and consultations, and in the comments submitted about its draft report of September 2019, the FACT heard a number of concerns about establishing a university-level advisory body, and spent significant time grappling with them. The predominant concerns raised are described below, followed by the FACT’s assessment. A non-exhaustive list of additional concerns and questions are also described and assessed.

¹⁸ Observed one interviewee: “When a decision is easy [the university-level body] may seem unnecessary because it simply reaffirms the soundness of the choices made in all previous steps. But when a decision is complicated, it can be helpful in ensuring a thoughtful and good process that offers an added layer of scrutiny to what we do at the highest level.”

¹⁹ See James J. Duderstadt, “Governing the Twenty-first-Century University: A View from the Bridge,” in William G. Tierney, ed., *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance: Negotiating the Perfect Storm* (2004), p. 151 (“[T]he key to achieving adequate competence and accountability in the governance of contemporary university is to infuse in all of its components the perspectives of practicing faculty members.”).

Predominant Concerns Raised

Potential for prolonging the tenure process. As anticipated by the president in his charge to the FACT, a frequently voiced concern across all the tenure-granting schools was that creating another tenure review element, even if only “advisory,” would further prolong what is already a lengthy tenure process. This concern was also mentioned in consultations with peers, when asked about the challenges they faced with their committees.

FACT’s assessment: Johns Hopkins’ current tenure process ends with approval by the full Board of Trustees, which meets eight times per year. Accordingly, the current university-level step in the process now takes approximately two months from the time the president first receives a tenure recommendation. The FACT would urge that any proposed change in the current arrangement ensure a review period that will fit within this two-month timeframe and therefore will not prolong the process. (See Subsections V.C.i-ii below.) This aligns with the feedback received from colleagues at other universities, who found that their university-level body worked well when it coordinated its review with the overall tenure calendar, and when it was designed to allow efficient reviews of most cases, e.g. through subcommittees that do initial reviews (as is done at Duke).

Addition of a new “decision step” with new uncertainty. Many faculty, particularly from the Homewood schools, expressed concern that review by another committee would amount to a new decision step in the tenure process, one involving faculty members unfamiliar with the tenure candidates and the culture of their disciplines, creating additional uncertainty in an already uncertain process. In particular, it was noted that, at the Homewood schools, tenure is awarded at promotion to associate professor, while, at the other schools, at full professor.

FACT’s assessment: The FACT views the role of any university-level body as strictly advisory to the President, helping her/him weigh the strength of the dossier upon which the recommendation for tenure rests. Rather than make decisions, it would provide the president with independent advice through the lens of senior, distinguished faculty uninvolved in the request for tenure. Tenure recommendations would remain with the president. Thus, the body would not introduce a new decision step in the process but rather would augment who participates in that step, adding more emphasis on faculty perspectives. In so doing, the committee would enhance faculty input at the university level of tenure review. Including faculty perspectives at this step should reduce uncertainty among faculty candidates, who can be assured that distinguished senior faculty, well versed in Johns Hopkins’ tenure processes, are informing presidential decision making.²⁰

FACT agrees that the differences in disciplines, cultures, and level of appointment at which tenure is recommended differs among Schools. For this reason, FACT strongly recommends that the members of the university-level committee all be: (a) senior faculty, (b) who have been elected or otherwise named to their own school’s school-level tenure

²⁰ The FACT also notes that, while the president makes the ultimate recommendation to the Board of Trustees, every prior step in the process is an equally significant decision-making step. If a tenure recommendation is not supported by the department, the school’s appointments, promotions and tenure committee, or the school-level faculty body, the recommendation does not go forward.

review body (or, in the case of the Homewood schools, HAC) and served at least one full term on that body. Further, each member should be acculturated to the appropriate standards for tenure for all the tenure-granting schools at Johns Hopkins.

A considerable number of colleagues, primarily from the Krieger School, shared their concern that – whether or not it has decision-making power – the formation of a university-level faculty committee would be seen by many junior faculty as an additional hurdle to tenure, making junior faculty harder to recruit and more likely to seek tenured positions elsewhere. While FACT is sensitive to this concern, the reality is that the tenure process at the vast majority of our Ivy Plus peers already includes a university-level faculty committee step. Unless young recruits have been attracted to Johns Hopkins by a perception that tenure is somehow more assured here, or that the review process is less demanding than elsewhere (a recruiting method that FACT would not support), this step will thus bring Hopkins in line with its peers in this regard. The FACT of course understands that junior faculty already at Johns Hopkins may be concerned by changes to the Johns Hopkins tenure process, but the introduction of an advisory committee at the university level – particularly in the form proposed below in Part V – should not be a cause for concern. All available evidence from our Ivy Plus peers indicates that the vast majority of tenure cases passed by the relevant school-level body receive the support of the university-level committee (see Appendix D). It is our hope that experienced department chairs help to allay these concerns among their junior colleagues.

Insufficient disciplinary expertise and experience. Another frequently stated concern was that a university-level body composed of faculty from multiple schools would lack sufficient disciplinary expertise, and an understanding of the “culture” within each discipline, to adequately assess candidates’ tenure dossiers.

FACT’s assessment: Most of Johns Hopkins’ school-level faculty bodies performing tenure reviews already possess disciplinary variety. The HAC combines professors from the KSAS and the WSE, each with its array of disciplines; the SOM’s Advisory Board of the Medical Faculty (ABMF) includes faculty spanning disciplines from molecular biology to surgery to the history of medicine, and deans of the BSPH and the SON; and the BSPH Advisory Board spans disciplines that include microbiology, biostatistics, epidemiology, and law. The SON Academic Council includes faculty representatives from the BSPH, the CBS, and the SOM; and the Carey Academic Board includes five non-Carey Business School professors. Disciplinary variety has not prevented these faculty bodies from performing tenure reviews well; if anything – in our increasingly interdisciplinary academy – it has strengthened their ability to do so.

Moreover, specific disciplinary expertise is not requisite for the type of review contemplated for this university-level body. This body would be tasked with assessing each candidate dossier relative to the school’s and department’s own written tenure standards and processes, guided by the interpretation provided by the school’s own tenure recommendation and the school’s representative(s) on the university-level body. It would pay particular attention to the completeness of the dossier materials based on divisional standards and expected contributions to scholarship, education, and service; other sources of assessment, including outside letters evaluating the candidate’s standing

within his/her scholarly community; the vote of the school-level faculty body; and all other material presently forwarded to the president to inform her or his review.

Additional Concerns and Questions

Potential for the perceived “costs” of a university-level committee to outweigh its anticipated “benefits.” Some faculty questioned whether the “benefits would be worth the costs” if Johns Hopkins introduced a university-level faculty advisory committee into its tenure process. Perceived “costs” mainly included the concerns raised above: delay and faculty uncertainty, as well as the time commitment of senior faculty serving on the committee.

FACT’s assessment: The FACT believes that the predominant “costs” can be addressed in the design of the committee. Its efforts to address them are detailed in Part V. In the end, however, all “benefits” and “costs” will need to be carefully tallied and evaluated once the committee gains experience, to determine whether it is succeeding in supporting the overall tenure process, and that the effort is worth the investment. We recommend a formal evaluation of the committee’s value, and investment, no later than three years after the committee has begun to function. (See Part V below.) Given the time commitment likely to be required of faculty who serve on this new committee, we recommend that its members be relieved of competing administrative responsibilities and/or be compensated in other appropriate ways.

Tenure quotas. Several faculty suggested that introducing a faculty advisory committee was a strategy to limit or even reduce the number of candidates recommended for tenure.

FACT’s assessment: The FACT views the purpose of any university-level advisory committee as improving the president’s ability to make informed tenure recommendations and thereby complement the school-level components of the university’s tenure process. It is not the purpose of the committee to limit the number of tenured faculty. In places where similar committees exist, university-level tenure declinations are rare, on the order of one to two percent per year (see Appendix D). (See also FACT’s assessment of the “false negatives” concern.)

“False negatives.” Several faculty commented that, while a university-level faculty committee reviewing tenure recommendations would be able to identify “false positives,” e.g., recommendations for tenure that do not meet appropriate standards, it should also be concerned with “false negatives”: faculty deserving tenure who were denied it at the school or departmental levels. It cannot do this if it only reviews recommendations for tenure.

FACT’s assessment: We agree that this is an issue that deserves attention, although is not the issue that was assigned to FACT, and not an issue that the university-level committee being contemplated is designed to address. However, we recommend that, if a new university-level committee is created, it be made available to provide advice to the provost in her/his adjudication of appeals from tenure denials by the school-level tenure review bodies.

V. Recommendations

After careful study and deliberation, and considering the perspectives shared by faculty, administrators and others, the FACT recommends that Johns Hopkins establish a standing Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC) chaired by the provost and composed of senior faculty from across the university.²¹ This committee would be charged with advising the president, in a timely manner, on all recommendations to grant tenure or its equivalent (in the case of SOM) emanating from school-level tenure review bodies. The president would then take into account TAC's assessment in deciding whether or not to forward tenure recommendations to the Board of Trustees or to seek additional evidence or assessments bearing on that recommendation. The rationale for recommending such a committee, and specific suggestions around its composition and procedures, are offered below.

The FACT further recommends that this committee be instituted on a trial basis and be rigorously evaluated after it has been in operation for three years, the length of time needed for all inaugural members to complete their initial terms of service and for the staggered appointment model proposed below to be implemented.

A. Rationale

From its review of reports and information regarding university-level tenure practices at peer institutions, and from its numerous consultations with colleagues, the FACT is persuaded that properly implementing a Tenure Advisory Committee would deliver the important benefits described above while addressing the concerns raised. Specifically, this Committee would provide stronger institutional stewardship, assure inclusion of university-wide perspectives, and better promote shared governance.

Regarding institutional stewardship, a Tenure Advisory Committee would allow seasoned faculty, representing a cross-section of schools and disciplines, to bring their situational knowledge to bear on whether disciplinary or school-level standards are being adhered to consistently, shortening the distance between faculty and presidential understandings of a candidate's dossier. This collegial review strengthens the overall tenure process; after all, "the fairness of the tenure process depends not just on the outcome of an individual decision, but also on the consistency of multiple decisions over time."²²

Regarding university-wide perspectives, a Tenure Advisory Committee would support the president in applying a university-wide lens to tenure dossiers. The president has a bird's eye view of the institution, shaped by his own faculty training and perspective. A complement of faculty from across all tenure-granting schools would provide a wider field of vision, facilitating a final recommendation that more closely represents the entire university. As the authors of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education wrote in their 2014 report, "there is no more important university decision than the awarding of tenure to individuals

²¹ We recognize that having the provost chair the TAC may conflict with the provost's available time and other roles, and therefore deserves further consideration by university leadership.

²² AAUP, American Council on Education (ACE), and United Educators, *Good Practices in Tenure Evaluation* (2000), p. 9. *See id.* ("The faculty, administration, and governing board should strive for consistency in the operation of the institution's tenure evaluation process.").

who can help Johns Hopkins fulfill its highest aspirations as a locus of teaching and research excellence.”²³ This wider view is particularly helpful in an era of increasing interdisciplinarity, in which scholars are often reaching beyond the fields of inquiry of a single department or school. Bringing together faculty peers from multiple schools can improve how their body of scholarship is understood and evaluated.

Regarding shared governance, a Tenure Advisory Committee would enable a more sustained and organic flow of feedback among the several levels of tenure review. When faculty colleagues participate in the university-level step of the tenure process with the president, and observe at close hand the tenuring of colleagues from other schools at Johns Hopkins, they are able to bring the insights gained back to their home departments and schools, creating a virtuous circle whereby lessons learned at each stage of tenure review organically inform best practices for tenure across the institution.

B. Composition

The FACT recommends that the Tenure Advisory Committee be chaired by the provost and composed of a diverse group of senior full professors from across the university’s tenure-granting schools who have been elected or otherwise named to their own school’s school-level tenure review body (or, in the case of the Homewood schools, HAC) and will have served at least one full term.²⁴ Members should be recommended by the deans and appointed by the president, who is best positioned to derive from those recommendations a committee composition that embodies appropriate inclusivity and diversity.

Because of the volume of dossiers needing review for tenure each academic year – roughly 120 or an average of 13-14 per month (September through May) – the FACT recommends that the new advisory committee contain roughly 12-14 faculty members. This will enable the committee to distribute dossiers among its members and convene subgroups to do initial reviews expeditiously (see Subsections V.C.i-ii below). The FACT does not recommend more than 14 (plus the provost), as in its experience larger committees can become unwieldy and prolong the process. Similar university-level advisory committees at peer institutions tend to have 17 or fewer members.

Given the school and disciplinary distribution of tenure requests among the university’s tenure-granting schools, the FACT recommends that the new advisory committee have two to three seats reserved for faculty members from each of the larger tenure-granting schools: three each from KSAS (one each from the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences) and SOM (given the large volume of tenure requests); two each from BSPH and WSE; and one seat reserved for faculty members from each of the other tenure-granting schools (CBS, SAIS, SON).²⁵ This would allow for a total of 13 members plus the provost.

²³ Middle States Commission on Higher Education, *Comprehensive Evaluation Team Report* (May 2014), p. 3 (emphasis in original).

²⁴ The recommendation to have the provost chair the TAC is in accord with the 2014 report of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, which suggested that “the role of the provost in this process should be strengthened” to help guarantee “consistency of process in all academic departments and divisions.” Middle States Commission on Higher Education, *Comprehensive Evaluation Team Report*, May 2014, p.10.

²⁵ See Appendix E: Faculty Receiving Tenure Per School, Years 2009-2018.

To ensure sufficient knowledge is built up around both the landscape of tenure recommendations across the university and the needs of the advisory process, the FACT recommends that each member of the TAC serve for a three-year term, renewable once. After the initial three-year phase of the committee, appointments should be staggered, such that roughly one-third of the members will be replaced each year.

C. Procedures

The FACT has carefully considered the procedures the TAC might initially follow to allow it to conduct its business most effectively and efficiently. With time, and experience, the TAC may decide to alter them in ways that promote even greater efficiency and effectiveness.

- i. **Frequent scheduled meetings.** The TAC should meet sufficiently frequently so as not to unduly delay the university-level step in the tenure process. It is presently anticipated that the full committee will meet monthly, with additional meetings added as needed. It is further recommended, to expedite reviews, that subcommittees of the TAC meet to review dossiers between full committee meetings, as described in Subsection V.C.ii. Because the Board of Trustees meets eight times per year, few if any recommendations received at least one month before an upcoming Board of Trustees meeting should miss the earliest possible approval by the Board.
- ii. **Initial review by TAC subcommittee; discussion by full TAC only if subcommittee is uncertain.** Each candidate dossier would first be reviewed by a subcommittee of the TAC that includes one member from the candidate's school, as most appropriate (e.g., humanities vs. social sciences vs. natural sciences for candidate dossiers from the KSAS). This would mean that each TAC member would need to closely review only three dossiers per month on average. We expect that most of these reviews would go quickly, given the strength of dossiers that reach the university-level step in the tenure process.

For each candidate, members of the subcommittee to which the dossier is assigned would review all relevant material presently forwarded to the president, as well as, a summary cover letter from the Dean, and then meet to discuss. This discussion may be conducted by conference call or in person, with all subcommittee members participating. Each member of the subcommittee will then offer one of two assessments:

1. Support the recommendation for tenure; or
2. Do not support the recommendation for tenure.

In the case of unanimous support by all subcommittee members with the recommendation for tenure, the dossier would be forwarded to the full TAC, which would approve the recommendation as part of a "consent" agenda (without debate). In instances in which there is not unanimous support by the

subcommittee, the dossier would go to the full committee for discussion at its next meeting.²⁶

The assessment by the TAC would then be forwarded to the president, including the rationale behind it. Its advice would take one of the same two forms as the subcommittee, stating the proportion of members who agreed that:

1. The TAC's advice is to support the recommendation for tenure.
2. The TAC's advice is not to support the recommendation for tenure.

These would be advisory recommendations, not binding on the president. When the TAC's advice is not to support the recommendation, it would summarize its rationale in writing, and forward it to the president.

iii. **Dossier requirements.** To aid in the TAC's review, the dossier sent to TAC for each candidate should include:

1. The full packet of materials and recommendation from the school-level faculty body;
2. All documents ordinarily sent to the president in support of the school-level faculty body's recommendation, including votes where taken.
3. A cover letter from the relevant school dean; and
4. A cover sheet that lists all of the above material (to ensure completeness).

iv. **President's response.** The TAC is strictly advisory to the president as to the strength of the dossier provided in the recommendation for tenure. The president may choose to meet with the TAC to discuss its recommendation(s) and/or seek further input from the relevant school. As stipulated by the university's bylaws, the president retains final authority to determine whether to recommend that the Board of Trustees award tenure in any case.

In instances in which the president decides not to forward the recommendation for tenure to the Board of Trustees, and the TAC's advice was not to support the recommendation, the president may choose to share the TAC's summary with the school-level tenure review body so that its members might better understand the reasoning behind the decision.

The FACT's members support the recommendations described above, and believe the new Tenure Advisory Committee, as proposed, would add value to the Johns Hopkins tenure process.

²⁶ Some faculty with whom FACT members consulted suggested that a university-level advisory committee should limit its attention to "questionable" cases, rather than review all dossiers. The FACT's view is that, while limiting attention to "questionable" cases would certainly save the advisory committee effort, it begs the question: What makes a case "questionable," and who decides? Some suggested that the provost could make this decision. At this stage of experience, however, the FACT believes it is fairer and more just to engage the new committee in making such distinctions. The provost, as a member of the new committee, would be called upon to add to the evidence contained in each dossier, as appropriate, but should not be solely responsible for identifying cases that might benefit from greater scrutiny. The FACT considers a wider faculty lens to be more appropriate, unless experience proves otherwise.

Appendix A: Membership of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure

- **Alfred Sommer**, Dean Emeritus and Professor of Epidemiology, International Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, and Ophthalmology, School of Medicine (chair)
- **Janet DiPietro**, Vice Dean for Research and Faculty and Professor of Population, Family and Reproductive Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health
- **Kevin Hemker**, Alonzo G. Decker Chair and Professor of Mechanical Engineering , Whiting School of Engineering
- **Robert S.D. Higgins**, William Stewart Halsted Professor of Surgery, School of Medicine
- **Ralph Hruban**, Baxley Professor of Pathology, School of Medicine
- **Barbara Landau**, Dick and Lydia Todd Professor of Cognitive Science, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
- **Mary Elise Sarotte**, Marie-Josée and Henry R. Kravis Distinguished Professor of Historical Studies, School of Advanced International Studies

Appendix B: Faculty Tenure Review Committees at JHU's Tenure-Granting Schools

JHU Tenure-Granting School	Body Evaluating Candidate	Membership
Arts & Sciences (KSAS) Engineering (WSE)	Ad Hoc Committee	Tenured professors at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered, appointed by the Dean
Carey Business School	Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee	3-5 Members of the Academic Board (excluding Dean)
School of Advanced International Studies	SAIS Rank and Tenure Committee (Subcommittee of Academic Board)	3-4 Tenured full professors (3 standard; 4 th member can be added with the approval from the Dean and the Academic Board)
School of Medicine	Professorial Promotions Committee	30 Faculty members, appointed by Dean
School of Nursing	School of Nursing Appointments and Promotions Committee	6 Faculty members, appointed by Dean
School of Public Health	Bloomberg School of Public Health Appointments and Promotions Committee	~12 Faculty members, appointed by Dean First review done by 3-4 member ad hoc committees (3 standard; 4 in certain circumstances; chaired by A&P Committee members)

Appendix C: School-Level Tenure Review Committees at JHU's Tenure-Granting Schools

JHU Tenure-Granting School	Body Making Tenure Recommendation	Membership
Arts & Sciences (KSAS) Engineering (WSE)	Homewood Academic Council	<u>Voting Members</u> 12 tenured full professors; President <u>Non-Voting Members</u> Provost, KSAS & WSE Deans
Carey Business School	Carey Academic Board	<u>Voting Members</u> Dean, 5 Non-Carey Business School professors, 3 Carey Business School professors <u>Non-Voting Members</u> Provost
School of Advanced International Studies	SAIS Academic Board	<u>Voting Members</u> Dean, other tenured members of the Johns Hopkins SAIS faculty, Vice Dean for Education and Academic Affairs (if tenured) Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs and International Research Cooperation (if tenured), other members of the Johns Hopkins SAIS faculty whom the Academic Board have accepted by a 2/3 vote of the membership (these members do not vote) <u>Non-Voting Members</u> President, Provost, Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs, Director of SAIS Europe at Bologna (on SAIS Europe matters)
School of Medicine	Advisory Board of the Medical Faculty	<u>Voting Members</u> Presidents of JHU and JHH, Chair of the Medical Board of JH Bayview, Department Directors and 1 add'l senior faculty each from Dep'ts of Medicine, Surgery, and Pediatrics, President of KKI, Deans of SOM, BSPH, and SON, and the Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate (prev. Medical School Council) <u>Non-Voting Members</u> Provost, Ass't Dean for Medicine (Secretary), JHM Exec. Vice Pres., Welch Medical Library Director
School of Nursing	School of Nursing Academic Council	8 School of Nursing faculty, 3 reps from School of Medicine, School of Public Health, and Carey Business School
School of Public Health	Bloomberg School of Public Health Advisory Board	<u>Voting Members</u> Deans of BSPH, SOM, and SON, Executive Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, Department Chairs, MPH Program Chair, and past/current/elect presidents of the Faculty Senate <u>Non-Voting Members</u> President, Provost

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

University	U ⁺ -level body?	Advisory only?	Reports to	Membership	Terms	Function	Procedure	Volume of Cases	Tenure Denials
Brown U. Tenure Promotions and Appointments Committee (TPAC)	Y	Y	Provost	• 3 tenured faculty members from humanities, elected by university-wide faculty senate • 3 tenured faculty members from social sciences, elected • 3 tenured faculty members from biological sciences (incl. public health), elected • 3 tenured faculty members from physical sciences, elected	3 years	To review personnel recommendations coming from the tenure/promotion review committees of departments or other academic units and make a recommendation to the Provost about whether to accept or reject these recommendations.	• Dossiers sent from department to TPAC for review by full committee • Prior to TPAC discussion, a staffer reviews dossier for completeness and red flags (if spotted, staffer asks chair to supplement dossier) • TPAC meets weekly for 2 hours from Sept. – May • Internal tenure cases go through TPAC twice: (1) for members to raise questions that then get sent back to chair, who drafts a written response; (2) to vote • In second meeting, chair attends to answer questions • TPAC then accepts or rejects chair rec and sends to Provost • May solicit additional evidence	12-16 tenure cases per year out of 80-100 cases	1-3 per year
Columbia U. Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC)	Y	Y	Provost	• 13 tenured faculty members, appointed by the Provost • Faculty are broadly representative, but no school, department, or discipline is guaranteed a seat except Barnard • Provost designates 1 to be chair (usually someone in the 3rd year of their term) • Provost or Provost's representative	3 years	To conduct a final university-wide evaluation whenever a school or department, including Barnard College but excepting the Faculty of Law and Teachers College, recommends a candidate for tenure. By examining both the process by which candidates are nominated and their qualifications, the standing committee seeks to ensure a university-wide consistency in the evaluation of nominations to tenure and thereby to promote	• List of nominations sent to TRAC by April 15 of AY preceding the tenure review. • Departments and schools complete internal evaluation by Dec. 15 and then send to TRAC. • TRAC meets at least twice a month from Sept. – May. • After Dec. 15 deadline, TRAC chair assigns 5 members to the review panel for each dossier, with 1 serving as primary and 1 serving as secondary reviewer (composition of review panel is confidential). • Each member of a review panel independently prepares a report on the candidate's qualifications which they submit to the Office of the Vice Provost. Once all of the reports are received, the	N/A	Rare (1 denied out of 66 in '17-'18)

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

University	U'-level body?	Advisory only?	Reports to	Membership	Terms	Function	Procedure	Volume of Cases	Tenure Denials
				attends all TRAC meetings and may actively participate in discussions about a nomination		the appointment of faculty of exceptional quality and distinction throughout the institution.	Office distributes them to the full committee to discuss at a full meeting. • If vote to rec is not near-unanimous at that meeting, case returns for a “second hearing.” • TRAC’s recommendation is not binding on the Provost, but the Provost “depends heavily upon its evaluation.” • After considering TRAC’s formal tenure recommendation, the Provost submits her recommendation to the President. If the President agrees, the nomination is forwarded to the Trustees for their approval. • A candidate who is denied tenure is invited to meet with the Provost to discuss the decision. • In those unusual cases where the Provost, President, or Trustees do not accept TRAC’s formal recommendation, the Provost informs its members of the reasons. • TRAC reviews 60-70 cases per year.		
Cornell U. Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure Appts. (FACTA)	Y	Y	Provost	• 15 tenured faculty members, 1 elected by the faculty in each of the 10 colleges and 5 nominated by the University Faculty Nominations Committee and appointed by the Faculty Senate • Dean of the Faculty serves as a non-voting member and chair;	2 years	To advise the Provost on all proposed promotions to and appointments with tenure, except that the Provost may waive FACTA review for candidates who have held tenure previously, either at Cornell or elsewhere.	• FACTA members do not meet as a group, but are each called for service about 4 times per year (coinciding with the 4 BOT meetings) • Once the dean (per the recommendation of an ad hoc tenure committee) submits materials to FACTA, 4 members of FACTA are chosen at random to read each dossier independently. • Review between 1 and 7 dossiers per time • If all 4 members are positive with no concerns or reservations, a positive	38 per year	Rare (0 in ‘18-‘19, which is typical)

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

University	U'-level body?	Advisory only?	Reports to	Membership	Terms	Function	Procedure	Volume of Cases	Tenure Denials
				role is “role is “limited to facilitating timely decision making and ensuring that the committee adheres to its charge and mandated procedures”			recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. • If any of the 4 has reservations, each member of the full committee reviews the file. • The committee’s decision is sent to the Provost within 4-6 weeks of receiving the file. Committee only meets with Provost if its decision is not unanimous. • After considering FACTA’s recommendation, the Provost decides either to forward a positive recommendation to the Board or to consult with the dean pending clarification or denial. • President does not play an active role, but positive tenure recommendations are presented to the Board of Trustees under presidential authority. • Trustees then vote by secret ballot and that board action is transmitted to the dean, who in turn notifies the faculty member. • Final decision is by the Trustees. The decisions of the Provost and the Trustees are not subject to appeal.		
Dartmouth College Committee Advisory to the President (CAP)	Y	Y	President	• 6 tenured faculty members, 2 from each of Dartmouth’s 3 divisions (never from the same dep’t), appointed by the President • 2 of President’s appointees shall be the result of ranked	3 years	To consult with the President on matters of appointment or promotion of members of the faculty [to tenure-track ranks] . . . any other matter which the President desires to bring before it; [and] any other matter which the Committee wishes to have considered.	• Dossiers submitted to CAP on a set cycle, after which CAP meets do deliberate on the recommendation letter of the Associate Dean for the Faculty of the relevant school. • During CAP deliberations, Associate Dean presents background answers to questions, but is not present during CAP discussion and vote.	N/A	N/A

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

University	U'-level body?	Advisory only?	Reports to	Membership	Terms	Function	Procedure	Volume of Cases	Tenure Denials
				- choice voting among the faculty • Dean of the Faculty, non-voting • Provost, non-voting			• CAP then makes its final recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees.		
Duke U. Provost's Advisory Committee on AP&T	Y	Y	Provost	• 12 tenured faculty members, nominated by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and then appointed by the Provost • At least 2 members come from each of the 3 divisions (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences), 1 from the Pratt School of Engineering, 1 from the Fuqua Business School, 1 from the basic medical sciences, 3 others • 1 chair, nominated by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and appointed by the Provost • President, non-voting (<i>does not sit in meetings</i>)	1 year	To evaluate dossiers forwarded to it and formulate its own independent recommendations for presentation to the Provost.	• Dossiers submitted via dean on a set cycle. • Committee meets at least weekly for 2 hours. • After reviewing a dossier and any additional materials it requests, the full committee votes on whether to recommend for tenure. • One member is assigned lead reviewer, and presents case to full group. • A recommendation is considered definitive only if it has been supported, affirmatively or negatively, by vote of an absolute majority (seven) of the AP&T Committee. In the event the AP&T Committee's recommendation is negative, the Provost will review the dossier (prior to notification of the candidate or department) to “determine whether all factors relating to the merit and value of the candidate, including ethnic, racial, and gender diversity, have been fully and adequately considered.” • The Committee may supplement the record with letters “from evaluators who are competent to judge the candidate's scholarship.” • It may also convene an ad hoc panel to conduct a further review of a dossier.	60-65 per year	4-5 per year

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

University	U'-level body?	Advisory only?	Reports to	Membership	Terms	Function	Procedure	Volume of Cases	Tenure Denials
				- Provost, non-voting - Dean of the Graduate School, non-voting			- Provost is the primary decider, and informs the AP&T Committee of her decision. Should the Provost choose not to accept its recommendation, she must inform the Committee in writing and indicate the basis for the decision. - When the Provost's recommendation is favorable, the Provost consults with the President. With the President's approval, the Provost submits the recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final action.		
Harvard U. Ad hoc committees <i>NOTE: Harvard only tenures at full professor</i>	Y	Y	President	Multiple ad hoc committees used for each case. Each has for its membership: - President, co-chair - Provost, co-chair 2 area experts from co-divisional departments at Harvard 3 area experts from outside Harvard - Dean of the relevant school, non-voting - Senior Vice Provost on Faculty Diversity and Development, non-voting	None	To review school/divisional tenure recommendations and offer views to the President and Provost, then disband.	- After dossier submitted with decanal recommendation, ad hoc committee to review a particular candidate is convened. - Lasts around 3 hours; no votes taken. - President and Provost split up the work of chairing these meetings (sometimes they split up by school; sometimes share across schools). - Witness from the candidate's department are called during that meeting for 30-minute interviews. - After meeting ends, President makes a decision and her decision is final. - Once decided, the dean informs the candidate of the outcome. The candidate receives no report or explanation, simply the decision itself: a yes or a no.	40-50 non-SOM per year	~15% by the time it gets to ad hoc comm.
MIT Academic Appointments Subgroup of the	Y	Y (but see note)	President	- President - Provost - VP for Open Learning	On-going	To hear appointment, promotion, and tenure cases after they have been heard by the appropriate School	- Dossiers submitted via dean on a set cycle. - Each dossier goes to every member of the AAS.	N/A	Very rare (none in past 4 years)

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

University	U ⁺ -level body?	Advisory only?	Reports to	Membership	Terms	Function	Procedure	Volume of Cases	Tenure Denials
Academic Council (AAS)				• VP for Research • 3 Assoc. Provosts • Chancellor • Chancellor for Acad. Advanc't • Vice Chancellor for Undergrad and Grad Education • Chair of the Faculty • 5 Deans of schools • Dean of Digital Learning		council and make a recommendation to the President.	• Jan: 3 days of AAS review of dossiers for potential promotion to assistant to associate w/o tenure. • April: 3 days of AAS review of dossiers for potential tenure. (out-of-cycle is possible) • At the meetings, relevant dean presents on each dossier, then there is a discussion, then a vote (President has a vote).		
Princeton U. Faculty Advisory Committee on Appts. and Advancements (Comm. of 3)	Y	Y	President	• 6 tenured faculty members, elected by peers; at least 1 from each of Princeton's 4 division, with 3 from humanities and social sciences, and 3 from natural sciences and engineering • President, non-voting, chair • Provost, non-voting • Dean of Faculty, non-voting, secretary • Dean of Grad School • Dean of College	1 year	To advise the President on the appointment of Professors; the appointment and promotion of Associate Professors; the reappointment and promotion of Assistant Professors, and Senior Lecturers; and the salaries of these members of the Faculty.	• Proposals for appointment/advancement are made in writing to the Chair of the relevant department and sent to the Dean of Faculty for transmission to the President (dean does <i>not</i> play a role other than transmitting) • The President then presents the proposals to the C/3 for consideration. • C/3 meets twice a week for 2 hours throughout the academic year. All members review all dossiers. • Review includes external letters sought by C/3, in addition to those already in dossier. • President is the primary decider; in consultation with the C/3, the President makes a recommendation to the Trustees. • Trustees generally follow the recommendations of the President and the C/3.	70-75 tenure cases per year (out of 110-115 cases)	Rare

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

University	U'-level body?	Advisory only?	Reports to	Membership	Terms	Function	Procedure	Volume of Cases	Tenure Denials
Stanford U. Academic Council Advisory Board	Y	Y	President	7 tenured faculty members, 1 each from 7 “electoral groups” representing major undergrad disciplines and grad schools (school of medicine gets 2 dedicated seats; all other grad schools share 1) - Elected by faculty senate	3 years	To evaluate all recommendations for appointments, promotions, and for the creation and dissolution of departments. Also authorized to make recommendations to the President regarding policy as it may decide by vote to be expedient, but no recommendations for appointments, promotions, or dismissals may originate with the Advisory Board.	- Dossier gets sent from relevant dean to the Provost, who then signs and sends to Advisory Board for consideration. - Advisory Board reviews and makes a positive or negative recommendation to the President. - Meets weekly for 2 hours. - President reviews recommendation and can choose to accept or not accept it by making a favorable decision, a negative decision, or remanding the case to the department or school for further info or consideration. - If he accepts it, he then reports the decision to the Board of Trustees. - If he rejects, the Advisory Board can appeal to the Board of Trustees.	50-70 per year	Rare (only 2-3 times in past decade)
U. Chicago	Y	Y	Provost	Multiple ad hoc committees used	None	To advise the Provost on tenure recommendations from the schools.	- Recommendations for appointment/promotion/tenure are forwarded from the school dean to the Provost. - The Provost then reviews and makes a determination, with advice of an ad hoc committee; review typically takes two weeks. - Offers of employment for professors not currently on the faculty can only be made after review and approval by the Provost.	20-25 per year	1.5-2 per year
U. Penn. Provost's Staff Conference	Y	Y (but see note)	Provost	- Provost, chair 3 Vice Provosts – for Education, Faculty, and Research - Deans of the School of A&S, Wharton School,	N/A	To consider proposals for academic appointments and promotions and advise the Provost on whether they are consistent with approved academic and financial plans of both the school	- Positive recommendations of the relevant school personnel committee are forwarded to the Provost's Staff Conference by the dean, who may choose to concur with or dissent from the proposal. - All members of the Provost's Staff Conference then review to determine	100 per year	1-3 per year

Appendix D: University-Level Tenure Review Models at Ivy Plus Peers

University	U ⁺ -level body?	Advisory only?	Reports to	Membership	Terms	Function	Procedure	Volume of Cases	Tenure Denials
				School of Engineering & Applied Science, and Perelman School of Medicine • 5 additional rotating positions		and the University and are in accord with statutory provisions.	whether they meet academic and other policy standards and are consistent with financial plans. • Meet twice/month for 2 hours; if all members like all files that week, meeting is cancelled. • Provost is the primary decider; Staff Conference helps her decide. • Provost, after receiving the advice of the Provost's Staff Conference, consults with the President. • The President and the Provost then decide on the final recommendations to be made to the Trustees of the University.		
Yale U. <i>NOTE: Yale only tenures at full professor</i>	N	N/A	Provost	N/A	N/A	N/A	• 6 school-level bodies advise the Provost, known as the Provost's Standing Advisory and Appointment Committees (SAACs) ○ 1 for each of the professional schools ○ For the Faculty of Arts& Sciences, there is no SAAC but rather 4 Tenure and Appointments Committees (TACs), 1 for each division of the Faculty of A&S: humanities; social science; biological science; physical science and engineering • Dean forwards appointments and promotions recommended by the TACs or their equivalents to the SAAC. • SAAC reviews and dossiers and makes a recommendation to the Provost. • Provost decides and then forwards promotion/tenure decisions on to the Yale Corporation for final approval.	N/A	N/A

Appendix E: Faculty Receiving Tenure Per School, Years 2009-2018

FACULTY TENURED BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES, PER SCHOOL, FOR YEARS 2009-2011 AND 2014-2018												
Month (of Board approval)	School	2009	2010	2011		2014	2015		2016	2017	2018	
February	KSAS	-	-	1		2	-		1	0	1	
	SOM	8	-	3		1	-		11	2	9	
	SON	-	-	-		-	-		1	-	-	
	BSPH	1	-	1		1	2		1	4	-	
	SAIS	-	-	-		-	2		-	1	1	
	Subtotals	9	0	5		4	4		14	7	11	
March	KSAS	-	1	2		-	1		2	1	1	
	WSE	1	2	-		-	2		1	-	1	
	SOM	1	12	9		20	21		5	3	5	
	BSPH	-	3	1		2	-		-	2	1	
	SAIS	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	1	
	SON	1	-	1		-	-		-	-	-	
	Subtotals	3	18	13		22	24		8	6	9	
May	KSAS	3	3	-		4	14		4	10	5	
	WSE	-	1	1		2	4		4	1	3	
	SOM	6	-	4		9	26		17	13	7	
	BSPH	-	3	-		-	3		1	4	3	
	SAIS	-	-	-		-	1		-	2	4	
	CBS	1	-	-		1	-		-	-	-	
	Subtotals	10	7	5		16	48		26	30	22	
June	KSAS	-	7	3		8	5		13	5	5	
	WSE	-	2	2		3	4		4	3	7	
	SOM	-	5	15		13	3		15	10	21	
	BSPH	-	-	2		-	-		2	1	1	
	SAIS	-	-	-		-	-		2	-	1	
	Subtotals	0	14	22		24	12		36	19	35	
July/August <i>No meetings.</i>	SOM	-	-	-		-	-		11	2	7	
	KSAS	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	5	
	CBS	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	1	
	WSE	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	4	
	BSPH	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	1	
	Subtotals	0	0	0		0	0		11	2	18	
September <i>2009-No mtg. Inaug. Events.</i>	SOM	-	-	3		8	-		3	9	3	
	BSPH	-	2	-		2	2		4	1	1	
	SON	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	1	
	KSAS	-	-	-		1	-		-	-	-	
	CBS	-	-	-		-	1		-	-	-	
	WSE	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-	
	Subtotals	0	2	3		11	3		7	10	5	
October	SOM	22	12	13		6	13		13	2	-	
	SAIS	-	-	-		-	-		1	-	-	
	BSPH	4	1	-		1	-		-	2	-	

Appendix E: Faculty Receiving Tenure Per School, Years 2009-2018

	KSAS	8	-	4		1	2		-	-	-	
	CBS	-	-	-		-	1		-	-	-	
	WSE	4	2	1		-	-		-	-	-	
	SON	-	1	-		-	-		-	-	-	
	Subtotals	38	16	18		8	16		14	4	0	
November	KSAS	-	-	-		-	2		-	-	-	
	SOM	-	-	-		3	-		-	21	-	
	WSE	-	-	-		-	1		-	-	-	
	Subtotals	0	0	0		3	3		0	21	0	
December	KSAS	4	2	-		1	-		3	3	-	
	CBS	-	-	-		-	-		2	-	1	
	WSE	-	-	-		-	1		1	-	-	
	SOM	5	3	7		3	10		9	2	15	
	SON	-	1	-		-	-		3	-	-	
	BSPH	-	1	-		1	1		3	-	1	
	SAIS	-	-	-		-	-		1	1	-	
	Subtotals	9	7	7	3 yr. total	5	12	2 yr. total	22	6	17	3 yr. total
	TOTALS	69	64	73	206	93	122	215	138	105	117	360

Note: Typically, Board meetings are not held in January, April, July, and August unless there is a special meeting or recommendations are approved by electronic ballot.

Total tenured from 2009-11 = 206

Total tenured from 2014-18 = 575

3-year average (2009-11) = ~69 persons tenured per year (roughly 7-8 per month, using a 9-month cycle)

3-year average (2016-18) = 120 persons tenured per year (roughly 13-14 per month, using a 9-month cycle)

Overall divisional totals from 2016-18 (ranked by volume)

SOM 215 (~60% of all faculty tenured at the university, across all schools, during 2016-18)

KSAS 59 (~16%)

BSPH 33 (~9%)

WSE 29 (~8%)

CBS 15 (~4%)

SON 5 (~1%)

SAIS 4 (~1%)

TOTAL 360