

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

A. Preamble

The reputation of a law school and its ability to attract excellent students and new faculty heavily depends on the reputation of its faculty as scholars and dedicated educators. The Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law (the "Law School") has a responsibility for recruiting, developing, mentoring, supporting, and retaining outstanding faculty. This document is intended to provide a framework to facilitate efforts to support and nurture faculty through the tenure and promotion processes. The procedures and substantive guidelines for faculty hired after January 1, 2017 will be evaluated based on these Revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The procedures for tenure and/or promotion applications for faculty hired prior to January 1, 2016, will be governed by these Revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. However, faculty hired prior to January 1, 2017, may elect to apply the substantive guidelines of either these Revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines or the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that were in place at the time of hire. Substantive guidelines are highlighted in the text.

B. Promotion and Tenure

A new, full-time tenure-track faculty member, whose performance is satisfactory, will be reappointed one academic year at a time for a maximum probationary period of six-years. As a faculty member begins year six of the probationary period, the faculty member must make application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor if the faculty member has not already attained that rank. (Exceptions to the minimum probationary period may be made under special circumstances in accordance with the University of Memphis Faculty Handbook.) Faculty members who are not approved for tenure will not have their contracts renewed at the end of the probationary period. However,

they will be rehired for the following year on a one-year, nonrenewable contract.

1. The Application Process

a. Notice Regarding Tenure and/or Promotion. On or before the first day of April, a faculty member who wishes to apply for tenure and/or promotion during the upcoming fall semester will notify the Dean in writing of such intent (hereinafter "Applicant").

b. Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee (the "P & T Committee") will consist of all tenured associate professors and professors except the Dean. For promotion to full professor, the P & T Committee will consist of all tenured professors who have attained the rank of full professor. The committee's primary function is to consider the substance of a faculty member's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion, ensuring that the Applicant has met the minimum criteria.

c. Chair of P & T Committee. The Chair will be appointed by the Dean for the upcoming academic year during the spring semester but no later than April 15th. The Chair of P & T will serve for a one-year term. The Chair will appoint a mentor (the "Mentor") for each Applicant. The Chair will select the Mentor in consultation with the Applicant; however, the Mentor must have attained the rank as to which the Applicant is seeking promotion. A Mentor for each Applicant will be selected before April 30th. In addition, the Chair of P & T will manage the process for the P & T Committee's evaluation of teaching. See Section II.B.1.b. The

Chair of P & T will schedule a meeting to discuss and vote on promotion and tenure applications. The meeting should be held by the middle of October.

d. Submission Guidelines/Dossier. The Applicant has the responsibility of submitting data pertinent to the Applicant's application for tenure and/or promotion in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The list of materials necessary for the dossier can be found on the Provost's website. Pertinent materials will be prepared and uploaded into an electronic dossier by the Applicant. The Dean will ensure that the Applicant, Mentor, and Chair of P & T receive an internet link to a personal folder in which the application materials can be uploaded. All dossiers for tenure/promotion will be submitted electronically. In addition, the Applicant will assemble a hardcopy binder with copies of the content included in the electronic dossier. In preparing the dossier, the Applicant may seek help from the Applicant's Mentor. A timeline for Tenure and Promotion is provided in Section IV, Appendix A.

e. Mentor: The Mentor for each Applicant will help the Applicant assemble the dossier, manage the external scholarship review process, and compile peer reviews of the Applicant's teaching, scholarship, service, and administration (when applicable). Prior to the closure of the edossier, the Applicant will be provided with an opportunity to review the materials submitted by others (e.g., external reviews, peer reviews, etc.) and to submit any comments or exhibits in response to such materials. Anonymous and/or unattributed submissions and any

submissions arising after the closure of the edossier will be handled in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section II.A.6 and II.A.7e, respectively. In addition, the Mentor may also draft the P & T Committee Report for the Applicant, if appointed to do so by the Chair of P & T.

f. Peer Review. The Mentor for each Applicant will invite Law School faculty, administration, and staff who have knowledge of the Applicant's teaching, scholarship, service, or administration to provide written comments about the Applicant's performance in these areas. Anonymous and/or unattributed submissions and/or comments are not allowed. An exception exists in situations where the anonymous comment or submission contains content that could reasonably be expected to affect the voting outcome. If the Chair of P & T makes such a determination, the Chair will request an investigation by or additional information from the Administration to reasonably substantiate the content. The Administration will seek a response from the Applicant. If the content cannot be reasonably substantiated in the opinion of the Chair of P & T before the meeting, it will not be allowed. If the submissions and/or comments are allowed, the Applicant will be given the opportunity to provide a response for consideration by the P & T Committee. Comments provided must be based on first-hand knowledge and should not include hearsay. Submissions meeting these criteria will be uploaded to the dossier by the Mentor.

g. Voting:

- (1) An Applicant for promotion or tenure is not allowed to be present during the discussion or vote on the Applicant's application.
- (2) Spouses and family members may not vote, participate, or be present in the consideration of their family member's tenure and/or promotion application.
- (3) In order to vote, a P & T Committee member must have reviewed an Applicant's dossier either on-line or checked out the paper dossier and be physically present for the discussion. On the day of the P & T meeting, the Chair of P & T will determine which P & T Committee members have reviewed the dossier(s).
- (4) Faculty members on leave for the fall semester may participate in the voting process only if they have had the opportunity to evaluate the Applicant's dossier and are physically present for the P & T Committee meeting.
- (5) The P & T Committee will review, discuss, and evaluate each Applicant's dossier. The P & T Committee deliberations will be based on the criteria for tenure and promotion outlined in this and other university documents. No facts or information will be introduced at the meeting as to any matter that is not raised or present in the Applicant's dossier. However, if after the Applicant's dossier has been completed a significant new matter or issue comes to light, the Chair of P & T will be notified. If the Chair of P & T concludes that the matter or issue is significant, the Chair of P & T will notify the Applicant and give the Applicant the

opportunity to respond in writing prior to the meeting at which the vote is taken. The new matter or issue along with the Applicant's written response may be considered by the P & T Committee. Comments expressed during deliberations will be kept confidential. Applicants applying for the same rank will be reviewed and discussed in alphabetical order by last name. After all Applicants applying for the same rank have been discussed, a vote will be taken by secret ballot. A simple majority vote is required for a positive recommendation.

- h. P & T Report. The P & T Committee will issue a report (the "Committee Report") assessing the Applicant's qualifications and indicate whether the Applicant meets the criteria for promotion and/tenure. To the extent feasible, the Committee Report will contain the rationale for the P & T Committee's recommendation that is consistent with the vote of the P & T Committee. The Committee Report will not include reference to isolated or ancillary comments. The Committee Report will be drafted by the Chair of P & T or a member the P & T Committee selected by the P & T Chair. Because each faculty member makes unique contributions to the Law School, each Committee Report should be tailored to highlight the contributions of the individual Applicant. Typically, the length of the Committee Report will be between five and seven pages. It will include a summary analysis of the student teaching evaluations, a description and assessment of any academic advising and/or mentoring responsibilities, and a summary of peer teaching evaluations. With respect to

scholarship, the Committee Report will provide summaries of the external reviews and a brief description of the journals or other forums in which the Applicant's work has appeared. Finally, with respect to service, the Committee Report will provide an analysis of the Applicant's service in the context of the expected service contributions to the Law School, legal profession, and the community. The Committee Report will be circulated to all P & T Committee members for review. Any member of the P & T Committee may offer factual corrections within three days of the receiving the draft of the Committee Report. By November 15th or no fewer than three days following circulation of the Committee Report to the P & T Committee, the Chair of the P & T committee will incorporate appropriate factual corrections and submit the completed report to the members of the P & T Committee and to the Dean.

- i. Minority Report. If the decision of the P & T Committee is not unanimous, then the dissenting member or members of the P & T Committee may elect to submit a minority report, which explains the rationale for their dissent. If a member or members of the P & T Committee elect to submit a minority report, the minority report must be signed. Minority reports may not be submitted anonymously.
- j. Dean's Recommendation. The Dean will file the Dean's recommendation in accordance with the Provost's Guidelines. In addition, the Dean will close the dossier and forward the dossier to the Provost. If the Dean's recommendation

is inconsistent with the P & T Committee's recommendation, the Dean will meet with the P & T Committee and explain the rationale for the decision.

C. General Criteria

1. Teaching Skill and Effectiveness: Teaching is central to the purposes and objectives of the University and the Law School. It encompasses classroom instruction, development of courses and certificate programs, mentoring students, testing, grading, and professional development. Effectiveness in teaching requires having a current, accurate, and balanced command of the field being taught, the ability to communicate one's knowledge, and the willingness to interact and exchange views with students. Effectiveness in teaching also is evidenced by the fostering of intellectual stimulation and inspiration. Neither tenure nor promotion will be awarded in the absence of clear, convincing, and continuing evidence of an acceptable level of effective teaching.

a. *Criteria*. Since evaluation of teaching is a qualitative process, multiple sources of evidence will be employed. The Applicant should organize, record, and exhibit evidence of the Applicant's teaching efforts in such a manner that colleagues are able to assess the Applicants insights and achievements in instruction. Included should be a statement of teaching philosophy and student evaluations (SETE) including comments, course syllabi, examinations, and anything else relevant to teaching quality.

b. *P & T Committee Evaluations*. The Chair of the P & T Committee will appoint at least two Committee members to

attend classes taught by the Applicant. The appointed P & T Committee members will prepare a written evaluation that will be included in the Applicant's dossier and shared with the full P & T Committee. The written evaluation will assess the Applicant's teaching effectiveness as evidenced by the classes attended. The evaluation will also address command of the subject matter, ability to engage students, and ability to present material in an interesting, organized, and logical manner. The selected Committee members will each visit at least two classes of the Applicant in the semester in which the application for promotion and/or tenure is made. However, if the Applicant is teaching a seminar or a 2-hour one day-a-week course, then one class visit is sufficient. Committee members have the discretion to attend the class or classes or evaluate the class or classes based on a video recording. However, any class that is evaluated for the purposes of promotion and/or tenure should be recorded and access should be provided to the full P & T Committee. All class visits should occur before September 30th.

2. Research and Scholarly Activity. Intellectual contributions and scholarship advance knowledge and learning by producing new ideas and understanding. It is a fundamental responsibility of faculty and constitutes the foundation upon which all other activities are built. As provided in the Faculty Handbook, scholarship can be divided into five sub-categories: engaged scholarship, creative activity, inquiry, integration, and the scholarship of teaching.

a. General Criteria. The quality of a faculty member's research and scholarly activity is measured by the significance of the issue or issues addressed to the evolution of legal thought within the subject area of the activity, the thoroughness of the research undertaken, the depth of the analysis engaged in, the logical nature of the presentation and the comprehensibility and the readability of the expression, as well as objective indicators such as length and citations. The extent to which the research and scholarly activity is shown to be of value to attorneys, judges, legislators, executive office holders, other law faculty, or the general public is also a measure of the quality of a faculty member's research and scholarly activity. Peer recognition is also an important criterion in evaluating intellectual contributions and/or scholarship. See Section II.C.1 for Minimum Requirements for scholarship for promotion or tenure.

b. Activities Considered. Manifestations of research and scholarly activity which will be considered include:

(1) Articles authored by the Applicant and published in regularly published law reviews and professional journals. Coauthored articles may be considered to the extent the Applicant identifies the specific portions of the article authored by the Applicant.

(2) Papers presented at professional meetings or seminars if the papers were reproduced and distributed to the attendants.

(3) Reports or memoranda authored by the Applicant and submitted to a governmental entity and published by that

governmental entity in a form that clearly identifies the Applicant as the contributor of an identifiable portion of the publication.

(4) Casebooks and other teaching materials that have been produced and used in the teaching of a Law School course. In this context, if the material is not commercially reproduced by an established publisher, then the Applicant must submit the names and schools of the users in order for the materials to be considered.

(5) Other books directed at and beneficial to legal audiences or to the advancement of legal thinking generally.

(6) External and internal grants are supported and encouraged. Their contributions will be evaluated in light of their source and upon the contributions made to the intellectual life of the Law School.

(7) The Law School recognizes that legal academics may make significant scholarly contributions in non-print publication venues, including but not limited to blogging and other web contributions.

(8) The Applicant may submit for consideration other material not provided herein if the Applicant believes the material to be relevant evidence of the Applicant's research and scholarly activity. In this event, the Applicant must also provide a written justification for the consideration of the materials.

c. *External Evaluation of Research and Scholarly Activity* The purpose of external peer reviews is to provide an informed, objective evaluation of the quality of scholarship, research or creative activity of the Applicant. Each major piece of scholarship will be reviewed externally. It is expected that the external reviewers will be selected from peer or comparable institutions with national reputations in the faculty member's discipline. Because external reviewers can be difficult to obtain and place a burden on the busy schedules of the evaluators, an honorarium will be provided. In order to obtain external reviews in a timely manner, the process of developing the lists of potential external reviewers, as described below, should be initiated in May of the spring semester preceding the fall tenure and promotion process.

(1) *Selecting Reviewers:* The Applicant will develop a list, normally four to eight names of recommended peer reviewers from outside the University. The Applicant may also submit a list (with justifications) of persons who may pose a conflict for consideration by the Applicant's Mentor. The Applicant will provide the Applicant's Mentor with a list of potential external reviewers by May 30th. In conjunction with submitting the list of external reviewers, the Applicant will also provide the Applicant's Mentor with a copy of the scholarly works that are ready to be reviewed externally. However, if an Applicant completes a substantial scholarly work over the summer and receives an offer of publication, then the Applicant may elect to have

the scholarly work reviewed at the beginning of the fall semester.

(2) The Mentor will strive to obtain at least three external reviews per substantial scholarly work with at least one reviewer chosen from the Applicant's list. In addition to compiling and uploading the external reviews into the Applicant's dossier, the Mentor will prepare for the dossier a brief paragraph describing the credentials for each reviewer and any relationship between the reviewer and the Applicant. Each reviewer will receive the Applicant's c.v., scholarship, and a letter from the Mentor (see Appendix C).

(3) If a work has been reviewed externally in conjunction with a previous application for tenure or promotion, then the work does not have to be re-reviewed in a subsequent tenure or promotion application. The evaluations required in this section will not apply to writings published before the Applicant became a member of the Law School's faculty.

3. Service

a. *Law School and University Service.* The Applicant's contribution to the Law School and University is measured by: (1) the faculty member's level of participation and general availability to colleagues and students in carrying out the advisory and administrative functions and duties of the Law School and University and (2) the extent to which the particular services rendered furthered the goals and improve the quality of the Law School and University.

Among the activities to be considered are Law School and University committee work, recruiting efforts, and student advising and coaching, both formal and informal. The Applicant is encouraged to report in the Applicant's Service Narrative about any other contributions that the Applicant would like to have considered.

b. *Professional and Public Service*

(1)Professional Service. Professional Service will include services rendered to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government; federal, state and local bar activities, especially committee service; services rendered in connection with legal education organizations or journals; and institutional service which requires commitment of professional expertise.

(2)Public Service. Public Service will include pro-bono legal services, educational activities conducted to benefit the general public, and activities designed to inform students in secondary and elementary schools about the legal profession. It also includes serving on the board of a non-profit organization or other substantial service to a non-profit organization.

(3)Procedure. The Applicant will provide the Promotion and Tenure Committee with a list of public and professional activities, including a description of work performed, offices held, length of service, and letters from individuals who are familiar with the Applicant's service (if the so chooses).

(4)Evaluation. The P & T Committee will review the information in order to evaluate the Applicant's contribution to the profession through public and professional service. Evaluations will be based on the follow factors: (1) length of service; (2) whether the Applicant held an office in the organization; (3) whether the Applicant served in any administrative capacity; (4) whether the Applicant contributed positively to the profession by involvement with the activity; and (5) whether the Applicant provided a service to the community.

(5)Excluded Services. Professional or public service will not include compensated legal services.

(6)Other Professional Service. The Applicant may submit additional evidence of involvement in a professional activity or public service not listed above if the Applicant believes the activity contributes to the advancement of the profession or is a public service.

4. Collegiality. Collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service. Collegiality is only relevant to the extent that it significantly impairs an Applicant's teaching, scholarship, or service.

D. Minimum Requirements

1. Promotion to Associate Professor. In order to attain the rank of Associate Professor, the Applicant's dossier must provide documented evidence of quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. In the area

of scholarship, the grant of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor is based on whether the Applicant has documented evidence of high quality professional productivity which may lead to national recognition. The normal expectation of scholarly production for promotion or tenure is two full-length law review articles, not including co-authored pieces assessed by the criteria in Section II.B.2.a. At least one of the articles must be published, while it is permissible that the Applicant have an offer of publication for the second article, even if it has not yet been published. Depending on the circumstances, it may be possible to satisfy the scholarship requirement for promotion or tenure with alternative publications that reflect ability and effort equivalent to researching and writing two full-length law review articles.

2. Promotion to Full Professor. In order to attain the rank of Professor, the Applicant's dossier must provide evidence of quality in teaching, scholarship. In the area of scholarship, promotion to full professor requires evidence of an established research agenda that has led to (a) sustained quality scholarly production since promotion to associate professor and (b) a national and/or international reputation for scholarship in the Applicant's discipline. Such evidence normally is expected to include at least three law review articles or their equivalent since promotion to Associate Professor.

E. Criteria for Director of Experiential Learning

1. Generally. To the extent that they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, the general criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service are applicable. However, because a significant portion of the Director's time is typically devoted to

overseeing the clinical and externship programs, professional performance as reflected in the success or lack of success of those programs is to be given substantial weight.

2. Teaching. Given the time required to direct the clinical and externship programs, the Director is not expected to carry a full teaching load. The Director's teaching effectiveness will be judged under the same criteria as other tenured and tenure-track faculty, with due consideration for the unique aspects of the subject matters and the smaller faculty-to-student ratios in clinical and externship courses.

3. Scholarship. Although the Director is expected to meet the Law School's standards for scholarship, the Director must have the flexibility to address issues specifically related to clinical legal education, externships, and experiential learning. Thus, the Director's scholarship obligations may be satisfied through research and publication directed toward pedagogy, programmatic considerations, and other topics related to clinical legal education, externships, and experiential learning.

4. Service. The general criteria for service will apply.

5. Administrative Performance. For purposes of assessment of such performance, the following factors are relevant but not exclusive: development and implementation of effective clinical and externship programs, in accordance with the curricular objectives of the Law School; establishment of clear teaching and program goals for the clinical and externship programs; further development of existing clinical courses and externship field placements, when resources are allocated and permit such further development; development of new clinical courses and externship field placements, when resources are

allocated and permit such development; effective assignment, training, and evaluation of externship faculty and externship field placement supervisors; effective training and coordination of activities of clinical professors, and provision of input to the Dean regarding evaluation of such professors upon the Dean's request; identification of problems in the clinical and externship programs and the promotion of their solution; and general administrative skills. In assessing the administrative performance of the Director, the Mentor will request a written report by the Director reviewing the Director's work during the pertinent period. The P & T Committee will also rely on the Dean's evaluations of the Director's performance as reflected in previous annual performance evaluations.

F. Criteria for Director of the Law Library and Associate Dean for Information Resources.

1. Generally. To the extent that they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, the general criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service are applicable. However, because a significant portion of the Director's time is typically devoted to overseeing the law library and information technology resources in the Law School, professional performance as reflected in the success or lack of success in such programs is to be given substantial weight.
2. Teaching. Given the time required to direct the law library and information technology resources in the Law School, the Director is not expected to carry a full teaching load. The Director's teaching effectiveness will be judged under the same criteria as other tenured

and tenure-track faculty, with due consideration for the unique aspects of the subject matter.

3. Scholarship. Although the Director is expected to meet the Law School's standards for scholarship, the Director must have the flexibility to address issues specifically related to law library and information technology resources. Thus, the Director's scholarship obligations may be satisfied through research and publication directed toward legal information and research, information technology, legal bibliography, and other topics related to law libraries and information technology resources in law schools.

4. Service. The general criteria of service will apply.

5. Administrative Performance. For purposes of assessment of such performance, the following factors are relevant but not exclusive: management of the law library and information technology in the Law School; personnel management; identification and resolution of problems in the law library and use of information technology in the Law School; and general administrative skills. In assessing the professional performance of the Director, the Mentor will request a written report by the Director reviewing the Director's work during the pertinent period. The P & T Committee will also rely on the Dean's evaluation of the Director's professional performance as reflected in previous annual performance evaluations.

G. Criteria for Director of Legal Writing

1. Generally. To the extent that they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, the general criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service are applicable. However, because a significant portion of the Director's time is typically devoted to

overseeing the legal writing program, administrative performance as reflected in the success of the program or lack of success is to be given substantial weight.

2. Teaching. Given the time required to direct the legal writing program, the Director is not expected to carry a full teaching load. The Director's teaching effectiveness will be judged under the same criteria as other tenured and tenure-track faculty, with due consideration for the unique aspects of the subject matter.

3. Scholarship. Although the Director is expected to meet the Law School's standards for scholarship, the Director must have the flexibility to address issues specifically related to legal writing. Thus the Director's scholarship obligations may be satisfied through research and publication directed toward pedagogy, programmatic considerations, and other topics related to legal writing and research.

4. Service. The general criteria of service will apply.

H. Administrative Performance. For purposes of assessment of such performance, the following factors are relevant but not exclusive: development and implementation of an effective program of legal research and writing instruction, in accordance with the curricular objectives of the Law School - establishment of clear teaching and program goals; personnel management; effective assignment, training, and evaluation of legal writing instructors; identification of problems in the legal writing program and the promotion of their solution; and general administrative skills. In assessing the professional performance of the Director, the Mentor will request a written report by the Director reviewing the Director's own work during the pertinent period; and written or oral evaluations by members of the adjunct

legal writing faculty. The P & T Committee will also rely on the Dean's evaluation of the Director's professional performance as reflected in the Director's annual performance evaluations.

I. Mid-Tenure(Third-Year)Review

1. Purpose

The mid-tenure review is a major evaluation of untenured faculty in tenure-track positions during the faculty member's third year of appointment. The purpose is to provide the faculty member with information about the status of the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure. The review process should provide an objective review and assessment of the faculty member's performance to date. The review should include feedback focused on enhancing the likelihood of promotion and tenure for the faculty member. The timeline for mid-tenure review can be found in APPENDIX B: Mid-Tenure Review Timetable.

2. Procedures

The following procedures should be observed in the third-year review:

- a. Mid-Tenure Review Committee: Before August 15th, the Dean will appoint a mid-tenure review committee (the "MTR Committee") from the membership of the P & T Committee for each faculty member who is eligible for mid-tenure review during the upcoming academic year. It is recommended that the MTR Committee include recently tenured faculty and/or faculty with expertise similar to that of the faculty member who is seeking mid-tenure review. The MTR Committee should consist of three faculty members and the committee will select its chair. The MTR Committee is expected to serve as a resource for the faculty member, provide general

advice, and counsel about teaching, scholarship, and service as needed.

b. Peer Teaching Evaluations: The MTR Committee will ensure that each class taught by the faculty member who is under mid-tenure review is visited by at least two committee members. After the class visit, the committee member will draft a written report that evaluates the teaching of the faculty member who is seeking mid-tenure review. The written evaluation will assess the Applicant's teaching effectiveness as evidenced by the classes attended. The evaluation will also address command of the subject matter, ability to engage students, and ability to present material in an interesting, organized, and logical manner. Members of the MTR Committee will review classes in both the fall and spring semester.

c. Dossier: The dossier for mid-tenure review should be the same as the one for promotion and tenure, with the exception of external scholarship reviews. The dossier will be an e-dossier. The faculty member who is undergoing mid-tenure review is responsible for preparing the dossier. The dossier should be submitted to the chair of the MTR Committee by the end of February.

d. Review Criteria: The basic review criteria for the quality of a faculty member's three-year accomplishments are the same as those used for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Those criteria relate to the Law School's tripartite mission of teaching, scholarship, and service. With respect to scholarship, the normal expectation is that an Applicant will have published

or have an offer to publish at least one full-length law review article, not including co-authored pieces. (Neither internal nor external reviews of scholarship occur at the mid-tenure review level, but Applicants should be guided by the general scholarship review criteria set forth in Section II.B.2.a for articles likely to be subject to external review at the promotion or tenure stage.) Depending on the circumstances, it may be possible to satisfy the mid-tenure review scholarship requirement with alternative publications that reflect the ability and effort equivalent to researching and writing a full-length law review article (e.g., a book or multiple shorter works).

e. Committee Feedback: The Chair of the faculty member's MTR Committee will present the dossier to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for discussion and review. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee has the responsibility for scheduling the meeting to discuss and vote. This meeting will typically be scheduled during the end of March. The voting rules provided in Section II.A.6. will apply to the meeting and vote regarding mid-tenure review. The Chair of the faculty member's MTR Committee will prepare a written report based on the recommendation of the full Promotion and Tenure Committee. The report should discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. In each category, the report should state that the faculty member is "progressing satisfactorily towards tenure and promotion" or "needs improvement." The report should provide meaningful feedback and direction to the faculty member to assist

in planning and organizing subsequent work activities. This report should be circulated to all P & T Committee members for review. Any member of the P & T Committee may offer factual corrections no later than three days after the circulation of the draft. No later than ten days following the circulation of the report, the Chair of the MTR Committee will incorporate appropriate factual corrections and submit the final report to the members of the P & T Committee and to the faculty member undergoing review. The Chair of the MTR Committee will schedule a meeting with the faculty member to provide a copy of the report and discuss the candidate's progress. After the meeting, the faculty member will have an opportunity to write a brief response to the report, if desired. The purpose of this response is to allow the faculty member the opportunity to address any concerns or inaccuracies in the report. The faculty member may also describe plans for addressing concerns raised during the mid-tenure review. This response must be received by the faculty member's MTR Committee Chair within seven days of the faculty member's receipt of the report. The Chair will then upload the final report and the faculty member's response (if any) to the dossier. The Chair will provide the Dean with access to the final dossier.

f. Dean's Feedback: The Dean will also prepare a written report that addresses the strengths and weakness of the faculty member's accomplishments and will upload the report into the e-dossier. The Dean will meet with the faculty member to discuss the report.

J. Amendments

This document is part of the Governing Rules of the University Of Memphis Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law. Thus amending this Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document requires following the procedure for amendments which can be found in Section VIII of the Governing Rules.

K. APPENDIX A: Promotion and Tenure Timetable

STEP	RESPONSIBILITY	ACTION	DUE DATE
1	Applicant	Notify Dean of Intent to Apply for Tenure and/or Promotion	April 1st
2	Dean	Appoint T & P Committee Chair	April 15th
3	Applicant; T & P Chair	Appoint/Select Mentor for Applicant	April 30th
4	Applicant	Provide Mentor with a list of potential external reviewers, an electronic copy of current c.v., and electronic copy and where applicable of reprints of scholarship that is ready to be reviewed.	May 30th
5	Mentor	Select external reviewers. Send letter, candidate's materials, and P & T Guidelines to reviewers.	Mid-June
6	Dean	Dean submits a list of all faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion to the Provost	University Tenure and Promotion Calendar - usually due by late August
7	Dean	Ensure that Applicant, Mentor, and Chair of P & T receive an internet link to the e-dossier folder.	August 31st
8	Applicant	If necessary, notify Mentor of any additional scholarship that needs to be reviewed and provide Mentor with a copy of the additional scholarship and updated cv	September 1st
9	Mentor	If necessary, send additional scholarship to external reviewers. Find additional reviewers, if needed	Early September
10	Applicant	Complete Dossier (following University guidelines as provided by the Provost). Upload dossier to the website.	End of September

11	Mentor	Upload external evaluations of scholarship and peer evaluations about service to the Applicant's Dossier. Verify that all required dossier materials have been uploaded; notify Chair of P & T that dossier is ready for review.	Beginning of October
11	P & T Chair	Schedule and lead P & T Committee review meeting; facilitate vote	Mid October
12	Mentor	Prepare Report; Circulate draft to P & T Committee members	Circulate draft no later than two weeks after the vote (late October)
13	P & T Committee members	Review draft of Report; provide factual corrections to the Mentor	No later than three days after circulation of the draft (early November)
14	Mentor	Incorporate factual corrections in the Report and provide final Report to the P & T Committee and to the Dean	No later than seven days after P & T Committee review period (mid-November)
15	Dean	Independently Review Applicant's dossier; review Report and prepare recommendation	November
16	Dean	Submit dossier documents including recommendations to Provost through UMdrive	University Tenure and Promotion Calendar Deadline - usually early December

L. APPENDIX B: Mid-Tenure Review Timetable

Step	Responsibility	Action	Due Date
1	Dean	Appoint Mid Tenure Review Committee	August 15
2	Chair of P & T	Send memo to eligible faculty with a copy of these guidelines for review	August 15
3	Mid Tenure Review Committee	Meet with candidate to discuss the process and Fall class visits.	By September 30
4	Mid Tenure Review Committee	Review Fall classes and write reviews	October - November
5	Chair of MTR	Provide MTR with dates for Spring Class visits	Mid-January

6	Mid Tenure Review Committee	Review Spring classes and write reviews	January - late February
7	Faculty Candidate	Upload dossier materials; notify Mid-Tenure Review Committee Chair that dossier is ready for review	By February 28 th /29 th
8	Chair of MTR	Upload documents concerning class visits and service. Verify that all materials have been uploaded. Notify P & T Chair that the dossier is complete	By February 28 th /29 th
9	Chair of P & T	Provide access to dossier to P & T Committee; Schedule and convene meeting to discuss mid-tenure review	Hold meeting by March 15
10	Chair of MTR	Draft the MTR report; Circulate the report to P & T Committee for corrections	End of March
11	P & T Committee members	Provide factual corrections in the Report to Chair of MTR	No later than ten days after circulation of the draft
12	Chair of MTR	Make any factual corrections and circulate final draft to P& T Committee and faculty member	No later than seven days after P & T review period - late April
13	Faculty Candidate	Candidate may write statement in response to report from T & P Committee	Within two weeks from receipt of report
14	Chair of MTR	Incorporate any additional factual corrections. Circulate final Report to P & T Committee. Provide Dean with access to the dossier including the final Report	Once faculty response (if any) is received
15	Dean	Independent review of dossier; write report. Meet with candidate	Within two weeks of receipt of the dossier
16	Dean	Submit dossier including Report and Dean's report to the Office for Faculty Administrative Services for inclusion in the faculty member's permanent file	Upon completion of report and meeting with faculty member

M. APPENDIX C: Sample External Review Letter

[Your Name]
[Title]
[Street Address]
[City, ST ZIP Code]

[Date]March 14, 2016

Dear [Your Name]:

On behalf of the Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law, I appreciate your willingness to serve as an external evaluator of the application of Professor _____ for (*promotion to Associate Professor*), (*tenure and promotion to Associate Professor*), or (*promotion to Professor*). As I indicated in our correspondence, external evaluations are extremely valuable in providing us with information and insight into the professional accomplishments of our faculty. Your evaluation will become a part of Professor _____'s dossier and will be a significant element in the review process.

Promotion and tenure decisions at the University of Memphis require the evaluation of a candidate's teaching, research, and service. I ask that you provide a written review of Professor _____'s scholarship. To aid you in this appraisal, I have included the candidate's current vita and *publication(s)*. Please kindly provide a candid evaluation of the candidate's scholarship and potential for continued success in *his/her* discipline. *In the case of promotion to Professor, I ask that you also provide an evaluation of Professor _____'s professional reputation nationally.* The Promotion and Tenure Committee is especially interested in the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity in view of the following guidelines:

The quality of a faculty member's research and scholarly activity is measured by the significance of the issue or issues addressed to the evolution of legal thought within the subject area of the activity, the thoroughness of the research undertaken, the depth of the analysis engaged in, the logical nature of the presentation and the comprehensibility and the readability of the expression, as well as objective indicators such as length and citations. The extent to which the research and scholarly activity is shown to be of value to attorneys, judges, legislators, executive office holders, other law faculty, or the general public is also a measure of the quality of a faculty member's research and scholarly activity.

Also, please feel free to include any additional information that you believe would help us in evaluating Professor _____ for promotion and/or tenure. Please be aware that Tennessee's Open Records Law allows individuals to request and receive access to external and internal letters in candidate tenure and promotion files. Also note that our Promotion and Tenure procedure does not require additional external reviews for subsequent tenure and/or promotion decisions. Thus your review may be relied on when making future tenure and or promotion decisions with respect to Professor _____.

Finally, it would be very helpful if you could also include a copy of your curriculum vita with your evaluation. This information will also be a part of Professor _____'s file. Please send your evaluation and vita no later than August 31st. To facilitate your response, I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope. You should also feel free to send your evaluation and c.v. via e-mail to _____.

I realize that this request places an added burden on your busy schedule, and I am extremely grateful for your time. If you have any questions regarding this request, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Your Name /Title