

Department of English and World Languages Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

OVERVIEW

These Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Department of English and World Languages (“departmental guidelines” hereafter) are intended to foster excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service among the faculty. These guidelines do not supersede, but supplement and further elaborate on the *Pamplin College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* (“college guidelines” hereafter) and Augusta University’s *University Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (“university guidelines” hereafter).

While it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate excellence in all areas of his/her professional responsibilities, it is the responsibility of the college and the candidate’s department to maintain a robust course of faculty development and assessment which, starting from the date of hire, assists the candidate in understanding what is expected for promotion/tenure, assessing his/her progress in fulfilling those expectations, and if necessary, developing an appropriate plan of improvement prior to requesting promotion/tenure.

In fulfillment of that responsibility, the Department provides all tenure-track faculty with timely and frequent opportunities to assess their progress. These include the assignment of a faculty mentor, regular annual reviews, regular peer evaluations of teaching, a comprehensive third-year review of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, and the establishment of clear expectations for the award of promotion/tenure as outlined in these and the college guidelines. Support continues after tenure through regular annual reviews and peer evaluations of teaching, as well as a comprehensive post-tenure review every five years. Full-time, non-tenure track faculty receive similar forms of support.

Purpose of this Document

The purpose of this document is to explain how the college guidelines for promotion/tenure are applied within the Department, including any departmental or discipline-specific procedures or criteria for assessment. This document only addresses the most pertinent, departmental-level criteria for promotion/tenure of full-time, tenure-track faculty. Candidates should also consult the college guidelines for a more complete understanding of the process and college-wide expectations for promotion/tenure. Guidelines for the review and promotion of Lecturers are in Appendix 3 of the college guidelines.

Additional topics and information may be found in the college guidelines, the university guidelines, the BOR Policy Manual, and the USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook, all of which may be accessed from the Resources page of the Pamplin website at www.augusta.edu/pamplin/resources.php.

GENERAL CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS

To be recommended for promotion/tenure, the candidate must demonstrate all of the following:

- Appropriate credentials and experience as specified in the college guidelines. Credit toward promotion/tenure shall be awarded only if it was specified in the candidate’s contract at the time of his/her hire or last promotion.
- Outstanding achievement in teaching, as demonstrated in the promotion/tenure portfolio.
- Outstanding achievement in scholarship, as demonstrated in the promotion/tenure portfolio.
- Satisfactory (“meets the standards”) achievement in service, as demonstrated in the promotion/tenure portfolio.

Additionally, requests for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or higher must be supported by three letters from external reviewers.

College-wide expectations for each of these topics may be found in the college guidelines. Departmental and discipline-specific criteria are described in the sections that follow.

Teaching Expectations

Teaching refers to the best practices and responsibilities required to be an effective educator, advisor, and mentor. These include: (a) knowledge of the subject matter, (b) effective planning and communication of curriculum, (c) supervision of students, (d) creation of engaging learning environments, (e) fostering of student development and engagement, (f) availability and receptivity to students, (g) fair and timely evaluation of student performance, (h) student advisement, and (i) innovation in educational delivery.

See the college guidelines for college-wide expectations for outstanding teaching. Departmental and discipline-specific expectations for outstanding teaching are described below.

Teaching expectations in the Department of English and World Languages include two categories. Category 1 centers on performance in the classroom, while Category 2 measures teaching efforts outside the classroom as well as efforts to improve one’s teaching abilities.

Teaching Category 1: Proficiency in the Classroom

Regardless of reported effort for teaching, all candidates for promotion/tenure must demonstrate proficiency in classroom teaching as follows:

1. Mastery of course subject matter demonstrated by annual faculty evaluations and submission of syllabi for each course.
2. Teaching effectiveness demonstrated by peer evaluations of teaching.
3. Teaching effectiveness demonstrated by student evaluations.
4. Teaching effectiveness demonstrated by student achievement on learning outcomes

Teaching Category 2: Engagement in Pedagogical/Curriculum Development and Teaching Outside of the Classroom

All candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to have engaged in work outside the classroom related to curriculum development, mentoring, student-centered research, and pedagogical development and innovation, which may entail any combination of the following:

1. Innovation in teaching practices demonstrated by refinement of courses already in the catalog
2. Significant and innovative change to existing curriculum
3. Creation of new courses
4. Publication of textbook, except when it is to be credited toward Scholarship
5. Organization of, or significant involvement in, teaching workshops
6. Invited lectures outside of Augusta University
7. Significant involvement in events sponsored by the Office of Faculty Development and Teaching Excellence or a similar entity or professional organization
8. Recognition of teaching excellence (nominations and/or awards for pedagogical excellence and/or student mentoring)
9. Act as mentor on honor’s theses, capstone projects, or other research projects broadly defined (students must either be primary authors or contribute significantly and substantially)
10. Internship coordination including advisement on and placement in internship sites; also administration of, and community outreach to this effect
11. Supervise directed or independent study courses
12. Act as instructor or director for Study Abroad or Study Away
13. Use of technology in the classroom demonstrated by an online course component and/or incorporation of other technologies into course curriculum
14. Other activities with comparable merit and involvement to those above.

Expectations for outstanding achievement in teaching vary in proportion to the candidate’s reported effort for teaching as described in the following table:

Objective	Reported Effort for Teaching	Teaching Expectations
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	80% (4/4)	Fulfill all expectations in Category 1 <u>and</u> a total of 4 expectations in any combination in Category 2.
	60% (3/3)	Fulfill all expectations in Category 1 <u>and</u> a total of 3 expectations in any combination in Category 2.
	40% (2/2)	Fulfill all expectations in Category 1 <u>and</u> a total of 2 expectations in any combination in Category 2.

Promotion to Professor	80% (4/4)	Fulfill all expectations in Category 1 <u>and</u> a total of 5 expectations in any combination in Category 2.
	60% (3/3)	Fulfill all expectations in Category 1 <u>and</u> a total of 4 expectations in any combination in Category 2.
	40% (2/2)	Fulfill all expectations in Category 1 <u>and</u> a total of 3 expectations in any combination in Category 2.

Scholarship Expectations

Scholarship refers to scholarship, research, and creative endeavors appropriate to the candidate’s discipline. In evaluating scholarship for promotion/tenure, primary consideration is given to dissemination of the individual’s scholarly work; however, consideration will be given to other forms of scholarship, especially in fields where publication of scholarly work is not a mainstream method of dissemination.

See the college guidelines for college-wide expectations for outstanding scholarship. Department and discipline-specific expectations for outstanding scholarship are described below.

The Department recognizes that scholarly work may take many forms, including creative work, and values the quality, not just the quantity, of the scholarship produced. In general, greater weight is given to national/international publications than to regional publications; however, evidence of the quality of a press/publishing outlet may also include its affiliation with major scholarly/literary organizations; acceptance rate; circulation; and other measures of its stature within the field. Likewise, evidence of the quality of a publication and its impact on the field may include citations, reviews, and prizes. Non-print projects (e.g., dramatic productions, documentary projects, web-based projects, or other digital projects) will be evaluated according to the scope of the project, peer review status, and demonstrated impact on field (as measured, for example, by citations, reviews, or course adoptions).

While length of publications is not a measure of quality, articles, essays, stories, and books should fall within normal ranges for the discipline and field. Publications that are significantly shorter than average will generally be given less weight in evaluating scholarly and creative output. Publications of exceptional length may be given more consideration, if they represent a more substantial contribution to the field, although length alone is an insufficient measure of substance.

Other forms of scholarly work, such as scholarly editing and translation projects will be evaluated based on length and the candidate’s demonstrated contribution to scholarship. Editing a regional/national journal or organizing a regional/national conference may be considered equivalent to the publication of an article. For candidates whose primary appointment is in Creative Writing, prizes, fellowships, reprints in anthologies, and other achievements may also be counted as evidence of creative activity and reputation.

Candidates for promotion/tenure should clearly articulate the quality of their publications and other projects in the Scholarship Statement of their Promotion and Tenure Portfolio.

Scholarship is evaluated according to two categories. Category 1 establishes criteria for productivity in the form of publication and/or grants within the candidate’s discipline. Category 2 establishes criteria for maintaining a persistent scholarly presence.

Scholarship Category 1: Scholarly Publications and/or Grants

Candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to demonstrate productivity in publication/grants through any combination of the following:

1. Publication of a peer-reviewed journal article (including those of a pedagogical nature and open access journals)

NOTE: The primary criteria for inclusion here is peer-review. Publications in journals with enhanced prestige within subfields or with very high impact factors can be weighted higher by the departmental committee when appropriate.
2. For creative writers, publication of one short story, one essay, or two poems by a reputable press
3. Editor of an academic book or a special issue of a peer-reviewed journal in the appropriate discipline
4. Publication of a peer-reviewed chapter in an academic book
5. Principal investigator of an externally funded grant for the discipline
6. Publication of a book or novel (excluding textbooks) by a reputable press, which shall be equivalent to fulfilling *five* activities in this category.

All publications should be published in the appropriate discipline, broadly interpreted. The Department Chair shall resolve any questions regarding the appropriateness of a project (e.g., a textbook, a translation, or interdisciplinary work) to the candidate's discipline or a cognate discipline.

Scholarship Category 2: Persistent Scholarly Presence

Candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to demonstrate persistent scholarly presence through any combination of the following activities:

1. Refereed state, regional, national, or international scholarly presentation (multiple presentations at the same conference are counted individually)
2. Invited reading of creative work at a venue of state, regional, national, or international significance
3. Peer-edited publication
4. Publication of a book review for a peer-reviewed journal in appropriate discipline
5. Publication in a non-peer reviewed journal
6. Invited research lecture outside of Augusta University
7. Recognition of scholarly excellence (nominations and/or awards for books, articles, or other scholarly publications)
8. Substantially funded internal grant
9. Submission of substantial external grant application
10. Substantial contribution to a grant for which the candidate is not a principal investigator

11. Other activities with comparable merit and involvement to those above.

Expectations for outstanding achievement in scholarship vary in proportion to the candidate’s reported effort for scholarship, as described in the following table:

Objective	Reported Effort for Scholarship	Scholarship Expectations
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	10% (4/4)	Fulfill two expectations from Category 1 <u>and</u> five expectations from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	30% (3/3)	Fulfill three expectations from Category 1 <u>and</u> five expectations from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	50% (2/2)	Fulfill four expectations from Category 1 <u>and</u> five expectations from Category 2 above, in any combination.
Promotion to Professor	10% (4/4)	Fulfill three expectations from Category 1 <u>and</u> five expectations from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	30% (3/3)	Fulfill four expectations from Category 1 <u>and</u> five expectations from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	50% (2/2)	Fulfill five expectations from Category 1 <u>and</u> five expectations from Category 2 above, in any combination.

Service Expectations

Service refers to activities that contribute directly or indirectly to the well-being of the university, college, department, profession, or broader community. These activities may be solicited or unsolicited, paid or unpaid. In evaluations of service for promotion/tenure, primary consideration is given to professional service in the area of the candidate’s expertise and that furthers the mission of AU. Service activities outside AU which relate to fulfilling one’s civic duty should *not* be considered in evaluating service.

See the college guidelines for college-wide expectations for satisfactory service. Department and discipline-specific expectations for satisfactory service are described below.

Service in the Department of English and World Languages generally falls under one of the following three categories:

Service Category 1: Service to the Department and University

1. Advising of students
2. Advising student clubs
3. Accreditation documentation
4. Serving on or leading any of the following:
 - a. Departmental committees
 - b. College committees
 - c. University committees (including shared governance committees)
 - d. USG committees
5. Direction or coordination of departmental or campus programs or organizations
6. Program development, including academic planning and degree development

Service Category 2: Service to the Discipline

1. Leadership, including serving on committees, in professional organizations
2. Organizing, chairing, or serving as a discussant/commentator on a panel at a state, regional, national, or international scholarly conference
3. Serving as an external reviewer for a grant or peer-reviewed journal
4. Serving as an external reviewer for promotion/tenure
5. Serving on editorial board for a peer-reviewed journal

Service Category 3: Service to the Community

1. Documented involvement or leadership in non-professional organizations including, but not limited to:
 - a. Community and non-profit organizations
 - b. Religious or humanist groups and organizations
 - c. Involvement in area education system
2. Making expertise available to community groups including, but not limited to:
 - a. Organizing, chairing, or serving as discussant/commentator for non-academic panels and conferences
 - b. Organizing, chairing, or serving as participant in student panels on-campus
 - c. Invited lectures for non-professional organizations (including those listed above)
3. Making expertise available to media including but not limited to:
 - a. Print interviews
 - b. On-camera interviews
 - c. Publication of articles, editorials, and opinion pieces in newspapers, magazines, and blogs
4. Giving public testimony
5. Consulting services offered pro bono for community and non-professional organizations (including those listed above)

Expectations for satisfactory achievement in service vary in proportion to the candidate’s reported effort for service, as described in the following table:

Objective	Reported Effort for Service	Service Expectations
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	10%	Fulfill a total of five expectations from at least two categories above, in any combination.
Promotion to Professor	10%	Fulfill a total of seven expectations from at least two categories above, in any combination.

REQUIRED APPLICATION MATERIALS

An application for promotion/tenure consists of two principal components:

1. Letters from external reviewers

Three letters from external reviewers are required to support requests for tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or higher.

The process of selecting reviewers should begin at least four months prior to the start of the fall term in which the candidate intends to apply.

See *Letters from External Reviewers* below for more information.

2. The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio (“portfolio” hereafter) is compiled by the candidate to summarize and provide evidence of his/her achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service since the time of hire or last promotion.

The portfolio is due *no later than the start of the Fall term*. Consult the college calendar of promotion/tenure deadlines on the HR Promotion and Tenure Process website for the specific date.

See *Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Requirements* below for more information.

LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Requests for tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or higher must be supported by three letters from external (non-AU) peers or academic leaders *of the same or higher rank and tenure as that to which the candidate is applying* or, when appropriate, qualified professional peers with comparable standing as approved by the departmental committee and Department Chair.

To ensure adequate time to obtain the letters, the process of selecting external reviewers should occur in the spring term, *at least four months prior to the start of the fall term in which the candidate intends to apply*, and requests for letters should be made at least three months prior to the start of the fall term.

Refer to the college guidelines for detailed information about selecting and contacting external reviewers for letters, ensuring the confidentiality of the reviews, and other topics.

PROMOTION AND TENURE PORTFOLIO

The candidate for promotion/tenure must submit a portfolio that documents his/her achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Those achievements shall be assessed in the light of the candidate’s reported effort, rank, and years of service, and in accordance with the promotion/tenure criteria specified in these and the college guidelines.

The candidate should present the information that best supports his/her candidacy based on the expectations of his/her discipline. The candidate must submit his/her portfolio to the departmental promotion/tenure committee *no later than the start of the Fall term*. (Consult the college calendar of promotion/tenure deadlines on the HR Promotion and Tenure Process website for the specific date).

Refer to the college guidelines for detailed information about the format and organization of the portfolio. The lists of required and optional forms of evidence that appear in the college guidelines have been refined below to include departmental and discipline-specific materials.

Evidence of Teaching

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's achievements in teaching, especially as they pertain to the nine categories of teaching effectiveness listed under "Teaching Expectations" above.

Required Evidence

The following materials must be included:

- A list of all courses taught, organized by semester and including enrollments, for the past five years.
- Summary Reports of student course evaluations for all courses taught for the past five years.
- Copies of all summative Peer Evaluations of Teaching for the past five years.

Optional Evidence

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Up to three formative Peer Evaluations of Teaching or letters from a peer who has watched the candidate teach.
- Letters from up to 5 graduate students/advises that address the quality of the supervision received (if advising graduate students).
- A list of examples of student achievements such as projects, awards, honors theses, publications, presentations, time to degree for graduate students.
- A list of course and program development activities.
- Evidence that the candidate assesses whether or not s/he has been successful in improving student learning and meeting student learning outcomes.
- An annotated list of pedagogical literature and instructional development sessions that have influenced the candidate's teaching and how the candidate has addressed this information in planning his/her classes and instructional strategies.
- Data on student performance on standardized examinations pertinent to the discipline.
- Data on student performance in subsequent courses.
- Evidence of Scholarly Teaching. (See Section 4.7.2 in the *USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook* for definitions and criteria.)
- Other evidence that reflects excellence in teaching.

Evidence of Scholarship

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's achievements in scholarship, research, or creative endeavors, including the dissemination of his/her work through publication and other peer-reviewed outlets. Since not every publication or creative endeavor is of equal intellectual merit, the candidate should define and make the case for what is significant.

Required Evidence

The following materials must be included:

- A list of all publications that explicitly designates peer review from others.
- A list of refereed conference presentations.
- A list of relevant creative endeavors and activities, including art exhibitions; professional poetry recitals; theatrical, dance, or music performances; etc.
- Copies of the most recent publications that are to be counted as satisfying the minimum requirements specified in *Scholarship Expectations* above.

Optional Evidence

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Copies of additional significant publications by the candidate.
- A list of invited seminars and presentations.
- A list of funded research activities, with funding amounts.
- A list of grants, fellowships, and scholarships as appropriate to the discipline, with funding amounts and time periods during which funding was active.
- A list of involvement in the scholarly, research, and creative products of students and other trainees, including but not limited to, conference presentations, publications, and like creative activities.
- Evidence consistent with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, the Scholarship of Engagement, and The Scholarship of Discovery. (See Section 4.7.2 in the *USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook* for definitions and criteria.)
- Evidence of citations of the candidate's scholarship
- Copies of published reviews of the candidate's scholarship or creative work.
- Other evidence that highlights peer recognition of the quality and sustainable contributions of the candidate's scholarship in the field.

Evidence of Service

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's service as a member of communities within and beyond AU, and in activities that draw upon the candidate's professional expertise.

Required

The following materials must be included:

- A list of international, national, or regional professional committees, including any offices held.
- A list of USG, university, college, and departmental committees, organized by level, indicating leadership roles.

Optional

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Evidence that the faculty member links his or her work in some way to public contemporary issues and/or to improving quality of life.
- Evidence that the faculty member, either through scholarly work and/or service, applies knowledge toward solutions to complex societal problems and human needs.
- Evidence that the faculty member contributes to the continuous improvement of higher education.
- Evidence that the faculty member contributes in some way to the public good.
- Evidence that the faculty member has served his or her profession through professional organizations and/or other professionally oriented entities (service on national committees, offices held, etc.).
- A list of manuscripts, textbooks, or other materials reviewed as a peer reviewer for journals or presses.

PROCESS OVERVIEW

An overview of the promotion and tenure processes is outlined in Figures 1 and 2, respectively, of the university guidelines

As the candidate's materials move up the review process, each level will decide whether to support candidate's request for promotion/tenure. At each step of the process *that is marked with an asterisk (*)* in Figures 1 and 2 of the university guidelines (the Chair, Dean, and Provost steps), candidates shall be notified via Augusta University email within five (5) business days of the recommendation and receive a copy of the written summary. **Note that any identifying references to external reviewers must be redacted in the copy sent to the candidate.** A copy of this notification should also be sent to the candidate's Department Chair.

If, at any level (including review levels not marked with an asterisk), the recommendation is made not to support the candidate's request, the candidate and the previous level of review shall be notified immediately in writing of that decision. In such cases, the process stops and the candidate's materials

should not be forwarded to the next level unless the candidate appeals the decision. See *Appeals of Promotion and Tenure Decisions* below.

Additional information about the process, including the procedures for negative decisions and candidate appeals, may be found in the college guidelines.

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

The following guidelines apply to all members of any promotion/tenure committee:

- No individual shall serve on more than one promotion/tenure committee at different levels (department, college, university).
- No faculty member in a position at or above the level of Department Chair shall serve on any promotion/tenure committee.
- All promotion/tenure committee members shall adhere to AU's Individual Conflict of Interest policy.
- The chair of the promotion/tenure committee at each level (department and college) will provide a 1-3 page letter containing a written summary of the committee's recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. If the candidate has requested *both* promotion *and* tenure, the letter must contain separate sentences conveying the committee's recommendation with regard to each request. The letter should be prepared on official letterhead, should be addressed to the chair/head of the next level of review, and should address the candidate's achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. This letter will be added to Appendix A of the candidate's promotion/tenure portfolio as it moves to the next level of review. See *Process Overview* above for additional details on the review process.

Additional guidelines for the departmental committee are described below.

Departmental Committee Guidelines

Unless the candidate is an administrator or has a cross-departmental/cross-college appointment (see *Exceptions to Departmental Review* in the college guidelines), the promotion/tenure process begins with a departmental committee recommendation. Each department will establish a standing Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee ("departmental committee" hereafter).

The departmental committee will write a formal, detailed letter with an explicit recommendation concerning promotion/tenure for each candidate. The letter, which should be considered a form of peer review, must articulate clear reasons for the committee's recommendation, summarizing or making specific references to the evidence presented in the candidate's portfolio. Additionally, the letter should specifically address and qualitatively evaluate any material that may be difficult for non-specialists to evaluate. This letter should be prepared on departmental letterhead and inserted in Appendix A of the candidate's portfolio.

The departmental committee shall adhere to the following guidelines:

1. The policies and procedures (i.e., term limits, quorum rules, membership, voting procedures, etc.) of the departmental committee shall be established by the department. These policies and procedures

must be approved by the College Dean and the University Provost, published in the institutional policy library, made readily available to faculty, and reviewed at least every three years.

2. The committee must be comprised of a minimum of three members of the department who hold full-time appointments at the rank of Associate Professor or higher.
3. Recommendations for tenure shall be made by a minimum of three tenured members of the departmental committee.
4. In the event that a department does not have three eligible members as described in 2 or 3 above, qualifying faculty from other departments in the college must be appointed to the department committee by the Department Chair or his/her designee.
5. When outside members are elected/appointed to a departmental committee, every effort should be made to solicit members who have some understanding of the disciplines contained within the department and some familiarity with those disciplines' norms for excellence.
6. Quorum rules and majority vote percentage standards will be established by the department.
7. Appeals of departmental committee decisions are to be made in accordance with the appeal procedures outlined in the university guidelines.

The membership of the departmental committee is selected by faculty vote at the first departmental meeting of the academic year. Only full-time departmental faculty are eligible to vote, and only tenured faculty are eligible to serve. Six faculty are nominated. From those six, three members are chosen: (1) the highest vote earner from English; (2) the highest vote earner from World Languages; and (3) the next highest vote earner, regardless of discipline. The fourth highest vote earner shall be designated as an alternate, who will also work with the departmental committee in the event that another member of the committee submits an application for promotion or cannot fulfill his/her duties. The departmental committee will select a chair.

The departmental committee is responsible for reviewing pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion portfolios for the Department. Committee members will read portfolios, discuss the merits of applications, and write letters to the Department Chair to indicate the committee's support or non-support for each candidate. The committee will file additional copies as directed in the college and university guidelines.

The departmental committee is also responsible for reviewing policies and procedures related to personnel issues, including promotion and tenure. Any changes to procedure or policy must be submitted to the department for a vote. The committee should evaluate the departmental policy when changes are made to university or college policy to determine if adjustments to the departmental policy need to be proposed to departmental faculty.

PRE-TENURE REVIEW

Each faculty member's department shall provide a comprehensive pre-tenure review of his/her progress toward tenure during the candidate's third year of service. If the faculty member was hired with prior credit toward tenure, a mid-course review shall be conducted.

The review committee should instruct the candidate to submit his/her materials by **January 15** of the appropriate year, and must complete its review—including communicating its findings by written report to the candidate and the Department Chair—*no later than March 15 of that year*.

Additional details about the timing, format, and process to be used for pre-tenure review are described in the college guidelines.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Annually, Human Resources will provide the Dean with a list of faculty who are due for post-tenure review. The review shall be conducted five years after the faculty member's most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. The review committee should instruct the candidate to submit his/her materials by **January 15** of that year, and must complete its review—including communicating its findings by written report to the candidate and the Department Chair—*no later than March 15 of that year*.

Additional details about the timing, format, and process to be used for post-tenure review are described in the college guidelines.