

# Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

## OVERVIEW

These Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (“Pamplin guidelines” hereafter) are intended to foster excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service among the college’s faculty. These guidelines do not supersede, but supplement and further elaborate on 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, Pamplin 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 mid-course 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 departmental 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 university guidelines for promotion/tenure are applied within Pamplin, including any college-specific procedures or criteria for assessment. This document only addresses the most pertinent, college-specific criteria for promotion/tenure of full-time, tenure-track faculty. Guidelines for the review and promotion of Lecturers are in Appendix 3 of this document.

Additional topics and information may be found in the university guidelines, Section 8 of the BOR Policy Manual, and Section 4 of 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](http://www.augusta.edu/pamplin/resources.php).

Departmental and discipline-specific criteria for promotion/tenure are described in the Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (“departmental guidelines” hereafter), which may be accessed from the Resources page of the Pamplin website.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview.....	1
Appropriate Credentials and Experience .....	3
General Expectations and Assessment Criteria .....	4
Required Application Materials .....	8
Letters from External Reviewers.....	8
Promotion and Tenure Portfolio .....	9
Process Overview .....	13
Promotion and Tenure Committee Guidelines .....	14
Appeals of Promotion and Tenure Decisions.....	16
Pre-Tenure Review .....	17
Post-Tenure Review.....	19
Appendix 1: External Reviewer Disclosure and Approval Form .....	22
Appendix 2: Sample Letter to External Reviewers.....	25
Appendix 3: Review and Promotion of Lecturers .....	27

## APPROPRIATE CREDENTIALS AND EXPERIENCE

The minimum credentials and experience required to be eligible for each rank and tenure are listed in the following table:

Status	Rank	Minimum Criteria (as of the effective promotion date)
Full-time, tenure-track	Assistant Professor	Terminal degree (or nearing its completion), or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience.
	Associate Professor	Terminal degree or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Completion of at least <i>four</i> years, but normally <i>five</i> , as Assistant Professor.
	Tenure	Terminal degree or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Completion of at least <i>five</i> years, but not more than seven, as Assistant Professor or above.
	Professor	Terminal degree or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Completion of at least <i>five</i> years as Associate Professor.

Neither the possession of appropriate credentials nor longevity of service is a guarantee of promotion or tenure. Since expectations for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor are the same, candidates normally apply for both at the same time.

Credit toward promotion/tenure shall only be awarded if it was specified in the candidate’s contract at the time of his/her initial appointment. Except when credit is awarded, faculty members are typically eligible to apply for tenure at the start of their sixth year of continuous, full-time service, and may not apply later than at the start of their seventh year of service.

Faculty who intend to apply for promotion/tenure should make that fact known to their Department Chair by the January prior to the fall term in which they intend to apply to ensure they are eligible.

### Exceptions

The following exceptions are permitted under the college and the university guidelines:

- A faculty member may apply for tenure at the start of his/her fifth year of service at the invitation of his/her Department Chair and Dean.
- A faculty member may apply for tenure later than his/her seventh year of service if he/she is granted a one- or two-year extension for an event that qualifies under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), but does not necessarily result in a formal leave of absence. Normally, such an extension *must be requested within three months of the extenuating event*. See “Extension of Probationary Tenure Periods” in the university guidelines for additional details.
- A faculty member may apply for promotion with fewer than the required minimum years of service in rank if the request has strong justification and approval by the president.

See BOR Policies 8.3.6-7, USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.5, and the university guidelines for additional information or exceptions to these criteria. Definitions of terms pertaining to status and rank may be found in AU policy on Faculty Classification.

## GENERAL EXPECTATIONS AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

In accord with the policies established by the Board of Regents (BOR) and Augusta University, Pamplin specifies three areas of assessment for the award of promotion/tenure:

1. Teaching
2. Scholarship
3. Service

A fourth area—“professional growth and development” as delineated in BOR Policy 8.3.6.1—is subsumed in these three. All faculty are expected to engage in professional development that enhances their teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities.

Since faculty expertise, responsibilities, and workload vary, the candidate’s contributions in each area shall be assessed in terms of the candidate’s rank, discipline, and reported effort. Departments will specify appropriate expectations for promotion/tenure in accordance with these variables.

At each level of review within the college, the candidate’s contributions in each area will be assessed based on the evidence presented in the candidate’s promotion/tenure portfolio and external letters. Positive recommendations for promotion/tenure shall require a finding of “outstanding” in the areas of Teaching and Scholarship, and “meets the standards” in the area of Service.

General expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for Pamplin faculty are described below. Effort- and discipline-specific criteria may be found in the departmental guidelines.

### 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.

Pamplin faculty are expected to employ teaching methods and techniques that recognize a variety of learning styles, cultural backgrounds, and instructional settings. Instructional and curricular innovation is encouraged, especially when it provides ways for students to become actively engaged in the lesson or the work of the discipline. Faculty members should also be skillful advisors and mentors, encouraging students to seek and engage in other educationally- and professionally-beneficial experiences outside of the classroom, when appropriate.

All Pamplin faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching, to maintain a regular program of assessment of their teaching, to stay abreast of new techniques in the literature, and to share those ideas with the campus community. As faculty become more senior, it is expected that the scope, depth, and/or impact of their teaching efforts should also increase, especially with regard to directed student learning activities outside of the classroom and curricular contributions beyond their immediate course responsibilities.

Responsibilities and expectations for teaching, regardless of rank, are listed in the following table:

<b>Responsibilities</b>	<b>Teaching Expectations</b>
Knowledge of the subject matter	Has command of the subject matter. Demonstrates breadth and depth of knowledge. Remains current on developments in the field.
Effective planning and communication of curriculum	Organizes study of the subject effectively, including student learning outcomes and instructional objectives. Is well prepared for each class. Constructs appropriate syllabi and materials. Covers material consistently and deliberately with good organizational planning. Structures classroom discussions in a manner that facilitates learning. Stays abreast of new technology, innovative teaching practices, and pedagogical tools. Meets teaching obligations diligently: begins/ends class on time, submits grades on time, cancels classes only for exigent circumstances, and compensates for missed time by scheduling make-up classes or other pedagogical means.
Supervision of students	Fosters student accomplishment of objectives (services, procedures, internships, apprenticeships, etc.), when applicable.
Creation of engaging learning environments	Creates an environment conducive to learning. Motivates students to learn. Makes effective use of different teaching methods and technologies as appropriate. Conveys concepts through content delivery, questioning, and moderation of student discussion, as appropriate.
Fostering of student development and engagement	Stimulates critical thinking, analysis, and other forms of active engagement by students.
Availability and receptivity to students	Is reasonably available to students. Is receptive to student questions. Maintains regular office hours. Offers advice to students on academic and professional matters.
Fair and timely evaluation of student performance	Assesses student work/performance in a fair and timely manner. Creates appropriate examinations. Develops guidelines for student papers or presentations. Grades student examinations, papers, or presentations impartially. Creates and uses appropriate tools for reviewing and evaluating areas of hands-on performance and ethical and professional responsibility.
Student advisement	Advises students on academic and professional matters during and outside of assigned advisement periods. Is knowledgeable of graduation requirements, general registration procedures, and any other requirements stipulated in the advisee's major.
Innovation in educational delivery	Utilizes innovative techniques in educational delivery which foster excellence in student learning and performance, as appropriate to the discipline.

See the departmental guidelines for discipline-specific criteria for outstanding teaching.

### 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 departmental guidelines for discipline-appropriate forms of scholarship.

Pamplin faculty are expected to establish a lead role in scholarship, research, and/or creative endeavors. Those efforts must be of high quality, appropriate to the candidate’s college and professional affiliation, and should be on a trajectory of national and international development. Candidates are also encouraged to collaborate; however, each individual should make original contributions to collaborative processes.

General expectations for scholarship are listed in the following table:

Objective	Scholarship Expectations
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	Trajectory of <i>regional</i> and <i>national</i> scholastic development. Growth as an accomplished scholar and/or artist within his/her discipline, with new dissemination of his/her work through publications or other peer reviewed outlets at an outstanding level.
Promotion to Professor	Sustained record of publication in high quality, refereed professional journals; publication of a monograph with a peer reviewed, national or international academic press; or artistic endeavors that have peer recognition and have reached a national or international audience since last promotion or hire. Leadership role for grant writing activities as appropriate to his/her discipline. Dissemination of his/her scholarship at <i>national</i> or <i>international</i> conferences on a consistent basis since promotion to Associate Professor. Promise of continued achievement in scholarship or creative endeavors.

Items accepted for publication *prior to the candidate’s hire or last promotion* shall not count toward the minimum departmental expectations for scholarly publication/production unless such credit was specified in the candidate’s contract at that time.

Items accepted for publication during the period under review will be counted towards scholarship, even if they are not yet in print, as long as evidence confirming acceptance (e.g. correspondence from the publisher or press) is included in the candidate’s promotion/tenure portfolio.

Items “in progress” or “under submission”—but not yet accepted—shall not be credited toward minimum departmental expectations for publication/production; however, reviewers may consider such items as evidence of the quality, trajectory, and/or sustained effort of the candidate’s scholarly agenda.

See the departmental guidelines for discipline-specific criteria for outstanding scholarship.

### 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, including:

- *Service to the profession*: participating or holding office in professional associations and societies, professional adjudications, organizing a conference, serving on an editorial board, serving as external reviewer for grants or a peer-reviewed journal, and other such contributions.
- *Administrative service*: duties normally expected of program directors, assistant chairs, and other university-sanctioned administrative appointments below the rank of Department Chair.
- *Academic service*: activities within AU, such as serving on committees, overseeing programs, consulting with committees or peers, lectures, conducting workshops, providing instruction beyond assigned teaching load, and providing other services or assistance.
- *Community service*: activities in which the candidate applies his/her professional expertise to the broader community, such as serving on committees, administering programs, consulting, lecturing, conducting workshops, providing instruction, media interviews, op-eds, and other such contributions.

Service activities outside AU which relate to fulfilling one’s civic duty, but not to the candidate’s professional expertise, should *not* be considered in evaluating service.

As faculty become more senior, it is expected that the scope and depth of their service efforts will also increase, especially with regard to their service to the profession.

General expectations for service are described below:

Objective	Service Expectations
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	Satisfactory (“meets the standards”) service to his/her department, college, university, and profession.
Promotion to Professor	Sustained record of satisfactory (“meets the standards”) service to his/her department, college, university, and profession.

See the departmental guidelines for discipline-specific criteria for satisfactory (“meets the standards”) service.

## 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 one week after the first day of classes in the fall term in which the candidate is applying.

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 (Appendix 1).

### Selecting and Contacting External Reviewers

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.

The departmental promotion/tenure committee and the candidate should work together to contribute to a list of external reviewers (Appendix 1). The candidate may recommend colleagues from other institutions who have significant scholarly reputation and sufficient knowledge of the candidate’s work, but with whom the candidate does not have a close personal or professional relationship that may prevent the reviewer from making a fair and impartial assessment. The candidate shall disclose the nature of any relationship he/she may have with any reviewer listed. The departmental committee and/or Department Chair may challenge any reviewer whose relationship to the candidate is deemed

close enough to pose a potential conflict of interest, or whose qualifications are deemed inadequate. The candidate can challenge for cause any reviewer listed.

After generating a mutually acceptable list of at least *six* qualified reviewers, the departmental committee will select three names, but *shall not inform the candidate which three it has selected*. The departmental committee or the Department Chair will contact the selected reviewers and provide clear instructions about the purpose and scope of the review.

At a minimum, each external reviewer is to be provided with a copy of these college guidelines, the departmental guidelines, the candidate's curriculum vitae, and at least one representative sample of the candidate's scholarship—the latter of which the reviewer should assess in terms of its quality and importance in the field.

At the department's discretion, external reviewers may be asked to assess additional materials evidencing the candidate's contributions to scholarship, teaching, and/or service, as appropriate. Departments should keep in mind that the more materials they include for external review, the greater the likelihood it may pose a hardship for the candidate, who will need to provide those materials by the time reviewers are contacted, well in advance of the deadline for submitting his/her completed promotion/tenure portfolio.

See Appendix 2 for a sample letter to external reviewers, which may be adapted as needed.

### **Deadline for External Review Letters**

Letters from external reviewers must be signed, dated, and on official stationery. All letters should be received *at least one week prior to the first day of classes in the fall term in which the candidate is applying*. The Department Chair shall ensure that the letters are received by the deadline.

### **Confidentiality**

The candidate shall not be informed of the identity of the three reviewers selected by the departmental committee. If the candidate subsequently wishes to review the letters written by the external reviewers, he/she must make a written request to the Dean of the Pamplin College who has the sole responsibility for redacting letters. Only redacted letters that protect as fully as possible the identity of the external reviewers will be made available to the candidate, and only in response to a written request.

## **PROMOTION AND TENURE PORTFOLIO**

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

The candidate should present the information that best supports his/her candidacy based on the expectations of his/her discipline. This information should be presented in the most concise manner possible (using lists, tables, and diagrams) and must adhere to the format and organization specified

below. (Departments may require or request additional information to help them make their decisions, but those additional materials should remain at the department level; they should not accompany the portfolio as it moves up to the college promotion and tenure committee.)

### Submission Deadline

The candidate must submit his/her portfolio to the departmental promotion/tenure committee *no later than one week after the first day of classes in the fall term*. Once the initial application has been made, the committee may request supplementary materials or rebuttal documents if it is deemed necessary; otherwise, the candidate shall not be permitted to make changes or additions to the portfolio after the submission deadline.

### Format and Organization

The portfolio must be submitted as a single PDF document that contains all of the following materials, in order, using the specified headings to mark the start of each section:

Order	Heading	Description
1	Application Form(s)	Complete separate forms for promotion and tenure if applying for both. The forms may be downloaded from the AU website. Signatures are required on the forms.
2	Curriculum Vitae	A current curriculum vitae in the appropriate college format.
3	Annual Evaluations	Summary page(s) from the candidate's annual performance evaluations for every year since last review or promotion
4	Teaching Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 11 font) highlighting the candidate's teaching philosophy, methods, and procedures, and how these contribute to student learning, as well as contributions in student advising and mentoring.
5	Evidence of Teaching	See <i>Evidence of Teaching</i> below.
6	Scholarship Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 11 font) highlighting the significance of the candidate's scholarship, including publications, presentations and other examples of scholarship. The candidates should explain how his or her scholarship contributes to regional, national or international prominence, appropriate to rank.
7	Evidence of Scholarship	See <i>Evidence of Scholarship</i> below.
8	Service Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 11 font) highlighting the candidate's service to his/her profession, department, college, university, and/or the USG.
9	Evidence of Service	See <i>Evidence of Service</i> below.
10	Appendix A	Letters from the departmental promotion/tenure committee(s), the Department Chair, the college promotion/tenure committee, and the Dean.

No other materials should be included in the portfolio except those that fall within the format and scope specified in the table above. Examples of appropriate forms of evidence are listed below.

## 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

The following materials must be included:

- A list of all courses taught, organized by semester and including enrollments, since the date of hire or last promotion.
- Summary sheets of annual faculty evaluations since the date of hire or last promotion.
- Copies of all summative Peer Evaluations of Teaching since the date of hire or last promotion.
- Summary sheets of student course evaluations for all courses taught since the date of hire or last promotion.

### Optional

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 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

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.

### Optional

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Copies of 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.)
- 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, AU, 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.

## PROCESS OVERVIEW

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

The review process begins with the departmental committee. Positive decisions to support the candidate's request for promotion/tenure subsequently move up, in order, through the following levels of review: the Department Chair, the college promotion/tenure committee, the Dean, the university promotion/tenure committee, and the Provost.

As the candidate's materials move up the review process, each level will decide whether to support the candidate's request for promotion/tenure and shall notify the candidate of the decision as required in the university guidelines. If, at any level, the decision 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 candidate's materials should not be forwarded to the next level unless the candidate successfully appeals the decision. See *Appeals of Promotion and Tenure Decisions* below.

The candidate shall have the right to withdraw his/her name from consideration for promotion and/or tenure at any time in the review process.

## PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

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

- All candidates for promotion/tenure shall be notified *in writing* within five business days of the recommended decision, and receive a copy of the written summary, at each step of the process outlined in Figures 1 and 2 of the university guidelines.
- 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 one-page written summary of that committee's recommendation for promotion/tenure. The summary will address teaching, scholarship, and service. This summary will be added to 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 college and departmental promotion/tenure committees are described below.

### College Committee Guidelines

The Pamplin College Promotion and Tenure Committee ("college committee" hereafter) shall adhere to the following guidelines:

1. The college committee will consist of seven members, all full-time, tenured, and holding the rank of either Associate Professor or Professor. The seven members will consist of one representative elected from each of the following departments:
  - Art
  - Communications
  - English and Foreign Languages
  - History, Anthropology, and Philosophy
  - Music
  - Political Science
  - Sociology, Criminal Justice, and Social Work
2. Exceptions to this committee membership policy may be appealed by the Dean to the Provost. The Provost will review college committee membership annually.
3. Approximately one-third of the committee membership will be elected/appointed each year. Initial committee members will be elected/appointed to one-, two- or three-year terms. Members shall not serve consecutive terms. Initial terms will be determined by lot. In the event a member must

be replaced before his/her term of service expires, that member's department shall recommend a replacement to the Dean.

4. All committee members are eligible to vote on tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion decisions.
5. A quorum will consist of 75% of those eligible to vote, who must be physically or real-time virtually present at the meeting. A 60% majority vote of those present physically and real-time virtually will be required to pass a motion to promote or to tenure. Since the vote required is 60% of the members *present*, an abstention will have the same effect as a *no vote*.
6. In the event that a sufficient number of qualifying faculty is not available in the college, faculty outside the college shall be appointed by the Dean to serve on the college committee. When outside members are appointed to the college committee, every effort shall be made to solicit members who have some understanding of the disciplines contained within the college and some familiarity with those discipline's norms for excellence. The procedures used to place outside members on the committee must be harmonious with the elected/appointed proportions described in 1 above.
7. Appeals of the college committee decisions are to be made in accordance with the appeal procedures outlined in the university guidelines.

### **Departmental Committee Guidelines**

Each department will establish a standing Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee ("departmental committee" hereafter) which will serve as the first level of review in the promotion/tenure process except in cases specified in *Exceptions to Review by Departmental Committee* below.

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. A copy of this letter shall be forwarded to the Department Chair and to the candidate.

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. Tenure recommendations 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.

### **Exceptions to Review by Departmental Committee**

#### Administrators

In the case of administrators (Department Chairs and above) being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the individual's superior will appoint a three-person committee to review the portfolio and make a recommendation. This committee serves in place of the departmental committee. The three individuals will have the same or higher rank and tenure status for which the candidate is being considered. The candidate will be reviewed in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendation is made to the college promotion/tenure committee.

#### Cross-Departmental and Cross-College Appointments

In the case of cross-departmental appointments within one college, the Dean shall designate the applicant's primary department for the purposes of this process and shall establish a procedure for appropriate consultation between the primary department and other department(s) in which the candidate holds appointment. Once established, the normal procedures for promotion/tenure review will be followed.

In the case of cross-college appointments, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall designate the applicant's primary department for the purposes of this process, establish a procedure for appropriate consultation between the primary department and other department(s) in which the candidate holds appointment, and notify the Deans of the appropriate colleges as to the manner in which they should share the responsibility of making a recommendation on the application.

## **APPEALS OF PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS**

A candidate may appeal a recommended decision at each level of the promotion/tenure review process within 10 business days from the date of communication of the decision to the candidate.

In the event of such an appeal, Pamplin will follow the appeal procedures outlined in the university guidelines.

## Pre-Tenure Review

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the pre-tenure review shall be to provide the faculty member with a clear understanding of those areas that might need attention if the candidate is to continue his/her progress toward successfully achieving tenure.

### TIMING

Annually by August 1, Human Resources will provide the Dean with a list of faculty who are not yet tenured and have completed their third year on the tenure track. Each faculty member's department shall provide a comprehensive pre-tenure review of his/her progress toward tenure, which is to be completed and submitted to the Dean *no later than March 1 of the candidate's fourth year*.

If the faculty member was hired with prior credit toward tenure, a mid-course review shall be conducted. Assuming that a tenure review normally occurs in the sixth year of service, this mid-course review shall occur in the year that divides the difference between the years of credited service and year six in half (e.g., a person hired with two years credit would undergo this review during the second year of institutional service).

Faculty who believe they are due for pre-tenure review should make that known to their Department Chair and/or Dean in the year prior to their expected review, rather than waiting for official notification.

### BASIS OF REVIEW

The materials used for the pre-tenure review should be similar to those specified above in the *Promotion and Tenure Portfolio* section of this document; however, the candidate will not be required to provide internal or external letters of support.

### PROCESS

The pre-tenure review will be conducted by a committee of at least three tenured faculty members from the candidate's department or academic unit. If an insufficient number of tenured faculty exist within the unit, tenured faculty from a related field may serve on the committee; however, the candidate must consent to the appropriateness of the appointments. At the department's discretion, the review may be conducted by the departmental promotion/tenure committee. Any necessary exception to this procedure will be implemented by the Faculty Policies Committee.

The committee should review the candidate's progress toward the completion of the requirements of tenure as outlined in the university guidelines, as well as these and the departmental guidelines. The committee should examine and note the candidate's accomplishments, as well as provide constructive assistance to the candidate by detailing areas of weakness that he/she should address and any changes in orientation or activity that might aid the candidate in meeting the requirements for tenure.

The committee will prepare a written report summarizing its recommendations for improvement. That report should also remind the candidate that although the committee's comments are intended as an aid to achieve tenure, the successful satisfaction of the committee's recommendations will not alone guarantee a positive tenure review. A copy of the report shall be delivered to the candidate and to the candidate's Department Chair. The candidate and the Department Chair will review the report together.

Once approved and signed, the report must be submitted to the Dean of the college for consideration and approval. The Dean will notify the Office of the Provost when the pre-tenure review has been completed.

## Post-Tenure Review

### PURPOSE

All units are required to conduct a periodic, regularly scheduled review of tenured faculty to provide ongoing assessment of teaching, scholarly achievement, and service activities of the individuals after they have been granted tenure.

### TIMING

Annually, by August 1, 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. It shall be completed no later than the end of that academic year. If an individual is on leave at the time of review, he/she will be reviewed during the first academic year after his/her return.

Faculty who believe they are due for post-tenure review should make that known to their Department Chair and/or Dean in the year prior to their expected review, rather than waiting for official notification.

### BASIS OF REVIEW

The faculty member shall submit a Post-Tenure Review Portfolio that describes his/her achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service since the time of last review. That portfolio must adhere to the format and organization outlined under "Post-Tenure Review Portfolio" on the Resources page of the college website (<http://www.augusta.edu/colleges/pamplin/resources.php>).

The review will encompass teaching, scholarship, and service. It will focus on the materials presented in the portfolio, which will be assessed in the light of the faculty member's assigned/reported effort, rank, and years of service.

Competence in all three areas is expected, as is excellence in the area of highest reported effort. Lack of activity in an area for three years shall be deemed unsatisfactory.

### PROCESS

Review will be conducted by at least three tenured faculty members, all or a majority of whom should be in the Pamplin College (typically, a subcommittee of the Pamplin Promotion and Tenure committee). A representative of the individual's department may be included as a non-voting member of the review committee.

Results and recommendations of the review committee will be communicated in writing to both the individual faculty member and the Department Chair. The Department Chair and the committee will come to an agreement on the content of the review. If they cannot come to an agreement, the Dean will be consulted.

The Department Chair will then review the findings with the individual faculty member. The individual faculty member will be provided with a written copy of the report at least five working days prior to the meeting. The faculty member and the Department Chair will sign the document after review. If the faculty member desires, he/she may prepare a written response. The Department Chair will then transmit the report and any response to the Dean.

In the case of reviews of Department Chairs the results will be communicated directly to the Dean. After review by the Dean, the report and any response will be communicated to the Provost with a recommendation for further action or no further action.

### **Post-Tenure Development Plan**

When areas of deficiency are noted and further action is required, the Department Chair is responsible, in consultation with the faculty member and Dean, for establishing a Post-Tenure Development Plan (PTDP) directly related to the findings of the post-tenure review and identifying appropriate resources for completion of the PTDP. If a PTDP is required for a Department Chair, it will be developed by the Dean in consultation with the Chair. The PTDP shall be included with the report and forwarded to the the Provost.

The Post-Tenure Development Plan (PTDP) shall do all of the following:

1. specify goals or outcomes that are required for the faculty member to overcome identified deficiencies
2. outline specific activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes
3. set appropriate times within which the goals or outcomes will be accomplished (which should not exceed three years)
4. indicate the criteria by which progress will be monitored

The Department Chair will monitor the faculty member's progress and reassess the plan annually as part of the faculty member's annual evaluation.

The Dean will be responsible for financial arrangements associated with the PTDP. If the nature or scope of the PTDP is such that the individual cannot carry out other duties, the Department Chair and the Dean shall make other arrangements for these duties to be completed.

At the end of the PTDP the individual shall be reviewed by a three-member review committee. If possible, the committee should have the same members who completed the original review. Results of the review will be communicated in writing to the Department Chair. The Department Chair and the committee will come to an agreement on the content of the review. If they cannot come to an agreement, the Dean will be consulted.

1. Upon satisfactory completion of the PTDP the individual shall continue with five-year reviews, such time commencing with the next academic year after completion of the program.

2. If completion of the PTDP is deemed unsatisfactory by the review committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean, this decision with a recommendation from the Department Chair and the Dean will be referred to the President for further action.

All records of reviews will be retained by the Dean's office. At the end of each academic year the college must forward to the office of the Provost the names of the faculty members reviewed that year, the results, and the names of each member of the review committees.

A faculty member who disagrees with the results of a post-tenure review, a PTDP, or any subsequent actions resulting from the review process has the right to appeal, as outlined below.

### **Appeals of Annual and Post-Tenure Evaluations**

Individual faculty members shall have an avenue for appeal of decisions made from annual review or post-tenure review, or for disagreement with a PTDP or any subsequent actions resulting from the evaluation process.

1. Decisions by an administrative head, Department Chair, or review committee may be appealed to the Dean within ten days of written notification of a decision, action, or finalization of a PTDP.
2. Decisions by the Dean may be appealed to the President within 10 days of written notification from the Dean. The President shall refer the appeal to an *ad hoc* Appeals Committee composed of the Chair of the FADPT Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate and four corps of instruction members to be named by the President, two of whom must be members of the Faculty Senate, one of whom must be from the College of the appellant, and in the case of post-tenure review appeals, three of whom shall hold tenure. The appellant has the right to strike for cause one member of the *ad hoc* Appeals Committee. The President shall inform the Dean and the Provost that an appeal has been submitted and is under review. The findings and recommendations of the Appeals Committee shall be made to the President. The appellant will be notified of the President's decision with copies to the Dean and the Provost.
3. Decisions by the President may be appealed in writing to the Board of Regents within 20 days of notification of the President's action.

Procedures for appeal at each level shall be available through the department and through the Dean's office.

## **EXCEPTIONS TO POST-TENURE REVIEW**

Tenured faculty who have a primary administrative appointment (greater than 50% reported effort) will not be subject to post-tenure review. If an administrator should return to a primary academic position, s/he will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will be evaluated under these guidelines in the fifth year following the return to the faculty and at subsequent five-year intervals.

## **Appendix 1: External Reviewer Disclosure and Approval Form**

### Purpose

The “External Reviewer Disclosure and Approval Form” is to be used to identify appropriate external reviewers for the promotion/tenure process. Essential information about each reviewer is requested on the form, and all reviewers must meet the criteria established above in the *Letters from External Reviewers* section of this document.

### Instructions

The departmental committee and the candidate should work together to generate a mutually acceptable list of at least six qualified reviewers.

With regard to using the form:

- “Source” is the person who identified the external reviewer (normally, the candidate, a member of the departmental promotion/tenure committee, or the Department Chair).
- If the candidate has any relationship to the reviewer, that relationship must be disclosed in “Relationship to the Candidate.” If the person is an acquaintance or someone known from academic conferences, that does not necessarily disqualify them, but should be disclosed.
- The departmental committee can object to any reviewer whose relationship to the candidate is deemed close enough to pose a potential conflict of interest, or whose qualifications are deemed inadequate.
- The candidate can challenge for cause any reviewer listed.
- As the candidate and departmental committee reach agreement on the qualifications of each reviewer, that reviewer’s name should be added to the list with all requested information. Both the candidate and the chair of the departmental committee should sign to indicate their approval.
- If the departmental committee and the candidate are unable to generate a complete and mutually acceptable list, the Department Chair will make the final decisions to complete the list.

Once the list is finalized, the departmental committee will select three names to contact for letters *but will not disclose the identities of the selected reviewers to the candidate.*

The process of contacting reviewers to request letters should begin at least three months prior to the start of the fall term in which the candidate intends to submit his/her portfolio. See the “Sample Letter to External Reviewers” in Appendix 2 for additional details on making those requests.

Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences  
**EXTERNAL REVIEWER DISCLOSURE AND APPROVAL FORM**

Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Request (*check all that apply*):  Tenure  Promotion to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences – Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> [ ] Yes [ ] No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> [ ] Yes [ ] No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> [ ] Yes [ ] No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

## Appendix 2: Sample Letter to External Reviewers

[date]

[reviewer name]

[address]

RE: Review of [candidate] for [promotion/tenure, etc.]

Dear [name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for [candidate]. [Candidate] is applying for [objective – *e.g., tenure and promotion to Associate Professor*]. Your experience, expertise, and reputation make you an especially appropriate person to help us evaluate [his/her] achievements.

For your review, I am enclosing [identify the enclosed materials to be reviewed]. As you will note from the candidate's CV, [he/she] has [published/co-published/presented/exhibited/etc.] other works. I would be happy to send you copies of those as well if you would find them helpful. Certainly, to the extent that you are familiar with the candidate's other work and can evaluate the enclosed work in that context, we welcome your comments.

Copies of our college and departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion are also enclosed. Please note that our discipline-specific expectations for excellence vary according to the candidate's rank and reported effort. [Quote or summarize the relevant standards for the rank the candidate is seeking, including the rank and reported effort by which the candidate is to be judged.]

Your assessment of [candidate]'s scholarly/creative work will play a very important role in our review process. We ask that you please submit a written report that discusses the quality of that work, including:

- The technical and conceptual quality of the work.
- The extent to which it builds upon and advances scholarship in the field.
- The recognition the candidate has achieved in his/her field, including how his/her work is regarded by others, if known.
- The stature of the forums in which the candidate has published and presented his/her work.
- The trajectory of the candidate's scholarly/creative work and potential for future achievement.
- Whether the candidate's work meets the relevant standard for [identify rank/tenure candidate is requesting] as defined in the promotion and tenure documents we have provided.

If you have seen [candidate] present [his/her] work at professional meetings, we would also welcome any observations you might have about the quality of presentation. Likewise, if you have worked with [candidate] in other contexts germane to this evaluation, or have other information or commentary you deem relevant to [his/her] qualifications, we welcome that information as well.

The report should be in letter form, signed and on official stationery. Its length is subject to your discretion. We ask that you also include a copy of your curriculum vitae or biosketch. Our college promotion and tenure procedures allow us to share copies of the external review letters with the candidate upon request; however, in order to protect your confidentiality to the greatest extent possible, all identifying information—including your CV or biosketch—is redacted before those letters are shown to the candidate.

We would appreciate your report by [date – *no later than two weeks prior to the start of fall classes*] in order to complete our evaluation in a timely manner. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at [phone number] or by e-mail at [email address].

Please accept our sincere thanks for your assistance in this important matter.

Sincerely,

[Name of the chair of the departmental tenure/promotion committee]

[Title]

Enclosures

[NOTE: *Enclose a copy of the candidate's CV, the materials selected for review, a copy of the college and the departmental promotion/tenure guidelines, and any other materials that may be required for the reviewer to make a fair and informed assessment.*]

## **Appendix 3: Review and Promotion of Lecturers**

To carry out special instructional functions such as basic skills instruction, instructional staff members may be appointed to the position of Lecturer. Upon the completion of at least six years of full-time service at the institution, Lecturers are eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are not eligible for the award of tenure.

### **ANNUAL REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT**

Reappointment of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers must be completed on an annual basis and should be based on evidence of effective performance as determined by peer evaluations of teaching, student course evaluations, and annual review by the Department Chair.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless *notified in writing* to the contrary as follows:

1. For Lecturers with less than three (3) years of full-time service, non-reappointment notice should be provided as early as possible, but no specific notice is required.
2. For Lecturers with three (3) or more years but less than six (6) years of full-time service, non-reappointment notice must be provided at least 30 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester.
3. For Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with six (6) or more years of full-time service, non-reappointment notice must be provided at least 180 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester.

This schedule of notification does not apply to persons holding temporary, limited-term, or part-time positions, or persons with courtesy appointments such as adjunct appointments.

Not more than 20 percent (20%) of an institution's FTE corps of primarily undergraduate instruction may be Lecturers and/or Senior Lecturers.

### **SIXTH-YEAR REVIEW**

Per BOR Policy 8.3.8.1, reappointment of a Lecturer who has completed six (6) consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted *only if the Lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution*. Accordingly, Lecturers in Pamplin are required to undergo a mandatory sixth-year review.

At the conclusion of that review, Lecturers who have successfully demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value shall be promoted to Senior Lecturer and eligible for further

reappointment. Such promotion shall not be construed as a form of tenure or other guarantee of employment. Senior Lecturers remain subject to the same terms of review and reappointment as Lecturers. See *Annual Review and Reappointment* above.

### **Sixth-Year Review Dossier\***

The responsibility for providing evidence of instructional excellence resides with the Department Chair, who should work with the Lecturer to compile a dossier of appropriate supporting documentation. This dossier should be assembled at the *beginning* of the Lecturer's sixth year of service, *no later than one week after the start of classes in the fall term*. It must include all of the following:

- A cover letter summarizing the Lecturer's contributions to teaching and why those contributions constitute exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution.
- A position description for the Lecturer's currently-held position. If the reappointment/promotion includes a change in professional responsibilities, the proposed position description should be included.
- A curriculum vitae that summarizes relevant biographical, personal, and professional data.
- A list of all courses taught, organized by semester and including enrollments, since the date of hire.
- Summary sheets of annual faculty evaluations since the date of hire.
- Copies of all summative Peer Evaluations of Teaching since the date of hire.
- Summary sheets of student course evaluations for all courses taught since the date of hire.

Appropriate documentation of the Lecturer's ability and value goes beyond superior end-of-the-term student evaluations and annual reviews. Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Materials from classes, such as syllabi, exams, and samples of student work.
- Comments from peers who have collaborated with the Lecturer.
- Comments from student interviews.
- Letters of commendation from students, faculty peers, or external colleagues.
- Evidence of involvement in appropriate forms of professional development.
- Data showing that the Lecturer's students are highly successful in subsequent courses that build upon knowledge and/or skills taught by the Lecturer.

If the Lecturer has had reported effort in the areas of scholarship or service, the dossier should include appropriate evidence of those contributions as well.

*\* This process pending approval of revisions to the university guidelines by the University Senate. Until such approval is obtained, the dossier will proceed through the regular promotion review process—and follow the regular portfolio guidelines—as specified in the university guidelines.*

### **Sixth-Year Review Process\***

The Department Chair will forward the dossier and a recommendation for promotion and reappointment to the Dean no later than September 15 of the Lecturer's sixth year. If the Dean concurs with the Department Chair's recommendation, the Dean will forward the dossier and a recommendation for promotion and reappointment to the Provost.

If a decision not to recommend the dossier is made at any level, the responsible administrator at such level (e.g., the Dean or the Provost) shall in writing notify the Lecturer and the administrators who processed the dossier. The notification to the Lecturer shall include clear notice that the Lecturer shall not be eligible for further reappointment, and shall make the Lecturer aware of his/her right to appeal as described in the section below.

*\* This process pending approval of revisions to the university guidelines by the University Senate. Until such approval is obtained, the dossier will proceed through the regular promotion review process—and follow the regular portfolio guidelines—as specified in the university guidelines.*

## **APPEAL PROCESS**

Lecturers who undergo sixth-year review may appeal a negative decision. The appeal must be based on the perception of significant omissions or commissions in the review process, impermissible bias in the review, or procedural errors that precluded an objective, fair review. The appeal must be to the next level of review. The responsible administrator at the appeal level shall convene a committee to review the appeal and make a recommendation.

If the decision on appeal is to support the promotion, the review process shall continue through the remaining review levels as if the decision from which the appeal was filed had been positive. If the decision on appeal is against the promotion, a further appeal may be filed. The process of appeals may continue until a final decision by the President.