### REVIEW TERM--FALL 2017

**Tenure and Promotion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of external evaluators due to Dean</td>
<td>03/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of external evaluators due to Provost from Dean</td>
<td>04/03/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of external evaluators approved by Provost</td>
<td>04/28/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio sent to external evaluators</td>
<td>07/25/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio to Chair/department/program</td>
<td>09/22/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio from Chair to Dean</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean to T&amp;P Committees</td>
<td>10/27/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;P recommendations to Dean</td>
<td>12/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean to Provost</td>
<td>01/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Actions</td>
<td>February – March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary letters sent to candidates</td>
<td>05/25/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Reappointment (faculty appointed Spring 2016 and those with tenure-clock extensions whose appointments end December 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio to Chair/department/program</td>
<td>09/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair to dean</td>
<td>10/03/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean recommendation to Provost</td>
<td>11/24/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Actions</td>
<td>12/12/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Reappointment (faculty appointed Fall 2014 and those with tenure-clock extensions whose appointments end August 2018)

Portfolio to chair/department/program 10/03/2017
Chair to dean 10/27/2017
Dean recommendation to Provost 12/22/2017
Provost Actions 05/16/2018

Annual Review (faculty with Spring appointment) 12/15/2017

Triennial Review Schedule

Faculty who wish to postpone the triennial for 1 year submit written request to the Dean with an endorsement from department chair
Portfolio to chair/department/program 10/15/2017
Chair to Dean 12/01/2017
Dean forwards triennial summaries to Provost 12/15/2017

Contract Renewal for Professors of Practice and Lecturers

Due to the Dean 12/15/17
Dean recommendation to Provost 02/16/18

REVIEW TERM--SPRING 2018

Tenure and Promotion (Only for tenure candidates whose probationary period ends in December 2018. This schedule is not for promotion to Full Professor. Such reviews must be conducted according to the Fall cycle.)

List of External Reviewers to Dean 09/29/2017
List from Dean to Provost 10/12/2017
List approved by Provost 10/31/2017
Portfolio sent to external evaluators 01/04/2018
Portfolio to Chairs/department/program 02/06/2018
Portfolio from Chair to Dean 02/20/2018
Dean to T&P committees 03/07/2018
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T&P recommendations to Dean 03/21/2018
Dean to Provost 04/06/2018
Preliminary letter sent to candidates 09/28/2018

First Reappointment (faculty appointed Fall 2016 and those with tenure-clock extensions whose appointments end August 2018)
Portfolio to Chair/department/program 01/26/2018
Chair to Dean 02/16/2018
Dean recommendation to Provost 03/16/2018
Provost Actions 05/16/2018

Second Reappointment Review (faculty appointed Spring 2015 and those with tenure-clock extensions whose appointments end December 2018)
Portfolio to chair/department/program 02/02/2018
Chair to Dean 02/27/2018
Dean recommendation to Provost 04/04/2018
Provost Actions 08/15/2018

Annual Review (faculty with Fall appointment) Due to Dean 05/15/2018

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY REVIEWS

Important General Points:

1. Confidentiality must be maintained throughout all faculty review processes.

2. Timeliness in meeting deadlines is important.

3. Follow all Provost office guidelines.

4. Make sure that faculty evaluators understand that any time taken for Family and Medical Leave (FML) should not be included in measuring the quantity or quality of research, teaching or service conducted by the candidate.

5. Pre-tenure assistant professors who have a tenure clock extension, with or without taking a FML, undergo a maximum of 5 reviews during their pre-tenure period – 3 annual and 2 reappointments. Generally, they should not undergo a review during the time of or immediately after they have been on FML.

May, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Department summary letter addressed to:</th>
<th>What is sent to Dean’s office:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>3 copies of the chairperson’s summary letter and candidate’s response or declination to respond from the pre-tenure professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triennial Review</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>The original triennial portfolio in a three-ring binder and two additional copies of the summary letter and faculty response or declination to respond from the tenured professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment Review</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>The original and two copies (3 total) of the reappointment portfolio, including copies of the recommendation form in each portfolio, in three-ring binders, and candidate’s response or declination to respond from the pre-tenure professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion Reviews</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>The original and eight copies (9 total) of the tenure or promotion portfolio, including copies of the recommendation form in each portfolio, in three-ring binders and candidate’s response or declination to respond from the faculty member. (One copy of supplemental information, such as books, DVDs, etc., may be sent to the Dean’s office for easy access during the deliberation process. A list of these materials should be included at the end of the supplemental section of the portfolio so reviewers know they are available.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP and Lecturer Contract Renewal</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>The original and two copies (3 total) of the portfolio, including copies of the recommendation form in each portfolio and candidate’s response or declination to respond, must be included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedures for Annual Reviews:**

- The Provost’s Office recommends that new faculty begin developing portfolios for their initial annual review and continue to add to these portfolios for reviews throughout their pre-tenure years. For annual reviews these portfolios are used by the department but not forwarded to the Dean.
Materials for the review are supplied by the pre-tenure professor to the chairperson who makes the portfolio available to the department’s tenured faculty. Once the portfolio has been reviewed, the chairperson convenes a meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss the pre-tenure professor’s progress.

The departmental conversation is summarized in a letter written by the chairperson. The departmental summary letter should include both an assessment of the pre-tenure professor’s teaching, research and service and carefully considered advice on how to maintain or reach departmental standards for tenure in these three areas. The chairperson will share and discuss the letter with the tenured faculty members.

The departmental summary letter is given to and discussed with the pre-tenure professor, she/he is required to provide a written response to the chairperson’s summary or declination to respond.

Three copies of the chairperson’s summary letter and the response from the pre-tenure professor is sent to the Dean.

**Procedures for Triennial Reviews:**

- Follow the Provost guidelines for the content and format of triennial portfolios.
- The department chairperson makes the triennial portfolio available to the full professors in the department and convenes a meeting to discuss the associate professor’s progress toward promotion.
- The chairperson writes a letter, summarizing the views of the full professors, which is shared and discussed with the full professors.
- The department chairperson discusses the summary letter with the associate professor and provides a copy for her/him. The department chairperson should inform the associate professor that she/he is required to provide a written response to the chairperson’s summary or declination to respond.
- The original triennial portfolio in a three-ring binder and two additional copies of the summary letter and faculty response, is sent to the Dean.
- In a department with fewer than three full professors, the chairperson, after consulting with the Dean and the associate professor being reviewed, will involve appropriate tenured full professors from a closely related academic discipline.
- If the chairperson is not a full professor, the Dean, will appoint a tenured full professor in the department to assume the chairperson’s duties with regard to the triennial review process.
- R&P section 2.2.4.2 allows a triennial review to be postponed for one year. A letter from the faculty member requesting the postponement and a letter of endorsement from the chair should be sent to the Dean. Postponements do not change the timing of subsequent reviews.

May, 2017
Requests for postponement of Fall 2017 Triennial Reviews are due in the CAS office by September 1, 2017.

Procedures for Reappointment Reviews:

- The candidate prepares a portfolio that follows all Provost guidelines for content and format.

- The department chairperson shares the portfolio with tenured department faculty and convenes a meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss the pre-tenure professor’s progress. The chairperson makes clear to the department faculty their responsibilities in reviewing the portfolio and writing their individual letters. Individual faculty letters should adequately address all three areas of scholarship, teaching and service and give a clear recommendation about reappointment. All letters must be signed; unsigned email letters are not acceptable.

- After receiving the faculty letters, the chairperson writes a departmental summary letter which should include both an assessment of the assistant professor’s teaching, research and service and carefully considered advice on how to reach departmental standards for tenure in these three areas. The chairperson will share and discuss the letter with the tenured faculty members.

- The chairperson will discuss the departmental summary letter with the candidate and provide a copy for him/her. The chairperson will inform the candidate that she/he is required to provide a written response to the chairperson’s summary or declination to respond.

- The original and two copies (3 total) of the reappointment portfolio, including copies of the recommendation form in each portfolio, in three-ring binders is sent to the Dean.

- Please be aware that it is possible that the Provost will decide to conduct Spring 2018 First Reappointment reviews using the new Lyterati eportfolio system.

Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Reviews:

- See R&P section 2.2.6.1 for the three ways of initiating a tenure review.

- A tenured associate professor may request a promotion review at any time.

- The department chairperson prepares a list of proposed external evaluators following the guidelines described in the next section.

- The candidate prepares a portfolio that follows all Provost guidelines for content and format. The research portfolio (candidate’s CV, statement on research and scholarship, and scholarly materials) is sent to the approved external evaluators. External reviewer letters are added to the portfolio, materials related to teaching and service are added to the
portfolio, and then the complete portfolio is shared with department faculty reviewers. For tenure and promotion reviews, the chairperson must convene a meeting to discuss the portfolio.

- The chairperson must ensure that each faculty letter adequately addresses the three areas of scholarship, teaching and service and gives a clear recommendation regarding tenure or promotion. Each faculty letter must be signed; unsigned emails are not acceptable.

- After receiving the faculty letters, the chairperson writes a summary letter about the department’s recommendation, which she/he shares and discusses with the relevant faculty. This letter summarizes: the voting members’ recommendations, analyzes the proposed action in terms of departmental goals and needs, and discusses in detail each of the criteria as applied to the candidate. The chairperson meets with the candidate and informs him/her orally of the department’s recommendation. The candidate may request the substance of this discussion in writing. The chairperson advises the candidate that he/she must submit written comments/response on the department’s evaluation or declination to respond, that will be included with the file or that he/she may withdraw from consideration and terminate the tenure/promotion review process.

- For tenure reviews – In a department with fewer than three tenured professors, the chairperson, after consulting with the Dean, will involve appropriate tenured professors from a closely related academic discipline.

- For promotions to full professor – In a department with fewer than three full professors, the chairperson, after consulting with the Dean, will involve appropriate tenured full professors from a closely related academic discipline. If the department chairperson is not a full professor, the Dean will appoint a tenured full professor in the department to assume the chairperson’s duties with regard to the promotion review process.

- R&P section 2.2.8.2 requires that all tenured associate professors be formally reviewed for promotion “not less often than every nine years.” However, a tenured associate professor may postpone a scheduled required promotion review for one to three years. The faculty member requests the postponement by submitting a written request to the dean which should be accompanied by an endorsement letter from the department chair.

- The original and eight copies (9 total) of the tenure or promotion portfolio, including copies of the recommendation form in each portfolio, in three-ring binders are sent to the Dean. (One copy of supplemental information, such as books, DVDs, etc., may be sent to the Dean’s office for easy access during the deliberation process. A list of these materials should be included at the end of the supplemental section of the portfolio so reviewers know they are available.)

Procedures for POP and Lecturer Reviews:

- The candidate prepares a portfolio that follows all Provost guidelines for content and format.

- The department chairperson shares the portfolio with all tenure-track (tenured and pre-tenure) department faculty and convenes a meeting of the faculty to discuss the progress.
of the POP/Lecturer. For reappointments of one or two years, only the department summary letter is required. For reappointments of three years or more, individual faculty letters and the department summary letter are required. All letters must be signed; unsigned email letters are not acceptable.

- The department chair will draft the summary letter, circulate among the faculty, and make necessary revisions.
- The chairperson will discuss the departmental summary letter with the candidate and provide a copy for him/her. The chairperson will inform the candidate that she/he must submit a written comment/response on the department’s evaluation or declination to respond that will be included in the portfolio.
- The original and two copies (3 total) of the portfolio, including copies of the recommendation form in each portfolio, are sent to the Dean.

**REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS**

1. The review schedules listed at the beginning of this document for faculty with department-only appointments also apply to faculty with joint appointments.

2. The Provost guidelines for preparation of portfolios are applicable to faculty with joint appointments. For faculty with joint appointments, the only additional document that should be included at the beginning of the portfolio is the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

3. In many respects the review processes for faculty with joint appointments are similar to the processes for faculty with department-only appointments. Please consult R & P 2.2.3.1 for a detailed description of review procedures for faculty with joint appointments. Here is a summary of the special procedures that apply to joint appointments:

   **Procedures for Annual Reviews:**

   - Evaluations must be made in accordance with the MOU.
   - The special committee members will meet with the tenured faculty in the home department to discuss the candidate’s portfolio.
   - The chair of the home department will write a letter summarizing the collective views of the special committee members and department tenured faculty. The members of both
groups will review the letter and make revisions to insure that significant differences in opinion, if any, are included in the letter.

- The home department chair and chair of the special committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss the summary letter, she/he is required to provide a written response to the chairperson’s summary or declination to respond.

**Procedures for Triennial Reviews:**

- Evaluations must be made in accordance with the MOU.
- The special committee will meet with the tenured full professors who are voting members of the home department to discuss the candidate’s portfolio.
- The chair of the home department will write the summary letter reflecting the views of all participating faculty members.
- A faculty member can object to this document, and if not satisfied, submit in writing his/her objections; these objections are included in the candidate’s triennial file.
- The chair discusses the summary letter (and any written objections to the letter) with the associate professor along with providing a copy for him/her. The department chairperson should inform the associate professor that she/he is required to provide a written response to the chairperson’s summary or declination to respond.

**Procedures for Reappointment Reviews:**

- Evaluations must be made in accordance with the MOU.
- The special committee members will participate in all meetings of the home department in which the candidate’s reappointment is discussed.
- The tenured faculty of the home department, including the chair, will write individual letters that include recommendations for or against reappointment and submit them to the department chair.
- The members of the special committee, including the chair, will write individual letters that include recommendations for or against reappointment and submit them to their committee chair.
- Individual letters from the home department will not be shared with special committee members and vice versa.
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• The department and special committee chairs then each write a letter summarizing the views of their respective groups.

• The members of each group will review and comment on their chair’s summary letter.

• After making any needed revisions, the special committee chair will send his/her summary letter and the individual letters from the special committee members to the home department chair.

• The individual votes of the tenured department faculty and special committee members will be tallied and separately recorded on the reappointment recommendation form.

• The home department chair will provide a copy to the candidate of the final written department summary letter and special committee summary letter.

• The department chair will inform the candidate that he/she is required to provide a written response to the department’s and special committee’s summary or declination to respond, that will become part of the reappointment review file.

• All individual letters and both summary letters will be forwarded to the dean as part of the reappointment review file.

**Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Reviews:**

• Evaluations must be made in accordance with the MOU.

• After the candidate’s tenure/promotion review file is prepared and external review letters are received, the special committee will meet with the participating faculty of the home department to discuss the candidate’s tenure/promotion file and external letters.

• The participating faculty of the home department will write individual letters that include recommendations for or against tenure or promotion and submit them to the department chair.

• The members of the special committee will write individual letters that include recommendations for or against tenure or promotion and submit them to their committee chair.

• Individual letters from the home department are not shared with special committee members and vice versa.

May, 2017
• The chairs will then each write a letter summarizing the views of their respective groups.

• The members of each group will review and comment on their chair’s summary letter.

• After making any needed revisions, the special committee chair will send his/her summary letter and the individual letters from the members of the special committee to the home department chair.

• The individual votes of the participating department faculty and special committee members will be tallied and separately recorded on the tenure/promotion recommendation form.

• In the event that the department recommendation (the majority vote of the department members) does not agree with the special committee recommendation (the majority vote of the special committee) the two votes will go forward in the tenure/promotion review file, together with the College Tenure Committee’s (Section 2.2.6.9) recommendation or the College Promotion Committee’s recommendation (Section 2.2.9.9), absent the designation of a “faculty recommendation.”

• The home department chairperson will provide a copy to the candidate of the final written department summary letter and final written special committee summary letter. The department chair advises the candidate that she/he must submit a written comment/response on the home department’s and special committee summary letters or declination to respond, that will become part of the tenure/promotion review file.

• All individual letters and both summary letters will be forwarded to the dean of the home department as part of the tenure/promotion review file.