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**Scope**

This document records the Department of History policies and procedures governing academic tenure and promotion in academic rank. These policies and procedures are in accordance with the Bylaws and Policies of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (Sections 402, 403, and 404) and the Mississippi State University Promotion and Tenure guidelines.

This document applies only to faculty members in tenure-track positions. The appointment and termination of non-tenure-track faculty members is governed by IHL Board Policy 404.01-401.02, and their promotion is governed by university, college, school and departmental policies. Such faculty members are not eligible for tenure, but may apply for open tenure track positions.

This document will be reviewed and revised as frequently as University and College procedures require. All suggested changes to this document will be made to the chair of the department promotion and tenure committee (hereafter called the department committee). The chair will distribute copies of the suggested change(s) to all the tenure track faculty members in the department. Only tenure-track faculty may vote on changes in the promotion and tenure document. Faculty must be present to vote, and a quorum is required. Changes are approved by a majority vote and must accord with the policies and procedures outlined in the College of Arts and Sciences document and the University document. Changes must be approved by the Dean of the College before they take effect.

The policies and procedures in effect in any academic year must have been fully approved by July 1 of that year.

Unaltered sections of the document remain in effect regardless of changes that are made to other sections.

**Academic Rank**

A faculty member of professorial rank must have a professional or terminal degree appropriate to the discipline (or the equivalent in training and experience), a strong commitment to higher education and to the mission of Mississippi State University, and a willingness to assume the responsibilities and obligations appropriate to a university faculty member.

Academic ranks at Mississippi State University include:

*Assistant Professor*: A faculty member with a terminal or professional degree (or on the rare occasion when a person has established a national reputation because of the equivalent in training and experience) in the discipline and a potential for successful research, teaching, and service.

*Associate Professor*: A faculty member who has met the criteria for assistant professor, who has consistently demonstrated excellence in research and satisfactory performance in teaching and service. Based upon the criteria established in the department promotion and tenure document, an associate professor is developing a national reputation, and is showing potential for sustained contributions to the university and to his/her profession or field.

*Professor*: A faculty member who has met the criteria for associate professor, who has consistently demonstrated excellence in research and either teaching or service, and satisfactory performance in the remaining area. Based upon the criteria established in the department promotion and tenure document, a professor is expected to have a national reputation in his/her area of expertise.

**Promotion**

Promotion is never granted routinely for simple satisfactory performance or for length of service, but reflects progressively higher professional competence and accomplishment. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, or from associate professor to professor, will normally only be considered after a faculty member has served at least five years in rank so that sustained productively at MSU can be demonstrated. Applications for promotion prior to that time will be regarded as early action and considered only for exceptionally strong and well documented cases. Rank should reflect comparable stature with others in similar disciplines in other university settings. Professional achievement at another academic institution may be considered for promotion.

**Tenure**

The granting of tenure is a faculty driven process and is the academic community's chief guarantee of academic freedom for the faculty member to perform his/her academic duties without undue or inappropriate external pressures.

Definition: Tenure is defined by IHL Board Policy 403.01 as:

Continuing employment that may be granted to a faculty member after a probationary period upon nomination by the Institutional Executive Officer for election by the Board.

IHL Board Policy 403.0104 further provides that a tenured faculty member is protected from dismissal except under the following extraordinary circumstances:

a. Financial exigencies as declared by the Board;

b. Termination or reduction of programs, academic or administrative units as approved

by the Board;

c. Malfeasance, inefficiency or contumacious conduct; or

d. Cause.

According to IHL Board Policy 403.01, tenure is granted in a department unless otherwise designated by the IHL Board.

Attainment of tenure at Mississippi State University is by no means automatic, based on years of service, but is the result of a thorough evaluation of a faculty member's performance in teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service. The proportions of these activities will vary by discipline. Excellence in research and satisfactory performance in teaching and service are needed to qualify a faculty member for tenure in the History Department.

Tenure is granted with the expectation that the faculty member will continue to perform at or above the minimum standards set by the department, college, and university.

Eligibility: Tenure may hereafter be granted only to associate professors, professors, and simultaneously to assistant professors upon promotion to associate professor. Professors of all ranks in specifically designated tenure-track positions may work toward tenure. Non-tenure track faculty positions cannot be converted to tenure-track positions (IHL section 404.01). Graduate assistants and adjuncts, research assistants and associates, lecturers, instructors, visiting or adjunct professors, and all other employees are non-tenure-track. An instructor, even if a full-time employee in an academic department, may not be automatically promoted to assistant professor upon earning a terminal degree.

Probationary Period: At MSU, a faculty member may apply for and be recommended for tenure by the president during the sixth full contract year of employment in a tenure track position. Failure to earn tenure after the sixth full contract year will result in a terminal contract in the seventh full contract year. The probationary period for tenure track faculty begins at the start of the faculty member's first full contract year. A full contract year is defined as one that starts on or prior to August 16 for 9-month employees and on or prior to July 1 for 12-month employees and continues until the next contract period. If the initial contract is for a partial year, e.g., starts after August 16 for a 9-month employee and after July 1 for a 12-month employee, that time is not included in the probationary period allowed.

Up to four years at other universities and up to three years in the rank of instructor may be counted in this probationary period, as determined and agreed upon by the university and the faculty member in the letter of offer at the time of initial appointment.

For clearly stated personal reasons (e.g., emergencies related to health, activation of military service, pregnancy, adoption, child care, care of parents), a faculty member may request an exclusion of up to two years from the first five years of this probationary period for an approved leave of absence or a modified assignment. Specific aspects of such an extension must be established by the department head or director, the dean, the provost, and the faculty member. Such an agreement must be in writing. The department promotion and tenure committee shall be notified in writing of the extensions and the revised probationary period.

IHL Board Policy 403.0101 allows an administrative employee who held faculty rank and tenure at another institution to be awarded tenure at the time of initial appointment upon the recommendation of the faculty of the tenuring department, the dean, the provost, and the president.

**Relation of Promotion and Tenure**

Faculty members who have met the requirements for promotion, but who have not fulfilled the probationary period for tenure, may be promoted without tenure. Faculty members who are granted tenure as assistant professors automatically meet the criteria for associate professor.

**Performance Standards and Evaluation of Professional Activities**

Every faculty member is expected to meet high standards of professional competence, integrity, and collegiality and to further the goals of the History Department. In every case, a faculty member's performance in research, teaching, and service will be judged by all parties to promotion or tenure decisions on the basis of the specific criteria listed in this document. Department criteria are based on the application of the highest professional standards and are in harmony with the standards listed in the college and university promotion and tenure documents.

**Department of History Criteria:**

Research

Scholarly research is essential to professional growth. With teaching, it ranks as an integral function of the University. The Department expects of its members a vigorous, self-motivated, and continuing commitment to productive scholarship. The guidelines which follow are considered the minimum for the rating of excellence required in this area for tenure and promotion.

Scholarly research should result in the publication of scholarly monographs, biographies, reference works, anthologies edited for a scholarly audience, primary sources edited for a scholarly audience, synthetic works, and articles in anthologies and/or scholarly journals. In evaluating a candidate's performance the department committee should give primary consideration to the quality, originality, and significance of the work. The candidate's efforts should be such as to have secured peer commendation from without the University as well as from within. The department committee should take into account, whenever applicable, the degree of difficulty of placement of articles and acceptance of book-length manuscripts in the candidate's field of study; the accessibility of the research materials necessary for completing the project; and the extent of innovative research—in methodology or field of concentration—in the quantity of research completed.

The department recognizes that awards of research grants from outside sources and the winning of professional awards and prizes are an indication of scholarly merit. It also recognizes as evidence of continuing scholarly development and peer recognition the presentation of papers, the commenting on papers, the chairing of sessions at professional meetings, and the critiquing of manuscripts for journals and publishers.

To be considered by the department for promotion to associate professor, a candidate must have an excellent performance rating in research. This means that a candidate should have made important published contributions to the scholarship in his/her field and should show promise of sustained achievements of scholarly significance. It is expected that the candidate, at the minimum, will have produced a book-length, peer-reviewedhistorical monograph published by a reputable publisher. In addition, the candidate is to produce three other significant publications, one of which should be an article in a leading journal in his or her field.

A candidate may substitute a major digital history project for one of the additional publications beyond the monograph, but *not* for the article in a leading journal in her/his field. As the AHA’s *Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship by Historians* (2015) suggests, digital history projects showcase the use of digital tools, methodologies, presentation forms, and/or archival practices as mediums for the collection, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of original historical research; they thus “represent a commitment to expanding what history is, and can do as a field, as well as the audiences it addresses.” As such, digital histories are *not* simply the digital versions of publications on paper; nor are they blogs or social media posts (either personal or professional). Normally, digital histories: 1) use digital tools and/or media to collect, interpret, *and* analyze original archival research, oral testimony, or other source materials for audiences on the web, or 2) innovatively create wholly new digital tools or web-based platforms for historians to use for research and/or to disseminate their research. A candidate wishing to pursue this option should read the AHA’s *Guidelines* and must consult with members of the department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee for suggestions about how best to document their project’s progress, achievements, impacts, and collaborations. In addition, the candidate and the Promotion and Tenure Committee will plan how the Committee will solicit external blind peer review of the project. In all cases, candidates *must* inform the Promotion and Tenure Committee of their intention to use a digital history project as part of their promotion and tenure dossier no later than the start of year four of their probationary period. When being evaluated for promotion and tenure, the candidate will include the external blind peer review of the project as part of their dossier. In addition, the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair and department head, in consultation with the candidate, should ensure that at least one external reviewer (and preferably two) is qualified to evaluate this digital work.

In determining excellence, quality will take precedence over quantity. The originality of the work, the reputation of the publisher, the academic community's reception of the work, and other similar qualitative measures will influence committee deliberations. Supplementary evidence of peer recognition of productive scholarship, such as attainment of competitive research grants, winning of professional awards and prizes, and substantive participation on programs at scholarly meetings may be considered as further evidence of excellence.

To be considered by the department for promotion from associate professor to professor, the candidate must have made sustained, substantial scholarly contributions since the last promotion. In addition to published works presented for promotion from assistant to associate professor, the candidate, at the minimum, must have produced another book-length, peer-reviewed historical monograph with a reputable publisher. The candidate is also expected to produce a minimum of three other publications but may substitute a major digital history project for one of them, excluding the article in a leading journal in her/his field. At least a year prior to standing for promotion to professor, the candidate must inform and consult with the Promotion and Tenure Committee as outlined above.

In determining excellence, quality will take precedence over quantity. The originality of the work, the reputation of the publisher, the academic community's reception of the work, and other similar qualitative measures will influence committee deliberations. Supplementary evidence of peer competitive research grants, winning of professional awards and prizes, and substantive participation on programs at scholarly meetings, may be considered as partial evidence of excellence.

Teaching

The department expects effective teaching of its members at both undergraduate and graduate levels. An effective teacher is one who seeks to broaden the intellectual horizons of his/her students through the careful selection, organization, and presentation of material in which he/she is thoroughly competent. The department expects of its members a demonstrated willingness to meet with students for academic counseling beyond the classroom. An effective teacher must maintain sound academic standards in his/her evaluation of the performance of his/her students. Faculty undergoing evaluation should provide documentation to substantiate their satisfactory teaching performance on the university campus or at the national or international level. It should be systematically selected and be representative of the total range of teaching assignments. This may include student evaluations and evaluations by peers or the department head. Additional documentation may come from letters from former students, syllabi of courses taught, sample course materials, graded student work, graduate student theses and dissertations, recordings of teaching sessions, grade distributions, enrollment trends, new courses and their relevance, course or curriculum revisions, evidence of undergraduate and graduate student (current and former) accomplishments, evaluations of textbooks for publishers, teaching-related grants, faculty teaching awards, and evidence of advising responsibilities, etc.

Should the faculty member be considered unsatisfactory in teaching, it is incumbent upon the department head and/or the department committee charged with reviewing the individual's request for tenure/promotion to present clear and convincing evidence to that effect, such as failure to carry out duties as prescribed in the Faculty Handbook and other relevant college and university documents.

Service

The department expects that its members will contribute positively to the necessary workload of making it function smoothly through service on committees and other assignments which may be given by the head or the department. Members should also be willing to serve on college and university committees and to accept special assignments. This is a normal part of involvement in the total community. In judging the importance of such activity the departmental committee should take into consideration the nature of the committee or the assignment and the effectiveness of the individual in such assignments, rather than mere service per se. The latter can be ascertained by contacting those who serve with him/her.

Members of the department should demonstrate their professionalism by attending scholarly meetings and accepting responsibilities within professional organizations when given such opportunities. Service to the profession may also be recognized in the form of reviewing manuscripts for various journals and publishers, reviewing books for professional journals, evaluating grant applications for professional and governmental agencies, and serving on review panels for professional awards or prizes.

The university also recognizes service activities that enhance the quality of life or society, or promote the general welfare of the institution, the community, the state, or the nation. These activities include the extension of academic knowledge to the public, membership on regional, national, or international scholarly committees, boards, or review panels, or service on public boards as a representative of the scholarly community.

To be considered for excellence in service, the faculty member must present evidence such as: office in Faculty Senate or chair of an active University or College committee; officer or committee member of a professional organization; participant through scholarly presentations at professional meetings; reviewer for national journals, presses, prizes, or awards; conducting workshops; supervising teaching assistants; administering external grants, etc.

**Annual Faculty Evaluation and Review**

At the time of initial appointment, each faculty member will be informed in writing by the department head or unit administrator whether the appointment is tenure-track or non-tenure-track and will be given a copy of this promotion and tenure policy, as well as any college and university promotion and tenure policies. The new faculty member will respond in writing that the terms of employment are understood and agreed to.

During the probationary period, the department head will counsel with each faculty member annually about progress toward promotion and tenure. This annual evaluation will comprise a written review of the previous year's progress and a written agreement about the faculty member's objectives, responsibilities, and expectations for the coming year, and the department head's assessment of progress toward tenure. Probationary faculty may request that the Promotion and Tenure Committee provide input into annual evaluations progress toward tenure or into a pre-tenure review.

The written agreement about the coming year must be consistent with the promotion and tenure criteria of the department, the school or college, and the university. If the department head and the faculty member cannot reach agreement, the matter will be referred to the dean or director.

The annual evaluation, signed by both parties, will be sent to the dean or director. The faculty member has the right to attach a dissenting statement to all copies of this evaluation.

No record in personnel files relating to promotion or tenure is to be added, changed, or withdrawn without the knowledge of the faculty member and the unit administrator. Personnel files are confidential and are available only to the faculty member, department head, dean or director, provost, and president. With the approval of the applicant, these officers will make all pertinent information available to elected promotion and tenure committees and administrators when the faculty member is a candidate for promotion and tenure. If the material from a personnel file (or other material that is not in the candidate’s promotion or tenure application) is provided to a committee or administrator, then the candidate will be provided a copy of the material and an opportunity to submit his/her written comments regarding the material before the material is considered by the committee or administrator. Otherwise, no additions will be made.

**Department Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The History Department Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all full-time tenured faculty members in the department who are not excused from service for the following reasons:

No faculty member functioning as an administrator, department head or director of an academic unit will be a member of the committee;

No faculty member may participate in an applicant's promotion or tenure review at more than one level (Thus department members who serve on the college or university promotion and tenure committees cannot simultaneously serve on the department committee);

No member of the committee will consider the application of a relative;

No individual will serve in a year that his or her promotion application is being considered.

Applications for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor are reviewed by every member of the department committee who is not excused for the preceding reasons.

Applications for promotion to professor are reviewed by every member of the department committee who holds that rank and is not excused for the preceding reasons.

The department committee must consist of at least three members. If three members are not available because of absence, recusal, or insufficient rank, the professorial faculty of that department will elect substitutes from the professors of an appropriate unit.

At its last meeting of the year the committee will annually elect a chair and secretary for the following year.

**Third-year review**

The purpose of the third-year review is to provide tenure-track faculty with a critical analysis of their progress toward tenure and promotion. Based on the review, the tenure-track faculty member should understand the relationship of the candidate's work to date as it applies to the standards required for promotion and tenure in the sixth year. Near the end of the third year of appointment (some time during the sixth semester of appointment), the department committee will request from the candidate an organized packet of materials that documents the candidate’s progress toward meeting or exceeding department standards for research, teaching, and service. The candidate is encouraged to seek advice and input from department committee members on how to organize the third-year packet. Ideally, this packet organizes the materials to date that will be resubmitted in the sixth year as part of the candidate’s application for tenure and promotion.

After reviewing the packet, the department committee shares a written assessment with the candidate and department head that analyzes the candidate’s research, teaching, and service and makes specific recommendations that will assist the candidate in reaching the department's standards for promotion and tenure. This third-year review is also sent to the dean as part of the annual review process for all assistant professors in their fourth year.

In the third-year review, the committee does not vote on the candidate’s work because the candidate's future prospects for promotion and tenure, not his or her current status, is the issue before the committee. If the committee and/or department head finds that the candidate’s progress is not satisfactory, they may set forth a program for improvement to be monitored closely by the department head and a subcommittee of the department committee over the next year. If the department head believes that such a program will not produce satisfactory results, he or she may recommend to the dean that the candidate not be reappointed. The department head may also make such a recommendation if the program of improvement set forth for the candidate is not being satisfactorily met at the end of the next year.

For faculty members with a shortened probationary period as specified in an offer letter or an approved extended probationary period, the “third year review” should be held at the midpoint of the individual’s probationary period.

**External Peer Reviews**

External peer reviews of the candidate’s research help the department committee and department head determine the extent to which the candidate has established a national reputation in his or her field of expertise. These external evaluators do not cast votes on promotion and tenure nor should they judge the candidate’s chances for tenure and/or promotion at their institutions. Obvious conflicts of interest disqualify someone from serving as an external reviewer.

The external reviewers will generally be tenured professors at institutions of at least equal prestige to MSU. An appropriate choice for an external reviewer would be a faculty member in a department that is considered comparable to the candidate's department. Obvious conflicts of interest should be avoided when selecting external reviewers. A collaborator may be an external reviewer, but not if a conflict of interest exists. Conflicts-of-interest in general would include but not necessarily be restricted to previous mentors, previous graduate students, collaborating co-authors, collaborating co-investigators, or relatives/past-relatives.

By April 1, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must notify the chair of the department committee and the department head of intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure in the fall. Five letters from experts in the candidate’s field at peer or peer plus institutions are to be solicited so that if one never materializes, the department still meets the college’s requirement of four external peer reviews. Shortly after April 1, but before finals week, the candidate will provide the department committee and head with a list of at least five people who are qualified to serve as external evaluators. At least one of the external reviewers selected must come from the candidate’s list of eligible reviewers. By May 15 the department committee and head will create separate lists of ten or more potential reviewers. These lists should be long enough to secure the minimum requirement of evaluators in a timely manner. The identity of reviewers will not be disclosed to the candidate.

The department head will solicit reviewers using the university template (available at the Provost’s website). All promotion and/or tenure applications must include an explanation of the credentials of the reviewers. The reviewers will be sent the appropriate parts of the History Department Promotion and Tenure document and a copy of the candidate’s C.V

Copies of all the candidate’s scholarly materials, not just materials since last promotion, are sent to the reviewers as soon as the reviewers are identified and agree to serve. Material from the candidate that emerges over the summer can be added to the file and sent to reviewers. Internal documents, such as annual reviews by the department head, shall not be included.

The external reviewers will be asked to return their recommendations to the department head by September 30.

All letters received from external reviewers must be included in the dossier of the candidate unless the department head and department promotion and tenure committee collectively decide to withdraw a letter from the review process if it contains information that refers to or describes a conflict-of-interest. In instances when substantial modifications of the application have occurred (e.g. official notifications of accepted publications or awarded grants) after documentation has been forwarded to the external reviewers, these achievements can be communicated in a letter written by the candidate and forwarded to the department head. The letter should be included in the section of the dossier containing the external letters of review.

The head will maintain custody of the letters to ensure confidentiality. Members of the department committee may view the letters and use them for their determinations at any reasonable time.

**Procedures for Faculty Promotion and Tenure**

The decision to recommend tenure to the IHL Board of Trustees is made by the president. All judgments made at lower levels of the university are recommendations to the president.

Prior to the offer of hire, the appropriate promotion and tenure committee will make a formal recommendation on the initial appointment of any faculty member or administrator at the rank of associate professor or professor, on the acceptance of experience as the equivalent of a terminal degree, and on the award of years of credit for service at another institution of higher education toward fulfillment of the minimum probationary period for tenure.

A faculty member eligible for consideration for promotion or tenure must have notified the department head and chair of the department committee in writing by April 1 so that external evaluations can be collected for the candidate’s application. The faculty member must provide the department head with a completed application and all pertinent and available supporting documentation by September 15. The department head has the responsibility to assist, where appropriate, the faculty member in preparing materials for tenure and promotion. The candidate is also encouraged to seek advice from members of the department committee on how to build and organize the application packet.

The candidate makes a formal application for promotion or tenure by completing the MSU Tenure and Promotion Application form and attaching supporting documentation. The supporting documentation, known as the packet, must accurately and persuasively show how the candidate has met or exceeded every standard for promotion or tenure. Supporting documentation for research productivity should include publications, conference papers and lectures delivered to professional organizations, grants or awards sought and/or received, a summary of past, present, and future research plans, and any other evidence that documents research excellence and the candidate’s growing national and/or international scholarly reputation. More information on documenting research can be found in this document under Department of History Criteria. Supporting documentation for teaching accomplishments should include syllabi from a range of courses taught, sample essay assignments and other course assessments, peer reviews of teaching, curriculum development activities, evidence of student accomplishments, student evaluations, teaching awards, and any other evidence that demonstrates how the candidate has met or exceeded the department’s teaching standards. If the candidate includes student evaluations, this documentation is only accurate and persuasive if all available student evaluations are included in the packet. Handpicking only the most favorable evaluations for inclusion is not an acceptable form of documentation. More information on documenting teaching can be found in this document under Department of History Criteria. Supporting documentation for service accomplishments includes letters from committee chairs or professional officers that evaluate the candidate’s service on department, college, university, or professional committees, public lectures or other evidence of public outreach, service to scholarly publications in the form of manuscripts reviewed for journals or presses, book reviews, public interviews or other forms of scholarly publicity, and any other evidence that demonstrates how the candidate has met or exceeded the department’s service standards. More information on documenting service can be found in this document under Department of History Criteria.

No material may be added to the application and packet after the department committee’s decision, unless the applicant, department head, and the department committee agree to consider it. The request will be made in writing, define what is being added or removed, state the purpose for the change in the application, be signed by all parties, and be included as part of the formal application. Letters of recommendation regarding the disposition of the promotion and/or/tenure application will be added to the dossier at each level of review. If the candidate submits letters of factual correction for any level of review, those letters and any review-level response (described below) will also be included in the application.

After submission of the application and packet, the candidate customarily takes no further part in the process until a decision had been announced by the president. No discussion of correspondence relating to the application is to be initiated by the candidate with any of the reviewing authorities, including the external evaluators. Deliberation at all levels will be confidential.

The candidate will be officially notified of the disposition of the application at each level of the process. The written recommendations made at each level in the process will be provided to the candidate, and placed on file by the department head, dean or director, and provost. The candidate may respond to the department promotion and tenure committee’s letter and/or the department head’s letter to correct any factual errors represented therein within 5 working days of the candidate’s receipt of the letters. The candidate’s letter of factual corrections must be sent to the committee and/or head. The committee and/or head may address the concerns in a new letter to be included in the application within 5 working days of receipt of the candidate’s letter of factual correction. All letters shall be included in the application as it proceeds through the review process.

These recommendations will be the basis of future discussions of professional development between the faculty member and the department head.

The faculty member has the right to discontinue the review process for tenure or promotion at any point before a decision has been made.

The department committee will assist the department head in reviewing the eligibility of all faculty members who have met the minimum requirements for advancement in rank or tenure. The committee will base its recommendation upon available and pertinent evidence documented in the faculty member’s promotion and tenure application and packet. The committee will arrive at its recommendation on the question of promotion and/or tenure by taking a single vote evaluating the three areas (research, teaching, service) as a whole. This vote will be conducted by secret ballot with a simple majority determining the outcome. This recommendation, with accompanying reasons, including the committee’s detailed evaluation of research, teaching, and service, will be provided in writing to the department head. If the committee is significantly divided about the recommendation, the minority can submit a written report to the department head that explains how and why its evaluation differs from the majority.

The department head will make a separate recommendation, based upon available and pertinent evidence, documented in the faculty member’s promotion and tenure application and packet, including the recommendation of the committee and the minority report, if one exists. This recommendation may agree or disagree with that of the committee.

By November 15 the department head will send to the dean a separate packet of materials for each candidate, consisting of:

1. The formal application of the candidate with attached materials. The full contents of the packet will be included only if specifically requested by the dean. Likewise, materials in the packet will not be forwarded to the provost unless requested.

2. A letter concerning each candidate, giving the following information:

a. The head’s evaluation of the candidate’s research, teaching, and service.

b. The summary vote of the department committee.

c. A summary of the procedures followed by the department in evaluating the candidate.

3. The written recommendation of the department committee with supporting arguments.

4. Each of these letters of recommendation and rationale will be copied to the candidate. The letters will be redacted only insofar as necessary to conceal the identity of the external reviewers.

5. The chair of the college promotion and tenure committee is responsible for inserting letters of recommendation and rationale from the department head and the department promotion and tenure committee, along with any letters related to correction of factual errors at the departmental level, into the dossier of each candidate reviewed by the college promotion and tenure committee.

December 15 (or earlier) the college promotion and tenure’s committee letter of recommendation and rationale for each candidate shall be sent to the college dean. Letters of recommendation and rationale shall be copied to the candidate. The letters will be redacted only insofar as necessary to conceal the identity of the external reviewers. The letter concerning each candidate must include the committee’s summary of the procedures followed by the college committee in evaluating the candidate and the committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness, research and /or creative achievement, and service to the profession and university. The college promotion and tenure committee chair is responsible for providing the dean each of the candidate’s application, including letters from previous stages of the review. For each candidate, the dean is responsible for collection and inclusion of any letters related to correction of factual efforts at the college level.

By January 15, the dean will send to the provost a separate packet of materials for each candidate, consisting of:

1. The formal application of the candidate with attached materials, including all materials received from the department head. Supporting documentation from the packet will be included only if specifically requested by the provost.

2. A letter concerning each candidate, giving the following information (the letter will be copied to the candidate in addition to being sent to the provost:

a. The dean’s evaluation of the candidate’s research, teaching, and service.

b. The summary vote of the college committee.

c. A summary of the procedures followed by the academic unit in evaluating the candidate.

3. The written recommendation of the college committee with supporting arguments.

The provost will review the recommendations of the department head, the dean, and the department and college committees and will make a recommendation to the president by March 10.

The president will review the recommendation of the provost and will decide to accept or reject that recommendation.

The president will transmit that decision, together with reasons for a negative decision, to the faculty member directly, with copies to the dean, department head, and chairs of college and department promotion and tenure committees.