

DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE & DANCE

University of Colorado Boulder

Policies and Procedures on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

(revision of Fall 1999 and Fall 2001 documents)

These Departmental policies and procedures are intended to be interpreted and applied in a manner consistent with current Regents' laws and actions and other University policies and procedures, as described in the Faculty Handbook. In the event of a conflict, Regent laws and actions and other policies and procedures of the University shall prevail.

When a faculty member is reviewed by colleagues for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the interpretation of the terms *meritorious* and *excellent* must be consistent with the expressed goals of the University of Colorado Boulder and the Department of Theatre & Dance. UCB is the premier center for higher education in the state, and in terms of the quality of its faculty and students, it now ranks among the top group of AAU Public Research Universities. Our standards must be in recognition and support of UCB's growing reputation for excellence.

This document addresses Criteria, Documentation, Standards, and Procedures.

I. UNIVERSITY POLICY

A. GENERAL CRITERIA

Every faculty member with a tenure track appointment will be evaluated for reappointment, promotion, and tenure on the basis of three criteria:

1. Teaching
2. Research and/or Creative Work
3. Service

B. GENERAL STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

Reappointment requires evidence of satisfactory progress towards meeting the requirements for tenure. The comprehensive review for reappointment is normally conducted in the professor's third or fourth year of appointment (assuming no prior credit towards tenure). This review is similar to the tenure review process but with less outside evaluation. Reappointment may be for any number of years up to the mandatory tenure review year, which is the seventh.

"Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated *meritorious* performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service to the University and the faculty member's profession, and demonstrated *excellence* in either teaching or research or creative work" (CU Faculty Handbook, Standards, Process and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, and Promotion). In the seventh year of a tenure track appointment, review for tenure is mandatory. Should tenure be denied, the individual would be given a terminal one-year appointment for their eighth year. Up to three years of prior credit may be counted towards the normal seven-year probationary period.

The standards of performance that apply to faculty members on the seven-year tenure clock apply to faculty members who come up for early tenure. They must have a record of achievement in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service that is equal to the record of a faculty member coming up in the seventh year. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure.

Promotion to Associate Professor is normally considered at the same time as tenure, and with the same requirements.

Promotion to Full Professor requires the following:

Professors should have the terminal degree (or its equivalent) appropriate to one's field and (A) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be **excellent**; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (C) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative work, and service.

II. SPECIFIC DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES

A. Teaching

The Department of Theatre & Dance is a teaching-intensive academic unit. The disciplines of theatre and dance require an unusual amount of one-on-one student to teacher interaction. Teaching in the performing arts is a multi-faceted activity: applied and creative work must be continuously supported by elements of historical, critical, and theoretical knowledge. Additionally, the high degree of subjectivity in educating and training artists requires teachers who are exceptionally sensitive and strongly inspirational, as well as consummately knowledgeable in their individual fields of study. Thus, teaching effectiveness – both in and beyond the classroom – is given very careful scrutiny in the reviewing process. And, consistent with University policy, dance and theatre faculty believe that the best judgment of teaching effectiveness requires documentation based upon the use of multiple means of teaching evaluation. Documentation of effectiveness is essential. The primary components of multiple means in teaching evaluation in the department include the following activities:

- Written class evaluations by peers
- External assessments of evaluation, as appropriate
- Written student evaluation comments regarding learning experiences related to production activities, special projects, theses and dissertations
- Summary information from student exit interviews
- FCQ summaries for each class taught
- Letters from students solicited by the department
- Information extracted from student outcomes and assessment materials
- Evidence of success of graduates in the professor's area(s) of teaching
- Confidential student interviews conducted by another faculty member with a class being taught by the faculty member under review

CRITERIA

- a. "Statement of Purpose by the Professor"
 - How does the professor's teaching area relate to the Department's curriculum?
 - How does the professor explain his/her approach to teaching graduate and undergraduates, majors and non-majors?

- b. "Preparation"
 - What is the design and purpose of each course taught by the professor?
 - What is the nature of the exams and projects used in each course to determine student grades?
 - For what new courses or curriculum revisions has the professor been responsible?
 - Since joining the Department, in what ways has the professor enhanced his/her preparedness to teach?
- c. "Teaching - on campus"
 - How effective is the professor in the classroom?
 - How effective is the professor in teaching situations that are beyond the regularly scheduled courses of the Department (e.g., theatrical productions, dance concerts, honors essays, community-based projects, etc.)?
 - How effective is the professor as a director of projects, theses and dissertations?
 - How effective is the professor as an advisor?
- d. "Teaching - extramural"
 - What workshops, master classes, or lectures has the professor presented off campus?
 - On what academic committees outside of THDN and/or off-campus has the professor been invited to serve?
 - What kind of venue and/or producer brought the faculty member for this workshop, master class, or lecture? (The venue could be nontraditional, e.g, a virtual platform, First Nation chapter house, Town Hall, etc.)

DOCUMENTATION (in the Teaching Portfolio)

- a. Provided by the professor:
 - Statement of Purpose
 - Syllabus for selected courses with examples of exams and projects
 - Description of new or revised courses
 - Description of activities undertaken to enhance teaching
 - Teaching awards or special recognition
 - Pedagogical articles, books, or papers the professor has published and/or presented
 - (optional) Reports of student success
 - (optional) FTEP Survey of Good Teaching Characteristics and/or CLIP (Classroom Learning Interview Process)
 - (optional) GPA for each class taught
- b. Provided by the Department:
 - FCQ summaries for each class taught (Required)
 - Summary of student exit interviews
 - Class evaluations by peers
 - Letters of evaluation from former students solicited by the department
 - External letters of evaluation, as appropriate
 - Confidential student interviews conducted by another faculty member with a class currently being taught by the faculty member under review

STANDARDS IN TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS.

Courses that are well planned, effectively taught, and appropriately graded are the basis of ***meritorious teaching***. But most professors in the Theatre & Dance Department are also expected to function regularly and effectively as teachers in activities beyond the classroom. In such activities – e.g., production preparation, theses and dissertation direction, project supervision – informed guidance, willing assistance, and appropriate inspiration are the qualities which determine the level of teaching effectiveness.

The normal teaching load in Theatre & Dance for TT faculty is two classes per semester. The Department also recognizes the teaching merits of creative projects involving students.

Faculty/Course Questionnaires (FCQs) are required for each course taught, and constitute part of the teaching assessment. While there is no fixed standard of expectation, ***meritorious teaching*** in Theatre & Dance is characterized by Course and Instructor ratings that are consistent with the Department average, which is usually above the University average. Class composition, size, level, and course complexity are contextual factors within which the FCQ evaluations are considered by faculty peers.

Faculty members are expected to continue their personal development as teachers through participation in professional meetings and workshops, discipline-related travel and study, etc. And while "extramural" teaching – e.g., off-campus workshops and master classes, published textbooks and articles on pedagogy – cannot substitute for effective teaching within the Department, such activities enhance a professor's overall teaching evaluation and can be an important contributing factor to an increase of assessment from ***meritorious*** to ***excellent***. A case for tenure that is based on excellence in the Teaching category rather than in Research or Creative Work must offer significant accomplishments in extramural teaching and awards.

B. Research & Creative Work

The Theatre & Dance Department exists within the College of Arts and Sciences, and as such espouses a Liberal Arts rather than a conservatory context for the study and practice of our arts. This, along with the existence of graduate programs in both theatre and dance, makes scholarly research an important area of accomplishment for this faculty and some faculty members concentrate entirely on creative work. The department values innovation and transdisciplinary work that traverses disciplinary boundaries to create a holistic approach.

In cases of joint authorship, it is necessary to establish the contribution made by each author, if the work is included in a promotion or tenure dossier. Live and recorded works are frequently, although not always, collaborative endeavors. Thus, it is extremely important to know what role(s) a faculty member played on a particular production. In some cases, the faculty member will have had total responsibility for the production. In other cases, their role might have been that of writer, editor, etc. In cases of shared responsibility, it is incumbent on the faculty member to note their degree or level of involvement on a project, and then best to rely on experts in the field to determine the relative importance of each individual's contribution.

Whether through emergent technologies or conventional venues, we hold strongly to the principles of generative exchange and evidence of impact.

Research

For faculty members whose contributions to the Department are primarily in the category of research, the candidate must have accomplished the following in order to demonstrate excellence:

CRITERIA

- a. Published a scholarly monograph with a university or trade press well respected in the candidate's field or specialty. In the event that the book is still in production, the candidate should be able to produce page proofs of the book by the time the department votes on the candidate's dossier.
- b. Published articles in recognized scholarly journals practicing peer review or in edited scholarly volumes published by appropriate presses practicing peer review. In cases in which highly ranked publishers adopt processes other than peer review, the faculty member must argue for the journal's excellence within the faculty's specific field of study.
- c. Made demonstrable progress on a new scholarly project, beyond the first book. Any one (or more) of the following accomplishments will constitute evidence of demonstrable progress on this new project:
 - i. Presentation of material related to a new project at a scholarly conference
 - ii. Submission of a fellowship proposal to an internal or external scholarly granting agency
 - iii. A publication contract from a university or trade press well respected in the candidate's field or specialty, based on the peer review of the book manuscript.
- d. Other major research accomplishments, such as significant publications in alternative or trade venues, prestigious participation at scholarly meetings and/or invited talks, research grants and awards, will also be taken into account to achieving an evaluation above meritorious.

DOCUMENTATION

- Copies of select publications (provided by the professor)
- Published reviews of the published research/scholarly work (provided by the professor)
- Reviews of the published research/scholarly work (solicited by the Department)

STANDARDS

For an evaluation beyond meritorious to **excellent** in research, the Department expects accomplishments of national and/or international significance. The publication of theatre and dance reviews in refereed journals and the presentation of scholarly papers at professional meetings will strengthen a professor's case in research, but cannot substitute for articles and books. There is no specific quantity of publications that translates into a rating of **meritorious** or **excellent**. The quality and originality of publications, as attested to by outside evaluators, and the status of the journals or publishers are as important as the quantity of publications. Yet candidates are advised that colleagues, outside evaluators, and committees at all levels may regard less than a monograph and three articles as low productivity when the professor's focus is research rather than creative work

The publication of theatre and dance reviews in refereed journals and the presentation of scholarly papers at professional meetings will strengthen a professor's case in research, but cannot substitute for articles and books when the professor's focus is research rather than creative work.

Creative Work

The Department of Theatre & Dance at the University of Colorado Boulder draws on the following standards from leading national organizations in our field in its criteria for reappointment, tenure and promotion in the area of creative work.

According to principles enunciated by the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST): "Artistic achievements as an actor, playwright, director, or designer, or any other performance-related activity is considered the equivalent of scholarly or scientific research in purely academic disciplines and provides the same basis for advancement in faculty rank and salary." The national association, American Theatre in Higher Education (ATHE), has a standards document for promotion and tenure that makes the same point. The National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD) echoes this philosophy: "Creative activity and achievement must be regarded as being equivalent to scholarship in matters of appointment and advancement when the institution has goals and objectives for the preparation of dance professionals in performance and choreography."

As Creative Work in dance and theatre increasingly defies historical categories, we have an expansive definition of dance, theatre, performance, venue, producer, etc. The criteria for assessing Creative Work will be applied in one or more of the following areas:

- a. Performing artist (e.g., dancer, actor, musician)
- b. Interpretive and/or Generative artist (e.g., director, choreographer, fight director, playwright, screenwriter, composer, librettist, lyricist, translator, designer, dramaturg, vocal coach, movement coach, music director, etc.)
- c. Producer, artistic director, executive director, curator, literary manager, production manager, stage manager, technical director, etc.
- d. Applied Performance practitioner

CRITERIA

- a. Special professional recognition (e.g., competitive union membership, elected office, awards, peer reviews, commissions, residencies)
- b. Grant support (campus and non-campus) awarded for creative projects
- c. Commissions and invitations
- d. Co-authored/collaborative creative projects
- e. External evaluation / peer review (for all works, included self-produced)
- f. References in external scholarship and/or curricula
- g. Recordings and distributions of creative work
- h. Quality, selectivity, and importance of venue. The appropriate context for the objectives of the project may be for-profit or not-for-profit, and may be in a non-traditional performance space. We acknowledge the emerging importance of unconventional venues (i.e. site-specific work, museums, community spaces, virtual communities, etc.). Similarly, a regional venue may have a national or international import, therefore the case must be made on an individual basis for the significance of each venue.

DOCUMENTATION

Documented evaluation of creative work is essential. When scholarly writing is accepted for publication as a book or in a refereed journal, this becomes documentation of positive value placed on the work by presumably qualified and objective reviewers.

According to the ATHE "Guidelines," such documentation should be accumulated over an extended period of time and should include evaluations by the Chair, by faculty peers, and by outside experts. Such evaluations will be provided by the Department and may include contracts or commissions for creative work, programs and reviews of productions, and/or letters of evaluation from a producer.

For creative accomplishments, the professor should submit such documentation as:

- Portfolio that shows evidence of the creative process and product
- Evidence of invitation and/or acceptance to industry specific conferences, organizations, exhibitions, festivals, etc.
- Reviews: solicited and non-solicited
- Awards
- Testimonials
- Employment by a reputable professional company
- Invited performances and workshops
- Competitive union memberships
- Honors and accolades for creative work
- Honorary positions in professional organizations
- Elected leadership positions in professional organizations
- Materials, as appropriate, from the on-campus list above

STANDARDS

For an evaluation beyond meritorious to ***excellent*** in creative work, the Department expects accomplishments of national and/or international significance. Both the stature of the employing agency and/or collaborator and the professor's specific creative achievement must be assessed, just as we assess the reputation of a scholarly journal and the quality of the article published in that journal.

Work with visiting or local companies is considered a professional accomplishment. Venues that are regional in location but national or international in reach contribute to excellence in creative work. This signification of venue comes from the stature of the company based on hiring standards, awards garnered, grants earned, and critical review. While work with these companies may not actually be off-campus or outside of the Denver-Boulder area, employment is competitive as faculty work with and are hired by the same standards as those theatre and dance artists who are brought in from all over the world.

Research and Creative Work (Artist-Scholar)

The department recognizes that there are different kinds of artist-scholars: the body of work of the artist-scholar might include research and creative work projects that result in (1) publication and public performance, or (2) publication and applied performance. The artist-scholar asserts new knowledge through publications, producing creative work and/or devising frameworks for performance experiences.

CRITERIA

The artist-scholar may use artistic experimentation as a method of theoretical research; they may perform their research, and/or research their performance. When an artist-scholar carries out research in parallel with making creative work, they are engaged in a process of developing or employing frameworks that guide their practice and the evaluation of the outcomes. They may also be experimenting with and articulating techniques for addressing social issues through performance-based methods.

Another type of artist-scholar could pursue process-oriented creative work in the case of applied performance. (Applied performance is an umbrella term that includes creative work that is process-oriented and/or community-based, work which is often in non-theatrical spaces and contexts.)

DOCUMENTATION

In addition to the prescribed criteria and documentation outlined for research and creative work, additional documentation could include:

- Invitations to lecture or present on productions, applied performance, and/or community-based processes, projects, or products
- Ability to develop performance, rehearsal, and/or applied performance programs/models/practices that are adopted by others
- Ability to develop and sustain partnerships and programs
- Ability of performance work to impact a population or community (sometimes this evaluation is formal and sometimes – if the populations are vulnerable – would be more informal and not necessarily publicly documented for an audience outside of the target population)
- Ability to marry form and function; demonstrate how applied performance methods and forms support community populations in obtaining desired outcomes

STANDARDS

While some professors will concentrate exclusively in research or creative work, it is not uncommon for a theatre or dance professor to undertake projects that have both research and creative work dimensions. Such projects can lead to publication and to theatre or dance production. For example, efforts to reclaim a "lost" performance style might lead both to publication of an essay on that style and to a creative work inspired by it. When evaluating such projects, the department will use the prescribed criteria and documentation for research and creative work in order to determine the level of achievement in each area.

As a rule, when a professor has accomplishments in both research and creative work, they will be expected to identify one or the other as their principal area of accomplishment, which can be supplemented and enhanced by quality accomplishments in the other area – a supplement which could add to the quantity of the principal area. A **meritorious** evaluation in the principal area can be raised to **excellent** by virtue of accomplishments in the secondary area; however, an evaluation of **non-meritorious** based on accomplishments in the principal area cannot be raised to **meritorious** on the basis of accomplishments in the secondary area. In other words, it is always necessary for the professor to be at least **meritorious** in their primary area of research or creative work.

C. Service

Service is an essential part of a faculty member's contribution to the department and must warrant an assessment of **meritorious**, even though for the purposes of promotion and tenure it is not as important as Teaching and Research/Creative Work. Service, however valuable and well done, cannot substitute for the tenure requirement of **excellence** in at least one of the other two categories. For promotion to Full Professor, a faculty member's service contribution becomes a more important factor in the eyes of the Department.

CRITERIA

- a. Services for the Department and University (E.g., Department administration, committees, recruitment)
- b. Services performed for the community and the profession (E.g., officer or board member of a professional organization, community service volunteer, leader of a professional project.)

DOCUMENTATION

The professor's CV should clearly indicate specific instances of service, with descriptions and explanations where the nature of the service is not self-evident.

STANDARDS

Service should be performed conscientiously and in a manner that enhances the educational experience of students and the goals of the Department.

Theatre and dance are collaborative art forms, and faculty and staff must rely upon each other to contribute, in his or her specialty, to the production program. Cooperativeness, supportiveness, and collegiality are therefore more than just socially desirable traits; they are important qualities for a faculty member who is regularly involved in the creative activities of the Department. For such a professor to achieve a **meritorious** rating, they must be an effective and constructive contributor to the production process. Faculty members who are not involved in the production program may be expected to contribute more in the areas of Department administration, advising, recruitment, and representing the Department beyond the campus in scholarly meetings and activities, although Teacher/Artists are not excluded from such activities.

III. SPECIFIC DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES

When a faculty member is to be reviewed (as required by the university or requested by the faculty member) for reappointment, tenure or promotion, they will be notified by the Department Chair in the spring of the preceding year. As soon as possible thereafter, the Chair will meet with the faculty member and review the policies and procedures outlined in this document. At that time, it will be determined what materials the faculty member will provide to facilitate the work of the reviewing bodies. While assistance from the Department Chair and the administrative staff can be assumed in the gathering of materials, the responsibility for documenting the case for reappointment, tenure and promotion lies with the individual faculty member.

A. Departmental Reviewing Bodies

While this document points to specific standards, criteria, and kinds of evidence to be used in the review process, recommendations are ultimately determined by a vote from individuals charged with such responsibility, not by any automatic tabulation or totaling of evidence collected in the process.

Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC). This committee is elected every fall at the first faculty meeting and consists of four tenured faculty members at or above the rank for which other faculty members will be considered during the following year. After reviewing a candidate's file, the Committee will meet, in accordance with an announced procedural schedule, discuss the candidate's qualifications for the proposed appointment, and vote on a recommendation to the entire faculty. A written summary of the Committee's deliberations will accompany the vote and be made available to the faculty.

Faculty of the Department (aka the Primary Unit). Faculty will review the candidate's file and, in accordance with the schedule, meet to discuss the candidate's qualifications for the proposed appointment.

All faculty are invited to attend the discussion of the candidate's qualifications for the proposed appointment, but only those at or above the proposed rank will vote on behalf of the Department.

Absentee votes from faculty members who are unable to attend the meeting will be accepted.

In these procedures, the term "faculty" does not include temporary visiting or guest faculty, but does include continuing part-time faculty (0.5+ FTE).

A written summary of the Department's deliberations, the vote (Chair not voting), and the rationale for its recommendation will be prepared by the Department Chair. This summary will be submitted with the candidate's file to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. At the same time, a copy of the summary letter will be distributed to THDN faculty.

In cases of Comprehensive Review and periodic review for reappointment, the same procedures will be followed as in tenure and promotion cases.

B. Professional Planning

Each year, every junior faculty member will meet with the Department Chair to review his or her plans for the next year and beyond. The purpose of the meeting will be to develop or further a plan of activity aimed at meeting the needs and expectations of both the individual and the Department. In the case of off-campus creative work, the Chair will advise the individual faculty member about the potential value of such activity for purposes of promotion and tenure. At the conclusion of the meeting between the faculty member and the Chair, an agreed upon plan will be signed and placed in the faculty member's file.

This document was originally approved by unanimous vote of the Faculty of the Department of Theatre & Dance at a meeting on April 27, 1993 and then approved by the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Revisions underwent the same approval process in 1995, November 1999, and December 2001.

**Erika Randall
Department Chair
01 May 2019**

MILESTONES FOR EVALUATION

DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE & DANCE

Timetable for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Individuals who are hired as beginning assistant professors in the Department of Theatre & Dance will have at least one evaluation for reappointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. The last reappointment prior to a tenure decision must be based upon comprehensive evaluation. A standard pattern would be for an assistant professor to receive a three- or four-year appointment initially and, upon positive comprehensive review at the end of this first appointment, to receive a second appointment that would extend to the mandatory tenure decision.

Tenure is required by the end of the seventh year. Faculty members in Theatre & Dance are typically evaluated for tenure in the seventh year; the seven-year probationary period will include any years of credit toward tenure that are specified in writing at the time of hiring. In unusual cases, tenure can be awarded a year early. However, because it is customary for review committees to apply standards strictly and without discounted expectations based on shorter time in rank, it is inadvisable for faculty members to seek early promotion unless there are compelling reasons to do so.

Typically, promotion to associate professor is considered simultaneously with the consideration of tenure, although formally the two are separate decisions. Under unusual circumstances, individuals may be hired as associate professors without tenure (mainly because the University is reluctant to hire individuals without a probationary period prior to tenure), and in this case the issue of tenure is separated fully from the issue of promotion to associate professor.

There is no mandatory point of decision for promotion to full professor. A customary waiting interval is approximately equal to the interval between the ranks of assistant professor and associate professor, because significant incremental achievement is expected between ranks. In unusual cases, an individual can be considered for promotion to full professor after only a few years in rank as an associate professor, but this is not advisable on a routine basis because review committees can be expected to apply criteria strictly and not in such cases take into account shorter time in rank. Individuals who have doubts about the timing of promotion should seek advice from their Chair, who may appoint an ad hoc personnel committee to evaluate the situation.

Any individual can ask to be considered for promotion or tenure at any time, and the request will be considered by the Department unless it is contrary to the rules of the University. Individuals who believe that they are promotable or tenurable should not hesitate to ask their Chair for an evaluation.

The Departmental Review Process.

Departmental judgments that involve the application of standards are based on peer review. The recommendation of the Department is ultimately determined by a vote of the appropriate theatre and dance faculty following discussion of the evidence that was collected for the review. The process of personnel review begins for the Department with the election of a personnel committee, which performs two functions. First, if there is some doubt as to the likelihood of a favorable outcome, the personnel committee may advise the candidate to

withhold the case until more time has elapsed, except in the case of mandatory tenure decision or mandatory comprehensive review. The committee may give this advice either initially, or after accumulating information indicating that the case needs to be stronger in order to be successful. The candidate is not bound to the advice of the personnel committee, however, and can proceed against it.

The second purpose of the personnel committee is to solicit external letters of reference and to collect other confidential information that the candidate cannot collect independently. The candidate is responsible for assembling the bulk of the personnel file, but can seek the help or advice of the personnel committee as appropriate. The Program Assistant of the Department will receive the file and will review it for completeness. The file should meet the requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the Campus as outlined on specification sheets that are available from the Dean's office. It is the candidate's responsibility to see that the file is attractively prepared, complete, and well-ordered, and that it has places for the insertion of confidential materials by the personnel committee. It is the responsibility of the personnel committee to obtain any additional information that it may require in order to make a complete presentation to the Department.

Following the assembly of all materials, the personnel committee in the Department of Theatre & Dance will have a final meeting in which it decides by vote its recommendation on the case. The PUEC must vote separately on Teaching, Research and/or Creative Work, and Service, noting whether the faculty member's performance in each category is Excellent, Meritorious, or Less than Meritorious. A member of the committee will be assigned by the Chair to write a summary of the committee's discussion and report the recommendation. This summary and recommendation will be sent to all faculty members, including the candidate. The candidate's file will be made available on a confidential basis to those faculty who will participate in the discussion two weeks prior to the Department's discussion and vote.

The faculty discussion will be scheduled by the Chair approximately two weeks following the announcement of the personnel committee's recommendation. The candidate for a particular decision will be absent on the day of discussion, and the personnel committee will be asked to make a presentation. This will be followed by detailed discussion of the case by all faculty. When the Chair is satisfied that discussion is complete, there will be a vote by closed or secret ballot. For the tenure review, faculty members will be asked to vote Less than Meritorious, Meritorious, or Excellent in each of the three areas of review: Teaching, Research and/or Creative Work, and Service. The right to vote is limited to those faculty members who have the professional status to which the candidate aspires, or a higher status. For example, only full professors would vote on the case of an associate professor being considered for promotion to full professor. Prior to voting, the faculty will be reminded by the Chair of the required standards for an overall affirmative vote from the department.

Following the Department's vote, the Chair will write a detailed letter to the Dean of Arts and Sciences summarizing the faculty discussion and stating the recommendation of the department. The letter will identify the departmental evaluation in each of the three areas of review, and include a separate personal response from the Chair. When the Chair's letter is sent to the Dean, a copy will be sent to the candidate and to all faculty members in the department.

Review above the Level of the Department

Following the departmental vote, the candidate's file is sent from the Department to the Dean. The Dean refers the case to a standing College committee (Dean's Personnel

Committee), which discusses the case and votes on it. The Dean then writes a letter to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This letter gives the Dean's personal evaluation of the case and a recommendation for action, as well as reporting the vote and, if appropriate, the opinions of the Dean's Personnel Committee. The Dean is not bound to agree with the Dean's Personnel Committee, with the Department, or with the Chair.

Beyond the Dean's office, the personnel file passes to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor's office receives files on all personnel decisions from all colleges on the Campus. The Vice Chancellor relies heavily on the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC), which considers all cases for comprehensive review for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The VCAC discusses each case in detail and votes on the disposition of the case. The vote is considered a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor, who may or may not accept the recommendation. The Vice Chancellor's decision is relayed to the Chancellor.

Beyond the Vice Chancellor's level, review occurs by the Chancellor, the President, and the Regents.

A negative decision by any level of review can be overruled by a positive decision at a higher level. For example, a negative decision by the Department could be overruled by the Dean or by the Vice Chancellor. Similarly, a positive decision at any level can be overruled by a negative decision at a higher level. When any decision is overruled, the case is sent back to the lower level with advice from the upper level and a request for clarification, reconsideration, or additional information. The case is then reconsidered by the lower level and forwarded again to the upper level for final review. The rights of appeal for rejected candidates are outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Return of cases from an upper level to a lower level cannot always be taken as a sign of weakness in the case. Sometimes, review committees find critical pieces of information missing from the file and ask for additional information, even though they fully expect to approve the case. Individuals under review should not be unduly concerned by a request for additional information, unless the request is accompanied by a negative vote from a review committee.

The candidate is directly advised through the Chair by the Dean's office of all review committee decisions. In addition, the candidate will receive a copy of the letter that passes from the Dean to the Vice Chancellor and will be notified of the reasons for any negative action or concern on the part of the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee about degree of documentation.

Personnel cases are prepared in the fall semester of the year before they take effect. The order of preparation is typically by increasing rank: comprehensive review, promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to full professor. Under the current scheduling system, the comprehensive review for reappointment cases will leave the Department by October 1, tenure and promotion to associate professor by November 1, and the full professor cases may leave the Department January 1 in the year of the proposed personnel action.