

NUMBER:

1412

TITLE:

Promotion in Rank [for Tenure-track Faculty](#)

APPROVED:

September 26, 2013; Revised June 9, 2016 (eff. 7/1/16); Revised June 6, 2017 (eff. 7/1/17); Revised June 14, 2018 (eff. 7/1/18); Revised June 13, 2019 (eff. 7/1/19); Revised June 18, 2020 (eff. 7/1/20); Revised June 17, 2021 (eff. 7/1/21); Revised September 15, 2023

SCHEDEDULED REVIEW DATE:

September 2028

Commented [A1]: Deans Policy Review Complete
AALT review complete
Ready for faculty senate review

I. [Expectations](#)

- A. All promotions in rank are based on evaluation of the faculty member's performance.
1. A tenure-track faculty member's performance in teaching, research, service, and clinical care (as appropriate) is evaluated over the total time in the previous rank based on the criteria established by the department or college/school.
- B. Promotion to the rank of associate professor must occur at the time of the tenure award, and the policy on tenure applies.
- C. Promotion to the rank of full professor is normally considered no earlier than during the sixth year of a faculty member's service as associate professor at Old Dominion University. Exceptions are made only under the following circumstances:
 1. A faculty member who has held the rank of associate professor at another institution and was initially appointed to Old Dominion University at the rank of associate professor may be considered for promotion to the rank of full professor at the time of the award of tenure.
 2. A faculty member of extraordinary merit may be considered for promotion to the rank of full professor before the sixth year as associate professor at Old Dominion University.

Deleted: Board of Visitors Policy

Deleted: and

Deleted: as compared to the criteria established by the Board of Visitors for the rank being considered and any other

Commented [A2]: This phrasing could be confusing for faculty who come to ODU as an untenured Associate Professor, and could apply for tenure without an associate promotion to professor.

Commented [A3R2]: This is the way the policy is written now. I think the statement is accurate since it covers promotion in rank to associate. Faculty appointed to ODU as untenured associates are covered by the tenure policy and are mentioned in C.1.

Commented [A4]: What does it mean "must occur at the time of the tenure award?" Why do we need to say this?

Commented [A5R4]: This means that if you are an untenured assistant professor you cannot be considered for promotion to associate without going through the tenure process.

Deleted: <#>A career -track non-tenure track research faculty member's performance in research, service (as appropriate) and teaching (as appropriate) and clinical care (as appropriate) is evaluated over the total time in the previous rank based on the as compared to the criteria established by the Board of Visitors for the rank being considered and any other criteria established by the center, department/program, or college/school.

Deleted: [...](#) [1]

II. Procedures for Promotion in Rank to Full Professor

A. Considerations Concerning Promotion

1. Each faculty committee and administrator considering a promotion case must specifically consider factors listed below as they apply to each case in the written recommendations that are submitted up the line to the appropriate executive vice president. In the case of committees, the vote must be recorded in the

Deleted: provost and vice president for academic affairs

recommendation. In instances of a non-unanimous vote, the minority opinion must be included in the committee recommendation, and the minority must be given the option to write the minority opinion.

2. Each committee and administrator making a recommendation concerning promotion considers evidence of the faculty member's performance over the total time in the previous rank based on the guidelines established by the department or college/school.
3. The committees and administrators shall examine the promotion portfolio submitted by the faculty member, the chair of the department, or any other relevant source. The department chair and the departmental promotion and tenure committee are responsible for providing an assessment of the quality of the publications and, for creative scholarly activity, the quality and reputation of the venues where creative works are exhibited or performed, when evaluating the faculty member being considered for promotion. The faculty member is responsible for ensuring that all information submitted by him or her in support of promotion is factually accurate and valid, and for providing corroborating evidence (e.g., web links, complete citations, grant numbers) for all claimed accomplishments. The evidence should address the quality of the journals and the reputation of books and other such publishers. For creative scholarship, the faculty member should provide supporting evidence about the quality and reputation of venues in which creative works are exhibited or performed. Fraudulent or non-valid claims can lead to faculty sanctions, including denial of promotion. Department/school chairs should work with promotion candidates within their respective departments to ensure the completeness and accuracy of their promotion portfolios. The chair and the department promotion and tenure committee should verify the accuracy of portfolio elements central to the promotion case. Should concerns be raised by external or internal reviewers about the validity of a candidate's claims, it is the chair's responsibility to verify those claims. The promotion process will be paused while the chair verifies those claims.

B. External evaluation of the faculty member's research and scholarly activity by nationally recognized experts in the field of specialization will be required.

1. The department chair is responsible for initiating the external review, securing the reviewers, and uploading the external reviewers' letters and current CVs to the secure site. If the department chair does not have the rank of full professor, all chair responsibilities for promotion to full professor will be delegated by the dean to a full professor in the department or from another department within the same college/school who will assume all chair's responsibilities described below. This appointed full professor, acting in the role of chair, cannot take part in any deliberations or votes of the departmental, college/school or University promotion committees while the promotion case is being considered. In promotion of department chairs, all chair responsibilities for the promotion process belong to the dean.
2. External reviewers with academic positions must hold the same rank or higher than the promotion rank for which the faculty member is being considered; only one

Commented [A6]: Are votes of the tenure committee secret? If so, requiring those members in the minority to produce reasons would require them to reveal their votes. ... [3]
Commented [A7R6]: Yes in practice often the chair ... [4]
Commented [A8R6]: We changed the language to make ... [5]
Deleted: , and the reasons produced by the minor ... [2]
Deleted: which
Deleted: has been held
Deleted: as compared to the guidelines for the ra ... [6]
Deleted: <#>The total rank structure of the depa ... [7]
Deleted: At the least,
Deleted: t
Deleted: ould
Deleted: faculty information sheets,
Deleted: chair evaluations, dean's evaluations, ar ... [8]
Deleted: It is the responsibility of the ...
Deleted: to
Deleted:
Deleted: e
Deleted: for
Deleted: It is the responsibility of the faculty me ... [9]
Deleted: to
Deleted: e
Deleted: , etc.
Deleted:
Deleted: The chair of each respective departme ... [10]
Commented [A9]: What steps are taken if the prom ... [11]
Commented [A10R9]: In practice sometimes the ch ... [12]
Deleted:
Deleted: as a part of the regular review process
Deleted: that are
Deleted: by external or internal reviewers
Deleted: responsibility
Formatted: Not Expanded by / Condensed by
Formatted
Commented [A11]: In the case of tenure I think we ... [15]
Commented [A12R11]: Changed the language here ... [16]
Deleted:Section Break (Next Page).....
Deleted: of the
Deleted:
Deleted: the
Deleted: responsibility
Deleted: gs

external reviewer per institution may serve as a reviewer on a single promotion case; and external reviewers should not be from the faculty member's degree granting institution(s) or from a non-peer institution. Any exceptions should be justified by the dean. The department tenure and promotion committee and the candidate will prepare separate lists of potential reviewers. The candidate will review both lists and will document personal and professional relationships with all potential reviewers, including potential conflicts of interest. This documentation will become part of the promotion file. The chair (or designee, see 1 above) will review the combined list, remove any disqualified proposed reviewers, and provide the list of reviewers to the dean. The dean will review the list to confirm the selection criteria are met and that the candidate has no conflicts of interest with any of the proposed reviewers and then submit the list to the appropriate executive vice president for final approval prior to initiating the review process by extending invitations to prospective external reviewers. The final list of external reviewers, together with the documentation of personal and professional relationships by the candidate (as outlined above), should be included as part of the application package for all internal reviewers. External reviewers should not be close collaborators or (former) mentors of the candidate. In general, co-authors on publications should also be excluded as external reviewers, except as permissible under the departmental statement on evaluation of research (see the Policy on the Evaluation of Scholarly Activity and Research). The selection of potential external reviewers must be completed before submitting credentials for promotion.

3. External reviews will be confidential; reviewers will be advised, accordingly, and breaches of confidentiality by internal reviewers may be subject to a minor sanction. Requests for exception to the confidentiality of external reviews should be made directly to the appropriate executive vice president before the reviewers are asked to submit evaluations. If an exception is approved, candidates for promotion will be allowed access to the substance of external reviews, but the authorship of specific external reviews and other identifying information contained therein will remain confidential. All external reviewers will receive a standard letter sent by the chair but prepared by the appropriate executive vice president in consultation with the deans and a copy of the policy on external reviews so their responsibilities will be clear.
4. A curriculum vitae will be required of each external reviewer, and it is the department/school chair's responsibility to include each reviewer's CV. Each reviewer will be asked to describe any personal or professional relationship with the candidate. For promotion of department chairs, the responsibility belongs to the dean. External reviewers will be asked to evaluate all submitted material sent to them. Candidates for promotion are responsible for preparing the research portfolio and curriculum vitae to be sent to external reviewers. In the case of the arts, reviewers may be asked to consider works of art or performances. External reviewers will be asked to evaluate (a) the quality of the scholarship or creative work under review; and (b) the scholarly reputation (regional, national, international) of the candidate.
5. All candidates for promotion to full professor must have their scholarship evaluated by at least four external reviewers. If fewer than four reviews are

Deleted:

Commented [A13]: What if a candidate reports COI with colleagues providing potential reviewer names? Should there be an additional COI step at this stage?

Commented [A14R13]: A COI with a colleague in the dept would be declared later. If the candidate thinks that the proposed reviewer might be biased they can indicate that on the form for the external reviewers and the Chair can take that into account when selecting external reviewers

Deleted: select three reviewers from the candidate's list and three reviewers from the department tenure and promotion committee's list; the chair (or designee) will provide ...

Deleted: an agreed upon

Commented [A15]: In practice we submit the full list to the dean and then to the EVP. Then the chair chooses 6 reviewers to ask a letter from and then chooses others if needed to get four letters. I don't think it matters

Commented [A16R15]: [Mention was removed] I suggest adding the revised language from the tenure policy related to soliciting external reviewers here. My memory is that the revised language in the Tenure policy captures what you're saying here and the current reality of identifying and securing reviewers.

Commented [A17R15]: I have modified the language here to reflect more accurately our current practices.

Deleted: provost and vice president for academic affairs ...

Deleted: and

Deleted: initiating the review process

Deleted: the end of the semester prior to the submission of...

Deleted: so

Deleted: provost and vice president for academic affairs ...

Deleted: provost and vice president for academic affairs ...

Commented [A19R18]: we will fix

Commented [A20R18]: I think it's okay now.

Deleted: The chair of the committee is responsible for including It is the responsibility of the chair to include a c...

Deleted: curriculum vitae of each reviewer.

Deleted: For promotion of department chairs, the responsibility belongs to the dean.

.....Section Break (Next Page).....

Deleted: mailed

Deleted: the

Deleted: ation of

Deleted: :

Deleted: will be required to

Deleted: no fewer than

received, the chair will choose additional reviewers alternately from the lists of the department promotion and tenure committee and of the candidate.

6. The University and college/school administration will assist departments where reasonable expenses are necessary to obtain appropriate external reviews.
- C. A candidate for promotion in rank is initially considered by the department promotion and tenure committee members who hold the rank being considered or above.¹ Only faculty holding the rank of full professor are eligible to deliberate, review, or otherwise participate and vote on candidates for promotion to full professor.

1. The department promotion and tenure committee faculty members in the rank being considered or above may select a subcommittee from their ranks to consider and make recommendations concerning promotion. In that case, the subcommittee is responsible for eliciting opinions from all faculty members holding the rank being considered or above.
2. In departments where fewer than three members hold appointments in the rank being considered or above, the dean, in consultation with the chair (or designee; see section II.B.1.), will appoint enough additional faculty in the rank or above from other disciplines to form a department promotion and tenure committee of at least three.
3. Candidates for promotion should provide a statement that identifies potential external and/or internal reviewers with whom there is a conflict of interest, e.g., co-authors, co-investigators, etc.
4. The group of faculty members on the department promotion and tenure committee elect their committee chair. It is the responsibility of that chair to direct the committee members to consider and apply the relevant sections in the *Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook* and the departmental statement of criteria for evaluation of research and scholarly activity in their comments and votes.

III.

1. No dean, full- or part-time associate dean or assistant dean, or other full-time administrator or department chair (or designee; see section II.B.1.) shall attend or participate in the deliberation of either the departmental, college/school, or University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The deliberations of all three committees are confidential and must not be shared with anyone outside of the committee.
2. The college/school committees shall consist of one tenured faculty member from each department in the college/school. For schools where there are no tenured faculty, the dean of the school should select a tenured faculty member(s) from another college to serve on their college/school's committee. All members of the college/school promotion and tenure committees shall be elected directly by the faculties they represent for a one-year term renewable twice for a total of three years. This member shall be chosen by majority vote of all full-time faculty of the department, present and voting, by secret ballot before April 15 of each year for the

Deleted: by committee faculty

Deleted: in the department

Deleted: In the case of large departments, t

Deleted: t

Deleted: f

Deleted: it is the responsibility of the committee to

Deleted: offro

Deleted: m

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted: s

Deleted: a

Deleted: a

Deleted: of the committee among their members

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: on

Deleted: evaluation

Formatted

Deleted:Section Break (Next Page).....

ensuing year. Every reasonable effort should be made to ensure that there are at least three full professors on the college/school committee. If the elected representative of a department will not be able to attend college/school committee meetings for a significant time span, the department may elect a temporary replacement for that time span. No person shall serve on a college/school promotion and tenure committee for more than three years consecutively but is eligible for reelection after an absence of at least one year. Only faculty holding the rank of full professor are eligible to join the deliberations and the vote on candidates for promotion to full professor. If the home department of a candidate for promotion to full professor has no full professor representing it on the college/school committee, a member of the departmental promotion committee for that candidate (convened as described in section C.1. and C.2) shall be elected to serve as its representative only during the duration of the deliberations on that specific candidate. In any case, the representative from a promotion candidate's department will participate in deliberations in the candidate's case but will not cast a vote.

3. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of one tenured full professor from each of the major degree-granting academic colleges/schools. This member shall be elected from among the members of the college's/school's promotion and tenure committee(s) by September 15. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee shall elect one of its members as chair.² No person shall serve on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for more than three years consecutively but is eligible for reelection after an absence of at least one year. The representative from a promotion candidate's college/school will participate in deliberations in the candidate's case but will not cast a vote.
4. Any committee member who participates in the promotion process votes at most only once on any specific case. Department promotion and tenure committee members shall vote at the department level. A member of the department committee may not choose to vote on cases from their department at the college/school or university level.
5. To ensure transparency, fairness, and equity in the internal review process, a faculty member or administrator who participates in the promotion process must disclose any potential conflict of interest that might undermine the credibility of the process. The chair of the department (or replacement, see Section II.B.1.) will work in consultation with the dean of the college/school to decide whether the person should be excluded from serving on the review committee.
6. The faculty member under consideration for promotion is given an opportunity at various intervals to submit written statements to the secure site, in support of their promotion case, or to correct any factual misinformation in previous recommendations. The candidate may also choose to submit a written statement to the office of the appropriate executive vice president, and they, will add such statements to the candidate's file.
7. In case of material new accomplishments before the conclusion of the evaluation process, additional documentation may be added to the portfolio with the concurrence of the dean. Such additional material must be clearly marked as such and dated at the time of addition to the promotion file. If such additional

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: by his/her

Deleted: For promotion cases Career Track Faculty must be represented.

Deleted: particular

Deleted:

Deleted: Members of the department committees must vote at that level and may not choose whether to vote at the department level or at some later point....

Deleted: In order to

Commented [A21]: This declaration may need to take place much earlier, e.g., if involved in the selection of potential external reviewers.

Commented [A22R21]: I see your point but I don't think it would be practical to identify these COIs before the external reviewers are identified. The candidate must indicate any concerns about the potential reviewers and the Chair should use judgment in selecting from the approved list.

Deleted: is informed whenever a committee is considering promotion and

Deleted: a

Deleted: (in electronic form) to the appropriate executive vice president Provost's Office

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted: Provost's Office

Commented [A23]: We need to change this. For tenure we wrote:

The faculty member under consideration is informed whenever a committee is considering tenure and is given an opportunity at each stage of review to submit a statement (in electronic form) to the Provost's Office in support of their tenure case, or to correct any factual misinformation in previous recommendations. The Provost's Office will add such statements to the candidate's file.

Commented [A24R23]: I note that something similar is written below near the end of the document.

Commented [A25R23]: fixed

Commented [A26R23]: [Mention was removed] I've modified the text here.

Deleted: Section Break (Next Page)

documentation is considered, this must be clearly documented in the recommendation letters by the committee or individual (e.g., dean) who first reviews this new material.

B. The committee or faculty group makes its recommendation concerning promotion to the chair (or designee; see section II.B.1.) together with reasons for the recommendation (including a minority statement in the case of a non-unanimous vote). All eligible committee members shall vote yes or no through a secret ballot after participating (either in person or remotely) in the deliberations of the committee. Proxy votes or votes submitted by non-secure means (e.g., email or communication accessible to a third party) are not permitted. The chair of the committee shall record the names of all members participating in the discussion and voting in the recommendation letter, as well as the total number of votes in favor and against. Only those faculty present as the candidate is being reviewed during the deliberations can participate in drafting or approving the letter. In instances of a non-unanimous vote, the minority opinion must be included in the committee recommendation, and the minority must be given the option to write the minority opinion. A copy of the recommendation letter will be provided to the faculty member by the chair of the committee. The department chair (or designee) evaluates independently the credentials of the faculty member, the rank structure of the department, and any additional evidence presented, either by the faculty member or from any other source, and makes a recommendation, with reasons, concerning promotion. A copy of that review and recommendation letter will be sent to the faculty member and the dean by the chair of the department.

If either the departmental committee (or group), or the chair (or designee), or both recommend promotion, the faculty member's credentials together with the recommendation of the faculty committee and the chair (or designee) will be forwarded to a promotion committee of the college for consideration. This committee will make an independent evaluation and make a recommendation concerning promotion with reasons (including reasons of the minority), to the dean. The recommendations will indicate the vote of the committee. All eligible committee members should vote yes or no through a secret ballot after

1. participating (either in person or remotely) in the deliberations of the committee. Proxy votes or votes submitted by non-secure means (e.g., email or communication accessible to a third party) are not permitted. Members eligible to vote on a specific candidate's promotion application are defined in section II.C.5. In instances of a non-unanimous vote of all eligible voting members, the minority opinion must be included in the committee recommendation, and the minority must be given the option to write the minority opinion.

2. If neither the faculty committee (or group) nor the chair (or designee) recommend promotion, the faculty member will not be considered for promotion in the coming year unless a review by the college/school promotion committee and the dean is requested by the faculty member. If a review is requested, the departmental committee and the chair forwards all documents to the promotion committee of the

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Commented [A27]: Same issue as in II.A.1. - although this language is not as direct the minority statement is required.

Commented [A28R27]: this language is OK. We fixed the earlier instance.

Commented [A29]: This is better than the way it is written in II.A.1., since the chair could summarize the negative points which presumably represent the minority opinion, or those in the minority could choose to write it, but they have the option of not revealing their vote.

Commented [A30R29]: yes this is how it should be

Deleted: sent

Deleted: to the faculty member by the chair of the committee.

Deleted: who are

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.08", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Right, Indent: Left: 1.08", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.08", No bullets or numbering

Formatted

college/school, which examines them and makes a recommendation concerning promotion to the dean following the stipulations of II.E. above. The dean examines all documents, including the college/school committee's recommendation, and makes a determination concerning promotion. If the dean's determination is negative and is in accordance with the recommendations of the departmental committee, the chair, and the college/school committee, then the faculty member is not promoted for the coming year. If the dean's determination is negative and is not in accordance with all previous recommendations, the faculty member may request a further review by the executive vice president. If the decision by the EVP is positive, the review will continue to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. If the decision is negative, the candidate's case will not go forward. The decision of the executive vice president is final.

C. The dean, considering all previous recommendations and all credentials, then makes a recommendation concerning promotion and posts it to the secure system.

D. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee, consisting of one tenured full professor from each of the major degree-granting academic colleges/schools, examines the facts and all previous recommendations and documentation, and makes a recommendation (with reasons, including minority reasons, if any) concerning promotion which is forwarded to the executive vice president. All eligible committee members shall vote yes or no through a secret ballot after participating (either in person or remotely) in the deliberations of the committee. Proxy votes or votes submitted by non-secure means (e.g., email or communication accessible to a third party) are not permitted. Members eligible to vote on a specific candidate's promotion application are defined in section II.C.6. In instances of a non-unanimous vote of all eligible voting members, the minority opinion must be included in the committee recommendation, and the minority must be given the option to write the minority opinion.

E. Based on all of the evaluations and recommendations presented, and after consultation with staff, the executive vice president makes a decision concerning promotion for the coming year. If the recommendations of the committees and administrators that have previously considered the case have not been in agreement with one another, or if the executive vice president disagrees with the recommendations that have been in agreement with one another, the appropriate executive vice president shall consult with the chair, the dean, and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee before reaching a final decision. The decision of the appropriate executive vice president will consist of one of the following:

1. promotion
2. deferral

F. If the decision of the appropriate executive vice president is for promotion, the faculty member will receive the higher rank in the subsequent academic year. The decision of the appropriate executive vice president will be reported to the president.

G. The faculty member may request that the president review a negative decision by the executive vice president. The decision of the president is final.

Deleted: in such cases

Deleted: The decision of the executive vice president is final in such cases.¹

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted: <#> [17]

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.83", No bullets or numbering

Commented [A32R31]: fixed

Deleted: <#>n, which is forwarded, with reasons, to the appropriate executive vice provost and vice president for academic affairs.¹

Deleted: <#>1

Deleted: <#> provost and vice president for academic affairs...

Deleted: <#>who are

Deleted: On the basis of

Deleted: provost and vice president for academic affairs

Deleted: provost and vice president for academic affairs

Deleted: provost and vice

Deleted: for academic affairs

Commented [A33]: Is this "deferral" rather than denial because the candidate can apply again next year? If so, isn't that restart of the process with a new decision? If not, to what is it being deferred?

Commented [A34R33]: the promotion itself is being "deferred". It is just a nicer way of saying denied. Yes the candidate can go up again and the process restarts.

Deleted: provost and vice

Deleted: for academic affairs

Deleted: provost and

Deleted: for academic affairs

Deleted: Section Break (Next Page)

H. All promotions are reported by the president to the Board of Visitors.

- I. Copies of the recommendations by all committees, chairs, deans, and the appropriate executive vice president shall be provided to the faculty member being considered for promotion. The faculty member will be provided opportunity to correct any factual misinformation in such recommendations by placing a letter in his or her promotion file at any stage, or up until April 1, to the appropriate executive vice president.
- J. The above procedures at the department and college/school level may be suitably adapted for faculty members who hold interdisciplinary or interdepartmental appointments. The adapted procedures should be recommended by the promotion and tenure committee of the college/school involved and approved by the dean or deans and the appropriate executive vice president. Procedures above the college/school level will be the same as those designated above in all cases.

¹ See the Schedules for Faculty Personnel actions in the appendix for specific dates and actions.

² Faculty members elected to serve on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee shall serve for the subsequent academic year. The promotion and tenure committee elected by each individual degree- granting college serve for an entire year, not for the spring semester of one year and the fall semester of the following year.

Deleted: provost and

Deleted: for academic affairs

Deleted: provost and vice

Deleted: for academic affairs

Deleted: or colleges

Deleted: provost and

Deleted: for academic affairs

Deleted: <#>Research Faculty[¶]

[¶] Promotion to the rank of research professor from the rank of research associate professor and promotion to the rank of research associate professor from the rank of research assistant professor shall be upon the recommendation of the department, chair, college/school promotion and tenure committee, dean and University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the appropriate executive vice president, provost and vice president for academic affairs. If the appropriate executive provost and vice president for academic affairs decides against the promotion, the person may request a review by the president. The decision of the president is final.[¶]

[¶] The process for promotion to the rank of research professor and promotion to the rank of research associate professor will require external evaluation of the quality of the faculty member's research performance from nationally recognized experts in the faculty member's field; procedures for the external review process can be found in section II.B. of this policy.[¶]

For those research faculty who only have appointments only in one of the University-level research centers outside of department or academic college/school, the following promotion policy will apply. Research centers will establish a promotion committee to review faculty promotions and make recommendations to the center director. Appointments to this committee will follow the guidance of section II.C. of this policy pertaining to departments. This promotion committee should include at least one member from the academic department(s) most closely aligned to the center to ensure promotion considerations are being applied equitably between the faculty assigned to that department and those assigned to the center. In centers where fewer than three members hold appointments in the rank being considered or above, the center director will solicit members of the department(s) most closely aligned to the center, in consultation with the chair(s) of those department(s), to form a committee of at least three. The center director will review faculty promotion recommendations and will recommend to the vice president for research and economic development or dean of the relevant academic college/school those members who have met the promotion criteria. The vice president[¶]

.....Section Break (Next Page).....
for research and economic development or college/school dean will forward a recommendation regarding promotion to the Office of Executive Vice President Academic Affairs for review by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the provost and vice presi[¶] [181]

Deleted: The members of the faculty who are

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [1] Deleted

Author

Page 2: [2] Deleted

Author

1.

Page 2: [3] Commented [A6]

Author

Are votes of the tenure committee secret? If so, requiring those members in the minority to produce reasons would require them to reveal their vote. If votes are secret, this could either indicate that there is an opportunity for providing a minority response or the chair summarizes negative points as part of the recommendation.

Page 2: [4] Commented [A7R6]

Author

Yes in practice often the chair of the committee summarizes the concerns and the committee as a whole has an opportunity to comment. Sometimes members of the committee will actually write the minority report.

Page 2: [5] Commented [A8R6]

Author

We changed the language to make it consistent with the better language later in this policy.

Page 2: [6] Deleted

Author

2.

Page 2: [7] Deleted

Author

Page 2: [8] Deleted

Author

3.

Page 2: [9] Deleted

Author

4.

Page 2: [10] Deleted

Author

5.

Page 2: [11] Commented [A9]

Author

What steps are taken if the promotion portfolios are incomplete and the candidate does not supply all materials? Is the process forced to continue or can it stop?

Page 2: [12] Commented [A10R9]

Author

In practice sometimes the chair will ask the candidate to supply the missing material before it goes to the dept committee with the added external reviews. If the candidate does not do that then the tenure evaluation must proceed based on the available information. If some information is not provided it makes tenure less likely.

Page 2: [13] Formatted

Author

List Paragraph, Left, Indent: Left: 0.83", Right: 0", Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.83" + Indent at: 1.08", Tab stops: 1.08", Left

Page 2: [14] Deleted

Author

6.

Page 2: [15] Commented [A11]

Author

In the case of tenure I think we replaced this with "uploading complete review files to the secure site belongs to the department chair."

Page 2: [16] Commented [A12R11]

Author

Changed the language here accordingly.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Page 7: [17] Deleted | Author |
| Page 8: [18] Deleted | Author |