

DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES

Department of Philosophy
University of South Florida

Approved January 26, 2007. Amended February 17, 2012. Amended September 4, 2015.
Amended October 28, 2016. Amended January 18, 2019. Amended May 5, 2020. Amended
January 21, 2022.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:
DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES

I. MISSION STATEMENT	2
II. CONDUCTING DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS.....	2
A. Departmental Meetings	2
B. Minutes of Faculty Meetings	3
C. Voting Procedures	3
III. DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATORS.....	4
A. Department Chair	4
B. Associate Chair	5
C. Director of the Graduate Program	6
D. Director of Undergraduate Studies.....	6
E. Department Parliamentarian	7
IV. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES.....	7
A. Standing and Ad Hoc Committees	7
1. Graduate Committee	7
2. Undergraduate Committee	8
3. Executive Committee	9
V. ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	10
VI. ADJUNCT SCREENING PROCESS.....	12
VII. SUMMER APPOINTMENT POLICIES	13
VIII. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND DISRUPTION OF ACADEMIC PROCESS	15
IX. CRITERIA AND PROCEEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION.....	15
X. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION	15
XI. AMENDMENTS TO THIS GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS.....	16
APPENDIX	17

I. MISSION STATEMENT

It is the responsibility of the Department of Philosophy to provide the very core of a university education in the liberal arts and sciences, and the Department is committed to fulfilling this responsibility. Courses in philosophy require critical analysis of foundational texts in the liberal arts and sciences and of contemporary work central to discussions of knowledge and values across the curriculum. The Department is also committed to providing its students, undergraduate and graduate, with the knowledge and abilities needed to complete their program of study, and to advance if desired, to the next level of professional activity. Undergraduates should receive the training needed to matriculate in graduate programs; graduates, with that needed to teach at the college and university levels and to engage in professional philosophical scholarship. The program of study at the undergraduate level will require courses in the history of philosophy and in the problems of philosophy, e.g., the theory of knowledge, logic, and ethics. The programs of study at the graduate level will require those receiving the MA and PhD degrees to be well grounded in all periods in the history of philosophy to have a solid grasp of contemporary philosophical work; and to be thoroughly familiar with some of the areas and subjects of inquiry of both traditional and contemporary interest. The Department of Philosophy endorses the study of diverse philosophical traditions.

II. CONDUCTING DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS

A. Departmental Meetings

1. The department's faculty meets on a monthly basis, subject to deferral or omission if pertinent business does not warrant a meeting. The department chair is expected to provide notice of the meeting five days in advance; this may be accomplished by distributing a projected set of meeting dates each semester. As needed, special meetings may be called; if circumstances permit, at least two days notice will be given. The Chair

- is responsible for developing and distributing a tentative agenda prior to all meetings. Faculty members may add to the final agenda upon request. Departmental meetings will be conducted by regular faculty members on a rotating basis. If circumstances dictate, the Associate Chair may conduct meetings or portions of meetings.
2. The faculty member conducting a given departmental meeting will be assisted in this process, as needed, by a faculty member designated Departmental Parliamentarian. The job of the Parliamentarian is to advise department faculty regarding pertinent parliamentary procedure and bylaws.

B. Minutes of Faculty Meetings

Minutes of all departmental faculty meetings, whether regular or special, shall be recorded. Minutes are distributed to faculty members, in advance of the next meeting. Faculty members may request to recommend changes to the minutes at the next scheduled meeting. In cases where there is dispute regarding changes to the minutes, proposed changes approved by 2/3 faculty present will be incorporated into the final minutes. Copies of the approved minutes, and any materials pertinent to the meeting discussed in the minutes, will be retained and filed in perpetuity.

C. Voting Procedures

1. Eligibility for Voting

- a. Only full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty and permanent full-time instructional faculty (with a Ph.D. in Philosophy or related fields) in the Department of Philosophy may vote. A representative of the PGSO may also cast one vote in decisions of hiring. Regarding faculty personnel decisions, (1) only tenured faculty vote on decisions to tenure and promote a non-tenure faculty member, and (2) only Full Professors vote on decisions to recommend promotion to Full Professor.
- b. This Department is not currently a multi-campus unit. If departmental faculty are hired

at branch campuses we will modify our governance and T&P documents to ensure that those faculty are included in matters of faculty governance and Tenure & Promotion to ensure they have voice in departmental issues. We recognize the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

2. Quorum

A simple majority of eligible faculty not on leave constitutes a quorum. A quorum is required for a vote to be held on any matter. Proxy votes are acceptable, if written and signed (electronic signatures are acceptable).

3. Procedure

Votes on any matter may be conducted by voice, by a show of hands, or by secret ballot. Most votes will be by voice, except for personnel, hiring, and election decisions, where secret ballots are required. For any other vote, faculty members may request an alternative voting procedure, subject to approval by 2/3 of the faculty. Voting on any matter must be done at a called regular or special faculty meeting. Proxy votes are acceptable, if written and signed (electronic signatures are acceptable).

III. DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATORS

A. Department Chair

1. Appointment

The Department Chair is appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences upon recommendation of the Department faculty, the senior ranking staff member, and consent of the appointee.

2. Charge:

The Department Chair, with the assistance of other department administrators and committees, directs the administration of the department, devises policy, supervises all personnel. The Chair also supervises advising, scheduling, budgets, and reports to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences on all issues relevant to the department.

The Chair is charged with implementing University and College policies and procedures and developing internal policies and procedures consistent with them. The Chair serves as the primary link between the department and other academic and administrative units on and off campus, acting as representative of the department's faculty, staff and students. In counsel with other Chairs and Directors and the Dean, the Chair participates in the development and implementation of policy and procedures within the College.

B. Associate Chair

1. Appointment:

The Associate Chair is appointed by the Chair upon nomination by the Chair, endorsement of the Department faculty, and consent of the appointee.

2. Charge:

The Associate Chair assists in the administration of the Department.

C. Director of the Graduate Program

1. Appointment:

The Director of the Graduate Program (DGS) is appointed upon nomination by the Chair, endorsement of the Department faculty, the senior ranking staff member, and consent of the appointee.

2. Charge:

The Director of the Graduate Program oversees the various aspects of the graduate programs by overseeing the graduate admission process, organizing the graduate student orientation program, overseeing the graduate programs' curricula, maintaining the graduate student handbook, monitoring the progress of students in the various graduate programs, facilitating periodic review of the graduate programs, serving on departmental Graduate Committee, and performing any other necessary duties with the graduate programs, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Graduate School. The DGS reports directly to the Chair.

D. Director of Undergraduate Studies

1. Appointment:

The Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) is appointed upon nomination by the Chair, endorsement of the Department faculty, the senior ranking staff member, and consent of the appointee.

2. Charge:

The Director of the Undergraduate Program supervises the various aspects of the undergraduate programs, oversees the undergraduate programs' curricula, maintains the

undergraduate student handbook, monitors the progress of students in the undergraduate programs, facilitates periodic review of the undergraduate programs, serves on departmental Undergraduate Committee, and performs any other necessary duties with the undergraduate program. The DUS reports directly to the Chair.

E. Department Parliamentarian

1. Appointment:

The Department Parliamentarian is elected by the faculty at a regular meeting, and remains in office until resignation or replacement by vote of the faculty.

IV. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES

A. Standing and Ad Hoc Committees

The department's standing committees include at least the following: Graduate Committee, Undergraduate Committee, and Executive Committee. Ad hoc committees are appointed as needed by the chair at a regular faculty meeting.

1. Graduate Committee

a. Selection:

1. The Graduate Committee is comprised of at least three faculty members. The DGS will be chair of the Graduate Committee. The other faculty members of the committee shall be appointed by the Chair upon nomination by the Chair, endorsement of the Department faculty, and consent of the appointee.

b. Responsibilities:

1. Review criteria and applications for admission to the Master's and Doctoral Programs and make decisions regarding admissions when applicants do not meet the standard criteria.
2. Review graduate curriculum and recommend revisions to the faculty.
3. Receive, review, and present to the faculty all graduate course proposals and changes.
4. Review applications for and recommend appointments of graduate assistantships, and make recommendations for university and college fellowships, scholarships, and awards
5. Review, when requested, the assignments of graduate assistants in accordance with an equitable policy; undertake and review evaluations of graduate assistant performance.
6. Review Master's and Doctoral student progress in the programs with the faculty at Departmental meetings once a year.
7. Review and make recommendations to the faculty regarding any other policies relevant to the graduate program.

2. Undergraduate Committee

a. Selection:

The Undergraduate Committee is comprised of at least three Department faculty members. The DUS will be chair of the Undergraduate Committee. The other faculty members of the committee shall be appointed by the Chair upon endorsement of the Department faculty, and consent of the appointee.

b. Responsibilities:

1. Review requirements for the undergraduate major.
2. Review undergraduate curriculum and recommend revisions to the faculty.
3. Receive, review, and present to the faculty all undergraduate course proposals and changes.
4. Make recommendations for university and college scholarships, honors, and awards for undergraduates
5. Review and make recommendations to the faculty regarding any other policies relevant to the undergraduate program.

3. Executive Committee

a. Selection:

The Executive Committee is comprised of at least three tenured Department faculty members, to be nominated and elected by the faculty at a regular department meeting. Executive committee members serve staggered three-year

terms. In the event any member of the Executive Committee is faced with a potential conflict of interest in carrying out a particular charge for the Executive Committee, the Department faculty may elect an alternate member for purposes of that charge.

b. Charge:

In the event any member of the department faculty seeks to dispute an annual evaluation rendered by the Department Chair, the Executive Committee will conduct an independent annual evaluation for the faculty member in question, applying the annual evaluation criteria set forth in this Governance Document. The Executive Committee's evaluation will then take the place of the Department Chair's evaluation. The executive committee may also be called upon to conduct an annual evaluation when a department faculty member or the Department Chair has a declared conflict of interest, or wishes to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest.

V. ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Annual evaluations in the Department of Philosophy will be conducted by the Department Chair in accordance with the following criteria. Faculty members may appeal the Chair's evaluations, without prejudice, to the Department Executive Committee (see above), whose charge includes procedures for declared or perceived conflicts of interest. Ratings are given on a scale of 1 (very unsatisfactory) to 5 (outstanding).

Research (Assumes 40% assignment. Adjustments will be made for different assignments).

Evidence of research activity may be presented for up to three years for any given project. For example, an article may be reported as under review in one year, accepted in the next, and published in the third. Where work is carried over into three years, e.g. where an acceptance is

reported but not publication, credit for the item will be divided, so that an article will be fully counted over three years rather than triple-counted. A score of 5 will be given for two articles or book chapters or more, a book contract, or for a major grant or fellowship. A book will be counted as 5 articles. An edited book will count as 2 articles. A book translation will count for between 2 and 5 articles, depending on the significance of the text, the profile of the publication venue, and the extent of ancillary scholarly apparatus. Co-authored work will be credited in proportion to the extent of contribution. Adjustments will be made for quality of work, publishers, journals, and so forth, as appropriate.

4.5 will be given for one article or chapter or equivalent.

4 will be given where there is evidence of activity, such as a paper under review or delivered at a conference, but no publications or acceptances.

3 will be given when there is evidence of work ready for submission but no evidence of current or pending presentation, acceptance or publication.

2 or lower may be given when there is no evidence of viable current or pending research.

Teaching

Mean E8 teaching evaluation scores will be considered as one of many types of evidence for each annual teaching evaluation, including more statistically representative, written, in class teaching evaluation scores; work directing and serving on graduate student dissertation committees and comprehensive exams; evidence of pedagogical innovation; service as instructor of record for sections enrolling 90 or more students; supervising GAs; developing online course shells; additional voluntary teaching; teaching beyond the call of duty in other respects, such as serving special department needs; and special service to the graduate or undergraduate program. Faculty members are entitled to up to two peer evaluations per year, which will be taken into account in adjusting teaching scores upward or downward.

Service

5 will be given for editing a scholarly journal, chairing a program committee for a regional or national conference, chairing a school, department, or university committee or council; or for two major, time-consuming activities each of which goes beyond routine membership in a department committee. These may include serving as Associate Editor for a scholarly journal, chairing a department committee, or membership in a school, college, or university committee or council.

4.5 will be given for multiple committee memberships or equivalent, including but not limited to substantive contributions to the peer review process.

4 will be given for active membership in at least one standing or ad-hoc committee of the department, or for modest participation in peer review.

3 or lower may be given when governance participation is confined to committees that have been largely inactive during the past year, or for minimal contributions to peer review.

2 or lower may be given when there is little to no evidence of service to the community, profession, or institution.

Appeals

All aspects of an annual evaluation conducted by the Department Chair are subject to appeal to the Department of Philosophy Executive Committee. Any member of the faculty may initiate, without prejudice, an appeal of the Chair's evaluation for a given calendar year, prior to the commencement of the Fall semester of the following year. Appeals should be made in writing to the Chair of the Executive Committee, which must within three weeks conduct a full independent evaluation of work performed within the year in question. The Executive Committee's evaluation will then take the place of the Chair's evaluation.

VI. ADJUNCT SCREENING PROCESS

A. The Adjunct Screening Process will be the responsibility of the Chair. Faculty members will assist the Chair when requested about hiring and assigning adjuncts in their areas of specialization.

B. The Chair will be responsible for obtaining all the documents necessary to assess the suitability of the applicant. This includes a current c.v., teaching evaluations from other institutions (if they are available), letters of recommendation, and an official college transcript. Applicants must have at least a MA degree or equivalent training.

C. New adjuncts will be assigned by the Chair to a permanent faculty member who will serve as a mentor. The faculty member will also review the adjunct's course syllabus and other related instructional material to be certain they meet departmental standards.

D. The Chair will review all adjunct teaching evaluations at the end of each semester.

VII. SUMMER APPOINTMENT POLICIES

A. Opportunities for summer employment shall be offered in an equitable fashion to every full-time, permanent member of the department (in full compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement).

B. A rotation system shall be utilized that enables faculty to make plans a year (or more) in advance. Assignments shall be made of a single course to each faculty in the order determined by the rotation system. Should funds exceed those needed to fund each eligible and willing summer appointment, a 2nd course can be offered to those faculty who desire such an assignment, again going through the established rotation system.

C. The rotation system is based on a list of all departmental summer teaching assignments (excluding Chairs) over the past 5 years. Faculty receive 5 points if they have received no summer assignment over those 5 years, 4 if they have not received an assignment in the past 4 year, and so on. A person who received a summer appointment in the

immediate past summer would receive 0 points. Assignment for a coming summer would first be offered to those with 5 points, next to those with 4 and so on. New hires to tenure-track, full-time positions will be assigned 3 points in their initial year.

D. Place in rotation system.

1. A person who receives funding for summer from any non-departmental source will not have his/her place in the rotation affected by such funding (grants, Honors, non-departmental administration, etc.)
2. Once person has reached the point of having 5 or more years without summer assignment, that person remains at the top of the rotation indefinitely.
3. To allow for planning, all faculty will be required to declare no later than January 1 whether they wish to be in the pool for summer appointment. This will give faculty “on the bubble” an opportunity to find other summer income.
4. Any arrangement that would affect the rotation (e.g. a faculty member teaching free courses for the department throughout the 9 month period in exchange for a summer course assignment) should be brought to the Department for approval.
5. In cases of ties for places in the rotation, decisions will be made by a flip of coin or some similar tie-breaking mechanism.

E. Priorities for assignment: Summer appointments for the foreseeable future will involve instruction only. Consequently, the needs of students and the needs of the department to produce funded SCH will take precedence in the determination of which courses will be offered. It is the responsibility of the department chair to make assignments of the courses to be offered; while the preferences of faculty should be accommodated as much as possible, the over-riding considerations are those of offering the courses most beneficial to students and to the department.

F. Eligibility: Because of the exclusively instructional nature of summer appointments, no faculty member, regardless of place in the rotation, shall be eligible for summer appointment if the most recent annual evaluation by the chair in teaching is less than a “satisfactory.” Visiting or limited term faculty will not be eligible except by vote of the Department, which vote should take place ideally before hiring is made of such an individual but not later than January 1. The place of faculty in the rotation will not be affected by sabbatical leaves.

VIII. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND DISRUPTION OF ACADEMIC PROCESS

Academic Dishonesty

When a graduate teaching assistant has reason to believe a student has been dishonest in his or her performance on an assignment, the graduate assistant will communicate his or her concerns to the faculty member for whom the graduate teaching assistant is working, or who is acting as the graduate teaching assistant’s mentor. The faculty member will, in turn, report the incident to the Chair, and the procedures outlined in the University’s Undergraduate Catalog under “Academic Dishonesty and Disruption of Academic Process” will be followed.

IX. CRITERIA AND PROCEEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

See document “Tenure and Promotion Criteria,” separation from governance document effective **XXXX, 2021**

X. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE

PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION

See document “Tenure and Promotion Criteria,” separation from governance document effective **XXXX, 2021**

XI. AMENDMENTS TO THIS GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS

This Governance Document may be amended at any regular meeting of the Department provided that the specific amendment in writing shall have been distributed at the previous regular department meeting.

A 2/3 vote of the faculty shall be required to amend this document.

APPENDIX

College of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures

The quality of a university depends chiefly upon the merited reputations of its faculty members. Thus, decisions to grant tenure and promotion are among the most critical in the university life. They require careful, deliberate planning by each faculty member who expects to be considered for such action, and responsible, objective and informed consideration by all who are involved in review and recommendations. For this reason, clear and consistent tenure and promotion criteria must be applied. The College of Arts and Sciences evaluates candidates for tenure and/or promotion based on their performance in teaching, research, and service. The following criteria establish minimum college-wide standards that are consistent with the University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. While the College standards allow for exceptions in compelling circumstances, the burden of proof in such a case rests on the candidate in the first instance and on those who review and judge the application favorably at successive levels of review.

Each department and program in the College of Arts and Sciences must also have written criteria for tenure and promotion that are consistent with both University and College standards. The criteria of each department or program should stipulate the relative importance and significance of teaching, research, and service in accordance with its particular mission. Departments or programs may establish criteria that assign higher priority to any one or combination of categories of teaching, research, and service. Whenever a department or program revises its criteria, it must submit revisions to the Dean for review to ensure compliance with College criteria.

In the tenure and promotion process, the reviewers at both the department and college levels should be thoroughly familiar with the documents offered to support the applications. The candidates and the responsible departmental representative should supply the College reviewers and the Dean with complete, clear, and accurate information.

CRITERIA

TENURE:

The minimum criteria for tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences are an outstanding record in either teaching or research and/or creative activity, at least a strong record in the other, plus at least a satisfactory record of service.

Teaching. To qualify for tenure, faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences must have a

consistent pattern of positive evaluation in teaching and have achieved a level of performance that is strong or outstanding.

Research. The granting of tenure is a judgment based on past performance and potential for future contributions to research and/or creative activity. For a recommendation of tenure in the College, candidates must document that they have made a substantial contribution to research and/or creative activity in their discipline and have established a record of achievement that is strong or outstanding.

Service. To qualify for tenure, candidates must display evidence of some appropriate service to the University and/or the profession and/or the civic community. Community service must relate to the basic mission of the University and to the faculty member's professional expertise.

Each recommendation for tenure should be accompanied by a statement of the mission, goals, and educational needs of the department, college, and/or regional campus, and the importance of the contributions the candidate has made and is expected to make in the future toward achieving the goals and meeting the needs. Consideration should be given to the candidate's ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the department, college, and/or campus.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: The minimum criteria for promotion to associate professor are the same as those for tenure. In cases where a candidate for tenure holds the rank of assistant professor, the recommendation for tenure should entail a recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR: For promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate must offer conclusive evidence of a reputation beyond the University, among peers on a national or international level, for outstanding contributions in either research and creative activity or teaching. The candidate must also have at least a strong record of service. In summary, the minimum criteria for promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences are an outstanding record in either teaching or research and/or creative activity and at least a strong record in the other two categories.

PROCEDURES

REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE: It is the responsibility of the department peer committee and department chair or other appropriate administrator to include a progress toward tenure review as part of the annual evaluation for all faculty in the probationary period for tenure. For those faculty appointed with the full probationary term a more extensive pre-tenure review will be conducted during the third year. If an individual is credited with tenure-earning service at the time of initial appointment, the review will be conducted at the approximated mid-point of the probationary period. The mid-point review will be conducted by the department's tenure and promotion committee, the department chairperson or other appropriate administrator, the college or college/campus tenure and promotion committee, and the college/campus dean. Upon the

request of the faculty member the review of progress toward tenure will include the Provost.

All mid-point reviews shall address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, research/creative activity, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should critically assess overall performance and contributions in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will not be as extensive as the formal tenure review that occurs later but should be based on a set of documents which would include: a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials and scholarship; and a brief self-evaluation by the faculty member.

The mid-point review is intended to be informative, and to be encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure, instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance, and cautionary to faculty where progress is significantly lacking.

The following procedures are intended to ensure uniform application of tenure and promotion guidelines within the College of Arts and Sciences. Individual departments and programs may include additional steps in accordance with their specific functions and disciplines, but all departments and programs must meet the deadlines set by the Dean.

Potential candidates for Tenure and Promotion should begin preparation during the Spring preceding the Tenure and Promotion process that occurs the following Fall. Chairs should ensure that candidates have received current Department, College, and University Guidelines and the BOR-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. Chairs should also inform candidates of the materials they will be expected to provide in support of their applications.

External reviewers. Candidates' scholarship and creative works are to be evaluated by external reviewers whose professional reputations are exceptional. The reviewers are expected to be familiar with the work of the candidate, to comment on the value of the candidate's work and to place it in relation to the work of others in the field. External reviewers should be selected so as to minimize the possibility of conflicts of interest - actual, potential, or apparent. Reviewers should be highly regarded and recognized scholars in the candidate's field and able to evaluate the quality, productivity, and significance of the candidate's research and creative activities.

A candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor should submit a list of at least six suggested reviewers to his/her Department Chair or equivalent academic officer. A candidate for promotion to professor should submit a list of at least eight suggested reviewers to his/her Department Chair or equivalent academic officer. Each list must be accompanied by brief statements, including biographical sketches, to support the choices. If any reviewer is recommended who has had significant previous contact with the candidate, reasons for the choice should be presented in sufficient detail to allay concerns about conflicts of interest.

In the event that the candidate's Department Chair believes additional names are desirable or necessary, then (1) the candidate should make supplementary recommendations, and (2) the Chair may suggest additional reviewers to the candidate. In choosing reviewers it is recommended that

the Chair seek the counsel of the department tenure and promotion committee. Ordinarily, this process will result in a list of reviewers acceptable to the candidate and to the Chair.

Should agreement not be reached, the candidate and his/her Department Chair will develop a list of external reviewers in consultation with the Dean. The final list of reviewers, however it is developed, will be submitted to the Dean for approval and should be accompanied by brief statements, including biographical sketches, to support the choices.

The candidate's Chair, in consultation with the candidate, will solicit from the approved list at least three letters of evaluation from reviewers for candidates applying for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and at least five letters for applying for promotion to professor. In either case, no more than six may be submitted. Although departments may contact the selected reviewers informally, an official request for an evaluation shall be in the form of a letter from the candidate's Chair composed in accordance with the model letter drafted by the Dean's Office. It is inappropriate for candidates to contact the reviewers regarding promotion and/or tenure consideration.

After ascertaining a reviewer's willingness to serve as an evaluator, the candidate's Chair will forward to the reviewer materials provided by the candidate, including a current vita and other materials the candidate chooses as appropriate. The process should be scheduled to ensure adequate time for the reviews to be returned and considered by the department and college committees. When the external reviews are added to the candidate's application, the materials, including biographical sketches, used to support the selection of these reviewers should be included.

Departmental recommendation for or against tenure is the prerogative of the tenured faculty. Typically, three distinct recommendations for or against tenure should be made by each department. The first will be by a vote of all the tenured members of a department, the second by the department's tenure and promotion committee, and the third by the Chair of the department. For all cases of tenure and/or promotion, the recommendation of the Department Committee and the Chair will be forwarded to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and must be accompanied a clear, substantive summary of reasons for both positive and negative votes. A copy of the department's criteria for tenure and promotion should also be included.

After a candidate's file has been submitted for review by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, materials may not be added or removed without consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair. Any proposed deletions (e.g., an incorrect document) must be justified in writing to the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair, who must approve the deletion. Any additions must be submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair and must be accompanied by a written request to add the material, explaining the reason for their late addition. If materials are deleted or added to a candidate's file after it has been submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair will be responsible for deleting or adding the materials and informing the candidate, the candidate's Department Chair, all members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Dean, of the

action.

After each member of the College's Tenure and Promotion Committee has reviewed the candidate's credentials, the Committee will meet to prepare its recommendations to the Dean. The Committee's deliberations will focus exclusively on how well a candidate meets college, university and department criteria for Tenure and Promotion. The Committee must not apply standards that are lower than those specified in the department's criteria.

If a College Tenure and Promotion Committee member is from the same department as a candidate for tenure and/or promotion, or if a member has special personal and/or professional associations with a candidate, that committee member will leave the room during all deliberations concerning that candidate and will abstain from making a recommendation concerning that candidate.

Tenure and Promotion Committee members shall confine themselves to making decisions solely upon the information provided in each candidate's official tenure and promotion file. No committee member shall solicit or consider any additional information conveyed privately, through personal contact, by phone, letter, or any other means. The entire committee may vote by a two-thirds majority to authorize the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair to solicit additional information if necessary. All requests for additional information must be in writing by the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair, who will provide the candidate and the Chair of the candidate's department with copies of the request.

Voting on a candidate by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee will be by secret ballot. These ballots shall be preserved in the Office of the Dean for a reasonable time. The committee's vote and clear, substantive summary of reasons for both positive and negative votes must be included in the candidate's file. All members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee must sign the recommendation forms for each candidate.

Once the Tenure and Promotion Committee has made its decision, it will identify those cases in which its recommendation differs from that of a candidate's Department Chair and/or the Department Committee, and the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair will inform the candidate and the Chair of the candidate's department, in writing. The candidate's Department Chair, the candidate or, at the candidate's discretion, a faculty advocate chosen by the candidate will then be given an opportunity to respond to the Tenure and Promotion Committee in writing.

Once the recommendations of the Tenure and Promotion Committee are final, they will be forwarded to the Dean. In any case where the recommendation of the Dean differs from that of a candidate's Department Chair and/or Department Committee, the Dean will inform the candidate and the Chair of the candidate's department, in writing. The Department Chair, the candidate or, at the candidate's discretion, a faculty advocate chosen by the candidate, will then be given an opportunity to respond to the Dean in writing. In the case of every application for tenure and/or promotion, the recommendations of the Department Committee, Department Chair, College Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Dean will be forwarded to the Provost.

Approved by Dean's Office on February 16, 2022.

Approved by Provost's Office on February 16, 2022.