Promotion and Tenure: Guidelines for Faculty from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee

Latest Revisions Approved by the Faculty Assembly of the Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters Spring 2022

I. Composition, Meetings and Responsibilities of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee

A. Composition

- Tenured and tenure-track faculty of each Department/Unit/School shall elect a tenured colleague to serve as representative to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The representative shall be of the rank of Full Professor unless exceptional circumstances apply that do not make this possible. The term of service is two years.

- Chairs and directors are excluded from serving on the College Committee unless no other member is available.

- It is imperative that Department/Unit/School representatives to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee acquaint themselves extremely well with Department/Unit/School criteria for promotion and tenure, along with College and University guidelines for promotion and tenure. Outgoing members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee are responsible for briefing their successors before they begin their service on the Committee.

- Candidates for promotion or tenure from one of the partner campuses or whose primary assignment is in a non-degree granting program may request that a representative from that campus or program may attend the meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee at which their case is being discussed on an advisory basis. These representatives are subject to the same rules of confidentiality as the members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

- All faculty reviewing applications and participating in the process will adhere to the strictest confidentiality related to the material in the portfolio, relating to all formal discussions that take place, and relating to the entire application process.

B. Responsibilities

- The Committee will periodically review guidelines for mentoring tenure-earning faculty, guidelines for the third-year review, and guidelines for promotion and tenure so that candidates can present the best possible case for promotion and tenure.

- The Committee will evaluate third-year review portfolios. No vote is required; the goal of the process is to provide candidates with useful information about their progress toward promotion and tenure.

- The Committee will evaluate whether candidates for promotion and tenure have met the promotion and tenure criteria established by their Units and the college and University guidelines in the areas of research/creative activity, teaching, and service.

- The Committee will vote on applications for promotion and tenure.

    - The Unit representatives to the Committee will not vote on candidates from their Units.

    - It is important to recognize that the college vote for promotion and tenure is independent of the Unit evaluation. Thus, a positive vote for promotion and tenure at the Unit level does not guarantee or mandate a positive vote by the College Committee.

- The Committee will periodically revisit College guidelines for promotion and tenure to ensure that they are in compliance with university guidelines. Hence, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee strongly recommends that each Unit review its own promotion and tenure criteria every three years to make certain they conform to College and University promotion and tenure guidelines.

II. Composition of the two separate Unit Promotion and Tenure Committees (Promotion and Tenure Committee; Promotion to Professor Committee)

- Applications for promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure will be considered by the Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee, which shall consist of all tenured associate and full professors in the Unit. The chair of this committee must be a faculty member selected from among the relevant body of faculty through a process developed by the faculty and cannot be the Unit chair or director.

- Applications for promotion to Professor will be considered by the Unit Promotion to Professor Committee, which shall consist of all faculty at the rank of Professor in the Unit. When there are fewer than three Professors in the Unit, then the chair or director of the Unit will consult with the candidate and Professors in the Department/Unit/School to identify an appropriate external committee member. The invitation to serve on the committee must be approved by the external committee member's chair or director.

- The chair or director of the Unit, at the discretion of the faculty in the unit, may serve as an ex officio member without voting rights. The deliberation of this body is advisory to the chair or director of the unit. The unit chair or director in attendance at the meeting provides information when requested but does not vote.

The Provost's office requires that each college have a policy for 'recusal', should there be a formal conflict of interest between a candidate for Third Year Review, Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure, and Promotion to Full Professor and any potential reviewer at any level in the university. Recusal includes not only abstaining from relevant voting but also individual removal from relevant discussion, such as being absent from the room, physical or electronic, where discussion is taking place for the duration of the deliberation.

- The College Committee recommends that the relevant body of tenured faculty accept the responsibility of mentoring tenure-earning faculty so that they can present the best possible case for promotion and tenure.

III. Annual Evaluations Procedures/Policies for Tenure-earning Faculty

- The relevant body of tenured faculty should be advisory to the Unit chair or director on the annual evaluation of tenure-earning faculty and their progress towards promotion and tenure;

- Annual Evaluations of tenure-earning faculty:

    - Faculty members are evaluated in three general categories:

        - teaching (using SPOT reports *and* peer evaluation of classroom teaching, based on examination of teaching materials as specified by Department/Unit/School)

        - research, creative, and professional activity

        - service

        - Unit chairs or directors are required to offer to discuss the Annual Evaluation and Performance Appraisal with the tenure-earning faculty member before it is signed and forwarded to the Dean.

IV. Third-Year Review Procedures and Policies

- The third-year review will normally take place during the spring term of the faculty member's contractual third year.

- For candidates who are granted years towards tenure, the timing of the third-year review will be set at the time of hire in the Letter of Offer. Prior to sending the Letter of Offer, the Committee recommends that the Unit Chair/Director consult with the chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee

- The evaluation process begins at the Department/Unit/School level and consists of the following process:

A. The Electronic Portfolio

- The candidate will assemble and upload the Third-Year Review portfolio. Questions concerning access and uploading of documents to the electronic portfolio should be directed to the Unit's Promotion and Tenure representative and/or chair. More information concerning questions around accessing and navigating the electronic portfolio can he found here.

    - It will contain everything required in the University's "Tenure Portfolio Guidelines" except for letters of evaluation.

    - The CV should conform to the CV template provided in the Provost's guidelines.

    - Candidates should also include their SPOT summary sheets in the section on instruction and two peer evaluations of their teaching.

    - Candidates are expected to submit their electronic portfolios in complete form in a timely manner. Submission of the portfolio with a minimum of five days for examination is expected at each level of review, except under rare, extenuating circumstances.

B. Evaluation of the Portfolio by the Unit

- The portfolio will be made available by the Unit head to be evaluated by the relevant body of tenured faculty within the Unit, which will hold a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress toward tenure.
- Unit policy regarding the presence of the chair/director at Unit-level promotion and tenure meetings should be consistent also for Third Year Review.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall use the relevant criteria for tenure and promotion to evaluate the candidate's record. Any reference to 'collegiality' should take into consideration the definition of the term by the American Association of University Professors and presented in the Provost's document "Criteria for the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty". 'Collegiality' is not an independent criterion for evaluation.

- The representative of the relevant body of tenured faculty within the Department/Unit/School will write a narrative account of the discussion, addressed to the Unit chair or director.

    - ❖ The account should accurately summarize the different points of view expressed during the discussion and solicited from the Department/Unit/School.
    - ❖ It should describe the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record rather than reporting on who said what.

- The goal of the process is to provide useful information to the candidate about his/her/their progress. No Unit vote is required.

- Copies of the narrative account will be sent electronically to the faculty member and the Unit Chair/Director.

    - The Chair/Director and the faculty member must sign the account, indicating that they have received it.

- The Chair/Director shall write a letter evaluating the candidate's progress towards tenure, considering the candidate's record, the Unit evaluation, and the relevant criteria and guidelines.

- If the candidate chooses, he/she/they may respond to the report in writing within 5 business days of receipt of the report and include the response in the portfolio.

C. Evaluation of the Third Year Review Portfolio by the College Committee

- The portfolio, with the Unit committee and chair or director's letters added to it, will be sent electronically to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. This Committee will examine the relevant criteria, the candidate's record, and the Unit review.

- A memorandum drafted by the chair of the Committee and acceptable to all members will summarize the discussion about the case. No vote is required.

- A copy of the memorandum will be sent electronically to the faculty member and to the Chair/Director of the relevant Department/Unit/School. Both will acknowledge receipt of the memorandum in writing.

- The memorandum and file will be sent electronically to the Dean for his/her/their information

- **Once an electronic portfolio is submitted to the Dean's office, it should not be amended by the candidate for any reason. The Unit representative can add pertinent information, but only after securing permission from the chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the representative within the Dean's office. Evaluation letters from the Department/Unit/School, Chair/Director, College Committee and Dean constitute the Third Year Review report and must be included in subsequent applications for Promotion and Tenure.**

V. Applications for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A. The Review Process

- Applications for promotion and tenure are evaluated at many points, and the recommendations of many groups and persons are solicited. Each level of evaluation should have sufficient review time, which is understood to be a five-day minimum.

  - The process begins at the Unit level at the beginning of the Fall term generally during the candidate's sixth year, unless otherwise arranged with the Provost's approval. Tenured members of the Department/Unit/School discuss the case and vote via a secret ballot that conveys its recommendation on the case. Faculty should first vote on the candidate's promotion. If a positive vote follows, the tenured members will then vote on the candidate's tenure.
  - Only tenured faculty members should be present at the meeting. Unit policy regarding the presence of the Chair/Director at Department/Unit/School-level promotion and tenure meetings should be consistent for the review of all candidates.

- **A member of the Department/Unit/School faculty will write an account of deliberations and write a letter that accurately reflects the discussion of the case. This memorandum will be entered into the portfolio and sent to the candidate. The candidate will have five days in which to respond formally in electronic format before the portfolio is passed to the Unit chair/director for evaluation. The portfolio may be forwarded sooner, if the candidate so indicates in writing.**

- Then, the chair or director writes a letter in which he/she/they evaluates the case in light of the Unit discussion and vote, the portfolio's evidence, and the relevant criteria; the Chair or Director must make a clear recommendation in favor of or against the application.

- **The letters from the Chair/Director of the Unit will then be entered into the portfolio and submitted electronically to the candidate, who will have 5 days to respond, if he/she/they chooses to do so. The portfolio may be forwarded to the next level of review sooner, if the candidate so indicates in writing.**

- Next, the portfolio goes to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, which discusses the case and votes on it. Members should first vote on the candidate's promotion. If a positive vote follows, the members will then vote on the candidate's tenure. The Unit representative abstains from voting. A memorandum drafted by the chair of the Committee and acceptable to all members will summarize the discussion about the case. This memorandum is then entered into the portfolio and submitted electronically to the candidate, who will have 5 days to respond, if the candidate chooses to do so. The portfolio may be forwarded to the next level of review sooner, if the candidate so indicates in writing.

- The College Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards its recommendation by sending the memorandum electronically to the Dean that describes the vote and discusses the case. The Dean reads the portfolio, considers the recommendations of the Department/Unit/School, the chair or director, and College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and writes a letter that recommends in favor of or against the application. This letter is entered into the portfolio and submitted electronically to the candidate, who will have 5 days to respond, if the candidate chooses to do so. The portfolio may be forwarded to the next level of review sooner, if the candidate so indicates in writing.

- The portfolio is then electronically sent to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, consisting of the chairs of the College committees. That committee, in its advisory role to the Provost, discusses the case and makes its recommendation in a vote. The vote and the portfolio go forward to the Provost. There is no response period for the candidate at this level of review.

    - The Provost reviews the case and makes a recommendation to the President. The President considers the recommendations that have been made at other levels, reviews the case, and makes a final decision on promotion and tenure.

B. The Electronic Portfolio

- The candidate will assemble and upload the promotion and tenure portfolio. Questions concerning access and uploading of documents to the electronic portfolio should be directed to the Unit's Promotion and Tenure representative and/or chair. More information concerning questions around accessing and navigating the electronic portfolio can he found here.

- The candidate's portfolio will contain everything required in the University's Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Guidelines. The candidate's curriculum vitae must conform to the template provided by the Provost's office for all candidates.

- In the case of the Third Year Review report, evaluation letters from the Department/Unit/School, Chair/Director, College Committee and Dean should be included in the Promotion and Tenure portfolio.

- The candidate's application is based primarily on material submitted in the portfolio. Nevertheless, there are instances where the format of the electronic portfolio is insufficient to contain relevant material for evaluation in specific disciplines. In these instances, hyperlinks to webpages or other readily available digital materials offer useful supplements. The relevance of hyperlink references should be explained clearly in the portfolio when necessary. Reviewers at all levels are expected to make a good faith effort to examine

materials accessible via hyperlinks; however, it is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that all resources remain viable.

- Once an electronic portfolio is submitted to the Dean's office, it should not be amended by the candidate for any reason. The Unit representative can add pertinent information, but only after securing permission from the chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the representative within the Dean's office.

C. External Reviewers

- Candidates are required to confirm their intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure by January 15th of the calendar year, in which their cases will be reviewed.

- External reviewers shall be selected and contacted according to University policy as articulated in the University Promotion and Tenure guidelines, which state that the candidate must have: a minimum of three current letters from outside this university at the rank the candidate is aspiring to or higher.

- A list of potential referees should be compiled by the chair/director and the senior faculty in the discipline in consultation with the candidate. The candidate should have the opportunity to review the list for any conflicts of interest. These should be letters from experts in the field that can evaluate independently the candidate's work. Effective in Fall 2025, per the Provost's document "Criteria for the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty (February 2022, page 7) referees from outside the University should be from Carnegie R1or R2 classified institutions, or their international equivalents (letters from reviewers at institutions not of these categories would require justification as to why the reviewer is appropriately qualified). The college recognizes that while a potential reviewer's professional status can take on many forms, an awareness of the candidate's institutional context is an important factor in the selection.

- A minimum of three external letters of evaluation are required. Candidates shall submit names of potential external reviewers to their Chair/Director, according to the guidelines, by February 1st of each year. Subsequently, the Chair/Director and the relevant body of tenured faculty are required to compile a list of potential referees in consultation with the candidate by February 10th of each year. By February 15th, the applicant shall indicate any potential conflicts of interest and the process of soliciting reviewers can begin.

- Chairs/Directors are required to obtain commitments from at least three of the potential external reviewers whose names have been submitted by the candidate and senior faculty in the Unit by March 15th.

- Candidates are required to upload all material that will be sent to external reviewers to the electronic protocol by May 15th of each year.

- Chairs/Directors should make available online review material to external reviewers by May 22nd of each year, unless the external reviewer requests a different date. All external reviewers will be sent the same review material.

- Chairs/directors will send only the following material to all external reviewers:

    - A current curriculum vitae, annotated or not, appropriate to the discipline.

- Electronic copies of completed refereed publications (books, journals, articles, images of art work, CD recordings, musical scores, etc.), as well as all published items, items in press and/or under review. See the statement above on the use of digital hyperlinks.

- The Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity section of the Department/Unit/School Promotion and Tenure Criteria.

- When relevant, the cover letter sent by the chair/director may include a review of the candidate's annual assignments.

- The letters from external reviewers will be uploaded to the candidate's portfolio and, if the candidate has not waived his or her right to see the external letters, shared with the candidate with a 5-day response period allowed to the candidate, following the insertion in the portfolio of the Department/Unit/School review committee's letter and the Chair/Director's letter.

D. College Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: Research and Creative Activity

In line with the American Association of University Professor (AAUP) Statement of Principles on academic freedom and tenure and the Florida Atlantic University College Bargaining Agreement, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee will use the following guidelines when evaluating a candidate's viability for promotion to associate professor:

- Scholarly productivity must demonstrate scholarly activity through publication of **refereed** books and articles. The College Committee will defer to the Department/Unit/School criteria for the appropriate amount of scholarship, in keeping with the University guidelines.

- Faculty who pursue creative endeavors must demonstrate a consistent and high quality of creative achievement appropriate to the endeavor and to Unit criteria. In some cases, there is a direct relationship between the faculty member's creative output and his/her/their teaching responsibilities (e.g. music conductors, theater directors, technicians, and the like). In such cases, the relationship must be clearly explained in the promotion and tenure portfolio.

- Community-engaged research (CER), the collaborative process between the researcher and a community partner with the goal of contributing to the discipline and strengthening the well-being of the community, is also included.

E. College Promotion and Tenure Committee Guidelines for Tenure
The awarding of tenure is based upon the Committee's judgment that the faculty member will have a <u>lifelong commitment</u> to scholarship or creative/artistic work, effectiveness in instruction, and become a willing and effective participant in university governance and appropriate service.

Thus, the awarding of <u>promotion</u> is based upon past performance; the awarding of <u>tenure</u> focuses on future performance potential.

F. College Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: Teaching

- The Promotion and Tenure Committee will critically review student and (at least two) peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching performed within the previous two years, along with any other relevant instructional material. The Committee understands that the SPOT evaluation form is a less than perfect and incomplete instrument for the evaluation of teaching, with many subjective factors playing into a student's scoring of a teacher and the course. However, SPOT scores do reveal a pattern of teaching over a period of time (3 to 5 years). To isolate any one semester accentuates the imperfect nature of the SPOT score as a device for the evaluation of teaching. The Promotion and Tenure Committee looks at long-term patterns in SPOT scores weighed against the long-term patterns of the Department/Unit/School and the College.

- It is further understood that SPOT scores are only part of the equation of evaluation and that peer evaluation and other structural support materials expand the subjective understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of a teacher. The effectiveness of the teaching profile is a combination of both objective and subjective considerations.

- Community-engaged teaching, defined as curricular activities that connect students and faculty with community-identified needs through mutually beneficial partnerships that deepen students' academic and civic learning, are included.

G. College Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: Service

- Service constitutes a series of activities that further the mission of the university. Service includes, but is not limited to, membership on Department/Unit/School, College and University committees, councils and senates that are not covered in the Instruction and Research portions of the annual assignment. It also includes service in professional organizations, participation at professional meetings, symposia, conferences and workshops, service on governmental boards, agencies, commissions, service to public schools, and other relevant community service.

- Service assignments**:** The University's Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty state that "although the typical Assistant Professor will have only a modest assignment to service, promotion to Associate Professor requires that the candidate have a record of responsible and conscientious participation in some service activities."

- This being the case, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends that assistant professors should serve mostly on Department/Unit/School committees up to the time of the Third Year Review. Thereafter, as appropriate to the discipline and Department/Unit/School, assistant professors will be expected to be assigned to Department/Unit/School responsibilities and/or to serve on Department/Unit/School committees and college committees. Untenured faculty should not chair committees.

- **The Committee recommends that** individual Units should revisit annual evaluation criteria with a goal of creating a sliding scale for service, so that more senior members of Department/Unit/School undertake leadership positions in their respective Department/Unit/School whenever possible. **The Committee recommends that, in order to bring the College in line with university norms, more service will be**

expected for tenured faculty.

- The application of one's professional expertise in collaboration with the community that addresses a community-identified need and supports the goals and mission of the university and the community may be considered under these criteria for tenure and promotion.

VI. Applications for Promotion to Professor

A. Progress of Associate Professors toward Promotion to Professor

Department/Unit/School Promotion and Tenure Committee representatives should apprise newly tenured faculty of expectations for promotion during the faculty members' first years in rank as associate professors.

B. Guidelines for Promotion to Professor

In keeping with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement of Principles on academic freedom and tenure and the Florida Atlantic University Collective Bargaining Agreement, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends that candidates for Professor have a consistent record of distinguished peer-reviewed publications, or, as appropriate, demonstrate consistent and high-quality artistic accomplishment during their time in rank as associate professors. Department/Unit/School must specify the criteria for recognizing distinction in research, scholarly, and creative activity.

--Candidates who seek promotion to the rank of Professor must also demonstrate competency in other aspects of the faculty role.

--Although Units may set additional requirements, candidates are expected to have demonstrated competence in teaching in the context of Department/Unit/School criteria.

Candidates must also demonstrate consistent involvement in service to Unit, College, and University during their time in rank as associate professors.

Procedures regarding the preparation of portfolios for Promotion to Full Professor match those for the preparation of portfolios for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure with appropriate adjustment for criteria appropriate to the aspired rank and eligibility of faculty to vote on relevant Unit and College committees.

Please refer to the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for information about University Promotion and Tenure requirements. The Guidelines memorandum describing University Promotion and Tenure requirements and procedures is issued on an annual basis during the spring semester with validity for the following summer-fall-spring semester cycle. Modifications are made year-to-year, so it is advisable to read each year's memorandum thoroughly.