



THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

PROCEDURAL HANDBOOK FOR SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS: REVIEW OF APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE CASES

Note: The information contained in this document should be construed as guidelines and summaries of university procedures for quick reference, and should not be construed to contradict any of the more extensive information contained in the Faculty Handbook. This procedural handbook also intends to give some insight into the methods and procedures followed by the Senate Committee on Appointments and Promotion (CAP), in order to limit confusion regarding the qualities sought in applications and regarding reasons for positive and negative assessments of applicants.

I. Timetable of Reviews for Reappointment and Tenure – Fall Appointment

For term reappointment of faculty members within the probationary period, the Academic Senate CAP is not involved. The matters in sections I and II of this document are strictly a school matter and reappointment requires no action by the Academic Senate. The information below is provided simply for convenience and completeness.

The following schedule applies for a faculty member whose appointment begins with the beginning of the *Fall* term:

	FALL SEMESTER	SPRING SEMESTER
ACADEMIC YEAR 1		
ACADEMIC YEAR 2	First term reappointment	
ACADEMIC YEAR 3		
ACADEMIC YEAR 4		Second term reappointment
ACADEMIC YEAR 5		
ACADEMIC YEAR 6	Tenure review	
ACADEMIC YEAR 7		

The first term reappointment review needs to be completed so that the outcome can be communicated to the appointee by December 15, the deadline in the *Faculty Handbook* for the end of the probationary appointment if the application for reappointment is unsuccessful. To comply with this schedule, it is recommended that the application be completed, reviewed, and voted by the department (in departmentalized schools), and the materials forwarded to the school dean's office, by November 10.

The timetable for steps in the process of review for tenure is identical to that for fall-appointment faculty, with the sole exception that faculty holding Spring appointments have an extra semester in their probationary period: for all dates in the following section, substitute “Academic Year 7” for “Academic Year 6” in reference to Spring appointments.

If the review is successful, the result is appointment with continuous tenure beginning with the first semester (August 20) of Academic Year 8. If the review is unsuccessful or the appointee does not apply for review for tenure, the result is termination of appointment at the end (August 19) of Academic Year 8.

III. Timetable for Simultaneous Application for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure

A recommended timetable for steps in the process of review for tenure (for Fall-appointment faculty) is in this section.

If the review is successful, the result is appointment with continuous tenure beginning with the start (August 20) of Academic Year 7. If the review is unsuccessful, or the appointee does not apply for review for tenure, the result is termination of appointment at the end (August 19) of Academic Year 7.

	ACADEMIC YEAR 5
SEP	Applicant meets with dean to preview application process; also with chairperson
OCT	
NOV	
DEC	
JAN	
FEB	
MAR	Dean/chairperson consults with applicant and with other faculty concerning potential externs
APR	Dean/chairperson begins soliciting externs
MAY	
JUN	Dean/chairperson sends applicants’ publications to externs no later than mid-June
JUL	
AUG	

ACADEMIC YEAR 6	
SEP	Deadline for receiving externs' letters in department (mid to late month); applicant meets with dean to review application materials
OCT	Review and vote by department (aim for mid-month) <i>for tenure and promotion</i> ; materials forwarded to school CAP immediately
NOV	Review and vote by school CAP (chair attends CAP meeting to present case) <i>for tenure and promotion</i> ; CAP hears tenure cases in order received from departments
DEC	Applications for tenure (and promotion, if applicable) are due in the Office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies no later than December 15.
JAN	Review and vote by Senate CAP (ideally before end of January) and by full Senate at February Senate meeting <i>for tenure and promotion</i> ; dean presents case (may ask chair to assist at CAP)
FEB	
MAR	Academic Affairs Committee of Board of Trustees reviews application at March Trustees meeting; vote of recommendation by committee <i>for tenure only</i>
APR	
MAY	
JUN	Full Board of Trustees votes <i>for tenure only</i>

IV. Timely Submission of the File

All CAP cases, but particularly applications for continuous tenure, should be presented on a timely basis. This is critical in the case of tenure, when the applicant is in his/her final probationary year. If the Senate CAP feels that there is insufficient material to assess the candidate for a vote (i.e. external letters provide strongly contradictory assessments of the candidate, some evaluations are too abbreviated or superficial, teaching evaluations or other materials are missing, etc.), the vote will be deferred and the application held for additional information. It is clearly advantageous to have the application for tenure submitted as early as possible. This provides a sufficient "buffer" period in case the Senate CAP holds up action on the application for further information or for clarification.

V. General Presentation of the File

There should be clear divisions of the components of the appointment (1-A), promotion (1-P), or tenure (1-T) form. The electronic submission of the components will take place through Blackboard. Each school should create a "Blackboard course" where it will place its completed applications. Each application should be placed in a unique folder with materials placed in four separate folders under the heading "Committee Documents for Review":

1. "Application Materials"
 - a. The official 1-A, 1-P, or 1-T application. The first page seen upon viewing the application should be the first page of the official application form. No table of contents is necessary.

- b. Other official materials such as curriculum vitae; executive summaries by the dean, department chair and/or applicant; research plans; research progress reports, teaching philosophies, etc. These are all optional.
 - c. In cases where a dean or chairperson has written an executive summary for cases that are being considered simultaneously for promotion and for tenure, separate summaries should be considered for each action. It may be possible that the application for tenure is denied and does not go forward while the application for promotion is allowed to proceed to the next step. A single-purpose summary for both actions may prejudice the vote on the promotion if it can be inferred that an accompanying tenure application was voted unfavorably.
2. "External Letters of Evaluation" (in applications for tenure and for ordinary professor)
 3. "Scholarly Products"
 - a. Scholarly and research products such as books, reprints of articles, and other examples of scholarly and professional activity. Each of these items should be numbered to correspond to its evaluation in the application form. In the case of textbooks, the cover page, table of contents and other pages deemed important by the applicant should be copied and included in the binder for the application. If the work cannot fit into a folder or binder containing the application materials, it should be provided separately but clearly marked with the number that corresponds to its evaluation. For textbooks, they should be provided in full, even if the cover and table pages are copied and included in the binder section.
 4. "Teaching Evaluations"
 - a. A summary of the evaluation scores at the beginning of this section is useful to the Senate CAP, along with the original evaluations. Evaluations can be provided by the Office of Financial Planning, Institutional Research and Assessment in electronic format.
 - b. Other evidence, e.g., peer assessments, teaching portfolios, etc.

VI. Letters of Evaluation

Letters of evaluation from external reviewers are required for applications for appointment with continuous tenure and for promotion to ordinary professor. They are optional in other cases.

A. Number of Letters

There must be an adequate number, i.e., a minimum of 6 substantive letters. The dean must use his or her judgment in determining whether the number of external letters is sufficient. The fewer the number of letters, the greater the impact a negative letter or one expressing reservations can be. Therefore, the dean or chairperson may wish to ask for additional letters if he/she feels that the compromising letter is not representative. The applicant can provide recommendations for external reviewers. The dean or faculty member coordinating the application should select a representative number from the candidate's list and from the department's or school's list, but the majority of the letters must be from reviewers selected by the academic unit. The candidate may include collaborators among the list of recommended reviewers, but they

should be clearly identified as collaborators; among those reviewers selected from the candidate's list, only a minority can be collaborators. The dean or faculty member coordinating the application must include all solicited letters in the application, even if one appears to be inconsistent with the others, or otherwise deemed an "outlier."

B. Qualifications of the Evaluators and Disclosure

Generally, the reviewer should be at the same rank as, or the equivalent of, the rank for which the candidate is applying, or in the case of tenure, of a senior rank. If the qualification is evident by the evaluator's rank, title and institutional affiliation, then no further items are needed to establish qualification. However, if the qualification of the reviewer to evaluate the candidate for the action being proposed is not evident, then a very short professional biography (1-2 pages maximum) should be included immediately following the evaluation letter. Please be mindful that appending a huge *c.v.* for each evaluator is generally a nuisance.

In the body of the letter, the evaluator should describe his or her relationship to the applicant and indicate how well he or she is suited to evaluate the applicant's work as well as disclose any conflict of interest such as professional collaboration with or consultation for the applicant. If there is any collaboration or consultation and if any remuneration is received either directly or indirectly in the form of a sub-grant, this must be divulged.

Evaluators chosen by the department or school should be as unbiased as possible by having no conflict of interest, as defined above.

C. Indication of Source of Recommendation of Reviewers

There should be clear indication in the candidate's application of which reviewers were recommended by the candidate and which recommended by the school or academic unit. In the case of reviewers suggested by the academic unit, the specific source of the recommendation should be noted (i.e. dean, school CAP, selected faculty members).

D. Solicitation of External Review

Evaluators should be sent the applicant's application, a *c.v.* listing the applicant's complete body of professional work (if not included in the application), along with specific examples of work for evaluation. The reason that the external evaluator is being asked to evaluate the applicant should be explicitly clear: the letter should state whether the applicant is being considered for appointment, promotion, tenure, or both promotion and tenure. If for appointment or promotion, then the letter should state to what rank. The evaluator should receive a copy of the University's guidelines for promotion to the various ranks and for qualification for tenure. The reviewer should be asked to provide an evaluation by a specific deadline that is preferably well before the time that the application should be submitted. The selection of the applicant's work sent to evaluators should not all be the same: different examples should be sent to different reviewers, although there can be some articles/works that are common to several evaluators. This is to avoid limiting the reviewers' evaluations to only a few of the applicant's best works. Evaluations should be "substantive," providing some detailed assessment of the candidate's scholarly work (also see below in the evaluation

section). In general, those evaluations that specifically rate the candidate's work, productivity, and standing to others in the field are very useful to the Senate CAP. A sample letter for soliciting the evaluation by external reviewers is appended to the application form online, in the section regarding letters of evaluation.

VII. Qualifying Publications and Equivalent Criteria of Professional Work

In many academic areas, publication is the primary indicator of scholarly activity. In other areas such as the performance arts and architecture, equivalent criteria as defined in Sections II-D-4, II-D-5, and II-D-6 of the *Faculty Handbook* are used.

A. Qualifying Publications

Only works that have been published or are in press should be included. Works that are "in progress" should not be included. A letter of acceptance from the publisher should accompany those works "in press"—unless they are presented as page proofs that contain the name of the journal—and publication date. All written products must include page numbers so that the length of the work in terms of pages can be easily determined. For manuscripts in press, the total number of manuscript pages must be included. If the candidate feels that works under contract or in progress can help the candidate's cause, then they should be entered under a separate category.

B. Works of Art, Artistic Performance, Plays, Architectural Design

Only those that have been performed or finished may be included.

C. Book Chapters, Monographs and Abstracts

In cases of a book edited by the applicant that includes chapters authored or coauthored by the applicant, only the book should be listed in the application. An abstract of a presentation given at a meeting is not included under publications unless the abstract is published in a professional publication. When included as a publication, the abstract should be so identified.

D. Indication of Length of the Published Work and Derivatives of Dissertation or Thesis

There should be an indication of the number of pages for each publication. If publications are derived from the applicant's dissertation or thesis for a degree, specific information about how the publication included in the application differs from the dissertation or thesis must be provided. Examples are revisions, additions, or deletions from the work used for the graduation and their overall effect on the conclusions of the publication.

VIII. Evaluation of Publications and Professional Work

A. General Considerations

Evaluations for qualifications for faculty rank are guided by the criteria set forth in the Faculty Handbook Section II-D-2 and II-D-3. Evaluations for tenure are guided by criteria set forth in Section II-D-8 of the Faculty Handbook.

If a publication submitted as part of the application has multiple authors, the applicant should provide an explanation of his/her role in the work. Moreover, the dean or chairperson should provide an indication whether in the particular field of the candidate, the practice of having multiple authors is common and whether the most important author is listed first or last.

In cases where the candidate has a very large number of publications but none or few that he/she is a primary author, then some guidance by the dean and/or the chairperson on assessing the candidate's work would be helpful to the Senate CAP. In certain fields of art and performance including architecture, the *Faculty Handbook* provides general criteria for assessment. Nevertheless, in certain cases, guidance from the dean and/or chairperson would also be helpful in such cases. This guidance is normally provided in person during the Senate CAP review of the application but can also be provided as a memorandum.

B. Internal Evaluation of Individual Scholarly Products

Applications contain a section for the assessment of applicant's work submitted as part of the applications. These evaluations are completed by the chairperson and or school CAP as well as by the dean. The evaluations are most informative to the Senate CAP if they present the following in some detail:

1. The type of work (i.e. peer review journal article, book chapter, opinion piece, etc.);
2. A brief summary of the work;
3. The importance of the publisher or the venue of the work if it is of the nature of an artistic performance; and
4. The contribution of the work and its impact in the field.

In cases where the applicant has more than 10 included works, the school has the option of choosing the 10 most important eligible works and providing an in-depth assessment. This is preferable to including short descriptive comments on all works. In the case of promotion, eligible works would refer to work produced since appointment or last promotion. In the case of tenure, the applicant's entire body of work is eligible.

C. Evaluation by the Senate CAP

While colleagues in the same field as the applicant are the best suited to assess fully the significance of the work, the Senate CAP is still capable of evaluating the work in a substantive way. It can confirm the type of work and affirm the length of the work and it can make broad determinations on whether it represents a substantial scholarly effort. Moreover, it can conduct its own assessment of teaching effectiveness, honors, and recognition in the applicant's field, and service to the school, university, and community.

IX. Teaching Evaluations

For faculty appointments that are not primarily of a research nature, teaching is an important element in determining qualification for appointment, promotion, and tenure. Teaching evaluations must be included in the evaluation. For those faculty members who have taught a number of courses, a summary of the teaching evaluation scores, usually in a table format, is most helpful.

X. Honors, Awards, and Grants

Awards given in recognition of outstanding accomplishment and service can be included in the application, and these constitute an important category for evaluation. Awards that are unearned such as those given solely for monetary contributions, purchase of paid memberships, etc. should not be included.

Grants and fellowships are another important area of recognition. Only those grants in which the applicant is a principal investigator or a co-principal investigator qualify for being included in the application. Being supported by a grant or collaborating with the grant's investigators are insufficient grounds for claiming credit for that grant and should not be included in a CUA application.

In cases of a sub-grant or a contractual agreement with the principal investigator of another grant this should be made clear. Moreover, the funds awarded should be clearly indicated. In cases of sub-grants, collaborative grants and other arrangements, only the funding received by the applicant can be included. Providing the total amount of funding given to the overall project is misleading, since these funds are not all intended for the applicant.

XI. CAP Deliberation, Dean's Presentation and Voting

A. First Discussion

Prior to the presentation of the candidate's application by the dean, the CAP will deliberate the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate as presented in the candidate's application. The discussion will include the candidate's qualifications and general suitability for the position or tenure. This discussion is moderated by the Dean of Graduate Studies as the chairperson of the CAP and is conducted with total confidentiality. As part of this discussion, specific questions to ask the dean are determined. These questions are intended to clarify and to provide additional information about the candidate or parts of the application, including the votes of other reviewing bodies.

B. Presentation by the Dean to the Senate CAP

After the confidential discussion in the absence of the dean, the dean is asked to present the qualifications of the candidate. In cases where the applicant has submitted applications for promotion or appointment to associate professor and appointment with continuous tenure, each of these applications is considered separately. The dean addresses the appointment or promotion action first.

Normally, the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies will provide the dean of the school a summary of the discussion and the principal items that came up during the discussion. The dean in his/her presentation is expected to address any concerns or requests for clarification. Before, during, or after the dean's presentation, the members of the Senate CAP may ask questions of the dean.

C. Second Deliberation and Voting

At the conclusion of the dean's session, the dean is asked to leave the meeting to allow the Senate CAP to discuss the dean's presentation of the application and his/her responses to the questions in confidence. The Senate CAP will normally vote on the candidate following this additional discussion. Only when the members of the Senate CAP are satisfied by the information provided by the dean and the information contained in the application is a vote taken by secret ballot.

D. Additional Questions of the Dean, Third Deliberation and Voting

In cases where the deliberation still indicates a lack of conclusion, the Senate CAP organizes additional questions, concerns, and other information to be requested of the dean. The dean of the school is then asked to return to the conference for a second series of questions. Upon conclusion of the questioning, the dean is asked to leave the meeting. There is a final brief deliberation. Only when all members of the Senate CAP are satisfied by the information provided by the dean and the information contained in the application is a vote taken by secret ballot.

E. Insufficient Basis for Voting

If the Senate CAP feels that despite these efforts, there is insufficient information or unresolved concerns to vote on the application, the Senate CAP must decide to defer the vote until all questions can be resolved to the extent possible. It may be possible that the Senate CAP determines that these questions and concerns cannot be resolved any further, in which case a vote is taken. If the vote is deferred, the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies prepares a list of specific information required by the CAP in order to vote. This list is then provided to the school dean and the vote for the application is rescheduled to a time that the dean can appear and address these issues.

XII. Report of the CAP Deliberation and Votes to the Academic Senate

The Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, as chairperson of the Senate CAP, reports to the Academic Senate on the votes and deliberations of the Senate CAP. In the presentation, the nature of the candidate's application (appointment, promotion, or tenure) is provided as well as the votes of the Senate CAP and those of the school deliberative bodies. The Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies also briefly summarizes the deliberations that took place. In cases of non-unanimous or unfavorable votes, the presentation presents the concerns discussed as well as rationale for the voting in as much detail as possible. In this role, the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies serves simply as the reporter of the voting results and deliberations and is not meant to serve as an advocate for the voting of the Senate CAP.