C. REVISION AND USE OF DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM STANDARDS

1. The Department/Program will periodically review Department/Program Standards. The Dean of the School or College must approve minor changes. Significant revisions must undergo the approval process described in Section A.

2. Chairs/Directors will disseminate and discuss the Department/Program Standards as appropriate with their faculty, especially pre-tenure and/or tenured faculty coming up for promotion. Such discussions should be documented and recorded (e.g., Faculty Service Reports, pre-tenure reviews).

3. It is the responsibility of the Provost to ensure the proper functioning of the entire rank and tenure preparation and review process. Thus, the Provost must ensure that the Department Standards chosen by the candidate for his or her evaluation for advancement to tenure and/or promotion have been authorized by the President and that these standards are disseminated and employed as the basis for evaluation at every level of the evaluation process.

Once verified as appropriate by the Provost, the version of departmental standards elected by the Candidate must be employed at each level of evaluation.

Procedures, Roles, and Responsibilities for Review of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion

This section articulates roles and responsibilities of various constituencies during the process of reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion. Certain constituents also have responsibilities prior to the completion of the application dossier and those are articulated in earlier sections of this manual. It should be noted throughout that, when a faculty member's appointment is in an academic program that does not reside in a department, the Dean of the college or school appoints a committee to function in the role of the department, and one of the committee members to serve in the role of the department Chair.

1. Departmental

These standards are consistent with the LMU Faculty Handbook and are intended to standardize practices, clarify expectations, and increase transparency for Departmental review of faculty across the University.

1) Prior to the Department Meeting

   a. Voting members of the Department will be defined as all tenured and tenure-track members of the department. All members of the department will be provided with a Candidate’s file at least seven days prior to the Department meeting. The Department Chair will be responsible for ensuring that the application is available to department members for timely review.
b. The departmental Tenure & Promotion Committee should consist minimally of five faculty members. Departments/Programs unable to provide this quorum will draw the necessary voting members from related departments and/or disciplines, this in consultation with the Candidate, the Dean and Chair of the Department/Program. The additional voting members shall be selected by the Chair and the Dean and subject to the approval of the Candidate. (If agreement cannot be reached as to the additional members, the Provost will make the final determination based on the reasons offered by the Candidate, Chair, and Dean). In some instances it may be necessary that the faculty member serving in the role of Chair for this process is external to the Candidate’s department/program.

c. In cases where the Candidate is Department/Program Chair, the Dean of the College or School in consultation with the Candidate shall appoint another tenured member of the Department or Program, or, if necessary, another tenured member of the faculty in the College/School, to serve in the role of Chair for the tenure and/or promotion review process.

d. The Scribe for the Department meeting is appointed by the Chair, in consultation with the Candidate.

2) During the Meeting

a. The Chair reminds the voting members to participate in a collegial and ethical manner, and to respect the confidentiality of the faculty discussion.

b. Those voting members of the department unable to be present at the meeting may participate in the discussion virtually, but will not cast a ballot.

3) Voting Procedures

a. Following the Departmental process for reviewing the candidate’s application, the Chair will then give instructions regarding the ballots and voting procedures. Voting faculty will be given the opportunity to abstain by marking the appropriate box on the ballot. Abstentions do not count for or against the candidate.

b. After all votes have been made, the ballots will be placed in an envelope, which will then be sealed in a separate envelope by the Department Chair or meeting facilitator and signed over the flap in the presence of the voting members of the Department to ensure confidentiality. Once the envelope has been sealed and signed, it will be immediately given to a staff member from the Dean’s Office who will deliver it to the Dean of the College or School.
4) After the Meeting

The Scribe will prepare a summary of the discussion regarding a candidate’s application for tenure and/or promotion. The contents of the summary should be organized according to the faculty responsibilities of teaching/advising, scholarship/creative works, and service. The summary must be confined only to a faithful rendering of statements (both positive and negative) made during the departmental discussion. The summary does not make any recommendation for or against tenure and promotion. There should be no attributions included in the discussion summary. A draft of the summary is to be circulated by the Scribe for review by the voting members in attendance at the meeting to insure accuracy of the summary. Members of the Department who agree that the summary accurately reflects the discussion will sign the document. Members who do not agree may write a separate letter and should indicate their reasons for not signing the Departmental summary. Such a letter should pertain to the discussion at the meeting on the candidate and the Departmental Standards used for tenure and promotion. The Departmental summary, as well as dissenting letters, will be added to the Candidate’s application by the Chair, either in hard copy or uploaded to Box.

2. Chair

Along with the College or School Dean, the Department Chair has the primary role and responsibility for overseeing the tenure and promotion process for faculty in his/her department. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that the process as outlined in the Standards for Departmental Review of Candidates applying for Advancement to Tenure and/or Promotion in Rank are shared with Departmental faculty and followed.

It is critical that the Department Chair see the content of the initial faculty contract as it relates to the Chair’s role in outlining the faculty member’s responsibilities, expectations, and monitoring of the progress of faculty. Any reference to a faculty member’s prior experience and body of work as cited in the contract should also be available to the Department Chair.

The following is a list of the Chair’s responsibilities:

1) The Chair oversees the conduct of the R&T Process on behalf of the Candidate and Department.
2) The Chair coordinates the External Evaluation Process. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the process outlined in Procedures for External Evaluation Process is followed with respect to obtaining the external evaluation materials concerning the Candidate.
3) The Chair receives two completed applications from the Candidate, or one complete application uploaded to Box, and reviews them to be sure they are complete. The Chair inserts the external review letters into the application, either inserting copies into both applications if in hard copy or uploading
electronic versions to the dossier in Box. If the Candidate has submitted applications in hard copy, the Chair forwards one copy of the application to the Dean of the candidate’s College or School.

4) The Chair makes the application available to the other voting members for review.

5) The Chair coordinates the procedures and moderates the Department meeting as described above. The Chair appoints the Scribe for the Department meeting in collaboration with the Candidate.

6) At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair seals the ballots in an envelope, signs it, and gives it to a staff member from the Dean’s Office.

7) The Chair writes a letter of evaluation concerning the candidate, addressed to the Dean of the College or School, and uploads the letter along with the signed Departmental summary to Box or, if the application was submitted in hard copy, forwards the original letter along with the original Departmental summary to the Dean.

8) The Chair forwards the application, if in hard copy, to the Provost’s Office after adding a copy of the signed Chair evaluation letter and a copy of the signed Departmental summary. The Chair sends extra copies of the application to the Provost for shredding.

Standards for Letters for Candidate Rank and Tenure Applications:

- Before preparing the letter, the Chair should review previous Chair letters in response to the Candidate’s annual Faculty Service Report.

- The Chair should describe supportive measures that have been taken in the past to assist the Candidate in achieving Department Standards in teaching/advising, scholarship/creative works, and service, and formed within the broader mission of the University (e.g., course release, support for attending conferences for professional development, etc.).

- The Chair’s letter should focus as much as possible on specific performance of the Candidate in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship/creative works, and service and avoid generalities. Comments regarding the Candidate’s character, personality, values, etc., are not appropriate.

- The Chair’s letter in evaluating Candidate performance should be consistent with and address specifically the Department’s rank and tenure standards regarding expectations in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship/creative works, and service, and formed within the broader mission of the University. In the category of service, the Chair also should include his or her assessment of the Candidate’s contribution to the effective operation of the Department’s responsibilities, including overall performance in contributing to a quality working environment within the Department.
3. Dean

The Dean is responsible for ensuring that all policies and procedures are followed in his/her College or School. This includes sharing elements of the initial faculty contract with the Department Chair as it relates to the Chair’s role in outlining faculty members’ responsibilities, and expectations, as well as monitoring of the progress of faculty. Any reference to a faculty member’s prior professional experience and body of work as cited in the initial contract should also be shared with the Department Chair.

The Dean is also responsible for providing a letter of evaluation concerning the Candidate, addressed to the Provost. For applications submitted in hard copy, the Dean forwards the candidate’s application to the Provost’s Office after adding a copy of the Dean’s evaluation letter, the original signed Chair evaluation letter, the original signed Departmental summary, and any letters from dissenting Departmental faculty members. For applications submitted to Box, the Dean uploads the signed Dean’s evaluation letter to Box. The Dean also forwards the Departmental ballots to the Provost’s Office.

Standards for College/School Dean Letters for Candidate Rank and Tenure Applications

• Before preparing the letter, the Dean should review past Chair letters in response to the Candidate’s annual FSR, as well as consult as needed with the Candidate’s Chair. The Dean should also consider the official Departmental vote on the Candidate, as well as consult with the Chair and other Department members as needed to obtain an accurate picture of the Candidate’s overall standing among his/her Departmental peers. The Dean should comment on the findings of the third or fourth year formal review, including identified areas for improvement.

• As with the Chair’s letter, the Dean should comment on the supportive measures that have been taken to assist the Candidate in achieving Department Standards in teaching/advising, scholarship/creative works, and service (e.g., course release, support for attending conferences for professional development, etc.).

• The Dean’s letter in evaluating Candidate performance should be consistent with and address specifically the Department’s rank and tenure standards regarding expectations in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service.

• The Dean’s letter should focus as much as possible on specific performance of the Candidate in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship/creative works, and service and avoid generalities. This is to be a professional evaluation of a Candidate’s qualifications for promotion/tenure.
• The Dean should comment on the Candidate’s past contributions and future promise related to Departmental achievements and the effective operation of the Department’s responsibilities, to the ongoing operations and activities of the College/School, and to the University.

• The Dean’s letter should report the Departmental vote tally.

4. **Committee on Rank and Tenure**

The primary role of the Committee on Rank and Tenure (CRT) is to make recommendations to the Provost and President based on a review of the Candidate’s application for advancement to tenure and/or promotion in rank. The evidence to be reviewed includes the material in the Candidate’s dossier as outlined in the application standards as well as external evaluation letters, Departmental vote and summary, the Department Chair’s letter, and the Dean’s letter and any other materials defined in the application standards.

The CRT reviews the recommendations of the Department, Chair, and Dean to ensure that Departmental Standards and university policies have been applied consistently and equitably in all cases. The recommendation then made by CRT is based on its application of the Faculty Handbook criteria of teaching/advising, scholarship/creative works, and service as those criteria are articulated in the approved Department Standards of the Candidate’s Department, Program, or School.

1) Any irregularities in the dossier or in the procedures up to that point in the process should be addressed and corrected before the Candidate’s dossier is reviewed by the department.

2) Once the Office of the Provost indicates to the CRT Chair and members that the application materials are complete, every member individually reviews the application dossiers and supplementary. Each member reads and reviews all application materials. The Provost also provides appropriate Department Standards for every candidate. Every member of the Committee takes notes independently. The staff member provides each member with a standard review form.

3) All formal meetings of the Committee must be conducted with all eligible members attending. The Committee meets on a weekly basis for at least two hours, normally twice a week, reviewing the applications until their deliberations are concluded. Generally, these formal meetings run from mid-January to March or April, depending upon the number of applications and issues encountered. The Chair brings to every meeting a copy of the Faculty Handbook and current Department Standards for every Candidate up for tenure and/or promotion, along with the dossiers as needed.

4) After an initial review and discussion of all of the dossiers, sealed envelopes containing the Departmental votes for each Candidate that had
been hand-delivered by the Provost to the Administrative Specialist are opened in the presence of all seven members. All ballots in every envelope are counted and recorded on the envelope by one member. Another member then verifies this count independently. Each envelope has two signatures to guarantee the accuracy of tallying. All envelopes are processed in the same fashion. Once the vote counts and verifications are completed, they are read out loud, case by case, to the Committee so that all members can register the votes on their respective review form.

5) This is the procedure followed by the Committee during the discussion phase:

a. The Dean and/or Candidate shall be available at the request of the CRT for consultation.

b. Should any questions arise that cannot be answered by the materials contained in the application dossier and supplementary material binder(s), the CRT Chair or representative is asked to consult with the appropriate individual. The CRT may not seek evaluative information on its own outside LMU. This information and copies of any relevant document(s) are brought back to the entire Committee for review and discussion. All responses must become part of the Candidate’s dossier. Conversations must be documented and included in the Candidate’s dossier.

6) If aspects of an application are in progress (e.g., a pending editor’s decision regarding a manuscript or a pending decision made to award or deny a grant proposal), candidates may provide updates to the CRT Chair (in addition to his/her Dean, Chair and Department). The CRT Chair may contact the Candidate through her/his Dean for updates. Such information is accepted until the final date of discussion as it varies every year depending on the number of applications each year. Documentation of additional information submitted to the CRT is placed in the appropriate section of the Candidate’s dossier.

7) After the CRT Chair formally indicates the termination of discussions, the members then retire for individual contemplation for a predetermined time. During the recess, the members register their votes independently on ballots provided by the Office of the Provost that are distributed by the CRT Chair once the discussion has been formally closed. At the Committee’s next meeting all seven members bring their ballots in a sealed envelope. The members place their votes in envelopes labeled with each Candidate’s name that have been laid out on a large conference table in alphabetical order.

8) The Committee then follows the same counting and recording procedure discussed in item #4 above.
9) The CRT Chair drafts letters to the Provost that report the results of its deliberations in appropriate detail. These drafts are then shared with the Committee during one or more meetings for collective revision. Final drafts of the letters are then prepared by the Chair and presented to the Committee at a final meeting for signature by all members of the Committee. Once signed, the letters are sealed in separate envelopes. The CRT Chair then hand delivers the letters to the Provost. After the final letters are completed, the Committee meets to collectively write a memo to the Faculty Senate President and the Provost detailing overarching issues encountered during its review of materials and deliberation.

5. Provost

The Provost is responsible for ensuring that policies and procedures are followed with respect to promotion and tenure and for advising the President on individual cases of promotion in rank and advancement to tenure. The Provost receives applications in the Box file sharing system, one copy per candidate. If in hard copy, the Provost receives one set of applications from the Department Chairs and another set of applications from the Deans, including all Deans and Chairs evaluation letters, Departmental summaries, and Departmental ballots. The Provost’s Office will forward one application for each candidate and the Departmental ballots to the CRT Chair. If in hard copy, one application is retained in the Provost’s Office. The Provost also receives the recommendation letters and CRT ballots from the CRT Chair as specified in the section on the Roles and Responsibilities of the Committee on Rank and Tenure.

In the event of conflicting recommendations from different levels of the review process (for example, the Department, the Department Chair, the College/School Dean and the Committee on Rank and Tenure) the Provost may meet with any or all of the following, either individually or as a group: Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure, College or School Dean, the candidate’s Department Chair. The goal of such meetings is to help the Provost formulate his/her advice to the President.

In cases of denial of tenure and/or denial of promotion, the Provost is authorized to provide to the Candidate the recommendation of the Committee on Rank and Tenure (but not the count of the vote) and the supporting reasons for that recommendation. This includes all materials in the Candidate’s application dossier, including redacted external evaluation letters.

6. President

The final decision on all aspects of the rank and tenure process as well as the final decision on promotion in rank or advancement to tenure in individual cases rests with the President.