Loyola Marymount University

# Faculty Handbook & Handbook Addenda

Revised Edition
2019
Updated July 10, 2019

# VIII. HANDBOOK ADDENDA

## A. RANK AND TENURE RESOURCE MANUAL

### Approved 09 May 2012

### Overview

The Rank and Tenure Resource Manual, a comprehensive guide to all aspects of tenure and promotion, is designed to bring clarity, consistency, and transparency to practices across the university. The Resource Manual is comprised of several interrelated documents, and should be read in its entirety for full comprehension.

### Preamble

The Faculty at Loyola Marymount University (LMU) actively contributes to the mission and goals of the University through the encouragement of learning, the education of the whole person, and the service of faith and promotion of justice. The University's reputation for academic excellence, its collegial culture, and its commitment to scholarly and creative pursuits reflect the activities of its outstanding faculty.

LMU is committed to multiple forms of scholarship and creative activity including scholarship of discovery, conceptual design, synthesis, engagement, and teaching and learning. These activities comprise the essential criteria for promotion and/or tenure and themselves reflect the mission and goals of the University.

Each Program, Department, College, and School at LMU strives to cultivate a climate in which faculty work together to fulfill those goals that support the mission and goals of the institution. The University recognizes that individual faculty members necessarily represent a spectrum of interests and abilities and that this is embodied in the diversity and excellence in teaching/advising, scholarship/creative work, and service. All faculty members, however, are expected to contribute to the mission and goals of the University in their own way, through these three interlinked areas of responsibility. The formation of LMU faculty members as teachers, scholars, artists, craftspeople, and contributing members of the academic community is embedded in an ethos of cura personalis, such that individuals are regarded and respected as whole persons within their faculty roles.

The Rank and Tenure Resource Manual may be amended by action of the Faculty Senate, and with the approval of the President.

## Rank and Tenure Timeline

This timeline is a general guide to the sequence of steps in the rank and tenure process. 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. The term "Department" hereafter refers in such cases to the committee appointed to function in the role of the department, and the term "Chair" refers to the committee member appointed to serve in the role of Chair, as described in the Procedures, Roles, and Responsibilities section below. See Appendix A for a chronologically organized table of responsibilities in the process.

CANDIDATE

- **March**: Candidates receive a letter from the Provost informing them of their eligibility to apply for tenure.
- **Not later than May 15**: Candidate sends his/her Confirmation of Intention to Apply for Tenure and for Promotion in Rank.
- **Not later than May 31**: Candidate receives confirmation from Provost's Office that intention to apply for advancement to tenure and/or for promotion to the indicated rank has been submitted.
- **March – June**: The Candidate works with the Department Chair to generate a list of names of individuals to provide external evaluation (see section on Procedures for External Evaluation Process.)
- **May – Early July**: The Candidate, in consultation with the Department Chair, prepares a representative sample of disseminated scholarly or creative material to be sent to the external evaluators.
- **May – September**: The Candidate works on preparing the application, consistent with Section VI, Rank and Tenure Application Standards.
- **One week prior to application deadline**: External review letters are due to the Department Chair.
- **First Monday in October**: Two original sets of the completed application, or one complete uploaded application in Box at the close of the business day, 5:00pm PST, should be submitted to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will be responsible for ensuring that the application is available to department members for timely review.
- **April – May of the following year**: The candidate is informed of the President's decision regarding tenure and/or promotion.

DEPARTMENT CHAIR

- **March**: A copy of the Candidate's letter from the Provost (candidates for tenure only) goes to the Department Chair.
- **March – June**: The Department Chair works with the Candidate to discuss and develop a list of potential external reviewers. (For details, see section on Procedures for External Evaluation Process.)

- **May – Early July**: The Candidate, in consultation with the Department Chair, prepares a representative sample of scholarly and/or creative material to be sent to the external evaluators.
- **By early July**: Chair sends a formal request to the External Reviewers, along with a representative sample of the Candidate's disseminated work, the Candidate's CV, and descriptive information about the University as stated in the Handbook. (For details and letter template, see section on Procedures for External Evaluation Process.)
- **August**: Chair should send reminder to external reviewers (if necessary).
- **One week prior to application deadline**: External review letters are due. One signed external evaluation on letterhead should have been received by the Department Chair by this date.
- **September – First Monday in October**: Chair prepares for departmental discussion; confirms voting members with the Provost's Office; selects meeting time and Scribe for departmental discussion; sets up process for distributing application material.
- **First Monday in October**: The Chair receives two completed applications, or one complete application uploaded to Box, from the Candidate after the close of the business day, 5:00pm PST, and reviews them to be sure that 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 application to the Dean of the Candidate's College or School.
- **Mid October – Second Monday in November**: Department faculty meet to discuss the application and vote. Ballots are submitted according to instructions sent from the Provost. The Scribe prepares a summary of the discussion (see section on Procedures for Review of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion). For applications submitted in hard copy, the Chair forwards the original signed Chair evaluation letter and signed Departmental summary to the Dean; in addition, the Chair forwards the application to the Provost's Office after adding a copy of the signed Chair evaluation letter and a copy of the signed Departmental summary. For applications submitted on Box, the Chair uploads the signed Chair evaluation letter and signed Departmental summary to Box.
- **April – May of the following year**: The Chair is informed of the President's decision regarding the Candidate's tenure and/or promotion.

DEPARTMENT

- **First Tuesday in October**: Department faculty begin reviewing applications.
- **Mid October – Second Monday in November**: Department faculty meet to discuss the application and vote. Ballots are submitted according to instructions sent from the Provost. The Scribe prepares a summary of the discussion, which is reviewed, discussed, and revised, if necessary (see section on Procedures for Review of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion)

DEAN

- **Mid October – Late November**: The Dean receives the external review letters and one application for each candidate within their College or School. The Dean receives the Departmental ballots for each candidate within their College or School. The Dean receives the original signed Chair evaluation letters and signed Departmental summaries from the Chair. The Dean then reviews these materials and writes his/her letter of evaluation for each candidate within their College or School. For applications submitted in hard copy, the Dean forwards the candidate's application to the Provost's Office after adding 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 on Box, the Dean uploads the signed Dean's evaluation letter to Box. The Dean also forwards the Departmental ballots to the Provost's Office.
- **April – May of the following year**: The Dean is informed of the President's decision regarding the Candidate's tenure and/or promotion.

CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON RANK AND TENURE

- **Late November - December**: Chair receives Candidates' applications from the Provost's Office, including the Deans' letters and Departmental ballots.
- **December**: Chair advises members of the CRT when they may begin to read all applications.

COMMITTEE ON RANK AND TENURE

- **January – April**: The CRT deliberates and votes on all applications. (See the CRT section of Procedures for Review of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion.)

PROVOST'S OFFICE

- **March of each year**: Provost's Office sends letters to individuals who are eligible to apply for advancement to tenure and/or promotion to the indicated rank.
- **Not later than May 15**: Provost's Office receives from the Candidate his/her Confirmation of Intention to Apply for Tenure and for Promotion in Rank.
- **Not later than May 31**: Provost's Office confirms receipt of intention to apply for advancement to tenure and/or promotion to the indicated rank.
- **November**: The Provost's Office receives the candidate's application from the Departmental Chair, who forwards it after adding a copy of the signed Chair evaluation letter and a copy of the signed Departmental summary. The Provost's Office receives from the Dean the Dean's evaluation letter, the original signed Chair evaluation letter, the original signed Departmental summary, and any letters from dissenting Departmental faculty members. The Provost's Office also receives the Departmental ballots from the Dean.

- **Late November – December**: The Provost Office forwards the application and all Departmental ballots to the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure.
- **April**: The Provost receives the letters of recommendation from the CRT, reviews applications and makes recommendations to the President.

PRESIDENT

- **April – May**: The President makes the final decisions on promotion and tenure and informs the candidates.

APPEALS PROCESS

- **May – June**: Independent appeal process begins. Provost's Office oversees the independent appeal process for any Candidate who wishes to appeal a negative decision.
- **Upon Completion of the Appeal**: The President considers the appeal, makes the final decision and informs the Candidate.

## College/School and Departmental Rank & Tenure (R&T) Standards

Every academic department is responsible for developing standards for the purpose of making recommendations on faculty advancement to tenure and/or promotion in rank. The following statement on Department Standards incorporates and embraces the spirit of the descriptions and expectations that define the Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor at LMU and as stated in the LMU Faculty Handbook. The term "department standards" applies to the program standards of autonomous programs and the school standards of the School of Education.

A. ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS

1. Department Standards should take into consideration Loyola Marymount University's Mission, the College or School's Mission, the Department Departmental/Program's Mission, principles of academic freedom, and, if appropriate, accepted practices in professional discipline-specific associations, as well as LMU's commitments to supporting teaching and scholarship/creative work that crosses disciplinary boundaries.

2. Department Standards must incorporate rank and tenure standards, descriptions of expectations for teaching and advising, scholarship or creative works and service. Regarding scholarly and/or creative works, candidates must be evaluated on the basis of their entire body of work, with the expectation that evidence is demonstrated of ongoing productivity. Department Standards may define or stipulate what constitutes evidence of ongoing productivity.

3. Department Standards for advancement to tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the appropriate College or School Dean, who is responsible for coordinating this process.

4. Autonomous programs in a college or school may develop their own standards with permission of the respective Dean.

5. The School of Education (SOE) will develop School Standards rather than Department Standards.

6. The College or School Dean is responsible for ensuring appropriate consistency in protection of academic freedom, rigor, equity, and balance of Department Standards across the College or School. Therefore, the Dean will review, suggest revisions, and finally approve the Department Standards. Once approved, the Dean forwards the Department Standards to the Provost.

7. The Provost is responsible for ensuring appropriate consistency in protection of academic freedom, rigor, equity, and balance across Colleges and Schools. Therefore, the Provost reviews and, if necessary, returns Department Standards to the appropriate Dean with questions and/or suggestions for revisions. The Provost shall have final say over whether Department Standards conform to the rank and tenure standards, descriptions of expectations for teaching and advising, scholarship or creative works and service. The Provost will approve the final version of a Department's Standards and then submit them to the President for authorization.

8. The President will authorize the final version of the Department or Program Standards and will return them to the Provost for distribution to the respective Dean and Department Chair. A copy of every set of Department and Program Standards will be maintained by the individual College or School.

B. EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES BY ESTABLISHED STANDARDS

Candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be evaluated on their teaching and service performed at LMU since the time of their initial faculty appointment at the University. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor will be evaluated on their teaching and service performed at LMU since the time of their last promotion. <u>All</u> candidates for tenure and/or promotion in rank will be evaluated on their scholarly and/or creative works based on their entire body of work, with the expectation that evidence is demonstrated of ongoing productivity as clearly and explicitly defined by relevant Department Standards. Departmental Standards are the central benchmark by which candidates for tenure and/or promotion are evaluated at all levels of the process. Departments, Department Chairs, Deans, the Committee on Rank and Tenure, the Provost, and the President are obligated to evaluate a candidate's file as measured against Departmental Standards. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion in rank have the right to be evaluated on any set of their own Department's Standards relevant to their advancement to tenure or promotion in rank, in use at the time of, or formally adopted since, their initial appointment to a tenure-track faculty position at LMU.

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.

## Policy on Recusal

A. CONFLICT OF INTEREST REQUIRING RECUSAL

Faculty members or administrators who participate in the evaluation of Candidates for promotion and tenure must avoid any real or perceived conflict of interest in order to ensure an objective and equitable evaluation.

To avoid conflicts of interest, two triggers for self-recusal exist.

First, a member of the Candidate's Department(s), College/School, or of the Committee on Rank and Tenure must recuse himself or herself – and may not vote – from meetings at any Departmental or College/School-wide level if a relationship based on family, romantic involvement, or finance exists or has existed with the Candidate.

Second, significant scholarly or creative collaboration, defined as ongoing co-authorship of publications (or similarly close or extensive collaborative work), which might warrant an inference of probable bias with respect to the candidate's overall body of work, may also present a conflict of interest.

Other causes of conflicts of interest that rise to the level described above may be reason for self-recusal.

When there is a question as to what constitutes significant scholarly or creative collaboration, the individual facing potential recusal shall consult with the appropriate party (Department/Program Chair for department members, Dean for Department/Program Chairs, Provost for Deans, or Chair of CRT for CRT members), who may seek further clarification as deemed necessary, and any decision regarding the existence of significant scholarly or creative collaboration must be recorded in writing and sent to the Candidate, Department Chair, Dean, Chair of CRT, and Provost.

If a Candidate perceives a conflict of interest, a request may be made by the Candidate, the Department/Program Chair or the Dean, in writing that the individual with the perceived conflict of interest recuse himself or herself from the review process. The perceived conflict of interest should be reported to the Dean (if the perceived conflict exists at the level of the Department or the College/School), or the Provost (if the perceived conflict exists at the level of the Dean or the Committee on Rank and Tenure). A Candidate's request for recusal is privileged and confidential. If it is determined that recusal is warranted the Candidate and individual being instructed to recuse himself/herself shall be notified in writing.

B. DELIBERATIONS AND VOTING

For individual faculty members whose participation would be at the level of the department or program and that may fall under the "significant scholarly or

creative collaboration" grounds for recusal, the question of whether or not to recuse himself or herself based on scholarly collaboration is left to the discretion of the individual faculty member.

If the Department/Program Chair or Dean has engaged in significant scholarly or creative collaboration with the candidate, the Chair or Dean must recuse himself or herself from serving in the role of Chair or Dean for that candidate's dossier. A Department Chair who has recused himself or herself from serving in the role of Department Chair may decide at his or her own discretion whether or not it is appropriate for them to participate in departmental/program discussions and vote.

A Dean who recuses himself or herself from serving in the role of Dean for a particular candidate on grounds of significant scholarly or creative collaboration should not participate in departmental discussions or the department vote.

If a member of the Committee on Rank and Tenure has a conflict of interest as described above, the CRT member must recuse himself or herself from service on the Committee during that academic year altogether, due to the Committee's practice that all seven members must participate in all deliberations regarding all candidates. He or she will be replaced for the year by a member appointed to serve a one-year term by the President on the recommendation of the Committee on Committees. A CRT member who has recused himself or herself from consideration of the candidate's application on grounds of significant scholarly or creative collaboration may decide at their own discretion whether or not it is appropriate for them to participate in departmental discussions and/or the department vote as an individual department member.

In the event that a Department Chair, Dean, or CRT member recuses himself or herself from a designated administrative role solely on the grounds of significant scholarly or creative collaboration and that person either is not eligible to or elects not to participate in departmental discussions or the department vote, that person retains the opportunity to submit a separate, personal letter for the dossier.

**Rank and Tenure Application Standards**

It is essential that Candidates' applications be as accurate and as concise as possible, while still making the strongest case. In cases where applicants submit a hard copy of the application, the Department Chair shall retain one copy of the application through the completion of departmental deliberations and the addition of the Chair's letter and the Departmental Summation, at which point the application is forwarded to the Office of the Provost; the second copy of the application, with external review letters added, shall be forwarded immediately to the Dean. In cases of submissions via the file sharing system, access will be granted to different individuals following the schedule detailed in the table below.

## A. APPLICATION DIRECTIONS

To the greatest extent possible, applications for advancement to tenure and/or promotion should consist of an electronic dossier of read only files, in the common format of the time, including primary and supplementary materials. At the Candidate's discretion, hard copies may be used instead.

Applications will be divided into six main sections, according to the Table of Contents (seven sections for those applying for early tenure and/or promotion). The six (or seven) sections should be labeled, paginated within each section, and tabbed when the media permits.

Candidates are encouraged to place supplemental materials in a portable, electronic format, or make them available on a secure, LMU file sharing network.

### Application Binder with Primary Materials

Table of Contents

1. Letter of Application to the Provost verifying candidate information. (See Sample A below.). Candidates applying for tenure should also include the letter from the Office of the Provost.

2. Curriculum Vitae (See Sample B below.)

3. Narrative (Teaching/Advising, Scholarship/Creative Work, Service). (See Narrative Standards below.)

4. A copy of the appropriate Departmental Standards (see Section III, above).

5. Faculty Service Reports (FSR) and Department Chair's annual review letters for all years since appointment. (Each FSR should be followed by the Chair's Review letter, in reverse chronological order.)

6. Letters to Candidates related to formal reviews and pre-tenure reviews conducted by their Department and College/School Pre-Tenure Review Committees, or in the case of joint appointments, by their Departments.

7. Copies of letters from Candidates requesting early promotion, and in such cases, letters to the Provost from Department Chair(s) and Dean supporting early consideration.

(The external letters will be received by the Department Chair, added to the application, and made available to the Candidate's department.)

**Supplemental Material (CD/DVD)**

1. Teaching/Advising (Please list courses in reverse chronological order, semester by semester, at current rank.)
   a. The courses taught while at LMU with the class enrollment indicated for each respective class. Where a Candidate carries less than the standard 3-course load, please indicate specific reasons.
   b. Statistical Summary Reports for all courses taught are required. In addition, candidates are strongly encouraged to provide all available written Student Course Evaluations for all courses. Student Course Evaluations may be submitted on CD (for applications submitted in hard copy) or uploaded to Box.
   c. Peer observations of teaching where available.
   d. A representative selection of course syllabi and other materials OR syllabi from the most recent two years.
   e. Material related to advising.

2. Scholarly Publications/Creative Work (This section should be consistent with Departmental Standards and aligned with the information listed in your Narrative; Candidates should attempt to provide this information in Box or, for applications submitted in hard copy, on a CD/DVD).

3. Service (Consistent with Departmental Standards, please include relevant and carefully selected evidence that reflects the quality of your service at different levels as highlighted in your Narrative).

4. Candidates may solicit up to three Letters of Recommendation from faculty, former students or other relevant colleagues.

**Sample A: Letter of Application to the Provost**

Date

Provost
1 LMU Drive, Suite 4820
Los Angeles, CA 90045-2659

Dear (Name of Provost):

Enclosed please find my application for advancement to tenure and/or promotion to the rank of _____ professor.

My tenure-track employment with LMU began in Month/Year at the rank of _____.

(**If Candidate is already tenured and seeking promotion only**) I was granted tenure in Month/Year and/or promotion to Associate Professor in Month/Year. (The relevant information will be supplied by a letter from the Office of the Provost.)

[Can add personalized text]

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at _____.

Sincerely,

_____
Assistant/Associate (as appropriate given rank at time of application) Professor
Department of_____ *

*If the Candidate has a joint appointment, each Department should be identified here.

**Sample B: Curriculum Vitae**

**Name**
**Department of _____**
**Loyola Marymount University**
**Los Angeles, CA 90045**
**310-999-9999**

## EDUCATION

Terminal Degree (Ph.D, Ed.D, M.F.A. etc.): University, Date.

Master's Degree: University, Date. Bachelor's Degree: University, Date.

## ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Current Academic Employment
Assistant/Associate Professor of_____ .
Loyola Marymount University, Date-Present (If tenured, please include when tenure took effect).
Tenure-track teaching position in_____.

Prior Academic Employment.
Please provide the following information for each Academic Appointment:
University,
College/School, Department
Period of Appointment
Rank
Date tenure was granted, if appropriate

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Prior relevant work experience

## TEACHING/ADVISING

- Courses taught
- Advising Responsibilities

## SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS

(Please organize this section using the following format with most recent work cited first.)

- Published/produced/performed/displayed (peer-reviewed or juried or disseminated) and evaluated work

- Grants awarded in support of research, scholarship, creative endeavors, teaching, etc.

- Peer-reviewed or Invited Conference Presentations

- Forthcoming work (It is important to identify clearly the status of the work at the time of submitting the application, such as "under contract," with independently verifiable evidence of acceptance from the publisher/distributor, etc. This evidence should be placed in front of the specific publication/creative work in the dossier.)

- Work under consideration by a publisher, distributor, curator and/or review by a scholarly journal (Again it is important to identify clearly the status such as "under blind review" with independently verifiable evidence from the publisher/distributor, etc. This evidence should be placed in front of the specific publication/creative work in the dossier.)

- Work in progress.

## PRESENTATIONS

- "Name of Presentation." Presented at the "Name of Conference," Name of City and Country, Date of Presentation. (Please indicate if this presentation is invited or refereed.)

    - Role at Conference: Paper presenter, commentator/respondent, chair/moderator, and/or organizer.

- Creative Work Presentations/Exhibitions

    - List "Name of Creative Presentation." Presented at the "Name of Conference/Event/Occasion," Name of City and Country, Date of Presentation. (Please indicate if this presentation is invited or juried/refereed.)

    - Indicate the specific creative role, such as acting, directing, etc.

## RELEVANT UNIVERSITY/PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY SERVICE

- Loyola Marymount University
- College/School
- Department
- Professional
- Community (Please list community service relevant to role as faculty member)

## RELEVANT HONORS, FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS

- Honors
- Fellowships
  Awards

### Narrative Standards

The Narrative is a critical component of a faculty member's application for tenure and/or promotion. Given its importance, Candidates may ask their Mentor or other colleagues for feedback on the Narrative.

The Narrative provides the Candidate with the opportunity to inform the Department, Department Chair, Dean, and the Committee on Rank and Tenure about the Candidate's body of work and any relevant information regarding the Candidate's performance. While it should address each of the faculty responsibilities of teaching/advising, scholarship/creative works, and service individually, it should provide the reader with a discussion of how the Candidate contributes to the Mission and Vision of LMU and his/her Department through the integration of these three areas. The Candidate should address his/her current strengths and areas for continued development as well as future plans. If any areas of concern have been cited in formal reviews, the Candidate may also discuss how these concerns have been addressed.

NOTE: It is important that Candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor address in the Narrative their teaching and service performed at LMU since the time of their initial faculty appointment at the University. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor should address their teaching and service performed at LMU since the time of their last promotion. All Candidates for tenure and/or promotion in rank should address their scholarly and/or creative works based on their entire body of work, with the expectation that evidence is demonstrated of ongoing productivity, consistent with Departmental Standards.

#### TEACHING AND ADVISING

The Narrative regarding teaching should address courses taught, new courses developed or any major revisions to existing courses, plans for future courses, and advising. The Narrative should be an analytical and thoughtful presentation

of the Candidate's teaching philosophy and effectiveness as a teacher and advisor. Any professional workshops and/or study should be clearly described. Candidates may wish to describe their advising duties and responsibilities as appropriate.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE WORK

The Narrative regarding scholarship should discuss the Candidate's scholarly/creative interests in their body of work and plans for future scholarly/creative work as well as contributions to the discipline.

RELEVANT SERVICE

The Narrative regarding service should include service to the Department/Program/School/College and the University, but may also include service to the profession or the community as relevant to the role of the faculty member.

## Scholarly and/or Creative Works in a Language other than English

A Candidate for advancement to tenure and promotion whose scholarship and/or creative works include texts and/or performance in a language other than English must include a substantive English abstract of the content of each such item in his or her tenure and/or promotion application. This abstract should be included in addition to, not in lieu of, the item(s).

If the scholarly or creative item is a sole-authored book, edited collection of essays or an anthology, the candidate must include an abstract of each book chapter or piece included in the work. If the book is an edited collection of essays or anthology, the candidate must include an abstract for each entry or section (e.g., an Introduction, Preface, etc.) that s/he has authored or edited. English abstracts may be necessary for some creative works (e.g., a play) but not for others (e.g., a short poem) composed in a language other than English.

The same requirement of an abstract holds for evaluation material of the items included (e.g., review of a digital media exhibit published in a language other than English or a critical review of an artistic event such as a film showing, etc.).

If there is any uncertainty regarding the need for an English abstract, the Candidate should refer the case, in writing, to his or her Dean who will consult, in writing, with the Provost to reach a decision regarding the item(s). The process adopted to resolve the uncertainty should be properly documented and the Candidate should be clearly informed in writing of the decision made by the Provost in time for his or her dossier preparation.

**Procedures for External Evaluation Process**

The purpose of the external review is to provide a fair, objective, and confidential assessment of the quality and contributions of the Candidate's scholarship or professional creative work. The Candidate's application will normally include five external review letters, three from names provided by the Candidate, and two from names provided by the Department Chair.

A. Names provided by the Candidate: The Candidate will submit a list of up to eight names and their professional credentials to the Department Chair, who will work with the Candidate to select three external reviewers, replacing any selected individuals who choose not to participate. The Candidate is encouraged to exclude evaluators who are former professors, former students, and anyone whose opinion might be compromised by a current or former professional relationship (e.g. co-authors, co-workers, mentors, etc.).

B. Names provided by the Chair: The Department Chair will create a list of five external reviewers and their professional credentials, from which the remaining two external reviewers will be selected. The Candidate will be given the opportunity to review the list, and may request the removal of no more than two names, for reasons of personal or professional bias.

C. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to contact the external reviewers and request their participation. In the event that the Department Chair is a Candidate for promotion, the Dean will contact the reviewers. All external reviewers should receive materials from the Department Chair by July 15 of the year of candidacy.

D. In cases where the reviewer is not a faculty member from a tenure-granting institution, an explanation should be provided as to why the reviewer is being solicited.

E. The Chair will ensure that any letter submitted in a language other than English shall be translated by an Apostille certified translator at the expense of the College or School. The Apostille certified translation and the original letter will be included in the candidate's dossier.

F. Faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion should have relevant application materials in the reviewers' hands by July 15th so that they have time to review the file, write a thoughtful assessment of the work, and send their evaluation. To facilitate the process, the Candidate should provide the Chair in early summer with a list of potential reviewers. All reviewers holding an academic appointment should be at or above the rank sought by the Candidate.

G. The Candidate, in consultation with the Department Chair, will prepare the scholarly and/or creative material to be sent to external reviewers. All materials sent to external reviewers must be consistent with Departmental

Standards. Only material that has been published/produced/performed/displayed (peer-reviewed or juried or disseminated) or is under contract should be included. This material will be sent by the Chair to the chosen reviewers along with:

1. The Candidate's curriculum vitae;

2. Sufficient descriptive material, including Departmental Standards and the sections of the Faculty Handbook pertaining to rank and tenure, expressing research and publication standards or standards for the creation and dissemination of professional creative work for promotion and tenure, to familiarize the reviewer with Loyola Marymount University's standards;

3. Instruction by the Chair that the evaluation is to focus on the quality and contributions of the Candidate's scholarly/professional/creative work;

4. The letter to the reviewer should contain an explicit request that the reviewer state, in the letter, any details related to his or her relationship to the Candidate;

5. The letter to the reviewer should include an addressed envelope to the Department Chair unless materials are being transmitted electronically.

H. A sufficient number of letters will have been received if three or more of the solicited letters arrive by the original due date for external letters as defined in this Section, provided at least one of the reviewers is from the Chair's list. Any external letters received after the original due date for external letters as defined in this section must be forwarded to the parties in possession of the application and inserted therein in accordance with Rank and Tenure Resource Manual, Procedures, Roles, and Responsibilities (section 4.6 above).

I. If the faculty member applying for tenure or promotion has reasonable grounds to believe that the external evaluation procedure will result in an evaluation that is substantially less valid or substantially less fair than an evaluation process that is purely internal, then he or she shall appeal as follows.

J. He or she shall write a statement detailing reasons and evidence relevant to his or her objection to the external evaluation process. One copy of this statement shall be delivered to the Chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee, whose committee shall render a final decision concerning the appeal. The applicant shall deliver a second copy of the appeal to his or her Chair. This Chair will initiate a discussion of the appeal with other voting members of the

Department or Program, and this Department/Program may communicate recommendations to the Rank and Tenure Committee in a timely manner.

K. A complete list of the materials submitted to external reviewers shall be compiled by the Candidate and verified by the Department Chair. This list of materials should then be included in the Candidate's dossier along with the evaluation letters.

L. All evaluation letters should be submitted no later than one week prior to the application deadline to the Department Chair and added to the Candidate's application by the first Tuesday of October. The external reviewers should send their assessment in PDF or electronic form with an accompanying hard-copy form on professional letterhead. E-mail narrative submissions are unacceptable. Each reviewer should also send a short CV with the assessment.

## Appeals Process

Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion will be given the opportunity to file a "Request for an Independent Review" in response to a negative decision from the President of the University. An Independent Review Committee (IRC) comprised of five Full Professors from five Colleges/Schools (eligibility and selection process described below), will be appointed as a standing committee. The IRC is charged with reviewing the merits of the appeal request based on evidence provided by the candidate in support of the stated ground(s) for appeal. An IRC recommendation in favor of the candidate is an affirmation by the IRC of the merit of the grounds of the appeal. All IRC proceedings will be completed by the beginning of the subsequent fall semester.

A. OVERVIEW

In the independent review process a faculty member has the opportunity to state his or her grounds for an appeal from the enumerated Grounds for Independent Review stated below to the IRC. The IRC will render a recommendation in favor of the appeal if it finds that the faculty member has provided clear and convincing evidence in support of the faculty member's stated ground(s) for review.

B. DEFINITION OF CERTAIN TERMS

Throughout this document, the terms appeal and independent review are used interchangeably.

**Notice of Intent to Seek Independent Review (NOI):**

A brief written statement by a faculty member that he or she plans to appeal a negative decision. It does not need to include any stated grounds for the review.

**Request for Independent Review:**

A written statement specifying the grounds from the Grounds for Independent Review upon which the faculty member is seeking an appeal of the President's decision.

**Independent Review Facilitator ("Facilitator"):**

The Faculty Senate President in collaboration with the Provost shall appoint an appropriately trained staff person to serve as a facilitator for all requests for an independent review.

**Independent Review Advisor ("IR Advisor"):**

The Provost in conjunction with the Faculty Senate President will appoint a tenured faculty member to serve as an IR Advisor. The candidate may once decline working with an appointed Advisor without giving a reason and request a replacement. Those serving in this position will serve a three-year renewable term. The IR Advisor will receive the same training as IRC members. The role of the IR Advisor is to arrange a face-to-face meeting with the faculty member at issue within 10 days after they have been informed of the negative decision. During this meeting, the IR Advisor will explain the independent review process to the faculty member, including timelines and the grounds for independent review.

While it is not the responsibility of the IR Advisor to write the request for an independent review, the IR Advisor should review the request and advise the faculty member.

C. INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS

The Independent Review process is detailed below:

1. If the review of a candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion results in a decision for denial of tenure and/or promotion ("decision"): The candidate will be provided a written statement regarding the reason(s) for the negative decision. The statement should be as specific as reasonably possible regarding the reasons for denial so that all of the factors contributing to the negative decision are clearly communicated to the faculty member. The candidate will be notified of the negative decision and provided with a copy of all written statements of the reason(s) for the negative decision (CRT and Department votes redacted). The faculty member, faculty member's Dean and Chair, as well as, the Facilitator and IR Advisor will be notified by the Provost. The IR Advisor will meet with the faculty member within 10 days after being notified of the negative decision.

2. A candidate receiving a negative decision who desires to seek IRC review shall timely file a "Notice of Intent To Request an Appeal" ("NOI") with the Provost with a copy to the Chair, Dean, Facilitator and IR Advisor, providing notice of his/her intent to submit a request for appeal of the negative decision. The Advisor will meet with the candidate within 10 days after notification of a negative decision by the Provost. The Facilitator will arrange, within the same 10 days, for the faculty member to receive all pertinent documents concerning any negative decision. (The external evaluation letters and CRT vote shall be redacted as to preserve confidentiality.)The NOI must be filed within 10 business days after the Facilitator has provided the candidate with all materials pertinent to the case, and the Advisor has met with the faculty member. Concurrent with completion of these two tasks, the Advisor shall notify both the candidate and the Provost of such facts and that the 45 day time limit to file the appeal has commenced.

3. Once the faculty member has met with the Advisor and received the appropriate documents, he/she has 45 days to file the appeal on one of more of the Grounds for Independent Review (assuming he/she timely filed the NOI) with the IRC. The faculty member should also submit copies of the appeal to the Provost, and the faculty member's Dean and Chair.

4. The appeal process timeline begins after the President has made and communicated his/her decision to the Provost.
    a. **A Request for Independent Review** must be in writing.
    b. **Grounds for Independent Review:** The candidate may file a request for Independent Review for the following grounds.

        "Significant procedural irregularity" – a deviation from the advancement to tenure and/or promotion in rank review procedures as set out in the Faculty Handbook or in the application of relevant Departmental standards relied upon in the process and which was likely to have significantly affected the decision;

        "New and compelling evidence" – new material information that could not, with reasonable diligence on the part of the applicant, have been timely and properly presented which suggests that the denial would have been different had the new material information been timely submitted and considered. This includes new evidence that sheds significant new light on documents already in the candidate's tenure file;

        "Unlawful discrimination" – evidence demonstrating that the denial is a product of unlawful employment discrimination prohibited by federal or California law, or was based on unlawful employment discrimination prohibited by federal or California law;

"Threats to academic freedom" – evidence demonstrating that the denial is the product, for example, of unreasonable bias against the candidate's teaching, scholarship or scholarly/creative work because the doctrinal or empirical basis of the candidate's teaching, scholarship or scholarly/creative work, although otherwise supported by academic standards, is politically, religiously, or socially unpopular;

"Objectively verifiable factual error" - When the process rests its decision on an erroneous finding of an objectively verifiable material fact.

5. Once the appeal has been filed, the IRC will make its recommendation within 10 days in writing to the candidate, candidate's Chair, and Dean, the Provost and the President.

D. COMPOSITION OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. The IRC will be comprised of five tenured faculty members with the rank of Full Professor from five Colleges/Schools. At least one of the five faculty members should have had experience serving on the Committee on Rank and Tenure. The Faculty Senate President in collaboration with the Provost will select the five faculty members as well as two alternates. The Faculty Senate President should consult with the candidate who has the right to replace one IRC member (without specifying the reason).

2. The Faculty Senate President and Provost will strive for a diverse membership representing Colleges and Schools across the University and should strive to include some past member(s) from the CRT.

3. No IRC member shall participate in an independent review of a faculty member's application if they have been involved in the department or CRT vote regarding that application. In such a case, the IRC Chair will request one of the alternates to serve for that independent review. If the IRC Chair cannot participate in the independent review, the IRC Chair will designate another committee member to act as IRC Chair for that independent review and the Acting IRC Chair will request an alternate to serve for that independent review.

4. The Faculty Senate President in collaboration with the Provost will appoint one faculty member as the IRC Chair of the committee.

5. The IRC Chair may request that the University's EEO Officer, or the University's counsel respond in writing to specific written questions from members of the IRC.

6. Terms of IRC committee membership will normally be three years staggered.

E. PROPOSED ORIENTATION/TRAINING

Before the IRC receives the appeal from the candidate, the Provost's Office in collaboration with the EEO officer, will provide an orientation to the review process for all Committee members as well as the facilitator, IR Advisor, and alternates.

F. CONSEQUENCES OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Should the IRC determine that there are not sufficient grounds to disagree with a negative decision, either because the appeal filed by the candidate fails to state such grounds or because the faculty member has failed to produce clear and convincing evidence for the existence of those grounds, the Chair of the IRC shall so inform the President, Provost, the Chair of the CRT, the faculty member's Dean and Chair, and the faculty member. This concludes the appeals process.

Should the IRC determine that there <u>are</u> sufficient grounds in favor of the candidate's appeal and in opposition to a negative decision, the Chair of the IRC shall so inform the President, Provost, the Chair of the CRT, the faculty member and the faculty member's Dean and Chair and shall provide a letter detailing the reasoning and facts that form the basis for the IRC's conclusions.

G. CONSEQUENCES OF IRC RECOMMENDATION IN FAVOR OF THE CANDIDATE'S APPEAL

Should the IRC make a recommendation in favor of the candidate's appeal, the IRC will send its recommendation in writing to the President, Provost, the candidate's Chair and Dean and the candidate. The final decision rests with the LMU President.

H. CONSEQUENCES OF IRC RECOMMENDATION AGAINST THE CANDIDATE'S APPEAL

If a candidate is denied tenure, as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook, the candidate is offered a terminal contract for one additional year of employment. If the candidate is denied promotion, s/he may re-apply in conformance with the Faculty Handbook.

I. GRIEVANCE

The Independent Review Process takes the place of the Grievance process for the Rank and Tenure process only.

## Appendix A. Rank and Tenure Timeline

| | | Action item for (or recipient) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Date | Activity Description | Candidate | Chair | Dean | Provost | Chair of CRT | CRT | President |
| March of each year | Provost's Office sends letters to individuals who are eligible to apply for advancement to tenure and/or promotion to the indicated rank. | To | cc | cc | A | cc | | |
| Not later than May 15 | Candidate sends his/her Confirmation of Intention to Apply for Tenure and/or Promotion in Rank. | A | cc | cc | To | | | |
| Not later than May 31 | Provost's Office confirms receipt of intention to apply for advancement to tenure and/or promotion to the indicated rank. | To | cc | cc | A | | | |
| March – June | Candidate works with the Department Chair to generate a list of names of individuals to provide external evaluation (see section on Procedures for External Evaluation Process). | A | A | | | | | |
| May – Early July | Candidate, in consultation with Department Chair, prepares a representative sample of disseminated scholarly or creative material to be sent to the external evaluators. Candidate includes a list of materials sent in the application dossier. | A | A | | | | | |
| By Early July | Chair sends a formal request to the External Reviewers, along with a representative sample of the Candidate's disseminated work, the Candidate's CV, and descriptive information about the University as stated in the Handbook. (For details and letter template, see section on Procedures for External Evaluation Process.) | | A | | | | | |
| May – September | Candidate works on preparing the application, consistent with Section VI, Rank and Tenure Application Standards. | A | | | | | | |
| August | Chair should send reminder to external reviewers (if necessary). | | A | | | | | |
| September – First Monday in October | Chair prepares for departmental discussion; confirms voting members with Provost's Office; selects meeting time and Scribe for departmental discussion; sets up process for distributing application material. | | A | | To | | | |
| One week prior to application deadline | External review letters are due. One signed external evaluation on letterhead should have been received by the Department Chair by this date. | | A | | | | | |
| First Monday in October | Two original sets of the completed application or an uploaded application in Box should be submitted to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will be responsible for ensuring that the application is available to department members for timely review. | A | To | | | | | |
| First Monday in October after 5pm | Chair receives two completed applications or an uploaded application in Box from the Candidate, and reviews them to be sure they are complete. The Chair inserts the external review letters into the applications, and forwards one application to the Dean of the Candidate's College or School. | | A | To | | | | |
| First Tuesday in October | Department faculty begin reviewing applications. | | A | | | | | |

| | | Action item for (or recipient) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Date | Activity Description | Candidate | Chair | Dean | Provost | Chair of CRT | CRT | President |
| Mid October – Second Monday in November | Department faculty meet to discuss the application and vote.<br>• Ballots are submitted according to instructions sent from the Provost.<br>• The Scribe prepares a summary of the discussion, which is reviewed, discussed, and revised, if necessary (see section on Procedures for Review of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion).<br>• The Chair uploads to Box or, for applications in hard copy, forwards to the Dean<br>  ○ the original signed Chair evaluation letter<br>  ○ signed Departmental summary.<br>• The Chair forwards the application, only if in hard copy, to the Provost's Office after adding<br>  ○ a copy of the signed Chair evaluation letter,<br>  ○ a copy of the signed Departmental summary. | | A | To | To | | | |
| Mid October – Late November | Dean reviews application, departmental ballots, Chair evaluation letter, and Departmental summary and writes his/her letter of evaluation for each candidate within his/her college or school. | | | A | | | | |
| Late November | The Dean forwards the Candidate's application, via Box or in hard copy as appropriate, to the Provost's Office after adding the Dean's evaluation letter, the original signed Chair evaluation letter, the original signed Departmental summary, and any letters from dissenting Departmental faculty members. The Dean also forwards the Departmental ballots to the Provost's Office in hard copy. | | | A | To | | | |
| Late November – December | Provost's Office forwards the application and all Departmental ballots to the Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure. | | | | A | To | | |
| December | The Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure advises members of the CRT when they may begin to read all applications. | | | | | A | To | |
| January – April | The CRT deliberates and votes on all applications. (See the CRT section of Procedures for Review of Candidates for Tenure and Promotion.) | | | | | | A | |
| April of following year | The Chair of the Committee on Rank and Tenure forwards or uploads letters of recommendation to the Provost. | | | | To | A | | |
| April of following year | Provost reviews applications and CRT letters of recommendation and makes recommendations to the President. | | | | A | | | To |
| April – May of following year | President makes final decisions on promotion and tenure and informs the Candidates. | To | cc | cc | cc | | | A |
| May – June | Independent appeal process begins. Provost's Office oversees the independent appeal process for any Candidate who wishes to appeal a negative decision. | A | | | A | | | |

| | | Action item for (or recipient) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Date | Activity Description | Candidate | Chair | Dean | Provost | Chair of CRT | CRT | President |
| Upon Completion of the Appeal | President considers the appeal, makes the final decision, and informs the Candidate. | To | cc | cc | cc | | | A |

## B. COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY

A lively and vital committee structure, characterized by regular meetings and a membership that engages fully in the tasks at hand, is central to healthy shared governance. It is through committees that stakeholders in the University are able to participate in shaping policies and procedures as well as provide informed advice to the Board of Trustees, the President, the Provost, the Faculty Senate and other entities on campus. The vitality and effectiveness of the committees listed below depend upon how often and to what extent they are used by all members of the University Community.

Faculty appointments to committees are made by the President through the Provost on the recommendation of the Faculty Senate as advised by the Committee on Committees. Committee Bylaws, on file with the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate, spell out the specific committee activities, memberships, and procedures in detail. Current committee descriptions and memberships are available in the Committee Directory, which is available online.

### 1. University Standing Committees

- Academic Affairs Policy Committee (AAPC)
- Academic Honesty Review Committee (AHRC)
- Academic Planning and Review Committee (APRC)
- Academic Technology Committee (ATC)
- Athletic Advisory Board
- Budget Planning Committee
- Committee on Excellence in Teaching (CET)
- Committee on Rank and Tenure (CRT)
- Faculty Awards Committee
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
- Loss Control Committee
- LMU Institutional Review Board (IRB)
- Sabbatical Review Committee
- Student Affairs Committee
- University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC)
    - UCCC Area Subcommittee: FYS/Rhetorical Arts & Information Literacy
    - UCCC Area Subcommittee: Foundations & Quantitative Reasoning
    - UCCC Area Subcommittee: Explorations
    - UCCC Area Subcommittee: Integrations & Engaged Learning
- University Policy Committee (UPC)
- University-Wide Teacher Education Committee

### 2. Special Committees

- Center for Ignatian Spirituality Advisory Board
- Children’s Center Advisory Board
- Disability Support Services Advisory Board
- Emergency Management Committee
- Enterprise Technology Committee

- Faculty Committee on Mission and Identity
- Frank Sullivan Social Justice Committee
- Honors Advisory Council (HAC)
- Intercultural Advisory Committee
- Intercultural Faculty Committee (IFC)
- International Programs
- Library Committee
- Special Committee on Math & Science Teacher Preparation (MASTeP)
- Status of Women Committee (CSW)
- University Comprehensive Benefits Committee (UCBC)
- Web Advisory Committee

### 3. Committees of the Faculty Senate

- Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Faculty Senate Governance & Bylaws Committee
- Faculty Senate Elections Committee
- Committee on Committees
- Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (ESOF)
- Faculty Handbook and Academic Life (FHALC)
- Grievance Committee

### 4. Committees of the Board of Trustees

Committees of the Board of Trustees, each of which includes a faculty representative, advise the Board on issues having to do with the life of the University. They include: Academic Affairs, Audit, Catholic Mission and Identity, Endowment Fund Investment, Facilities Planning and Technology, Finance, Student Life, and any other committee duly struck by the Board.

## C. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE UNIVERSITY

### 1. Records Retention & Disposal Policy

To create a systematic method of storing and managing records throughout their life cycle to ensure efficiency in their creation, use, maintenance and disposition or destruction, and to avoid the storing of duplicate, obsolete, or unnecessary records.

The Records Retention and Disposal Policy is available by following the link below: https://lmu.app.box.com/s/cdiodch8cbp8qm690egqhbn2o818lwdd

## 2. Instructional Support

### a. University Library

All Loyola Marymount University faculty members and their spouses have the full use of the University libraries and are invited to avail themselves of their resources.

Books may be borrowed for an indefinite period up to the end of each semester, at which time they should be returned or renewed. Faculty members should not loan library books to students or other registered or nonregistered borrowers.

### b. Instructional Media Center

The Instructional Media Center, located on the upper level of the Von der Ahe Library, is a multi-media area for audio-visual materials and equipment. Faculty are invited to acquaint themselves with the facilities which include classrooms and carrels supplied with a variety of equipment. Available also to faculty are media and equipment for instructional purposes. Reservations for use of media and/or equipment are made at the media distribution counter or by phone.

### c. Academic Resource Center

The Academic Resource Center, located in Daum Hall on the second floor (on the eastern edge of the campus) is a place where LMU students can enlist the help of specialists and tutors to enhance the learning process. Every LMU student is invited to make use of the ARC's free services and workshops. The Center's full-time specialists in the fields of writing, ESL/reading, mathematics, and study skills, as well as its peer tutoring staff, are ready to work with students to encourage those essential study skills that bring greater academic and personal success. Contact the ARC at arc@lmu.edu or 310-338-2847 for further assistance.

### d. Disability Support Services

Disability Support Services (DSS) located in Daum Hall (second floor) offers resources to enable students with physical, psychological and learning disabilities to achieve maximum independence in their educational goals. Services are offered to students who have established disabilities under federal and state law. DSS also advises students, faculty and staff regarding disability issues, though faculty and staff seeking accommodations should contact Human Resources (see section IV.C.4 above)

### e. Work Study/Readers

Readers may be assigned to faculty members by department Chairs. The following norms govern the assignment of readers:

a. The number of reader hours assigned to a faculty member is determined by the department Chair, who should exercise care that readers are adequately qualified for their assignments.

b. A faculty member requesting a reader should supply the Chair of the department with the following information:

the number of students enrolled in each class;
the number written assignments given each week in class;
the approximate length of each assignment.

c. Since compensation for reading services is a form of student financial aid, readers are employed in cooperation with the Office of Financial Aid and the Placement Office.

d. Application forms for readers may be obtained in the Work Study Office located in Malone.

e. Student readers' time sheets must be completed and submitted to the appropriate department Chair for approval before the date established by the Controller's Office. The Work Study Office circulates a semester schedule for bi-monthly submission of student time sheets.

**f. Facilities for Meeting or Special Events**

The Office of Conferences and Scheduling has been established to coordinate the reservation of facilities for all activities other than regularly scheduled classes. Appropriate forms for such reservations are available in this office. A charge may be made for an extraordinary cost connected with special events.

**g. Campus Digital Graphics**

LMU has a contract with Campus Digital Graphics as the exclusive provider for all campus printing needs. The Campus Digital Graphics Department offers various methods of high quality digital reproduction. Each of these methods is excellent for certain purposes and the quantity of copies that can be produced economically varies considerably. Campus Digital Graphics also has the most advanced print equipment and offers a certified digital graphic designer to assist your department production needs. Services extend to collating, stapling, folding, laminating, offset, binding and cutting.

Classroom instruction materials to be sold through the Campus Bookstore must be accompanied by a Campus Bookstore requisition before they will be reproduced.

All orders for printing to be done off-campus must be submitted to the appropriate Dean or administrator before any contact or agreement is made. No printing order will be honored unless the requisition is signed by the appropriate Dean. All envelopes and letterheads will be printed according to standard University format. Requests for personal or other supplementary uses of duplicating facilities by faculty members will be accepted on cash basis at the same rate charged for approved University business.

Copiers are also located in the William H. Hannon Library. They are designed for single copies and for copying materials which cannot be taken from the Library.

## 3. Class Enrollment

### a. Admission to Class

Official lists of duly registered students are to be obtained by the individual instructors from the Registrar's Office on the first day of class each semester. Students who attend class and whose names do not appear on the official class list should be sent immediately to the Office of the Registrar.

### b. Late Admission

As students are added to the class during the week of late registration, notification will be sent to the professor. During the second week of class a final official class list will be published.

### c. Withdrawal from Class

Before a student may withdraw from a course, he/she must secure the approval of his/her academic advisor and should consult with the instructor. The obligation of the student to consult the advisor and instructor is not just a formality. It is important for the student to discuss the problem before action is taken. Often a student gives up too easily if he/she is having trouble with a course, fails to contact the instructor or does not understand the consequences of a "W". The advisor should try to help the student reach an appropriate decision on withdrawal.

### d. Withdrawal from the University

A student wishing to withdraw from the University secures a withdrawal form from the Office of the Registrar and obtains the specified signatures. The completed form must be returned to the Office of the Registrar. The Registrar will notify the professor and the same procedure as noted above regarding withdrawal from a course should be followed.

### e. Leave of Absence

Undergraduate students who wish to absent themselves for one semester or one year may apply for a Leave of Absence by filing the Leave of Absence form in the Office of the Registrar. Such students need not re-apply for admission to the University, but must notify the Office of the Registrar of their plans to return to the University at least four weeks prior to the opening of the semester in which they plan to return.

## 4. Attendance and Class Meetings

### a. Student Attendance

Regulations concerning student attendance in class are left to the discretion of the instructor. If a student is to receive a failing mark by reason of excessive absence, the instructor should have an accurate record of such absences.

### b. Changes in Class Hours and Classrooms

Faculty members are not authorized to change hours of classes assigned or places of class meetings without approval of the department Chair, the Registrar and the Dean.

### c. Holidays

The University Calendar indicates official holidays. When a special event leads to a holiday or partial holiday, this holiday or partial holiday does not necessarily extend to the Graduate Division.

## 5. Examinations and Grades

### a. Final Examinations

The dates for the final examination are given in the University Calendar. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to observe the examination schedule published by the Registrar's Office. Final examinations may not be administered outside the scheduled times.

### b. Copies of Examinations

Faculty members should retain in a permanent file, copies of their written examinations for five years following date of use.

### c. Disposal of Examinations

Faculty members are required to retain student examinations for one month after the beginning of the following semester.

### d. Improper Conduct During Examinations

Faculty members have the responsibility of proctoring their examinations and of determining whether or not a student gives or receives illicit help. If cheating occurs, the instructor may impose an appropriate academic penalty. A student who feels that he/she has been unfairly assessed a lower grade for inappropriate conduct during an exam may appeal the case through the Chair and Dean. (Refer to the official University Bulletin for details.)

### e. Waiver of Examinations

Members of Alpha Sigma Nu, the Jesuit Honor Society, may request exemption from the final examination at the end of the last semester of the senior year. If the request is granted, the grade given the student is based on his/her performance to the time of the final examination.

### f. Special Examinations

In accordance with the regulations governing examinations as recorded in the University Bulletin, students who are absent from a final examination may be allowed on the instructor's approval to take an examination at a later date.

The final grade for such students must be submitted to the Office of the Registrar two days after the instructor receives the delayed examination.

### g. Submission of Grades

It is of great importance that midterm deficiencies and final grades be submitted to the Office of the Registrar by the date indicated in the University Calendar.

## 6. Student Appeals and Appeals for Change in Grades

The following procedures must be followed in the event a student disagrees with and wishes to challenge the validity of a final course grade or a finding that the student has violated any of the University's Academic Honesty and Integrity Regulations.

### a. General Appeals

Students wishing to appeal decisions pertaining to academic regulations, as stated in the University Bulletin, may obtain information about appeal procedures from their College Deans and file a written, formal appeal, if necessary.

Usually such appeals will be made directly to a Dean. If a Dean and a student cannot work out a satisfactory solution, the Dean may create a committee of three disinterested persons to investigate the matter and make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean will normally follow the recommendation of the committee. However, the decision of the Dean is final.

### b. Final Grade Appeals

It is understood that, except in rare instances, only the instructor, with the Dean's approval, may change the final grade through the Registrar's Office. The Dean may, however, change the grade if all of the following processes of appeal have been followed. The Dean must notify the instructor, in writing, of the change in final grade.

a. No later than three weeks into the semester following the issuance of a disputed grade, the student must meet with the instructor to review the reasons for the grade.

b. If the instructor is not available for discussion or if discussion fails to resolve the problem, the student may ask the appropriate department Chair to meet with both the instructor and the student. If the Chair and the instructor are in agreement about the validity of the grade, the student may appeal to the appropriate Dean. If the Chair cannot agree with the instructor, he will automatically refer the student to the Dean.

c. The student who appeals beyond the departmental level must file a written appeal to the appropriate Dean.

The Dean, upon receipt of the written appeal, will bring all parties together in an attempt to resolve the matter by mutual agreement. If an agreement cannot be reached at this meeting, the Dean may appoint a committee of three disinterested persons to investigate the matter and make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean will normally follow the recommendation of the committee; however, the decision of the Dean is final.

## 7. Content of Courses

### a. Course Description

Each faculty member must prepare a course description of his/her offerings each term and send it to the departmental Chair for distribution.

### b. Adherence to Content

In preparing courses assigned to them, faculty members should adhere to course content as established by department or college policy and as detailed in a course syllabus or outlined in the University Bulletin.

## 8. Classroom Suggestions

### a. Prayer

In accordance with Loyola Marymount's religious tradition, classes may begin with a prayer led by the instructor or a student.

### b. Smoking

It is the policy of Loyola Marymount University to provide a workplace and study environment which is healthy, productive and comfortable for all members of our campus community. Smoking is therefore permitted only outside of University buildings which house offices, work areas and classrooms.

This policy applies to faculty, staff, religious, students and visitors. Additionally, faculty members who wish to smoke must limit their smoking to break and meal periods.

Questions regarding this policy should be directed to Human Resources. The Smoking policy is available by following the link below: https://admin.lmu.edu/secure/hr/hrpoliciesandprocedures/safetyandhealth/Smoking.pdf

### c. Care of Classroom

Instructors should report to the Registrar anything needing attention in their classroom. Faculty members are expected to leave the chalkboards clean and the classroom immediately at the end of class so that the next instructor may have time to prepare for the ensuing session. Thus, end-of-class consultations by students with the instructor should take place outside the classroom.

## 9. Business Procedures

### a. Budgets

The University operates on an annual budget proposed in advance and geared to the fiscal year, which begins on June 1 and ends on May 31. The Dean of each college is required each year to submit her/his budget request for the following year. The budget requests are prepared by the departmental Chairs and submitted to the Dean of the appropriate college for approval. Budget requests are then submitted to the Provost for approval. When the Dean or the department Chair has received the budget as approved, he/she is expected to manage the affairs of the college or the department within the limits of the approved budget.

Requests for additional funds because of any unforeseen expense must be approved by the next line of authority and passed on to the Provost for his/her approval.

### b. Keys

Most doors on campus are controlled using the LMU OneCard. Requests for access should be sent to the Dean of the appropriate college. The Dean’s office will forward the request to the appropriate office on campus, either the OneCard office for online doors or the Facilities office for offline doors. If the door uses a metal key, this request will also go to the Facilities Office. Duplication of metal keys off campus is prohibited.

If a faculty member loses their OneCard, s/he should report the loss immediately to the OneCard office, either directly or through the OneCard website www.lmu.edu/onecard - click on “Manage Your OneCard”.) If a metal key is lost, the faculty member should inform Facilities immediately.

Faculty members who sever their connection with the University will return their OneCard to HR or the OneCard office and any metal keys issued to Facilities.

### c. Repairs and Maintenance

A faculty member desiring repair or maintenance work should submit in writing a request for such work to the proctor of the appropriate building. The proctor will submit a written request to Facilities Maintenance. Oral requests will not be considered. Work order forms can be obtained from Facilities Maintenance. Damage to furniture or building facilities is to be reported to the Office of Facilities Maintenance.

### d. Purchasing

Purchasing. All purchases are to be initiated through the approved departmental process. It should be approved by the person responsible for the budget to be charged and the budget number should be entered on the request. Purchases on university p-cards or reimbursements should be processed through Concur.

## D. FACULTY RESOURCE GUIDE

Please see the Faculty Resource Guide, published annually by the Office of Faculty Affairs, for additional information regarding LMU Administration and on-campus services like the OneCard Office, Public Safety and Parking, and Information Technology Services. The Faculty Resource Guide also has information about LMU policies and assistance provided for teaching, research, and faculty service. In the case of any discrepancy between the Faculty Resource Guide and the Faculty Handbook and Addenda, the Faculty Handbook and Addenda is the authoritative document.

The Faculty Resource Guide can be found on the Faculty Resources page under the Office of the Provost:
http://www.lmu.edu/academics/provost/resources/facultyresources/

## E. MERIT & EVALUATION SYSTEM

The merit and evaluation system described below will go into effect with the 2017 FSR. Merit awards based on 2016 FSRs will follow the 1994 Faculty Senate Statement on Teaching/Advising, Scholarship, Service, and Merit.

**1. Evaluation**
As per section III.A in the Faculty Handbook, all faculty are required to submit an FSR to be eligible for merit; any faculty member not submitting an FSR shall receive zero merit. The Chair evaluates the faculty member's performance in each of the three areas of responsibility – teaching/advising, scholarship/creative work, and service – on the basis of the information in the FSR and using a 5-point scale:

| | **Points** |
|---|---|
| Does not meet minimum expectations | 0 |
| Needs improvement | 1 |
| Good performance | 2 |
| Very Good performance | 3 |
| Excellent performance | 4 |

The criteria used to evaluate faculty performance in each of the three areas and to assign a rating using the scale above shall be developed following the same process used to develop and approve Department Standards for Rank & Tenure. In most cases, these criteria will be developed at the department level and submitted to the dean for approval; in some cases (e.g., SOE), these criteria will be developed at the college/school level.

**2. Determining the Merit Category**

The individual faculty member receives a rating of 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 in each of the three categories. For each category, the rating is multiplied by the weight of the category. The default weighting formula is 40-40-20 (with the teaching and scholarship ratings each multiplied by 0.40 and the service rating multiplied by 0.20). Any alternative weighting should only emerge out of consultations between the dean, the faculty member, and the faculty member's chair/program director and should be appropriately documented. The weighted scores are then summed to produce an overall total points score that ranges between 0.0 and 4.0. The faculty member's final score determines the merit award category, as follows:

| **Total Points** | **Merit Category** |
|---|---|
| 0.00 – 1.39 | No merit |
| 1.40 – 1.99 | Merit 1 |
| 2.00 – 2.79 | Merit 2 |
| 2.80 – 3.79 | Merit 3 |
| 3.80 – 4.00 | Merit 4 |

The Chair submits the merit determinations for all department/program faculty to the Dean, who submits them to the Provost, following procedures outlined in section III.C of the Faculty Handbook.

## 3. The Merit Payout Formula

Once the Provost has given final approval for the merit determinations for all faculty in a college/school, the monetary award for each merit category is determined using the approved formula (one of the following three models) for that college/school.

**A. Uniform Dollar Amounts Across Ranks**

Each merit category is assigned a point value, with the relationship between point values determining the relationship between the dollar amounts of the merit increases. The monetary award for each merit category is uniform across all ranks within the college/school. Once all the merit designations have been made, the salary increases are computed so that all the salary increases add up to the college/school's merit pool.

| Merit Category | Point Value |
|---|---|
| No Merit | 0 |
| Merit 1 | 1 |
| Merit 2 | 2 |
| Merit 3 | 3 |
| Merit 4 | 4 |

**B. Average Salary in Rank**

A weighted point value is assigned to each of the merit categories, the weight being determined by the average salary by rank (the table below uses the average in rank salaries across the university for 2015, where the average university Associate salary is 7.5% higher than that of Assistant and the average university Professor salary is 37% more than Assistant). Once all the merit designations have been made, then the salary increases are computed so that all the salary increases add up to the college/school's merit pool.

| Merit Category | Assistant Point Value | Associate Point Value | Professor Point Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Merit | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Merit 1 | 1 | 1.07 = 1.07 x 1 | 1.37 = 1.37 x 1 |
| Merit 2 | 2 | 2.15 = 1.07 x 2 | 2.73 = 1.37 x 2 |
| Merit 3 | 3 | 3.22 = 1.07 x 3 | 4.10 = 1.37 x 3 |
| Merit 4 | 4 | 4.30 = 1.07 x 4 | 5.46 = 1.37 x 4 |

## C. Percentage of Individual Salaries

The salary increase for each merit category is tied to an individual faculty member's salary. Once all the merit designations have been made, the multiplier *m* would be determined, so that all the salary increases add up to the college/school's merit pool.

| Merit Category | Salary Increase |
|---|---|
| No Merit | 0 |
| Merit 1 | *m* x Base Salary |
| Merit 2 | 2*m* x Base Salary |
| Merit 3 | 3*m* x Base Salary |
| Merit 4 | 5*m* x Base Salary |

## D. Reporting

Data about merit distributions shall be reported annually, including the following breakdowns: by college/school, by rank across the university (including the merit breakdown for chairs), and by gender across the university. Where possible, breakdowns by rank (including chairs) and gender should also be reported within colleges/schools.

## E. Review

The merit system shall be reviewed periodically. At the time of review, faculty in a college/school may choose to adopt a different one of the three payout formulas described above.

# F. PART-TIME FACULTY HANDBOOK

## 1. Lecturer

As defined in the Faculty Handbook (section I.C.3), the title Lecturer refers to part-time teaching-only faculty, including faculty who teach in the classroom, online, and in the field. A Lecturer will possess the qualifications required for Instructor status or, in technical and professional areas, considerable experience at a significant level in that field.

A faculty member at the rank of Lecturer may apply for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer in the eighth term of teaching at LMU. Promotion is not automatic; it follows on the recommendation of the department/program review committee, following a review of the faculty member's application. On the recommendation of the department/program and with the approval of the dean, part-time faculty may apply for early promotion. With the approval of the Dean and where the applicant demonstrates a level of teaching and/or professional experience commensurate with the rank of Senior Lecturer, departments/programs may hire directly at the rank of Senior Lecturer.

Current part-time faculty are eligible for an accelerated promotion process, but must go through at least one successful periodic review before becoming eligible to apply for promotion. Deans shall work with Department Chairs and Program Directors to develop a schedule of periodic and promotion reviews according to the seniority of part-time faculty.

## 2. Appointment

All requests for contingent faculty appointment must be approved by the Dean of the respective college. The initiating department should provide adequate evidential material to support the request, as to the need for the service and as to the qualifications of the requested appointee.

Position announcements for contingent faculty shall be posted on the LMU Human Resources (HR) website, generally at least two weeks prior to the hiring decision. The respective Dean's Office is responsible for the posting of position announcements. All applicants are required to submit a Curriculum Vitae, references, degree or professional expertise verification, and any additional supporting documentation through the HR website. Appointments of Contingent Faculty are made by the Dean on the recommendation of the Department Chair/Program Director or their designee(s).

In situations where expediency is required due to a faculty emergency and/or a late notice of need to hire, the Department Chair/Program Director or their designee(s) will be responsible for carrying out the hiring process. In the case of a part-time faculty opportunity hire of a person of national/international reputation, extraordinary expertise, or renown in the field, the process for hiring may differ, but that process must go forward only with the permission of the Dean.

The University is expected to have a record of all persons who have held teaching positions at any level at Loyola Marymount University. Thus, data must be sent to the office of the appropriate Dean and should consist of at least a minimum of information about the individual and his/her qualifications, including vita, application, and supporting documentation. Where there is any likelihood of a continuing relationship, the data provided should be equivalent to that provided for one at a regular professorial rank.

### 3. Periodic Review

Periodic reviews are part of the evaluation process. Periodic reviews of Lecturers shall be conducted every third term of teaching, with no more than 1 periodic review per year. Periodic reviews of Senior Lecturers shall be conducted every sixth term of teaching.

For the periodic review, all part-time faculty are required to submit a brief narrative about their teaching as well as an updated CV. In addition, part-time faculty are expected to administer student evaluations in their courses and to submit their syllabi to their chair/director. These teaching-materials will be considered in a manner consistent with how they are used in the annual FSR review for tenure-line and term faculty. The review shall be conducted by the Department Chair or Program Director, who will produce a written evaluation of the faculty member's teaching performance.

### 4. Promotion

Promotions in rank are based on the fulfillment of qualifications and meritorious performance by the applicant, on the vote and approval of the department/program review committee, and on the recommendation of the Chair and respective Dean. The final decision rests with the Provost. A Lecturer may apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer in the eighth term of teaching at LMU. On the recommendation of the department/program and with the approval of the dean, part-time faculty may apply for early promotion.

A formal promotion review is required when a part-time faculty member applies for promotion to Senior Lecturer. The review shall be conducted by a Promotion Review Committee of at least three people. Full-time faculty, including tenure-line faculty, clinical faculty, and full-time instructors, are eligible to serve on the review committee. Senior Lecturers are also eligible to serve on the review committee, but must be compensated for their service. Members of the review committee shall be elected by department/program vote. In cases where a department/program has fewer than three eligible faculty, an interdepartmental committee will be formed, through consultation among the chair/director, dean, and part-time faculty member.

For the promotion review, the part-time faculty member shall prepare a teaching dossier including: a letter of application to the Provost; a Curriculum Vitae; a

narrative focused on teaching; all periodic review narratives and chair's periodic review letters since initial appointment; list of courses taught at LMU, semester-by-semester, including enrollments, since initial appointment; statistical summary reports from student evaluations for all courses taught (candidates are encouraged to provide written course evaluations); peer observations of teaching where available (consistent with department/program expectations for peer observations for tenure-line and term faculty); a representative selection of course syllabi and other materials; and up to three letters of recommendation from faculty, former students, or other relevant colleagues. Part-time faculty members shall be evaluated on their teaching according to established criteria, which are consistent with the criteria used to evaluate the teaching of tenure-line and term faculty and which are clearly communicated to the part-time faculty member.

In those cases where promotion is denied, the Provost will give reasons in writing for such a decision at the request of the applicant. Lecturers denied promotion may be rehired as Lecturers and may reapply for promotion after a waiting period of at least two terms.

## 5. Specific Duties

In addition to the general responsibilities as well as the specific responsibilities of the faculty that apply to part-time faculty defined in section IV of the Faculty Handbook, part-time faculty have the following specific duties:

1. To aim for teaching excellence in the spirit of the LMU mission.
2. To adhere to university policies and regulations, as articulated in the Faculty Handbook and Handbook Addenda, by Human Resources, by the university administration, and in college/school and department/program guidelines.
3. To adhere to the standards of professional conduct articulated in the Faculty Handbook.
4. To be reviewed according to an established schedule.
5. To submit a syllabus for each course being taught before the beginning of each semester, according to established department/program guidelines and procedures.
6. To clearly articulate requirements, expectations, and grading policies in course syllabi.
7. To submit textbook orders to the bookstore in a timely manner.
8. To submit grades in a timely manner, adhering to University deadlines.
9. To make reasonable accommodations for students with documented disabilities.
10. To make themselves available to communicate with students at regularly scheduled times to be determined in consultation with the Chair of the department, in accordance with department policy, and consistent with college/school norms.
11. To notify the Chair and/or Dean in cases of absences and to make necessary arrangements for the classes affected.
12. To be present in the classroom for the opening of classes and to conduct classes at the scheduled times.

13. To check their official LMU email accounts on a regular basis.

## 6. Specific Privileges

In addition to the general faculty rights defined in section V of the Faculty Handbook, part-time faculty have the following specific privileges:

1. Salary and benefits commensurate with rank, experience, and responsibilities.
2. A review process that is both formative and summative, following established guidelines, criteria, and schedule.
3. To participate in college/school- and university-level shared governance.
4. To clear and open lines of communication with elected representatives.
5. To fair compensation for university service.
6. To timely notification in event of non-reappointment or dismissal and to compensation should courses be canceled after an established date relative to the beginning of the semester.
7. Access to office space where an instructor can meet privately with a student.
8. Access to facilities and equipment, including communications technology, along the same standards as full-time faculty.
9. To an identification card issued by the University.
10. To proper orientation and training by the appropriate University officials.

## 7. Ratification & Amendment

### A. Ratification

i. As an Addendum to the Faculty Handbook, the Part-Time Faculty Handbook must first be approved by Faculty Senate, pursuant to Section VII of the Handbook.
ii. Following Senate approval, electronic ballots for ratification of the Part-Time Faculty Handbook shall be sent to all active part-time faculty. The Part-Time Faculty Handbook shall take effect if a majority of those responding vote affirmatively.

### B. Amendments

i. Amendments to the Part-Time Faculty Handbook, an Addendum to the Faculty Handbook, must first be approved by Faculty Senate, pursuant to Section VII of the Handbook.
ii. Following Senate approval, electronic ballots for approval of amendments to the Part-Time Faculty Handbook shall be sent to all active-part-time faculty. Amendments shall be adopted by a majority vote of all those responding.