

The reason for this change is mainly to create a procedure that will allow candidates up for "voluntary promotion" (mainly those seeking promotion to Full Professor, but in a few cases the policy would apply those seeking "early" promotion to Associate Professor) to withdraw from the process without prejudice. Right now no procedure exists for withdrawing one's application for "voluntary promotion." Occasionally, those seeking such promotion receive a negative recommendation at the School Personnel Committee (SPC) level and at that point would like to withdraw from consideration before the promotion portfolio, with a negative recommendation letter from SPC or from the School Dean or one signed by both, goes forward to the APC.

At that point the question becomes what should happen to the Dean's and SPC's negative recommendation letter. In some cases, candidates would want to have the negative review letter expunged, for a variety of reasons, but mainly in order not to bias the Dean, SPC, and APC the next time the candidate wants to be considered for "voluntary promotion." (Between applications there may changes in personnel.) In other cases, the candidate might want the letter retained for a variety of reasons, but most likely because it focuses on a single area of concern and the candidate would want the record to show that he or she addressed that concern the next time application for "voluntary promotion" is made and to show that there was only one area of concern previously. These are the main issues that have turned up over the years.

Below is the actual language proposed for the Handbook as recommended by APC for Assembly approval. (This material was prepared at the end of last year but APC's recommendation was not acted upon.) The proposed changes are in bold letters. There are a few additional changes as well (also in bold), exhorting candidates to work closely with their Deans and fellow faculty in order to ensure that the portfolios coming to SPC and APC meet professional standards. That's been a problem in the past, addressed this year in forums presented by APC in the Fall.

APC recommends these changes be approved by the Assembly at our next meeting.

Here is the Handbook language APC proposes, with changes in bold.

(Underlined items not in bold are links in the electronic version of the Faculty Handbook.):

**APC Proposal: Revision of *Faculty/Staff Handbook*
(Proposed Additions to Steps 1, 3, & 6 - Underlined)**

PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWS

The Process

Faculty in their first or second year of service at Eastern will be reviewed by the School Dean with a formal consultation with the School Personnel Committee and recommendation to the Provost, who will forward a recommendation to the President. The President will inform the faculty member of the decision by March 15 of the first year and by December 15 of the second year.

Procedures for biennial post-tenure review are described separately, appearing elsewhere in this handbook. The procedures described in this section may be employed as a component of the post-tenure review processes when necessary; conditions leading to a need for this more intense post-tenure review are described in the policy on post-tenure review.

The procedure for each of the other types of review is initiated somewhat differently but then each type of review follows the same basic steps.

Step 1: Initiating the Process

A. Promotion: The Deans of the Schools meet with their respective School Personnel Committee and develop a list of nominees for promotion. The list of nominees for promotion considered will consist of those faculty who either apply for consideration or who are proposed by a member or members of the School Personnel Committee or who are proposed by the School Dean.

B. Tenure: Faculty members on annual tenure appointments who have begun their fifth year of service at Eastern will be automatically reviewed for tenure during their fifth year.

C. Third-Year (Retention) Review: Faculty members who are in their third year of service at Eastern will be automatically reviewed.

D. Continuance: Faculty not on annual or indefinite tenure appointments are reviewed for continuation in their fifth year and every four years thereafter.

E. Voluntary Tenure and/or Promotion: The candidate is encouraged to consult with the School Dean, the Division Chair, and other appropriate faculty members for guidance in deciding to apply for voluntary tenure or promotion.

Step 2: Notification

At the start of Fall Term, the Provost will inform faculty who will be evaluated for promotion, tenure, or continuance.

Step 3: Preparation of the Review Portfolio

Faculty being reviewed prepare a portfolio with contents as described below. **The candidate is encouraged to consult with the School Dean, the Division Chair, and other appropriate faculty members for assistance in the preparation of the portfolio.** (Faculty undergoing their first or second year review do not prepare a portfolio; their review utilizes the "green sheet" prepared annually by all teaching faculty.)

Step 4: Submission of the Portfolio

The portfolio is returned to the Dean of the School by a date mutually agreed upon in the School. At this point the file is shared by the School Personnel Committee (SPC) and Dean of the School. A portfolio that is incomplete when judged by the portfolio specifications in the *Faculty/Staff Handbook* may be returned to the candidate by the Dean or the SPC without action but with identification of the deficiencies and a request that the deficiencies in completeness be addressed and that the portfolio then be resubmitted.

Step 5: School-Level Review

The Deans of the Schools will then consult with their School Personnel Committees and, after that, write a comprehensive evaluation of each candidate based upon the four major categories taking into consideration the faculty member's past assignments and future potential as well as tenure criteria and general considerations. The SPC may concur with the Dean of the School or, if not, they must submit a separate evaluation(s). The results of the peer evaluation of teaching and the survey of alumni become part of the portfolio at this step (see Policy on the Evaluation of Instruction).

Step 6: School-Level Consultation with the Candidate

The Deans of the Schools will review their written evaluation with the faculty member at this point. As a result of this discussion, modification can be made and sent to the Assembly Personnel Committee.

When a faculty member makes a voluntary application for tenure or promotion, the candidate may elect to either a) proceed with the application process, or, b) terminate the application process, as follows:

a) To proceed with the application process, the candidate signs the dean/SPC letter of evaluation. The letter of evaluation and portfolio are

**then forwarded to the Assembly Personnel Committee (APC) (See Step 7).
Once the letter and portfolio are forwarded to APC, they may not be
withdrawn.**

**b) To terminate the application process, the candidate may either
1) withdraw all application materials, including the Dean/SPC
letter, or 2) retain the Dean/SPC letter in the candidate's personnel file, as
follows:**

**1) If the candidate wishes to withdraw all application materials, the
portfolio is returned to the candidate
and the Dean/SPC letter of evaluation is destroyed. No record of the
application for voluntary tenure or promotion will remain on file.**

**2) If the candidate wishes to retain the Dean/SPC letter of evaluation for
possible future use, the portfolio is returned to the candidate, the
Dean/SPC letter is signed by the candidate, and the original copy of the
Dean/SPC letter is retained in the candidate's permanent personnel file,
and a copy of the letter is provided to the candidate.**

Step 7: Submission to the Assembly Personnel Committee

The portfolio, along with recommendations and evaluations added in prior steps, is forwarded from the School to the Assembly Personnel Committee (APC). A portfolio that is incomplete when judged by the portfolio specifications in the *Online Faculty/Staff Handbook* may be returned to the School Dean by the APC without action but with identification of the deficiencies and a request that the deficiencies in completeness be addressed and that the portfolio then be resubmitted to the APC for further consideration.

□ *Step 8: APC Consideration*

The APC, as a whole, should then discuss each candidate and make a recommendation. It is expected that the recommendation will be accompanied by a rationale. Any minority positions should be included along with rationale.

□

Step 9: Addressing Differences in the Recommendations at the School and University.

Should the APC take a position contrary to the Dean of the School, the SPC will meet with the Dean of the School to discuss the difference. As a result of this conference, the Dean of the School may request a meeting with the APC. Following this the APC will notify the faculty member of the recommendation made.

□

Step 10: The Possibility of Appeal

In the case of a negative recommendation, the faculty member will be given a chance to meet with the Assembly Personnel Committee. This is the sole appeal point with this Committee or the School Personnel Committee.

□

Step 11: The Decision

The portfolio, containing all information and all recommendations, will then be submitted to the Provost. Prior to making a decision, the Provost will consult with the APC whenever, based upon her/his initial review of the portfolio, the Provost is unclear as to how the APC reached its recommendation. The Provost's decision will be reviewed by the President.

□

Step 12: Evaluation of the Process

Upon completion of the review procedures, the Provost meets with the APC to critically analyze the functioning of the University's review procedures. Recommendations for improving the procedures are formed with the expectation that they will be implemented for the following year.

From *Faculty/Staff Handbook*