

**Appointment and Promotion Procedures for Tenure Track Faculty
In The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and The Whiting School of Engineering**
(Effective ~~October 18, 2023~~April 3, 2024, May 16, 2024)

Table of Contents

Section 1. Definitions	2
Section 2. Criteria for Promotion or Appointment	2
Section 3. Conflict of Interest	3
Section 4. Process Transparency	3
Section 5. Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor	4
Section 5a. Overview of the Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor	4
Section 5b. Departmental Review and Decision to Request Solicitation of Referee Letters for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor	5
<i>Department Request for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor</i>	6
Section 6. Procedures for Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor	6
Section 6a. Overview of Procedures for Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor	7
Section 6b. Department Review and Decision to Request Solicitation of Referee Letters for Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor	7
<i>Candidate Dossier for Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor</i>	7
Section 7. Unified Procedures for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure: Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and Appointment at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor	8
Section 7a. Letter Solicitation Procedures for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure	8
<i>Guidelines for the Solicitation of Letters</i>	12 11
<i>Guidelines for Requesting Referee Letters</i>	13
Section 7b. Department Review and Decision to Request Promotion or Appointment for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure	14 13
Section 7c. Dean’s Review for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure	14
Section 7d. Ad Hoc Committee Evaluation for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure	15 14
Section 7e. Academic Council Review for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure	15
<i>Exceptional Circumstances</i>	16
Section 8. Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor	16
Section 8a. Overview of the Procedures for Promotion to Rank of Full Professor	16
Section 8b. Departmental Review and Decision to Solicit Referee Letters for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor	17

Section 8c. Referee Letter Solicitation for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor	1847
<i>Guidelines for the Solicitation of Letters for Promotions to the Rank of Full Professor</i>	18
<i>Selection of Referees</i>	18
<i>Guidelines for Preparing the Request for Letters for Promotions to the Rank of Full Professor</i>	19
Section 8d. Departmental Review and Decision to Request Promotion.....	20
Section 8e. Dean’s Review for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor	21
Section 8f. Academic Council Review of Cases for Promotion to Full Professor	21
<i>Exceptional Circumstances</i>	22
Section 9. Reconsideration of Negative Promotion Decisions	22
<i>Departmental Decision without Solicitation of External Letters of Evaluation</i>	23
<i>Departmental Decision after Solicitation of External Letters of Evaluation</i>	23
<i>Dean’s Review</i>	23
<i>Adverse Academic Council Decision</i>	23
<i>Provost Appeal</i>	24
Section 10. Procedures for Interim Review of Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor	24

Section 1. Definitions

In this document, the Homewood Schools are defined to include the Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and the Whiting School of Engineering; appointment is defined as the process of appointing new tenure-track members to the faculties of the Homewood Schools; and promotion is defined as advancement from one professorial rank to another or the conferral of tenure.

Section 2. Criteria for Promotion or Appointment

- Each appointment or promotion should be conducted so as to attract or retain faculty whose scholarly achievements, teaching ability, and qualities of University citizenship are superb. Appointment committees should seek the best candidate at the rank under consideration.
- For appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must be a recognized leader among scholars at a similar stage of career development. The primary criteria are the candidate’s scholarly research, teaching, and service to the University. The criteria shall also include the importance of the candidate’s scholarly research, citizenship and teaching to the academic program of the Department.
- To qualify for the rank of Professor, a candidate must be an eminent and influential scholar and demonstrate a continuing commitment to excellence in teaching and mentoring. There must be clear evidence of additional scholarly achievement since promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. University and professional

service are also expected of candidates. An outstanding record of service will be considered favorably in the evaluation of the case for promotion.

- The Academic Council encourages the evaluation of all essential elements of a candidate's scholarship and acknowledges that in some fields scholarly activities that reach beyond the academy complement conventional forms of scholarship. For instance, some fields recognize "engaged scholarship", which connects faculty expertise to public issues in a variety of ways; others recognize the importance of "translational" activities that aim to solve human or societal problems. Engaged scholarship, translational activities, etc. do not comprise a separate criterion of evaluation; rather, such activities fall into the existing criteria of research, teaching and/or service, as understood in the candidate's field, and should be a clear outgrowth of academic excellence as traditionally understood. It should be stressed, finally, that there is no *expectation* that a candidate's work should have such a public-facing dimension; some fields, and some topics within a given field, might lend themselves to this while others might not. The recognition of these kinds of activities in a candidate's profile enable a new possibility; *they do not impose a new requirement.*

Section 3. Conflict of Interest

The integrity of the process by which appointments and promotions are made is of profound importance to the University. Therefore, it is imperative that any individual involved in this process disclose any academic, professional, commercial, or personal relationship to the candidate that might be perceived by a reasonable observer to constitute a conflict of interest or source of bias with respect to the candidate. Any such relationship must be disclosed (in either the Department Report or in the Ad Hoc Committee Report as appropriate) in sufficient detail as to allow an observer to judge whether an actual conflict of interest exists. In cases where a clear conflict of interest exists, the individual involved should be recused from the process.

Members of the Academic Council must likewise disclose any relationship to the candidate that might be perceived by a reasonable observer to constitute a conflict of interest or source of bias with respect to the candidate. This includes but is not limited to cases in which both the candidate and the member hold primary appointments in the same department. Members shall be recused from all discussion of, and votes on, cases where they have a conflict of interest.

Section 4. Process Transparency

It is in the best interests of the candidate, the Department, and the University for promotion and appointment processes to be as open and transparent as possible, consistent with the privacy of the individuals involved and the confidentiality of both internal and external evaluations. Therefore, after each decision in the process the candidate, the Department, the Dean, and the Academic Council should be promptly informed of the decision.

For appointments and promotions in which tenure is conferred, the communication points are a) the Department decision whether or not to request solicitation of referee letters, b) the Department decision whether or not to recommend appointment or promotion to the Academic Council, c) the Dean's decision whether or not to request an ad hoc committee report, d) the

Council's decision whether or not to recommend appointment or promotion to the President, e) the Tenure Advisory Committee's decision whether or not to recommend appointment or promotion to the President, and f) the final decision of the Board of Trustees.

For promotions to Full Professor, the communication points are a) the Department decision whether or not to recommend promotion to the Dean, b) the Dean's decision whether or not to recommend promotion to the Academic Council, c) the Council's decision whether or not to recommend promotion to the President, and e) the final decision of the Board of Trustees.

Section 5. Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Section 5a. Overview of the Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

The Tenure Regulations of the Krieger and Whiting Schools govern the timing of the faculty promotion process. Consideration of promotion to Associate Professor must be initiated by the Department, in consultation with the faculty member.

The process for considering a promotion to Associate Professor, if successful, has nine stages:

1. Departmental review and decision whether to request solicitation of referee letters
2. Referee letter solicitation by an ad hoc committee
3. Departmental review and decision whether to request promotion
4. Dean's review
5. Ad hoc committee review
6. Academic Council review and recommendation to the President
7. Tenure Advisory Committee review and recommendation to the President
8. President's recommendation to the Board of Trustees
9. Final approval by the Board of Trustees

The various stages at which a case can be stopped are explained in the detailed descriptions below.

In order to ensure that the ad hoc committee has adequate time to complete its work and that cases come before the Academic Council in a timely fashion, the dates in the table below should be observed. In particular, the Department must request solicitation of external referee letters by the May 15/November 15 deadline to ensure a timely process.

Candidates should submit materials to their department no later than their sixth year in rank. Refer to the Tenure Regulations document for further details regarding promotion timeline.

Deadline	Candidates whose appointments began July 1-December 31	Candidates whose appointments began January 1-June 30
Submission of candidate dossier to Department by candidate	April 15	October 15

Department request for solicitation of referee letters	May 15	November 15
Formation of ad hoc committee by the Dean	June 15	December 15

Section 5b. Departmental Review and Decision to Request Solicitation of Referee Letters for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

The first phase in the consideration of a faculty member for promotion is a decision by the voting faculty of the Department whether or not to solicit letters from external referees. For this purpose, the voting faculty are those tenured faculty at or above the Associate Professor rank. The voting faculty do not include those with Emeritus and/or Academy status. The candidate shall provide the Department with a Candidate Dossier which includes:

- a current and dated curriculum vitae, including awards and recognition; co-authors and page numbers or electronic identifiers for all scholarly publications and other scholarly and technical work; list of invited talks and presentations; status of book manuscripts and other works in progress; advisory and mentoring information; list of internal and external funding with PI status, agency, dates, and levels of funding; list of fellowships or other scholarly support; list of service to the Department, University, Profession, and Public (if appropriate);
- research statement;
- teaching statement;
- service statement (optional);
- Covid statement (optional);
- representative work;
- book reviews or readers' reports; and
- any other materials germane to the case.

In evaluating the candidate's teaching, undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty may be consulted. However, any such consultation should be conducted with the utmost care to avoid pressuring students, especially those currently taking courses from the candidate or under the candidate's supervision. Letters from students should not be submitted. A summary of anonymous student evaluations, where available, must be included in the dossier.

If a Department concludes, based on its evaluation of the Candidate Dossier, that the candidate's case is insufficiently strong to warrant promotion, it may make a recommendation to the Dean against promotion without seeking external letters of evaluation. Such a recommendation requires a majority vote of the voting faculty. The Department shall provide the Dean with a tally of the vote, a letter from the Chair explaining the reason(s) for the decision and outlining any dissenting views, and a copy of the Candidate Dossier. The decision not to seek external letters is subject to approval by the Dean. A decision not to continue the promotion process will be reported by the Dean to Academic Council as an information item.

Department Request for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

If the promotion process continues, the Department Chair shall provide the Dean with the following:

1. The Candidate Dossier;
2. The Department Request (in writing) to form an ad hoc committee for the purpose of letter gathering;
3. The Department Referee List.

The Department Request describes the candidate's scholarly achievements as seen by members of the Department, the fit of the candidate's research area with the long-range plans of the Department, School, and University and the candidate's corresponding impact, an evaluation of the candidate's teaching and service, and a tally of the faculty vote. The Department Request should evaluate the following in detail:

1. the scholarly achievements of the candidate as seen by members of the department, including, as appropriate, comparisons with peers in the field;
2. the candidate's teaching ability, with supporting material outlining the courses that the candidate has taught at or through Hopkins and analyzing work performed in supervising graduate dissertations; and
3. the candidate's service to the Department, University, Profession, and Public (if appropriate).

The Department Request should also describe how the scholarly field(s) represented by the candidate are related to the present or planned programs of the department, and whether the candidate's expertise is helpful or necessary to the support of other programs at Hopkins, especially in the Homewood Schools.

The Department Referee List shall provide the names, ranks, and institutional affiliations of seven department-selected external referees, brief biographies including standing in the field, the basis of selection, and any special relationships between the referees and the candidate. The Department shall consult with the Dean about suitable referees, but the final choices are made by the Department. The Department shall neither solicit letters from these referees directly nor contact them to assess their willingness to provide letters. The candidate should not provide the Chair with a list of leaders in their field or recommend any letter writers. The involvement of the candidate should be limited to providing the names of anyone the candidate feels could not give an impartial evaluation letter (and the reason why), although the Chair may still select scholars on the list as referees. The Chair should not discuss whom to seek as letter writers with anyone except other members of the Department who are eligible to vote on the promotion. In particular, scholars at other universities should not be consulted for advice about potential letter-writers.

NOTE: From here, the procedures for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor follow Section 7, "Unified Procedures for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure: Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and Appointment at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor."

Section 6. Procedures for Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor

Section 6a. Overview of Procedures for Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor

The process for considering an appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor, if successful, has nine stages:

1. Departmental review and decision whether to request solicitation of referee letters
2. Referee letter solicitation by an ad hoc committee
3. Departmental review and decision whether to request appointment
4. Dean's review
5. Ad hoc committee review
6. Academic Council review and recommendation to the President
7. Tenure Advisory Committee review and recommendation to the President
8. President's recommendation to the Board of Trustees
9. Final approval by the Board of Trustees

The various stages at which a case can be stopped are explained in the detailed descriptions below.

Section 6b. Department Review and Decision to Request Solicitation of Referee Letters for Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor

Recommendations for all new faculty appointments must be made with the approval of the voting faculty of the Department, their vote being recorded in the Department Request to the Dean. For this purpose, the voting faculty are those tenured faculty at or above the proposed rank of the candidate.

The Department Chair shall follow the search process outlined for its School. The materials presented to the Academic Council will include the final Affirmative Action Report, along with all supporting materials.

Candidate Dossier for Appointments at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor

The Department Chair shall provide an initial Candidate Dossier, Department Request and Department Referee List to the Dean, with the following components:

1. A Candidate Dossier which includes:
 - a a current and dated curriculum vitae, including awards and recognition; co-authors and page numbers or electronic identifiers for all scholarly publications and other scholarly and technical work; list of invited talks and presentations; status of book manuscripts and other works in progress; advisory and mentoring information; list of internal and external funding with PI status, agency, dates, and levels of funding; list of fellowships or other scholarly support; list of service to the Department, University, Profession, and Public (if appropriate);
 - b research statement;
 - c teaching statement;
 - d service statement (optional);
 - e representative work;

- f book reviews or readers' reports; and
 - g any other materials germane to the case.
2. Department Request to the Dean;
 3. Department Referee List.

The Department Request describes the process by which the candidate was identified, the candidate's current institution rank and tenure status, the candidate's scholarly achievements as seen by members of the Department, the fit of the candidate's research area with the long-range plans of the Department, School, and University and the candidate's corresponding impact, and a tally of the faculty vote.

The Department Referee List shall provide the names, rank, and institutional affiliations of seven department-selected external referees, brief biographies including standing in the field, the basis of selection, and any special relationships between the referees and the candidate. The Department shall consult with the Dean about suitable referees, but the final choices are made by the Department. The Department shall neither solicit letters from these referees directly nor contact them to assess their willingness to provide letters. The candidate should not provide the Chair with a list of leaders in their field or recommend any letter writers. The involvement of the candidate should be limited to providing the names of anyone the candidate feels could not give an impartial evaluation letter (and the reason why), although the Chair may still select scholars on the list as referees. The Chair should not discuss whom to seek as letter writers with anyone except other members of the Department who are eligible to vote on the appointment. In particular, scholars at other universities should not be consulted for advice about potential letter-writers. If the Department has solicited letters as part of the search process, these letters must be included in the dossier submitted to the Dean, along with a detailed account of the correspondence by which they were solicited. Letters of recommendation solicited by the candidate during the recruitment process must also be included in the dossier. Neither letters solicited by the candidate nor letters solicited by the Department as part of the search count toward the external letters required for appointment and tenure. The Department should not select as a referee someone who has already provided a letter of recommendation for the candidate during the search.

If the Dean approves the Department Request, the Dean will appoint an ad hoc committee responsible for soliciting letters from external referees.

NOTE: From here, the procedures for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor follow Section 7, "Unified Procedures for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure: Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and Appointment at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor."

Section 7. Unified Procedures for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure: Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and Appointment at the Rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor.

Section 7a. Letter Solicitation Procedures for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure

If the Dean approves the Department Request, the Dean will appoint an ad hoc committee responsible for soliciting letters from external referees. The Academic Council shall provide a Council Liaison to the ad hoc committee to assist with questions of procedure. The ad hoc committee shall meet with the Council Liaison before beginning the process of soliciting the letters.

The ad hoc committee shall consist of two tenured faculty members, at least one of whom must be a faculty member in one of the Homewood Schools and neither of whom shall be from the candidate's primary department. Committee members shall be at or above the proposed rank, holding the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor for promotion to or appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, and holding the rank of Full professor for appointment at the rank of Full Professor. In appointing the committee, the Dean will attempt to appoint a disinterested and balanced group of faculty capable of evaluating significant aspects of the candidate's work. Faculty holding a secondary appointment in the candidate's department are automatically disqualified from serving on the ad hoc committee if they participated in any of the votes at the departmental level, or have voting rights for promotions in the candidate's Department. Academic Council members will be appointed to ad hoc committees only in unusual circumstances. Faculty will generally not be appointed to ad hoc committees charged with considering candidates with whom they have published or have applied for or received research funding. Ad hoc committee members shall disclose these or any other relationships with the candidate that might be perceived by a reasonable observer to constitute a conflict of interest or source of bias with respect to the candidate (see Section 3, Conflict of Interest, above). This disclosure shall be included in the Ad hoc Committee Report.

The constitution of an ad hoc committee shall be held in confidence. Should the candidate learn the composition of the committee, or the confidentiality of the process otherwise be compromised, or should a real or perceived conflict of interest exist between ad hoc committee members and the candidate, as circumstances indicate the Dean may suspend the work of the committee and appoint a new one. Members of the faculty must refrain from attempting to learn the composition of an ad hoc committee and from contacting the committee.

The ad hoc committee is furnished with the Candidate Dossier, the Department Request, and the Department Referee List provided by the Department to the Dean. In the case of candidates for whom previous ad hoc appointment or promotion committees have been formed at Johns Hopkins, the Dean shall also furnish the committee with a list of scholars who have previously submitted letters of appraisal. Similarly, for appointments, the Dean shall also furnish the ad hoc committee with the names of referees who have already provided letters of recommendation for the candidate during the search. The ad hoc committee shall solicit external letters of evaluation from each of the seven referees from the Department Referee List and from referees it selects. The committee should request reviews from enough referees so that at least ten substantive responses are obtained, including at least five from referees selected by the ad hoc committee. See below for further details.

Either the Department Chair or the Chair's designee shall serve as Department Liaison to the ad hoc committee. The identity of the Department Liaison shall also be held in confidence. The role of the Department Liaison is to provide information helpful to the committee in selecting

referees. The Department Liaison shall meet with the ad hoc committee at least once before it sends out requests for evaluation. During the process of this consultation, the Department Liaison must be given the opportunity to comment on the qualifications, appropriateness, and impartiality of all proposed referees. The ad hoc committee may take such comments under advisement, although the Department Liaison holds no veto over the selection of referees. The Department Liaison will provide the ad hoc committee with background information on the field of the candidate's scholarly research, including information on any engaged scholarship, translational activities, or other forms of public-facing scholarship (if appropriate). The Department Liaison shall be given the opportunity to review the candidate materials before they are transmitted to the referees. However, the ad hoc committee chair is ultimately responsible for obtaining up-to-date materials from the Department Chair. Beyond consulting on the selection of the referees, the role of the Department Liaison shall be confined to responding to specific requests from the committee for information it deems relevant to making its recommendation. All contributions of the Department Liaison to the development of the list of referees and to any other aspect of the committee's deliberations should be documented carefully in the Ad Hoc Committee Report.

In gathering information requested by the ad hoc committee, the Department Liaison may not normally consult with other individuals. Exceptions are permitted only if: i) no possibility exists of a breach of confidentiality; ii) the Department Liaison's consultations are fully disclosed in the Ad Hoc Committee Report; and iii) prior approval is obtained from the Appointments and Promotions Committee of the Academic Council.

Commented [AP1]: Approved by HAC on 5/15/24

The ad hoc committee solicits letters from each of the seven referees selected by the Department and from each of the referees it has selected. Should the Department List yield fewer than three acceptances, the Department may choose to continue to propose referees for solicitation by the ad hoc committee until three acceptances have been received from Department referees. The ad hoc committee will solicit letters from additional referees until the requisite ten total letters, including at least five from referees selected by the ad hoc committee, have been received. Letters that reveal previously unknown relationships with referees are not necessarily excluded; these and other relationships should be discussed in the Department Review and the Ad hoc Committee Report.

In exceptional cases, if the ad hoc committee is unable to compile a satisfactory list of potential referees or to obtain the requisite number of letters, the ad hoc committee may petition the Academic Council to allow the Department Liaison to furnish an extensive list of distinguished scholars with appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate. Such a petition will only be approved if the Academic Council agrees that there is no other reasonable alternative.

Under unusual circumstances, an ad hoc committee may solicit referee letters from members of the Johns Hopkins faculty. While such letters shall be included in the dossier, these letters are to be considered as supplementary information only and will not be used as a primary basis for the Academic Council's decision.

Departments must make every effort to minimize the involvement of candidates with their own appointment or promotion case. Candidates should not contact potential referees concerning their case. Any communications between the candidate and the committee should be channeled through the Department Chair or the Dean, as appropriate. It should be emphasized that the candidate should not be apprised of the progress of a committee's evaluation or of any problems encountered.

Letters to the external referees should be co-signed by the chair of the ad hoc committee and by the Dean. The Academic Council Administrator shall assist the ad hoc committee by managing the distribution of letters and promotion materials to the external referees, the collection of responses including evaluation letters and declinations from the referees, and the compilation of all other communications with referees. The Academic Council Administrator shall apprise the ad hoc committee of the responses. To ensure that the committee completes its evaluation in a timely fashion, ad hoc committee chairs should repeat any evaluation request that has not elicited a response within a reasonable time period. Each ad hoc committee should expect to report to the Academic Council within three to four months of its appointment. Should this prove impossible for any reason, the committee chair should so notify the Dean.

When sufficient referee letters have been received by the ad hoc committee, it shall prepare an External Referee Report with the assistance of the Academic Council Administrator. The External Referee Report shall include the following components:

1. Description of any relationships between the referees and the candidate that might be perceived by a reasonable observer to constitute a conflict of interest or source of bias with respect to the candidate (see Section 3 above);
2. Description of the contributions of the Department Liaison to development of the list of referees;
3. A table providing the full list of referees, the institution and rank of each, whether the Department or the ad hoc committee selected the referee, and whether the referee accepted, declined, or gave no response;
4. The accompanying biographical and selection information for referees;
5. All referee letters received;
6. All additional communications with the referees, including letters, emails, and other correspondence, including declinations;
7. A sample letter request;
8. Written approvals from the Appointments and Promotions Committee, if applicable.

The External Referee Report shall be redacted to maintain the confidentiality of the membership of the ad hoc committee

The External Referee Report shall then be provided to the Dean. In certain cases, upon review of this report, the Dean may find that the ad hoc committee did not follow the procedures as expected, or that the evidence in the External Referee Report is insufficient for the purpose of making a reliable recommendation. In such a case, the Dean may ask the ad hoc committee to take actions to supplement the External Referee Report, such as meeting with the Department

Liaison, soliciting additional letters, or consulting citation databases. The External Referee Report is then provided to the Department.

Guidelines for the Solicitation of Letters

Both the Department and the ad hoc committee shall select referees for evaluating the candidate's achievements and promise for the future from recognized authorities in the candidate's field(s) of expertise. Referees' letters are among the most important evidence in the dossier, and great care should be taken in assembling the list of referees.

For appointments at the rank of Full Professor, referees with academic appointments must hold the rank of Full Professor with tenure or equivalent. For promotion or appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, referees with academic appointments should hold the rank of Full Professor with tenure, but may hold the rank of Associate Professor with tenure with the permission of the Appointments and Promotions Committee of the Academic Council. In all cases, referees who do not hold academic appointments, or who have academic appointments but in fields that do not normally grant tenure, or at institutions without tenure, may be included with the permission of the Appointments and Promotions Committee. If the Appointments and Promotions Committee approves the request, the referee is permitted, and the written request and approval shall be included in the External Referee Report.

It is important to choose referees with the expertise necessary to assess the candidate's scholarship. Opinions should be sought from a broad selection of referees, including adherents of different, even opposing, schools of thought. In the case of candidates whose work spans more than a single field, evaluations should be solicited from a group of referees whose collective expertise covers the range of the candidate's work. In the case of candidates whose work includes engaged scholarship, translational activity, or other forms of public-facing scholarship, this should include referees who can speak with authority about this aspect of their work. This might include one or two non-academic referees. As usual (see the previous paragraph), selection of non-academic referees requires the permission of the Appointments and Promotions Committee. Because the University must maintain a faculty of strong international reputation, opinions from foreign referees should be included where possible. In identifying the pool of potential letter writers, the committee should strive to balance the eminence of the referees with the likelihood that they will be able to provide an informative evaluation of the candidate's work.

The primary consideration by departments and ad hoc committees should be whether the group of referees, taken as a whole, has the necessary expertise in the discipline to assess the candidate's scholarship while still having an appropriate degree of impartiality. Although it would be a mistake to assemble a group of referees with a preponderance of members known to be close to the candidate, it would also be a mistake to avoid individual referees with especially relevant expertise solely on the basis of a professional relationship with the candidate.

Any candidate who is an active scholar will form professional relationships with other scholars who are potential referees. For example, a candidate might co-organize conferences or symposia, contribute to edited volumes, or invite or be invited to give seminars. Such routine relationships

should not disqualify the individuals involved from writing letters; indeed, these people may be ideally suited to assess the candidate's scholarship.

Some particularly close relationships may compromise the objectivity of the referee. The candidate's doctoral and post-doctoral advisors and co-advisors, as well as members of the candidate's thesis committees, should not be asked to write letters. In addition, solicitation of letters from colleagues from the candidate's current institution, or individuals with a sustained record of collaboration with the candidate is discouraged. Any questions about the appropriateness of a given referee should be directed to the Council Liaison.

In every case it is essential that there be full disclosure of all known relationships between the referees and the candidate. To this end, when letters are solicited the referees should be asked explicitly to disclose any relationships they may have with the candidate. These relationships should be described in the External Referee Report.

Guidelines for Requesting Referee Letters

Template letters are provided on the Academic Council website (<https://academiccouncil.jhu.edu/appointments-promotions/>). With prior approval from the Dean's Office or from the Appointments and Promotions Committee, the ad hoc committee may modify these templates to suit individual circumstances, but the following points should be observed:

- Referees should be asked to compare the candidate with others who are at the same stage of their career in the same or comparable fields of research, and to evaluate the likelihood that the candidate will equal the achievements of current leaders in the field, regardless of seniority.
- Referees should be invited to comment on the candidate's abilities as a teacher.
- A separate template letter, with a specific focus on the candidate's achievements and impact outside the academy, is available for requesting letters from non-academic referees who are likely to be able to comment only on this aspect of the candidate's work.
- It should be indicated that the promotion or appointment involves the conferral of tenure.
- Great emphasis should be placed upon the fact that the referees' responses will be treated with strict confidentiality. Referees shall be informed that only senior faculty in the department and those directly involved in the evaluation process will see their responses.
- Referees should be asked explicitly to disclose any relationship they have with the candidate.

The ad hoc committee shall supply each referee with the candidate materials including vita, teaching statement, research statement, and copies of at least a representative sampling of the candidate's scholarly work. It is important that all referees receive the same materials. If a referee asks to be sent a completed article (whether published or in press) that was not in the original package of materials, it is the candidate's prerogative (in consultation with the Department Chair) to decide whether it should be sent. However, if it is sent to that referee, it should also be sent to all the other referees. Candidates should be aware that referees may wish to see articles listed on the vita as "in press". Candidates may wish to include some work in

progress in the sample of their work supplied to referees; but any requests from referees to see additional work in progress should be declined, and candidates should not be approached on the matter.

Section 7b. Department Review and Decision to Request Promotion or Appointment for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure

The voting faculty of the Department shall consider the case for promotion or appointment based on the Department Request, the Candidate Dossier and the External Referee Report. Although preliminary work may be designated to a subcommittee, the final decision rests with a vote of the entire voting faculty, recommending for or against promotion or appointment.

The Chair shall provide a Department Report to the Dean reporting and justifying the decision of the Department, including a tally of the faculty vote. The Department Report should discuss the external letters of evaluation as part of the justification.

Any minority views among the voting faculty should be represented accurately in the Department Report. The Department Report must be shared with the voting members of the Department for comment prior to its submission to the Dean. If faculty members holding the minority view are not satisfied that the final version of the Department Report adequately presents their view, they have the option of writing a minority report within two weeks. The minority report is shared with the voting faculty and appended to the Department Report.

The Department Report should also disclose any relationships between faculty members voting on the case and the candidate that might be perceived by a reasonable observer to constitute a conflict of interest or source of bias with respect to the candidate (see Section 3 above).

Whether the departmental recommendation is positive or negative, the Department Report is then transmitted to the Dean along with all materials assembled by the Department for its deliberation of the case. For promotions, every effort should be made to complete the departmental review process as early as possible in the academic year, even before the deadlines pertaining to promotions, in order to allow sufficient time for evaluation by the ad hoc committee and the Academic Council.

Section 7c. Dean's Review for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure

The Department Report, External Referee Report, and the Candidate's Dossier provide the basis for the Dean's decision whether to consider the case further. Upon receipt of these materials, the Dean may meet with the Chair to discuss the candidate and the recommendation of the Department. The Dean may ask the Department for more information and suspend the decision until the materials are sufficiently complete and informative. If the Dean is inclined not to follow the recommendation of the Department, the materials may be shared with the Academic Council to provide consultation before arriving at a conclusion. A decision not to follow the recommendation of the Department for a promotion must be explained in writing to the Chair. The Dean shall also provide a written explanation to the Academic Council, which together with the full set of materials shall be provided to the Academic Council to permit questioning by

Academic Council members. There is no requirement to provide such explanation for a decision not to follow the recommendation of the Department for an appointment.

Section 7d. Ad Hoc Committee Evaluation for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure

If the case proceeds, the ad hoc committee is informed that an evaluation is required but does not yet receive the Department Report, any minority report, or the tally of the Departmental vote. It is then the responsibility of the ad hoc committee to evaluate the candidate's qualifications for promotion or appointment as thoroughly and impartially as possible. The committee must not view itself as an advocate for either the Department or the candidate. The ad hoc committee's recommendation should be informed by its own impartial evaluation of the candidate's scholarly research, undergraduate and graduate teaching and mentorship, service to the candidate's Department, University, and Profession, and external letters of evaluation.

When an ad hoc committee has completed its evaluation, it will prepare an Ad hoc Committee Report reviewing its findings and recommending whether or not the promotion or appointment should be made.

The Ad hoc Committee Report shall then be transmitted to the Dean and to the Chair of the Department. When a tenured department faculty member's field is closer to that of the candidate, the Chair may, at the Dean's discretion, designate one faculty member to assist with the case. If so, the Chair's designee may also receive the Ad hoc Committee Report. The Department Chair may respond to the Ad hoc Committee Report in writing. Any such response will be added as an addendum to the Department Report. The Dean may, upon receipt of the departmental response, ask the ad hoc committee to take additional actions to supplement the materials. If the final Ad Hoc Committee Report is different in any significant respect from the version initially submitted to the Dean, the Dean must provide the Academic Council with a written account of the changes and the reasons for them.

Section 7e. Academic Council Review for Promotions and Appointments that Confer Tenure

The complete set of materials, including the Department Report, the Ad Hoc Committee Report, and the External Referee Report, is then transmitted to the Academic Council for its consideration, and the Department Report is transmitted to the ad hoc committee. The case will be presented to the Academic Council whatever the recommendation of the ad hoc committee as to its disposition. The Chair of the candidate's Department (and, if applicable, the Chair's designee) and the chair of the ad hoc committee each will appear before the Academic Council to provide any additional information that they may wish to present, and to answer questions from the Academic Council. They will meet sequentially with the Council. Normally, the Department Chair will appear first. In the course of the Academic Council's deliberations, the Dean of the relevant School and the Provost will be invited to comment on the case.

Three-quarters of the voting members of the Academic Council are required for a quorum for voting on promotion or appointment to the ranks of Associate Professor or Full Professor. If one or more voting members is recused from such a vote, the number of voting members required for a quorum shall be reduced by one. Approval of a promotion or appointment to the ranks of

Associate Professor or Full Professor requires a majority vote of members present. (See Bylaws Section XV). It is customary not to vote on a promotion during the Academic Council meeting at which the ad hoc committee makes its report, but to postpone the recommendation until the next meeting of the Academic Council. If there is special urgency in making an appointment or promotion, the Department or the Dean may request a waiver of this holdover rule. At the end of the discussion of the case, the holdover rule may be waived by a three-quarters vote of members present.

When an ad hoc committee submits its report to the Dean for distribution to the Academic Council, all other material relating to the Ad hoc Report is to be submitted to the Office of the Dean or destroyed.

Following a decision on a proposed appointment or promotion, the Academic Council Administrator will notify the ad hoc committee chair of the decision. As a courtesy, the ad hoc committee chair should inform the referees of the outcome, thanking them for their efforts.

Exceptional Circumstances

Under truly exceptional circumstances, the Academic Council may decide to follow an alternative procedure in considering an appointment or promotion, such as choosing not to solicit external letters. However, under no circumstances may the Academic Council suspend its rules for voting on appointments or promotions.

1. Requests for exceptional circumstances will be considered on a case-by-case basis, bearing in mind past precedents.
2. Requests will be transmitted in the first instance to the most relevant HAC subcommittee, as determined, if necessary, by the HAC Secretary. For example, requests for exceptions to the Appointment & Promotion Procedures will be passed to the Appointments & Promotions subcommittee of HAC.
3. The subcommittee receiving the request will discuss it and formulate a recommendation to be considered by the full HAC.
4. The request will be scheduled for consideration and a vote at a HAC formal meeting.
5. For requests that involve faculty appointments or promotions with conferral of tenure, the HAC vote will be held over until the next formal meeting, following the holdover rule for tenure cases.

Commented [AP2]: Approved by HAC on 4/3/24

The Dean should discuss with the Academic Council any proposed change in procedure before an ad hoc committee is formed.

Section 8. Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

Section 8a. Overview of the Procedures for Promotion to Rank of Full Professor

The Tenure Regulations of the Krieger and Whiting Schools govern the timing of the faculty promotion process. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor may be requested of the Department by the faculty member at any time consistent with the Tenure Regulations.

The process for considering a promotion to the rank of Full Professor, if successful, has seven stages:

1. Departmental review and decision whether to solicit referee letters;
2. Referee letter solicitation by the Department;
3. Departmental review and decision whether to request promotion;
4. Dean's review;
5. Academic Council review and recommendation to the President;
6. President's recommendation to the Board of Trustees;
7. Final approval by the Board of Trustees.

In order to ensure that cases come before the Academic Council in a timely fashion, the dates in the table below should be observed. In particular, the department must request consideration of promotion by the October 1 deadline.

Candidates are expected to submit material to their department no later than their seventh year in rank. Refer to the Tenure Regulations document for further details regarding promotion timeline.

Deadline	
Submission of candidate dossier to Department by candidate	March 15
Department request to Dean for promotion consideration	October 1

Section 8b. Departmental Review and Decision to Solicit Referee Letters for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

The first phase in the consideration of a faculty member for promotion is review by the voting faculty of the department. For this purpose, the voting faculty are tenured Full Professors. The voting faculty does not include those with Emeritus and/or Academy status. The candidate shall provide the Department with a Candidate Dossier that includes current and dated curriculum vitae, including awards and recognition, publication and presentation information, advisory and mentorship information, and funding history; teaching statement; teaching evaluations and related information; service statement; research statement; samples of work; and any other materials germane to the case.

If a Department concludes, based on its evaluation of the Candidate Dossier, that the candidate's case is insufficiently strong to warrant promotion, it may make a recommendation to the Dean against promotion without seeking external letters of evaluation. Such a recommendation requires a majority vote of the voting faculty. The Department shall provide the Dean with a tally of the vote, a letter from the Chair explaining the reason(s) for the decision and outlining any dissenting views, and a copy of the Candidate Dossier. The decision not to seek external letters is

subject to approval by the Dean. A decision not to continue the promotion process will be reported by the Dean to the Academic Council as an information item.

Section 8c. Referee Letter Solicitation for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

In the second stage of the departmental review, the Department obtains at least six letters of evaluation from external referees (see *Selection of Referees* below). Of these letters, at least three must be from referees who did not provide letters for previous consideration for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor, or to appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor, whether such promotion or appointment was approved or not. In exceptional cases, the Chair may petition the Academic Council to provide fewer than three letters from new referees. Such a petition will only be approved if the Academic Council agrees that there is no other reasonable alternative. The Academic Council shall provide a Liaison to the Chair to assist with questions of procedure. The Chair shall meet with the Council Liaison before compiling a list of potential letter writers. Subsequently, the Department shall consult with the Dean about suitable referees, but the final choices are made by the Department.

It is incumbent upon the Department to provide enough information and evaluation for the Academic Council to make a judgment. The candidate should not provide the Chair with a list of leaders in their field or recommend any letter writers. The involvement of the candidate should be limited to providing the names of anyone the candidate feels could not give an impartial evaluation letter (and the reason why), although the Chair may still solicit letters from scholars on the list. The Chair should not discuss whom to seek as letter writers with anyone except other members of the Department who are eligible to vote on the promotion. In particular, scholars at other universities should not be consulted for advice about potential letter-writers. The request for external letters must follow the procedures specified in the section *Guidelines for the Solicitation of Letters*, below.

Guidelines for the Solicitation of Letters for Promotions to the Rank of Full Professor

Selection of Referees

The Department shall solicit letters evaluating the candidate's achievements and promise for the future from recognized authorities in the candidate's field(s) of expertise. These letters are among the most important evidence in the dossier, and great care should be taken in assembling the list of referees.

It is important to choose referees with the expertise necessary to assess the candidate's scholarship. Opinions should be sought from a broad selection of referees, including adherents of different, even opposing, schools of thought. In the case of candidates whose work spans more than a single field, evaluations should be solicited from a group of referees whose collective expertise covers the range of the candidate's work. In the case of candidates whose work includes engaged scholarship, translational activity, or other forms of public-facing scholarship, this should include referees who can speak with authority about this aspect of their work. This might include one or two non-academic referees. As usual (see below), selection of non-academic referees requires the permission of the Appointments and Promotions Committee. Referees will

carry the rank of Professor or the equivalent. Because Hopkins must maintain a faculty of strong international reputation, opinions from foreign referees should be included where possible. In identifying the pool of potential letter writers, the Department should strive to balance the eminence of the referees with the likelihood that they will be able to provide an informative evaluation of the candidate's work. Referees who do not hold academic appointments, or who hold academic appointments at institutions that do not grant tenure, may be included with permission of the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

The primary consideration should be whether the group of referees, taken as a whole, has the necessary expertise in the discipline to assess the candidate's scholarship while still having an appropriate degree of impartiality. Although it would be a mistake to assemble a group of referees with a preponderance of members known to be close to the candidate, it would also be a mistake to avoid individual referees with especially relevant expertise solely on the basis of a professional relationship with the candidate.

Any candidate who is an active scholar will form professional relationships with other scholars who are potential referees. For example, a candidate might co-organize conferences or symposia, contribute to edited volumes, or invite or be invited to give seminars. Such routine relationships should not disqualify the individuals involved from writing letters; indeed, these people may be ideally suited to assess the candidate's scholarship.

Some particularly close relationships may compromise the objectivity of the referee. The candidate's doctoral and post-doctoral advisors and co-advisors, as well as members of the candidate's thesis committees, should not be asked to write letters. In addition, solicitation of letters from colleagues from any school of Johns Hopkins University, or individuals with a sustained record of collaboration with the candidate, is discouraged. Any questions about the appropriateness of a given referee should be directed to the Council Liaison.

In every case it is essential that there be full disclosure of all known relationships between the referees and the candidate. To this end, when letters are solicited the referees should be asked explicitly to disclose any relationships they may have with the candidate. These relationships should be described in the department's letter to the Dean.

Guidelines for Preparing the Request for Letters for Promotions to the Rank of Full Professor

Template letters are provided on the Academic Council website (<https://academiccouncil.jhu.edu/appointments-promotions/>). With prior approval from the Dean's Office or Appointments and Promotions Subcommittee, the department may modify these templates to suit individual circumstances, but the following points should be observed:

- The referees should be asked to compare the candidate with others who are at the same stage of their career in the same or comparable fields of research, and to evaluate the likelihood that the candidate will equal the achievements of current leaders in the field, regardless of seniority.
- Referees should be invited to comment on the candidate's abilities as a teacher if they are able to do so.

- A separate template letter, with a specific focus on the candidate's achievements and impact outside the academy, is available for requesting letters from non-academic referees who are likely to be able to comment only on this aspect of the candidate's work.
- Great emphasis should be placed upon the fact that the referee's responses will be treated with strict confidentiality; referees shall be informed that only senior faculty in the Department and those directly involved in the evaluation process will see their responses.
- The referees should be asked explicitly to disclose any relationship they may have with the candidate.

The Department shall supply each referee with the candidate's vita, research statement, teaching statement, and copies of at least a representative sampling of scholarly work. It is important that all referees receive the same materials. If a referee asks to be sent a completed article (whether published or in press) that was not in the original package of materials, it is the candidate's prerogative (in consultation with the Department Chair) to decide whether it should be sent. However, if it is sent to that referee, it should also be sent to all the other referees. Candidates should be aware that referees may wish to see articles listed on the vita as "in press". Candidates may wish to include some work in progress in the sample of their work supplied to referees; but any requests from referees to see additional work in progress should be declined, and candidates should not be approached on the matter.

Section 8d. Departmental Review and Decision to Request Promotion

The voting faculty of the department shall consider the case for promotion, based on the Candidate Dossier, external letters, and its own evaluation of the candidate's scholarly research, teaching, and service. Although preliminary work may be designated to a subcommittee, the final decision rests with a vote of the entire voting faculty, recommending for or against promotion.

In evaluating the candidate's teaching, undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty may be consulted. However, any such consultation should be conducted with the utmost care to avoid putting pressure on students, especially those currently taking courses from the candidate or under the candidate's supervision. Letters from students should not be submitted. A summary of anonymous student evaluations, where available, must be included in the report.

The Chair shall provide a Department Report to the Dean reporting the decision of the Department (including a tally of the vote) and justifying it on the basis of the elements of the Candidate Dossier including the external letters of evaluation. The Department Report should evaluate the following in detail:

1. the scholarly achievements of the candidate as seen by members of the Department, including, as appropriate, comparisons with peers in the field;
2. the candidate's teaching ability, with supporting material outlining the courses that the candidate has taught at or through Hopkins and analyzing work performed in supervising graduate dissertations;
3. the candidate's service to the Department, University, Profession, and Public (if appropriate); and

4. the Referee Report.

The Referee Report shall include the following:

- a list of all referees and potential referees contacted regarding the case;
- a brief statement of the basis on which the referees were selected;
- possible reasons for failure of any referees to respond;
- pertinent information on the standing of the referees in their fields (including those not responding);
- an indication of any special relationships between the referees and the candidate;
- a discussion of the role of the Dean in selection of the referees;
- a sample of the letter written to the referees;
- copies of correspondence with all referees, including declinations; and
- copies of all external letters received.

Any minority views among the voting faculty should be represented accurately in the Department Report. The Department Report must be shared with the voting members of the Department for comment prior to its submission to the Dean. If faculty members holding the minority view are not satisfied that the final version of the Chair's report adequately presents their view, they have the option of writing a minority report within two weeks. The minority report is shared with the voting faculty and is appended to the Department Report.

The Department Report should also disclose any relationships between faculty members voting on the case and the candidate that might be perceived by a reasonable observer to constitute a conflict of interest or source of bias with respect to the candidate (see Section 3 above).

Whether the departmental recommendation is positive or negative, the Department Report is then transmitted to the Dean along with all materials assembled by the Department for its deliberation of the case. Every effort should be made to complete the departmental review process as early as possible in the academic year, even before the deadlines mentioned above, in order to allow sufficient time for evaluation by the Academic Council.

Section 8e. Dean's Review for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

The Department Report and the Candidate Dossier provides the basis for the Dean's decision whether to transmit the case to the Academic Council. Upon receipt of the Department Report, the Dean may meet with the Chair to discuss the candidate and the recommendation of the Department. The Dean may ask the Department for more information and suspend the decision until he or she determines the materials to be sufficiently complete and informative. If the Dean is inclined not to follow the recommendation of the Department, he or she shall share the full set of materials with the Academic Council and consult with them before arriving at a final conclusion. A decision not to follow the recommendation of the Department must be explained in writing to the Chair and reported as an information item to the Academic Council.

Section 8f. Academic Council Review of Cases for Promotion to Full Professor

The complete set of materials is then transmitted to the Academic Council for its consideration. The Chair of the candidate's Department (and, if applicable, the Chair's designee) will appear before the Academic Council to provide any additional information that they may wish to present, and to answer questions from the Council. In the course of Academic Council's deliberations, the Dean of the relevant School and the Provost will be invited to comment on the case.

Three-quarters of the voting members of the Academic Council are required for a quorum for voting on promotion to the rank of Full Professor. If one or more voting members is recused from such a vote, the number of voting members required for a quorum shall be reduced by one. Approval of a promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires a majority vote of members present. (See Bylaws Section XV). It is customary not to vote on a promotion during the Academic Council meeting at which the department Chair appears, but to postpone the recommendation until the next meeting of the Academic Council. If there is special urgency in making a promotion, the Department or the Dean may request a waiver of this holdover rule. At the end of the discussion of the case, the holdover rule may be waived by a three-quarters vote of members present.

Following a decision on a proposed promotion, the Academic Council Administrator will notify the Department Chair of the decision. As a courtesy, the Department Chair should inform the referees of the outcome, thanking them for their efforts.

Exceptional Circumstances

Under truly exceptional circumstances, the Academic Council may decide to follow an alternative procedure in considering a promotion, such as choosing not to solicit external letters. However, under no circumstances may the Academic Council suspend its rules for voting on promotions.

1. Requests for exceptional circumstances will be considered on a case-by-case basis, bearing in mind past precedents.
2. Requests will be transmitted in the first instance to the most relevant HAC subcommittee, as determined, if necessary, by the HAC Secretary. For example, requests for exceptions to the Appointment & Promotion Procedures will be passed to the Appointments & Promotions subcommittee of HAC.
3. The subcommittee receiving the request will discuss it and formulate a recommendation to be considered by the full HAC.
4. The request will be scheduled for consideration and a vote at a HAC formal meeting.
5. For requests that involve faculty appointments or promotions with conferral of tenure, the HAC vote will be held over until the next formal meeting, following the holdover rule for tenure cases.

Commented [AP3]: Approved by HAC on 4/3/24

The Dean should discuss with the Academic Council any proposed change in procedure.

Section 9. Reconsideration of Negative Promotion Decisions

A negative promotion decision may be appealed. An appeal must be in writing and must contain a clear and detailed description of the specific grounds for the appeal according to the guidelines below. All appeals must be submitted within 30 days of notification of a negative decision. However, no appeal may be filed in cases where the resolution or remedy to the appeal would conflict with a policy or mandate of the Board of Trustees of the University. A decision on the appeal will be made within 30 days and the candidate will be notified.

Departmental Decision without Solicitation of External Letters of Evaluation

If a Department votes not to recommend a candidate for promotion and has not solicited external letters of evaluation, a candidate may appeal the Department's decision to the Dean on two grounds only:

1. substantial new evidence bearing on the candidate's scholarly research and professional standing;
2. clear evidence of impropriety substantially affecting the outcome of the promotion process.

An appeal may not be taken on grounds that the candidate disagrees with the Department's evaluation of his or her scholarly research, teaching performance, contribution to the Department's academic program, or fiscal considerations. An appeal also may not be based on allegations concerning the effect of allocations of departmental resources on the candidate's performance.

The Dean can either support the departmental decision not to promote or return the case to the Department for reconsideration with the requirement that external letters be obtained.

Departmental Decision after Solicitation of External Letters of Evaluation

If the Department has received external evaluation letters and subsequently votes not to request an ad hoc committee report, the candidate may appeal directly to the Dean. The appeal may be based only on the grounds enumerated above.

The Dean may either support the departmental decision or proceed with the request for an ad hoc committee report.

Dean's Review

If the Dean decides not to request an ad hoc committee report for a candidate, an appeal may be made by the candidate to the Provost on the grounds of procedural violations only.

Adverse Academic Council Decision

When a candidate has been denied promotion by vote of the Academic Council, the candidate's Department has the right to request reconsideration of the decision (unless the candidate is in the terminal contract year, when no departmental appeals are permitted). Should the Department not

request reconsideration, the candidate may submit a written request for reconsideration to the Dean, based only on the two following grounds: substantial new evidence bearing on the candidate's scholarly research and professional standing or clear evidence of impropriety substantially affecting the outcome of the promotion process.

Upon receipt of an appeal for reconsideration, the Dean may:

1. deny the request and notify the Academic Council as an information item, presenting the basis for the decision;
2. appoint a new ad hoc committee to review the case and recommend action to the Academic Council; or
3. transmit the request to the Academic Council for consideration, together with all of the documentation bearing on the original decision to deny promotion, and any other relevant material.

Upon receipt of an appeal, the Dean shall make appropriate inquiries of the Department and inform the Academic Council concerning the results of these inquiries. The Dean should also notify the Council concerning the course of action that he or she intends to pursue in the case.

After consultation with the Dean, the Council may decide to uphold the Dean's disposition of the case. If it does not, it may elect to conduct its own review of the case, or it may delegate such an investigation to a subcommittee of the Academic Council whose findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the Dean and reported to the Council as a whole. As a result of its consideration of the appeal, the Academic Council may vote to uphold the decision of the Dean, or it may recommend that the Dean form an ad hoc committee to evaluate the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

If the Dean declines to carry out the recommendation of the Academic Council, the Council may present the case to the Provost for resolution.

Provost Appeal

All individuals denied promotion by the Dean or the Academic Council, having exhausted any other appeals, may appeal to the Provost. The Provost's review of the matter is limited to alleged procedural violations resulting in a failure to conduct an impartial evaluation of the candidate's academic qualifications.

The Provost may send the case back to the level from which it was appealed, with instructions to correct the violations, or deny the appeal. If the violations are irreparable, the promotion case shall begin again de novo. There is no further appeal of a negative decision.

Section 10. Procedures for Interim Review of Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor

Departments should carefully review the academic progress of each untenured faculty member annually, and the Department Chair should inform each person reviewed of the Department's evaluation. It is particularly important that faculty whose performance is not up to expectation be

informed of the Department's concerns, and that those concerns be openly discussed in a forthright, helpful manner.

In the fourth year of appointment of an Assistant Professor, the Department shall prepare a formal report on the faculty member's progress. Any tenure clock extensions prior to the candidate's fourth year of appointment will delay the interim review. This interim review should evaluate accomplishment in teaching, scholarly research and service since the appointment, and assess to the extent possible the outlook for eventual promotion to tenured Associate Professor. The Department may follow a procedure of its choosing in preparing the interim review, although departments are not encouraged to solicit outside letters.

The Chair shall then draft a letter to the faculty member, on behalf of the Department, summarizing the interim review and making whatever recommendations may be indicated. If the senior faculty have explicit expectations for what needs to be accomplished before they would consider recommending conferral of tenure, these expectations should be made clear in the letter. However, care must be taken to avoid the implication that a positive recommendation would follow simply from the formal satisfaction of such requirements. The interim review must be endorsed by a vote of the tenured faculty in the Department.

The Chair shall then meet with the Dean to discuss the interim review and the proposed letter. Interim reviews are due to the Dean's Office no later than April 15 for faculty whose appointments began July 1- December 31 and no later than October 15 for faculty whose appointments began January 1- June 30. The Dean may suggest changes to the letter and may consult with the Office of the General Counsel on its wording. The Dean and the Chair must agree on the final form of the letter, which is then sent by the Department Chair to the faculty member. Copies of the interim review and the letter are retained by the Department and by the Dean, and they may be consulted when, subsequently, the faculty member is considered for promotion to tenure. To ensure the confidentiality and rigor of the review process, the interim review itself is not shared with the faculty member.