2.7 Evaluation Processes at the Department, School, and University Levels

2.7.A. Overview

The purpose of the appointment, reappointment or promotion evaluation is to appraise, on the record to date, the candidate’s standing in his or her field. Decisions on appointment, reappointment and promotion are subject to the exercise of professional and scholarly judgment and discretion by departmental faculty and academic leadership at the School and University levels. The criteria and guidelines outlined in Chapter 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 of this Handbook should be read and applied by all those who cast a vote on an appointment, reappointment or promotion action.

The University recognizes that there are significant variations in how candidates qualify for and secure appointment, according to field and discipline. Candidates come from different backgrounds and receive different educational training. In addition, there may be great variation in emphasis among the components of activity (i.e., scholarship, teaching and clinical care) depending on faculty line. Nevertheless, all appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

Procedures for the evaluation process at the department, School and University levels are described below. Departures from these guidelines should be rare and for good reason. Procedural questions should be addressed to the Senior Associate Dean or the Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs.

Instructions for assembly of each component of the appointment, reappointment or promotion long form, including the process for compiling a list of proposed evaluators (external and internal referees and trainees) is available on the Office of Academic Affairs’ website.

2.7.B. Confidentiality

The entire appointment, reappointment, or promotion proceedings during which specific candidates are discussed are to be held in strict confidence by all participants. The opinions expressed by the school or department faculty or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate or with other parties. This policy ensures that the candidacy of each person is treated with utmost confidentiality. It also provides an opportunity for those making the evaluation to have the freedom to provide written evaluation or to discuss the candidates during committee meetings without fearing that their comments will be shared outside the deliberations.

A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment, reappointment, or promotion case is a serious breach of professional ethics and may subject the individual to discipline.

The Dean or the Chair of the department (or his or her designee) shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate. Information regarding access to personnel
files is provided in the Chapter 2.8.B. of the University Faculty Handbook (and see also Chapter 2.8.C(2) of that handbook).

2.7.C. Role of the Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for compliance with University and School guidelines regarding faculty appointments, reappointments and promotions. He or she is to ensure that those conducting faculty evaluations are fully informed about these guidelines in order to avoid delays and other problems due to deficiencies in procedure and documentation.

The ultimate decision on whether to forward the appointment, reappointment or promotion to the Senior Associate Dean with a positive or negative recommendation is made by the department chair in his or her judgment and discretion.

2.7.D. Timing of Evaluations

After a search reaches its conclusion, the department chair, or his or her designate, is responsible for seeing that the appointment long form is completed in a timely manner. For assistant professor appointments, the review and approval process should be completed within approximately six months. For associate and full professor appointments, the review and approval process should be completed within approximately seven months.

Under normal circumstances, reappointment reviews for Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. However, the timing of the initiation of the evaluation process at the departmental level is at the discretion of the department chair, taking into account factors including the end date of a current appointment, the possible start date for the reappointment if the outcome of the School and University process is favorable, and considerations relating to notice of non-renewal and possible terminal year requirements if the outcome is negative. University policies regarding negative reappointment and promotion decisions and notice of non-renewal are found in the University Faculty Handbook at 2.8.C and 4.4.E.

Typically, promotion reviews are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. In the case of promotion from tenured Associate Professor to Professor, candidates should be brought forward based on an assessment of when criteria for the higher rank have been met.

Consultation between the department chair and the Senior Associate Dean is essential prior to initiating a review process leading toward early promotion. The process can only be initiated with the consent of the candidate and with approval of the Senior Associate Dean.

2.7.E. Assessment by the Department Chair

The department chair initiates the appointment, reappointment or promotion evaluation after making an appropriate assessment of the candidate’s credentials; in larger departments, the
The department chair may seek the advice of the candidate’s division regarding its assessment. The department chair may choose to concur with or reject a positive or negative assessment by the division in reaching his or her own assessment.

If the department chair’s assessment is negative, the negative recommendation will be forwarded to the Senior Associate Dean for consideration, with the appropriate documentation to explain the negative recommendation. In such cases for reappointment or promotion actions, it is expected that this documentation will include a summary of discussions held during annual counseling meetings with the faculty member.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in thereafter reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance with the matter.

In instances where, in his or her judgment and discretion, the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, the case may be remanded back to the department for further consideration.

If the department chair’s assessment is positive, the department chair proceeds to a full evaluation by appointment of a Departmental Evaluation Committee.

2.7.F. Departmental Evaluation Committee

If, after an appropriate assessment of the candidate’s credentials, the department chair decides to proceed with the full evaluation, the department chair appoints a Departmental Evaluation Committee to conduct the formal evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications and to prepare the long form. Departmental Evaluation Committees are advisory to the department chair, who ultimately makes the decision whether to recommend appointment, reappointment or promotion actions to the Senior Associate Dean.

Departmental Evaluation Committee members should be at or above the proposed rank of the candidate and are selected for their ability to make a critical and objective appraisal of the candidate’s qualifications in relation to the academic standards and other criteria of the University and School. It is not required that any or all members of the Departmental Evaluation Committee be an authority in the specialty or research field of the candidate, although such representation is desirable, if appropriate.

The department chair may choose to use a standing Departmental Appointments and Promotions Committee as the Departmental Evaluation Committee or, in the case of a new appointment, the Search Committee previously appointed by the department chair may be used. Anticipating this, the department chair may wish to constitute the original Search Committee in accordance with the above guidelines on composition of a Departmental Evaluation Committee. (Further information regarding the composition of departmental search committees is available in Chapter VII.D. of the Guide to Faculty Searches.) Such responsibilities for candidate evaluation and appointment form
preparation as may be delegated by the department chair to a division should be so defined as to maintain department and School perspective during this crucial phase of the review.

In reaching its decision on a candidate, it is the responsibility of the Department Evaluation Committee to decide the relative weight to be given to the information and opinions gathered, and to exercise its independent judgment within the context of University and School guidelines. In particular, Committee members should be familiar with the criteria for appointment, reappointment or promotion as outlined in Chapter 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 or 2.6 of this Handbook.

At the conclusion of its review, the Departmental Evaluation Committee should make a positive or negative recommendation to the department chair in a written report. The report should record the membership and the vote of the Departmental Evaluation Committee and any dissenting vote should be fully explained. The report should contain thorough documentation of the candidate’s qualifications and should give the reasons for the recommendation. A favorable report should be based on a record of clearly outstanding performance that has every prospect of continuing.

2.7.G. Options of the Department Chair

1. When the Recommendation of the Departmental Evaluation Committee is Positive

Upon receiving a favorable recommendation from the Departmental Evaluation Committee, the department chair may request the completed appointment, reappointment or promotion long form and (if he or she does make such a request) shall -- where consistent with departmental practice -- consult the appropriate departmental faculty to review the recommendation and vote to approve or disapprove the proposed action. It is required that the faculty members given responsibility for the review shall be broadly representative of such faculty. The names of the faculty participating in the review and the vote to accept or reject the recommendation should be recorded on the long form. Any vote against approval of the recommendation should be fully explained.

The department chair also has the authority, in his or her discretion, not to proceed to request the completed long form. In such cases, the department chair should discuss the matter with the Senior Associate Dean, who may, in his or her judgment and discretion, concur with or not concur with the department chair’s recommendation. In cases where the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, he or she may remand the matter to the department for further consideration.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair
in reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance in this matter.

2. When the Recommendation of the Departmental Evaluation Committee is Negative

Upon receiving a negative recommendation from the Departmental Evaluation Committee, the department chair may decide to proceed no further with the contemplated appointment, reappointment or promotion action. In such cases, he or she should consult with the Senior Associate Dean, who may, in his or her judgment and discretion, concur with or not concur with the department chair’s recommendation. In cases where the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, he or she may remand the matter to the department for further consideration.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in thereafter reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance with the matter.

Alternatively, the department chair may request the completed long form and, in such a case, shall – where consistent with departmental practice -- consult the appropriate departmental faculty to review the recommendation and vote to accept or reject the Departmental Evaluation Committee’s recommendation. It is required that the faculty members given responsibility for the review shall be broadly representative of such faculty. The names of the faculty participating in the review and the vote to accept or reject the recommendation should be recorded on the long form. Any vote against approval of the recommendation should be fully explained.

3. When the Recommendation of Departmental Faculty is Positive

If the department chair receives and concurs in a favorable recommendation from the appropriate departmental faculty, he or she forwards the completed long form to the Senior Associate Dean with a transmittal memorandum summarizing the reasons for the positive recommendation of the department and discussing the significance of any negative information or opinion.

If the department chair does not concur with a positive recommendation, he or she should discuss the matter with the Senior Associate Dean, who may, in his or her judgment and discretion, concur with or not concur with the department chair’s negative recommendation.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the
approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in thereafter reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance in this matter.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, he or she may either remand the matter to the department for further consideration or proceed to the next level of review by the Assistant Professors Review Committee or the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

4. When the Recommendation of Departmental Faculty is Negative

If the department chair receives and concurs in a negative recommendation from the appropriate departmental faculty, the department chair should discuss the matter with the Senior Associate Dean, who may, in his or her judgment and discretion, concur with or not concur with the department chair’s recommendation.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in thereafter reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance in this matter.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, he or she may either remand the matter to the department for further consideration or proceed to the next level of review by the Assistant Professors Review Committee or the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

If the department chair does not concur with a negative recommendation, he or she should forward the completed long form to the Senior Associate Dean with a transmittal memorandum summarizing the reasons for his or her positive recommendation and discussing the significance of any negative information or opinion. In such cases, the Senior Associate Dean has the option of remanding the matter to the department for further consideration or proceeding to the next level of review by the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

2.7.H. Draft Long Form Review by the Senior Associate Dean

A draft of the appointment, reappointment or promotion long form is submitted by the department chair to the Office of Academic Affairs for review and comment by Academic Affairs staff and the Senior Associate Dean. At this stage, the Senior Associate Dean may:
1. consult with the department chair, Dean or others as appropriate in his or her judgment;
2. remand the file to the department with instructions;
3. give preliminary approval for the finalization of the file;
4. make a negative recommendation on the file to the Dean;
5. or take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

After having received such review by the Senior Associate Dean and after any suggested revisions have been incorporated or other issues have been resolved, approved long forms are then submitted to Academic Affairs for distribution to either the Assistant Professors Review Committee (for appointments and reappointments to Assistant Professor) or the Appointments and Promotions Committee (for appointments, reappointments and promotions to Associate Professor and Professor).

2.7.I. Assistant Professors Review Committee (APRC)

1. Purpose

The School of Medicine Assistant Professors Review Committee (APRC) is a standing committee, advisory to the Senior Associate Dean, and appointed to review and assess the academic credentials for initial appointment or reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor in the University Tenure Line, the Medical Center Line and the Non-Tenure Line (Research).

2. Composition

Appointed by the Senior Associate Dean, the APRC is composed of seven members of the Professoriate, including two faculty members who also serve as Associate Deans for Academic Affairs. All members of the Committee must hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Normally, no department will be represented by more than one member from a given unit.

The School recognizes the challenges associated with the assembly of regular meetings of busy senior faculty members. Accordingly, the Senior Associate Dean may appoint faculty to serve as alternate Committee members. Alternate members must be Associate Professors or Professors. Their appointment should complement the composition of the Committee’s regular membership by faculty line and department affiliation.

3. Terms of Service

The Committee chair is appointed by the Senior Associate Dean for a term of up to three years. The two Associate Deans serve on the APRC concurrent with their administrative appointment. The other APRC members serve for staggered three-year terms, and each appointment is renewable for one additional term. The membership is reported annually to the School’s Executive Committee.
4. Function

For each appointment or reappointment considered by the APRC, the Office of Academic Affairs provides the APRC with the long form and the transmittal memorandum of the department chair. Academic Affairs staff assigns two APRC members to serve as first and second reviewers (the "Committee Reviewers") to aid in the assessment of the candidate's credentials.

The department chair (or his or her designee) will be asked to make himself or herself available (on standby) to appear at the appropriate meeting of the APRC to present the department’s recommendation and to answer questions posed by Committee members. During the opening of the meeting, the primary and/or secondary reviewers will be queried regarding their assessment of the need for the department chair (or designee) to appear in support of the recommendation. Administrative staff will then immediately notify the department chair (or designee) if his or her attendance is required.

Upon request by an APRC member (and with the concurrence of the Committee chair), the discussion of a candidate may be deferred until a future meeting. An action may also be tabled by the Committee chair for a variety of reasons including (but not limited to) a request for further input from the department or a recommendation that the Senior Associate Dean pursue an alternate strategy with the department.

Although rarely necessary, the APRC and/or the Committee Reviewers, in their discretion, also may request and consider any other material or information to complete the evaluation of the candidate’s credentials for the action recommended, including solicitation of additional letters of evaluation from external or internal referees, and consultation with others, such as Stanford faculty members, fellows, house staff or students. It is inappropriate for the APRC or the Committee Reviewers to consult with or receive advice from the candidate.

5. Meetings and Quorum

Normally, the APRC convenes once a month. Consideration of a recommendation by the Committee requires the presence of more than half of the current voting Committee membership, including either the primary or secondary Committee Reviewer assigned the file. Members who are on sabbatical or are recused are not counted toward the current Committee membership for purposes of quorum. Participation by alternate members will be counted for purposes of quorum and for purposes of voting as described below.

Minutes of the meetings are confidential and are retained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Minutes of a meeting of the APRC will be available only to Committee members who participated at that meeting. The minutes are to
include copies of any additional correspondence and materials requested by or on behalf of the APRC and/or the Committee Reviewers.

6. Voting and Recusal

Members of the APRC are not to vote in the context of, and are not to be present during, the APRC’s consideration of a candidate if they have (a) overseen, or participated in, preparation of the documentation on behalf of the candidate (including submission of letters of evaluation); (b) attended a departmental or division meeting during which the candidate’s currently proposed appointment, reappointment or promotion was discussed; or (c) voted on the recommendation at the divisional or departmental level. Members of the APRC are expected to notify the Committee Chair and/or the Senior Associate Dean regarding such situations or other possible circumstances that might make appropriate their recusal from consideration of a recommendation.

All members present at a meeting are required to vote by a show of hands. The tabulation of the vote is recorded. To carry affirmatively, a yea vote must be cast by a majority of APRC members (including alternates) in attendance. The same number of nay votes (a majority) is required for a negative recommendation.

Abstentions are inappropriate, except under extraordinary circumstances. Absentee votes are not allowed; however, APRC members who cannot attend a meeting may submit written comments to be reviewed by the APRC.

2.7.J. Options of the Senior Associate Dean on Receiving Recommendations by the Assistant Professors Review Committee

Upon receipt of a recommendation (whether positive or negative) from the APRC, the decision rests with the Senior Associate Dean, in his or her judgment and discretion, whether to make a positive or negative recommendation to the Dean, whether to remand the file to the department with instructions, or whether to take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

2.7.K. Decision by the Dean on Assistant Professor Appointments and Reappointments

Following receipt from the Senior Associate Dean of a positive or a negative recommendation (such as following a review and recommendation by the APRC), the Dean, in his or her judgment and discretion, shall make his or her decision as to whether to forward the file with his or her positive recommendation to the Provost, whether to remand the file with further instructions, or whether to take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.
If the Dean’s (and hence the School’s) decision is negative, then notification of that negative decision is provided to the candidate, the department and the Provost’s Office.

Reconsideration of a negative decision by the Dean will occur only if the department presents convincing evidence that new and material information bearing on the case exists, such as information that could not have been available in the original evaluation. Reconsiderations are rare and may be avoided by consultation between the chair and the Senior Associate Dean at appropriate intervals in the process.

2.7.L. Appointments and Promotions Committee

1. Purpose

The School of Medicine Appointments and Promotions Committee (“A&P Committee”) is a standing committee, advisory to the Senior Associate Dean, and appointed to review and assess the academic credentials for initial appointment, reappointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor in the University Tenure Line, Medical Center Line, Non-Tenure Line (Research), and Non-Tenure Line (Teaching).

2. Composition

Appointed by the Senior Associate Dean, the A&P Committee is composed of eleven members of the Professoriate. All members of the Committee must hold the rank of full professor and be tenured or on a continuing term appointment. The Committee membership will normally include three to five tenured faculty from the Clinical Science departments, three to five faculty from the Medical Center Line, and two to four tenured faculty from the Basic Science departments. Normally, no department will be represented by more than one member.

The Senior Associate Dean will attend meetings of the Committee contingent upon her or his availability.

The School recognizes the challenges associated with the assembly of regular meetings of busy senior faculty members. Accordingly, the Senior Associate Dean may appoint faculty to serve as alternate Committee members. Alternate members must be full professors, who are tenured or on a continuing term of appointment. Their appointment should complement the composition of the Committee’s regular membership by faculty line and department affiliation.

3. Terms of Service

The Committee chair is appointed by the Senior Associate Dean for a term of up to three years. The Senior Associate Dean also appoints a Vice Chair for a term of up to three years to provide leadership when the Chair is unable to attend.
A&P Committee members serve for staggered three-year terms, and each appointment is renewable for one additional term. The membership is reported annually to the School’s Executive Committee.

4. Function

For each appointment, reappointment or promotion considered by the A&P Committee, the Office of Academic Affairs provides Committee members with the long form, the department chair’s transmittal memorandum, and reprints of up to five papers -- published, in press or submitted -- provided by the candidate for their review. The Office of Academic Affairs assigns two A&P Committee members to serve as primary and secondary reviewers (the “Committee Reviewers”) to aid in the assessment of the candidate’s credentials.

The department chair (or his or her designee) will be asked to make himself or herself available (on standby) to appear at the appropriate meeting of the A&P Committee to present the department’s recommendation and to answer questions posed by Committee members. During the opening of the meeting, the primary and/or secondary reviewers will be queried regarding their assessment of the need for the department chair (or designee) to appear in support of the recommendation. Administrative staff will then immediately notify the department chair (or designee) if his or her attendance is required.

Upon request by an A&P Committee member (and with the concurrence of the Committee chair), the discussion of a candidate may be deferred until a future meeting. An action may also be tabled by the Committee chair for a variety of reasons including (but not limited to) a request for further input from the department or a recommendation that the Senior Associate Dean pursue an alternate strategy with the department.

Although rarely necessary, the A&P Committee and/or the Committee Reviewers, in their discretion, also may request and consider any other material or information to complete the evaluation of the candidate’s credentials for the rank recommended, including solicitation of additional letters of evaluation from external and/or internal referees, and consultation with others, such as Stanford faculty members, fellows, house staff or students. It is inappropriate for the A&P Committee or the Committee Reviewers to consult with or receive advice from the candidate.

5. Meetings and Quorum

Normally, the A&P Committee convenes twice a month. Consideration by the Committee of a recommendation requires the presence of more than half of the current voting Committee membership, including either the primary or secondary Committee Reviewer assigned the file. Members who are on sabbatical or are recused are not counted toward the current Committee membership for purposes
of quorum. Participation by alternate members will be counted for purposes of quorum and for purposes of voting as described below.

Minutes of the meetings are confidential and are retained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Minutes of a meeting of the A&P Committee will be available only to Committee members who participated at that meeting. The minutes are to include copies of any additional correspondence and materials requested by or on behalf of the A&P Committee and/or the Committee Reviewers.

6. Voting and Recusal

Members of the A&P Committee are not to vote in the context of, and are not to be present during, the A&P Committee’s consideration of a candidate if they have (a) overseen, or participated in, preparation of the documentation on behalf of the candidate (including submission of letters of evaluation); (b) attended a departmental or divisional meeting during which the candidate’s currently proposed appointment, reappointment or promotion was discussed; or (c) voted on the recommendation at the divisional or departmental level. Members of the A&P Committee are expected to notify the Committee Chair and/or the Senior Associate Dean regarding such situations or other possible circumstances that might make appropriate their recusal from consideration of a recommendation.

All members present at a meeting are required to vote by a show of hands. The tabulation of the vote is recorded. To carry affirmatively, a yea vote must be cast by a majority of A&P Committee members (including alternates) in attendance. The same number of nay votes (a majority) is required for a negative recommendation.

Abstentions are inappropriate, except under extraordinary circumstances. Absentee votes are not allowed; however, A&P Committee members who cannot attend a meeting may submit written comments to be reviewed by the A&P Committee.

2.7.M. Options of the Senior Associate Dean on Receiving Recommendations by the Appointments and Promotions Committee

Upon receipt of a recommendation (whether positive or negative) from the Appointments and Promotions Committee, the decision rests with the Senior Associate Dean, in his or her judgment and discretion, whether to make a positive or negative recommendation to the Dean, whether to remand the file to the department with instructions, or whether to take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

Before taking any of these options, the Senior Associate Dean may also refer the case back to the department chair (who may decide to withdraw it) or ask the A&P Committee to reconsider.
On a case-by-case basis, the Senior Associate Dean may further recommend to the Dean that the file be submitted to the School’s Executive Committee for advice (see below).

2.7.N. The Role of the Executive Committee in Associate Professor and Professor Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions

At the Dean’s discretion, the Executive Committee may be asked to provide advice to him or her on an appointment, reappointment or promotion action; in certain situations, the Executive Committee may be asked to vote on such an action. If taken, a vote is advisory to the Dean; the ultimate decision on whether to forward the long form to the Provost with a positive recommendation belongs to the Dean.

Discussion at a meeting of the Executive Committee is held after the department chair members have read the file. Substitutes are allowed if they will be representing the department chair at the Executive Committee meeting during which the candidate will be discussed. Department chair members who read the full file but will be unable to attend the meeting will be allowed to submit their comments in writing or, if applicable, to cast a proxy vote.

Note that the Executive Committee can also choose to take up and provide advice to the Dean on a file sent to it as a report item. At the Dean’s discretion, a vote may be called.

2.7.O. Decision by the Dean on Associate Professor and Professor Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions

Following receipt from the Senior Associate Dean of a positive or a negative recommendation (such as following a review and vote by the A&P Committee) or, where applicable, taking into consideration advice (or a vote) from the Executive Committee, the Dean shall make his or her decision as to whether to forward the file with his or her positive recommendation to the Provost, whether to remand the file with further instructions, or whether to take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

If the Dean’s (and hence the School’s) decision is negative, then notification of that negative decision is provided both to the candidate, the department and the Provost’s Office.

Reconsideration of a negative decision by the Dean will occur only if the department presents convincing evidence that new and material information bearing on the case exists, such as information that could not have been available in the original evaluation. Reconsiderations are rare and may be avoided by consultation between the chair and the Senior Associate Dean at appropriate intervals in the process.
2.7.P. Review by the Provost

“Recommendations for appointments, reappointments, and promotions are forwarded from the Dean to the Provost for his or her independent review and decision. Recommendations are reviewed by the Provost in consultation with University officers and members of the Provost’s staff. This step in the review process is intended to evaluate and confirm the school’s judgment: that the recommended action is a suitable one; that there has been (where appropriate) a satisfactory comparative search; that the documentation is complete; and that prescribed procedures have been followed. The Provost can obtain additional information to help assess the action. He or she can then make a favorable decision, a negative decision, or remand the case to the department or school for further information or consideration.” (Source: University Faculty Handbook)

2.7.Q. Review by the Advisory Board

“If the Provost’s view is favorable, the next step in the process (in general) is for the Provost to submit the case to the Advisory Board of the Academic Council for its review. The powers and functions of the Advisory Board are described in the Articles of Organization of the Academic Council. The Advisory Board normally assigns at least two, and sometimes more, of its members to read each file. The case is reviewed for adherence to procedural requirements, completeness of documentation, conformance with academic standards, and suitability. Occasionally, the Advisory Board may request additional information before voting on a recommendation or may table the matter for review by each member of the Board. After considering any issues raised by the assigned readers, the Advisory Board votes on the proposed action.

The Provost may also ask the Advisory Board for informal advice on a file, in which case no vote is taken until the case is submitted formally by the Provost to the Advisory Board.

At the end of each Advisory Board meeting, the members report to the Provost and request additional follow-up, as necessary. Because the Advisory Board advises the President, the list of recommendations approved by the Advisory Board is forwarded by the Advisory Board Chair to the President for his or her final review and approval. A list of recommendations not approved by the Advisory Board is forwarded by the Chair to the President for his or her further consideration.” (Source: University Faculty Handbook)

2.7.R. Review by the President

“The President, who makes the final decision, can choose to accept or not accept the recommendation by the Advisory Board. The President can obtain additional information on the file. He or she can make a favorable decision, a negative decision, or remand the case to the department or school for further information or consideration. Approved actions are incorporated into the President’s Report to the Board of Trustees.” (Source: University Faculty Handbook)
2.7.S. Announcement of Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Approvals

“Official notification of a successful appointment, reappointment, or promotion is contained in a letter from the Provost to the candidate. Deans, department chairs, and faculty members are often under pressure to offer assurances before the President renders his final decision, but this pressure should be resisted. Candidates should be generally informed of the University’s procedures and schedule for consideration of recommendations. Deans and department chairs, however, may report to the candidate in general terms on progress of the recommendation through the various stages and may indicate when final action may be expected.” (Source: University Faculty Handbook)