

# FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Updated 4/1/11, Approved by Provost 5/11, Updated 9/30/11 to reflect FHB changes, Clinical section updated 11/11 , Updated 04/21/2021.

The Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (updated 1/28/2020) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In the event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work department's faculty evaluation process is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, merit weight, merit percentage, merit allocation, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track, Clinical track, and Lecturer positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are probationary faculty and are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member's assignment) may lead to the issuance of a *letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure*. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

## The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found in the *Brief Guide for College of Liberal Arts Faculty* on the College's website.

## Merit Weight, Merit Percentage, Merit Allocation

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, Lecturers and part-time faculty should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

## The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

*Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member's workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member's assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean's Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA's faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).*

## Description of Types of Faculty Positions

### **Tenure Track Faculty (TTF):**

The "typical" annual teaching assignment for "research active" TTF is 5 courses<sup>1</sup> (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for "highly productive" research TTF is 4 courses (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 40% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty

---

<sup>1</sup> A course is defined as a 3-contact hour course.

member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does become productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

**Clinical Track Faculty (CTF):**

CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to guidelines found in the AU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.5.2, the clinician title series is a professional series for appointment and promotion of appropriately qualified individuals who contribute to the University's academic mission by participation in projects that (1) predominantly involve clinical practice/education; (2) are of contractually specified duration; and (3) operate under contracts, grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in the clinical setting.

**Instructors/Lecturers:**

Instructors will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Lecturers will be assigned the equivalent of 8 courses per year -ie, they may teach a 3-4 load and also have significant service such as a field director, or internship coordinator, for example. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the faculty handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attending departmental meetings, participating in departmental life and engaging students.

Appendix 1 provides a link to the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, & service.

Merit Weight, Merit Percentage, Merit Allocation adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

See Appendix 2 for Departmental Merit Weight, Merit Percentage, Merit Allocation Guidelines.

### Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status. All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure-track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, Lecturers, and part-time faculty (who teach regularly) should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. All faculty members are to be evaluated in the areas of **Teaching, Research, Service, and Outreach**. Faculty members will be evaluated according to the percentages of their assigned duties, preferences and needs. During spring semester, each faculty member, together with the Department Chair, will establish a tentative teaching load to be determined according to individual responsibilities and enrollment needs, as well as available funding.

The primary goal of the annual evaluation system is performance improvement. This evaluation process includes student, peer, and administrator input.

*Performance Descriptors.* The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

### Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost's website at the following URL:

<https://sites.auburn.edu/admin/universitypolicies/Policies/PostTenureReviewPolicy.pdf>

See Appendix 3 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

See Appendix 4 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate's submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 1 for a link to Auburn University's expectations for Teaching, Reserarch, Outreach and Service found in the AU Faculty Handbook

## **Appendix 1:**

### **Auburn University's Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service**

The AU Faculty Handbook outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, & service.

<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/>

## **Appendix 2**

### **Departmental Merit Weight, Merit Percentage, Merit Allocation Guidelines for Tenure-Track, Clinical-Track Faculty, Lecturers and Instructors**

## **Departmental Merit Weight, Percentage & Allocation Guidelines for Tenure-Track, Clinical-Track Faculty, Lecturers and Instructors**

The Department Chair is responsible for making teaching assignments in consultation with the respective program directors. The conditions governing such assignments are (a) the budgetary and faculty resources available, (b) the nature and volume of student requests for classes and, (c) the responsibilities and obligations of individual faculty such as scholarly research, assigned departmental or university committee service, or public service and outreach. All faculty members are expected to accept requests from the DC or their respective program directors to serve on committees that conduct departmental affairs.

### Tenure Track Faculty Course Load:

- 3-2 course load for TT faculty involved in research that results in a demonstrable product/outcome
- 2-2 course load for TT faculty with part-time administrative appointments (Program Coordinators)
- Course load for CSWE-accredited program directors and field directors will be consistent with accreditation requirements.
- Course load for the Department Chair is consistent with CLA requirements.
- Exceptions must be negotiated and are usually based on course buy-outs from grants and contracts.

### Clinical Faculty Course Load:

- Commensurate with tenure track faculty, the clinical faculty will maintain a course load comparable to 3:3:1. Specifically, one unit equates to 12 students for liaison work OR a section of integrative seminar OR one three-credit course.
- Course load requirements for CSWE-accredited program directors and field directors will be consistent with accreditation requirements.

Over the academic year, a typical course load may be:

- Fall and Spring-- One load of 12 students for liaison work and one section of integrative seminar and one three-credit course
- Summer-- One load of 12 students for liaison work OR one section of integrative seminar or another Social Work course.

The full teaching load for clinical faculty is 8 courses per calendar year; however, clinical faculty members are expected to engage in service/outreach. To that end, they receive a course reduction of one course for service/outreach; thus they generally teach 7 courses per year. Clinical faculty will maintain a workload of 3:3:1

### Lecturer and Instructor Course Load:

In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the faculty handbook, teaching in CLA includes holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the

field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

- 4-4 course load for full time instructors who receive university benefits
- 3-4 course load for lecturers who hold significant service assignments (such as internship coordinator, etc.).



## **Appendix 3**

### **Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines for Tenure-track and Clinical Faculty**

## **Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines for Tenure-track and Clinical Faculty**

The University requires that all probationary faculty undergo a third-year review for the purpose of determining the status of their progress toward tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Clinical Assistant professors will also undergo a third-year review in preparation for promotion to Associate Clinical professor. The department regards this review as diagnostic and advisory in character. As such, the Department does an intensive annual review of all untenured tenure-track faculty and clinical faculty members and makes a recommendation as to retention. Since the third-year review has been within the sequence leading to the eventual formal determination of a tenure-track faculty member's tenure and promotion possibilities, the tenured faculty of the department will be given the opportunity to participate in the process. Since tenured faculty, Associate Clinical professors, and Full Clinical professors vote on the promotion of Assistant Clinical professors, they will be given the opportunity to participate in the third-year review of Assistant Clinical professors.

The Third-Year Review Guidelines for probationary faculty in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the Faculty Handbook. An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation; however, a letter of non-continuation may be issued at any time prior to tenure.

The DC shall conduct a third-year review of all its assistant tenure-track and assistant clinical professors. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. As with the annual review, the DC shall request a dossier and any supporting material the DC, the program director, or the clinical faculty member deems appropriate prior to the third-year review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate professor. The DC shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the third-year review. The suggestions for improvement and concerns as well as the nature of the final vote will be expressed to the candidate. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as teaching, research, outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

## **Appendix 4**

### **Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

## **Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure Track, Clinical Track, and Lecturer Faculty**

The current document addresses three milestones in the professional career of faculty in the Department: tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Professor, promotion to Full Professor or Clinical Professor, and promotion to Senior Lecturer. The following paragraphs reference all three but pay particular attention to the tenure decision. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work will be evaluated with respect to their accomplishments in research, teaching, outreach and service.

The faculty member must collaborate and cooperate in the areas of teaching, research, service, and/or outreach to advance the mission of the department, college, and university. This aligns with the Faculty Handbook Section 3.6.2 which notes: In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research/creative work, (3) outreach, and (4) service, as described above under Promotion Criteria Considerations (Section 3.6.1) and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must demonstrate that they contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas. Are the candidate's professional abilities and relationships with colleagues compatible with the departmental mission and with its long-term goals? Has the candidate exhibited an ability and willingness to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks that a departmental group must often perform and to participate with some measure of reason and knowledge in discussions germane to departmental policies and programs? Does the candidate maintain high standards of professional integrity? Concerns respecting a candidate's collegiality should be shared with the candidate as soon as they arise; they should certainly be addressed in the annual review and the third-year review. For tenure, the candidate must demonstrate that they contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

AU guidelines require that candidates for promotion to Associate Professor demonstrate distinction in at least two areas, normally research and teaching. For Associate Clinical Professor it is expected that the candidates will excel in at least teaching and outreach. An additional general guideline is that candidates for Associate Professor should have achieved a regional or national reputation and for Associate Clinical Professor a regional reputation. Candidates for Full Professor are expected to enjoy a national or international reputation in their research area. AU has published guidelines that candidates should consult. The links are as follows:

Faculty Handbook:

<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/>

Clinical Faculty Guidelines:

[http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinicalpromotions\\_guidelines.html](http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinicalpromotions_guidelines.html)

## **Teaching:**

Faculty must demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. Teaching effectiveness may be evaluated in a number of ways including student evaluations and feedback, peer evaluations of classroom performance, instructional materials (e.g. syllabi, exams), self-evaluations, faculty participation in professional development activities related to teaching and learning, supervision of interns, honors theses, University Scholars, and course and curriculum development.

[http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies-guidelines/SETS\\_Fall2020\\_Spring2021.pdf](http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies-guidelines/SETS_Fall2020_Spring2021.pdf)

### **Peer Evaluation of Teaching:**

The tenure-track untenured faculty, clinical-track faculty, and lecturers in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work are required to participate in a yearly peer evaluation process designed to assess their teaching performance. Information gained through the peer evaluation process will be used to support the applications of faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure and will also be used to assist all faculty in addressing any issues that need special attention.

In order to obtain the most representative samples, it is recommended that faculty members be evaluated by their peers in different class levels. Faculty members may use some of their peer evaluations to supplement and enhance the student teaching evaluations. Peer evaluations may be conducted by colleagues in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work or faculty from a related program.

### **Peer evaluation of tenure-track faculty members:**

Probationary faculty during their first three years should expect one announced class visit per year from a tenured faculty member identified by the Department Chair. After the initial 3 years, probationary faculty will be expected to arrange at least one visit each year from tenured faculty of their own choosing. It is recommended that in any three-year period a tenure-track faculty member not be evaluated by the same person more than twice. Tenure-track faculty members must have all their classes evaluated by students, and at least one class each year evaluated by their peers. However, only some of the student evaluations may be taken into consideration in the annual review with the Chair.

### **Items to be taken into consideration in peer evaluations:**

Evaluators will comment on the following items when reporting on the classes they visit:

- a) **Course syllabus:** general compliance of the course syllabus with the structure required by the College of Liberal Arts, including but not limited to course objectives, required textbooks, required reading materials, additional print and/or electronic required or recommended materials, grading procedure, and boilerplate.
- b) **Class preparation and interaction:** ability of instructor to supplement and enrich textbook materials, to encourage class discussions, to ask questions that stimulate

students' intellect, to use the target language where appropriate, and to create a comfortable learning environment;

- c) **Completion and use of peer evaluations:** Copies of the signed reports of peer evaluators will be given to the faculty member and the Department Chair **within 30 class days from the date of the class visit**, and a copy will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file. Faculty members being evaluated may add their own comments on the reports, or write separate responses to be attached to the evaluator's report **within 30 days of receipt of the evaluation**.

#### **From Associate to Full:**

In addition to the above accomplishments, candidates for Full Professor are expected to demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. Candidates for Full Professor are required to arrange at least one peer evaluation visit each year for 3 years prior to promotion. It is recommended that in any three-year period a faculty member not be evaluated by the same person more than twice. In addition, Sociology program faculty are expected to have successfully chaired student(s) to the MA/MS degree.

#### **From Lecturer to Senior Lecturer:**

Criteria for promotion to senior lecturer are specific to each department and approved by the dean and the Provost's Office. Promotion decisions will be determined by the specific department head/chair and the dean of the respective college or school. As the chief academic officer of Auburn University, the provost retains the right to review all promotions and act appropriately. Promotion decisions must correspond to the annual deadlines approved by the Provost's Office and reported to the Provost's Office accordingly.

#### **Lecturer Eligibility for Promotion:**

There is no fixed requirement for years of service at a given rank before a lecturer faculty member can be promoted. Lecturer faculty members on leave of absence without pay need not count their leave time toward promotion. Except as otherwise required by law, a lecturer faculty member on leave without pay cannot be a candidate for promotion while on leave.

#### **Departmental Promotion Criteria and Considerations for Lecturer Faculty:**

The criteria for promotion from the rank of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer center on demonstrated evidence in classroom or laboratory teaching (and advising) and demonstrated contributions of importance to the undergraduate educational mission of the department beyond classroom teaching. This evidence should be manifest in such areas as new course development, curriculum development, extracurricular activities, demonstrated contributions to the undergraduate mission of the Program, Department and University through participation in Departmental, College or University-wide initiatives and the candidate's contributions to national pedagogy in their discipline.

The academic ranks and related titles in the lecturer title series shall be: (1) lecturer, (2) senior lecturer (See AU Faculty Handbook 3.5.1). Although it is not feasible to specify exact criteria for

evaluating the credentials of an individual for appointment to senior lecturer, the following statements are provided as guidelines:

**Lecturer:** This nontenure-track faculty appointment is designated for those with an emphasis on the teaching mission at Auburn University who are qualified to teach in their discipline. The appointments are not eligible for tenure and are made on an annual basis with no right or expectation of employment beyond the period specified in the letter of appointment. These appointments may be renewable on an annual basis contingent upon availability of funds, the need for services, and satisfactory performance.

**Senior Lecturer:** This nontenure-track faculty appointment is designated for those who have sustained outstanding performance in teaching and service at the lecturer level. There is no fixed requirement for years of service at the lecturer rank before a lecturer can be promoted. However, the qualifications for promotion to senior lecturer rank generally cannot be demonstrated fully in less than five complete years of service. A lecturer may apply for promotion to senior lecturer following criteria and procedures for promotion maintained in the college of appointment. These appointments may be renewable contingent upon availability of funds, the need for services, and satisfactory performance and are not eligible for tenure.

## **Research:**

Research productivity is defined by number of outputs and the quality of the output in combination with the quality of the journal or press and/or scholarly citations. Impact factors and citations will vary depending on the field of the faculty member. Rankings are available for each discipline and will be used to determine rank and quality of journals and presses.

## **From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor**

Candidates must have established a sustained program of research in their areas of expertise that has been published in refereed journals and/or in nationally or internationally recognized presses. Prime attention will be given to the volume and the quality of the scholarly output, and the reputation of the journals and publishers will also exert an impact on departmental and college assessment of publications. For those whose tenure and/or promotion relies heavily on books, articles, and book chapters, these must be published to count toward promotion. For individuals bringing in years toward Promotion and/or Tenure, productivity should also occur during the probationary period at Auburn University at an annual rate comparable to these department standards.

- 1) A significant number of peer-reviewed articles and/or book chapters published in refereed academic journals and/or scholarly-press books (including in refereed anthologies), is expected. Evidence of independence or leadership in scholarship (e.g., could include state of the field synthesis articles in review journals/edited volumes) demonstrated through sole-authorship or principal authorship in at least half of the refereed

publications is expected. The Department sets a minimum level of required articles and/or chapters for tenure and promotion in the range of six to nine peer reviewed articles and/or book chapters (without a full-length book). Scholarship should demonstrate original research beyond that of the candidate's dissertation and show the candidate's development of a new or revised research agenda beyond that of the dissertation. The quality of the publisher and rigor of the peer review, as measured by, for example, the journal's impact factor, and/or scholarly citation counts are also considered as part of the candidate's evaluation.

- 2) As a general rule books in university presses carry greater weight but other presses, if highly ranked, may be equivalent in status and reputation. Candidates should refer to updated rankings in their disciplines. A sole authored book will weigh more heavily than a co-authored book and both of these will have more weight than an edited volume. The important criterion is that any book being used as a primary document for tenure and/or promotion must contain independent research and scholarship by the author and cannot be a synthesis and presentation of the work of others (e.g., an introductory textbook in one's discipline). A single published book cannot be the sole criterion for tenure and/or promotion.
- 3) In addition to scholarly books, refereed journal articles, and/or book chapters, other types of written output will be considered as additional evidence of scholarship. Among these are scholarly monographs, including lengthy applied contract research documents entailing data collection and analysis, book reviews, scholarly encyclopedia articles, commentaries, research notes, and preliminary research reports.
- 4) The ability to obtain fellowships, grants, and awards will enhance the candidate's standing and submissions are encouraged of all faculty. External awards weigh more than internal awards and grants. It is recommended that faculty members participate in grant writing beyond the university sponsored competitions.
- 5) Presentations of research at national or international meetings are expected along with presentations at regional conferences. National conferences should be attended to demonstrate the value of the research to the disciplinary community. Invited lectures at other universities also show the value of the faculty member's research.
- 6) It is possible to count scholarly books, scholarly articles, and book chapters that have been accepted for publication and can be shown, through letters from the publisher, to be in the final pre-publication stage or in press.

### **From Associate to Full**

Candidates for promotion to Full are expected to show a level of sustained research productivity in their areas of expertise that has been published in refereed journals and/or in nationally or internationally recognized presses beyond that expected for tenure. The candidate for promotion to Full Professor should demonstrate the achievement of a national reputation in



her or his field through the number and quality of publications as well as participation in the discipline through service and collaboration. Prime attention will be given to the volume and the quality of the scholarly output, and the reputation of the journals and publishers will also exert an impact on departmental and college assessment of publications. Citations and impact factors of journals will also need to be noted to demonstrate the established value of the scholarship to the discipline and the candidate's stature in the field. For those whose tenure and/or promotion relies heavily on scholarly books, articles, and book chapters, these must be published to count toward promotion. For individuals bringing in years toward Promotion and/or Tenure, productivity should also occur during the probationary period at Auburn University at an annual rate comparable to these department standards.

- 1) A significant number of peer-reviewed articles and/or book chapters published in refereed academic journals and/or scholarly-press books (including in refereed anthologies), is expected. Recognition as an authority in the field and demonstration of a marked degree of scholarship and principal authorship are expected. The Department expects that candidates for Full Professor have a minimum level of publications beyond those counted for promotion to Associate Professor. These should be in the range of 6 to 9 scholarly articles, scholarly book chapters, and/or a full-length book. Scholarship should demonstrate original research (e.g., could include state of the field synthesis articles in review journals/edited volumes) and the national standing of the scholar. The quality of the publisher and rigor of the peer review, as measured by, for example, the journal's impact factor and/or citation counts are also considered as part of the candidate's evaluation.
- 2) As a general rule books in university presses carry greater weight but other presses, if highly ranked, may be equivalent in status and reputation. Candidates should refer to updated rankings in their disciplines. A sole authored book will weigh more heavily than a co-authored book and both of these will have more weight than an edited volume. The important criterion is that any book being used as a primary document for promotion must contain independent research and scholarship by the author and cannot be a synthesis and presentation of the work of others (e.g., an introductory textbook in one's discipline). A single published book cannot be the sole criterion for promotion.
- 3) In addition to scholarly books, refereed journal articles, and/or book chapters, other types of written output will be considered as additional evidence of scholarship. Among these are scholarly monographs, including lengthy applied contract research documents entailing data collection and analysis, book reviews, scholarly encyclopedia articles, commentaries, research notes, and preliminary research reports.
- 4) The ability to obtain fellowships, grants, and awards will enhance the candidate's standing and submissions are encouraged of all faculty. External awards weigh more than internal awards and grants. It is recommended that faculty members participate in grant writing beyond the university sponsored competitions. Presentations of research

at national or international meetings are expected along with presentations at regional conferences. National conferences should be attended to demonstrate the value of the research to the disciplinary community. Invited lectures at other universities also show the value of the faculty member's research.

- 5) It is possible to count scholarly books, refereed journal articles, and/or book chapters that have been accepted for publication and can be shown, through letters from the publisher, to be in the final pre-publication stage or in press.

## **Service**

### **From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor**

- 1) Candidates must have demonstrated, through sustained on-campus presence and regular involvement in on-campus service activities, their commitment to enhancing the life of the Department, the College, and the University. The University and College also grant occasional semester releases from teaching for research activities. For tenure and promotion to Associate, however, on-campus semesters must substantially outnumber off-campus leaves. Tenure-track faculty are expected to organize their professional lives in a manner compatible with service to AU and to its students.
- 2) The service contributions of untenured assistant professors are kept relatively light to facilitate excellence in teaching and research, but service on at least two department committees is expected each year. In addition, student advising, and committee work are expected as noted above. If sufficient service opportunities are not available at the department level, faculty are encouraged to seek service at the college and/or university level. Please note that college and university level service does not substitute for/replace department level service.
- 3) Regular participation in faculty meetings as well as attendance at recruitment colloquia is expected.
- 4) Scholarly service to the discipline (e.g. reviewing submissions to journals and panel participation at professional meetings or serving on professional or disciplinary boards and committees) is also expected. Service contributions to state or nation — including those in which research was carried out — are encouraged.

### **From Associate to Full**

- 1) Promotion to Full Professor presupposes an even higher level of extended on-campus service than is required of candidates for tenure. Between the granting of tenure and the application for Full Professor, the candidate should demonstrate a history of substantial and sustained service on department committees, e.g., serving as chair of standing or search committees or serving in a leadership role such as a departmental

officer or program administrator, is expected, along with service on College and/or University Committees.

- 2) The categories of scholarly service to the discipline and to the larger community expected in the dossier of the candidate to Full Professor are the same as those at the tenure decision, but the level of expected service is greater. Examples include service to professional associations (as officer or committee member), journal editor, service on NSF or NIH panels, and writing tenure and promotion evaluations for candidates at other universities.

Such extramural service, however, is a supplement to, not a substitute for, the earlier mentioned requirement of service to the department, college, and/or university.

## **Outreach**

Outreach is defined as scholarly engagement that applies academic expertise for the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. Faculty should consult the Faculty Handbook for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration. Outreach can take the following forms: community or civic engagement, outreach scholarship, extension, continuing education, distance education, technical assistance, service learning, clinical work and others as defined by specific program activities. Outreach is considered a valuable part of the Department's mission and expertise. The College does not require a tenure track faculty member to assign a minimum percentage to outreach activities, but such work is strongly encouraged in the Department. Clinical track faculty are required to allocate at least ten percent of their annual effort toward outreach (unless they have an administrative appointment), and in many cases this percentage is set higher. The outreach activities of a faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of the specific needs addressed and met, the benefit to target audiences, the efficiency of time and effort involved and creativity and innovation. Outreach projects should be defined in annual reviews and tenure and promotion dossiers in terms of the above indicators and target audiences, needs, and time and effort should be documented as specifically as possible.

## **Procedures for Application**

### **From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor**

The College and the Department have institutionalized a mentoring system for junior faculty by which they will be linked to a senior faculty member in their department or the university early in their career at AU. The mentor will guide and counsel them during the advancement process. The mentor may change over the course of the candidate's career.

AU and the Department conducts annual reviews and third year reviews for junior faculty (see format for the tenure and promotion dossier). It is suggested that the junior faculty member begin creating the dossier at the end of the first year and continue to update it until the third-

year review. This will allow for early detection of strengths and weaknesses. The third-year review entails the compilation of a dossier that will be examined not only by the chair and the mentor but also by tenured faculty in the department. Feedback from annual reviews and especially the third-year review is essential in assisting junior faculty in identifying which if any mid-course corrections will be required in their research, teaching, or service to ensure a smooth transition into tenure.

AU T&P decisions are normally made during the fall and spring of the academic year. At the end of the spring semester, the Chair of the department consults with the faculty to prepare a list of candidates to undergo formal consideration for tenure and/or promotion during the fall of that year.

The Chair provides each candidate with department, college, and university guidelines and forms for tenure and promotion in the spring term. The selection of outside evaluators should be in accordance with CLA and Provost guidelines found at: <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html>

The Chair's letter of request to the external evaluators will follow College and Provost guidelines, and it will provide referees with the candidate's curriculum vitae and a sample of the applicant's research. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide these materials to the chair.

Candidates should follow the dossier instructions found in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook. Candidates have a right to review their T&P dossier therein--except for confidential reference letters--prior to the packet's submission. The tenure and promotion procedure and evaluation process should follow the guidelines found in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty should consult the Faculty Handbook for requirements of time in service. Probationary faculty who do not have prior service at another institution of higher education *must* come up for tenure and promotion in their sixth year of appointment (except in the case of documented FMLA leave or leave without pay, as described in the Faculty Handbook).

### **From Associate to Full**

Candidates for Full Professor will compile a dossier that documents their research, teaching, outreach, and service. Outside reviewers will be selected in accordance with College and Provost guidelines found at: <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html>

The promotion procedure and evaluation process should follow the guidelines found in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook.

### **Clinical Series Promotion Guidelines**

#### ***I. Initiation of the Process***

The promotion process can be initiated by the unit head or by the candidate. It is the joint responsibility of the unit head and the faculty member to see that the promotion process

begins at the appropriately scheduled time. The steps delineated below are the procedures to follow for promoting a clinical faculty member.

Candidates and unit heads should supply information necessary for evaluation in the format outlined. This information should be made available first to eligible faculty members, a college/school committee (if appropriate), then to the dean. The information requested is sufficiently detailed so that a candidate can be evaluated in terms of both potential and achievement. Unit heads and candidates who have questions about material to be submitted should feel free to contact the dean of the appropriate college/school.

## ***II. Information on the Candidate***

The outline printed below indicates the kind of information each candidate for promotion and his/her unit head should supply and describes the format to be followed in presenting that information.

Guidelines and/or criteria are subject to periodic revision with approval from the appropriate dean's office and the Office of the Provost.

## ***III. General Instructions***

All lists (of positions held, publications, and, if applicable, courses taught, etc.) should be in reverse chronological order with dates clearly indicated.

Supporting material such as publications, slides, evaluative material (book reviews, published critiques, adjudicated production reviews, practice portfolio, etc.) should be made available for review by the unit head and later by the dean. The candidate and unit head should agree on the selection of material to be made available.

## ***IV. Information to Be Supplied by the Candidate***

- A Standard Biographical Data sheet (see Faculty Handbook for form).
- A percent breakdown of the allocation of time and effort as specified by the terms of his/her contract for the past three years.
- A list of honors and awards. Include academic honors, research, clinical, and professional service awards, fellowships (such as NEH, NEA), internal support, election to professional societies, etc.
- A list of scholarly contributions in accord with the following outline. A candidate should present his/her work as informatively and accurately as possible. A candidate should cross-reference work that falls in two areas (e.g.: See X.x.).

### **A. Scholarly Contributions by the Candidate**

#### **1. Teaching**

- Actual courses taught for each semester of the past three years including clinical rounds, clinical clerkships/practicums. Indicate lecture/lab, hours per week and enrollment.
- Responsibilities including supervision and evaluation of interns, residents, post-doctoral fellows and/or professional students in a small group, case-oriented teaching hospital environment.
- Teaching students, in small group settings.
- Graduate students whose work has been completed. Indicate degree awarded to the student, year, and, if known, position now held by the student; indicate whether the candidate was the major professor or a committee member.
- Graduate students on whose committee the candidate is presently serving. Indicate whether the candidate is the major professor or a committee member. Indicate the degree the student is working towards and the work that the candidate has done.
- Courses and curricula developed.
- Grants received related to teaching.
- Publications pertaining to teaching. Include textbooks, manuals, and articles on pedagogy.
- Other contributions to teaching.
- Statement of candidate's teaching philosophy and self-evaluation in terms of his or her stated values. This should be no longer than one page.

## 2. Research/Creative Work

For publications, provide complete publication data. For publications with multiple authors, please list names of all authors in correct order. Inform the committee of the significance of author order on publications in the candidate's discipline. Indicate percent of the candidate's contribution or describe the nature of the candidate's contribution; indicate, by means of an asterisk, student contributions. Provide, in an appendix, proof of acceptance of publications in press and proof of publications of which acceptance is conditional. **Do not submit manuscripts that have not been accepted for publication.** For exhibitions and performances, provide dates and locations.

- Collaboration for academic and/or scholarly purposes with others, including clinicians, researchers, physicians, and instructors.
- Books.
- Article-length publications. Distinguish by type: book chapters, articles in refereed journals and invited articles, bulletins, proceedings, transactions, abstracts, book reviews, non-refereed articles, etc.
- Papers or lectures. Distinguish by type: papers at professional meetings, invited lectures, etc.
- Exhibitions. Distinguish between juried or invitational shows; identify work(s) and juror (juries); indicate regional, national, or international exhibitions.
- Patents and inventions.

- Other research/creative contributions.
- Grants and contracts. Note all co-authors, identifying the principal investigator and the involvement of the candidate; indicate funding source and amount. Distinguish between grants received and grants applied for but not funded. (Note: internal support and NEH and NEA fellowships should be listed under Honors and Awards above.)
- Description of candidate's scholarly program. Work in progress and work anticipated should be described in no more than one page.
- Presentations at local, regional, and national continuing education programs/workshops.

### 3. **University Outreach**

The purpose of this section is to document achievement in outreach scholarship. It is divided into two parts.

**A. Part 1** is a reflective commentary on the candidate's outreach program or programs. It is intended to highlight and explain the candidate's most significant contributions.

**B. Part 2** is a list of all of the candidate's outreach activities and products.

**Part 1 - Commentary.** The commentary should describe and explain the scholarship involved in one or more outreach programs that you consider the major achievements of your efforts. A program is a set of activities that share a common focus and depend upon a particular expertise. The entire commentary is limited to five pages, single spaced. Each program should include the following.

1. *Description.* Provide a brief overview of the addressed needs, the objectives, methods, and target audience. Describe selected activities and/or products from Part B that are most illustrative of the candidate's contribution to this program. Include example in the portfolio.
2. *Mission.* Indicate how the program was compatible with university and unit missions.
3. *Scholarship.* Describe the role of the candidate's professional expertise in the design and execution of the program. Describe how the activities applied the candidate's discipline to the needs of society, required integration with other disciplines, and/or generated new knowledge for the discipline and/or audience. Explain how this knowledge was communicated to broader audiences. Indicate how the program led to increased recognition of the candidate's professional expertise by external audiences. Indicators would include requests for information, invitations to make presentations, service on review panels, receipt of contracts, grants, and professional awards, etc.
4. *Impact.* Describe observed impacts and/or explain any unobserved impacts that are to be expected according to the discipline(s) applied. Identify the direct and indirect beneficiaries. Evidence of impact can include both quantitative results (e.g. changes in test scores, increased crop production, or widespread adoption of a product or technique) and qualitative results (e.g. testimonials from clients, reviews by

knowledgeable scholars/critics).

**Part 2- Activities and Products.** List activities and products using the categories outlined below. There is no page limit on Part B, but candidates are encouraged to be concise in order to focus reviewers' attention on the most important contributions. In particular, numerous activities or products of the same type should be summarized to the extent possible. Brief descriptions accompanied by examples and totals will suffice.

1. *Clinical Work/Clinical/Practice activities.* Clinical activities participated in, including diagnosis, treatment, and management of cases. Consultations provided for local, regional, national and international health care professionals. Service provided to clients, patients, referring clinicians and other professionals.
2. *Instructional activities.* List the title or subject of each distinct course or presentation, the type (curriculum, course, workshop, exhibit. etc.), the duration (usually in hours), the candidate's role in creating (developer, presenter), the target audience, the method of reaching the audience (conference presentation, telecommunications, site visit, etc.) and the number of presentations given.
3. *Technical assistance.* List each type of assistance (e.g. job classification), the clientele, the contribution, and the number of times provided.
4. *Outreach publications.* Distinguish by type as indicated in paragraphs B1-B3 above: books (including published manuals and reports), article-length publications, papers and lectures. Provide complete publication data, including number of pages, names of all authors in correct order, and percentage of candidate's contributions. Indicate all refereed or peer-reviewed publications.
5. *Electronic products:* computer programs, web sites, etc.
6. *Other outreach products:* videos, job aids, etc.
7. *Copyrights, patents, and inventions.*
8. *Contracts, grants, and gifts.*

#### **4. Service**

- *University Service:* Distinguish among service to the University, to the college/school, and to the department. University service as part of a previously held position may be listed here. Administrative work which reduces the candidate's teaching or research assignment should be listed here.
- *Professional Service:* Service to professional associations and learned societies such as offices held, committees served on, etc.

#### ***V. Information to be Supplied by Unit Head***

Information should be supplied in each of the following areas:

- 1) *Teaching*
- 2) *Research/Creative Work*
- 3) *University Outreach*



- 4) *Service*: Statement as to how the level of support (dollars, personnel, space, etc.) provided to the candidate compares to others engaged in similar work in the department.
- 5) *Outside Referees*: The unit head (or the dean) shall solicit information from outside referees in the case of candidates nominated for associate clinical professor and clinical professor. In consultation with the candidate, the unit head (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. He/she shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he/she shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, or professional degree faculty, post-doctoral residents or fellows, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners and past collaborators are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc. Letters must be part of the file.

### **Lecturer Series Promotion Guidelines**

#### ***I. Initiation of the Process***

The promotion process can be initiated by the unit head or by the candidate. It is the joint responsibility of the unit head and the faculty member to see that the promotion process begins at the appropriately scheduled time. The steps delineated below are the procedures to follow for promoting a Lecturer.

Candidates and unit heads should supply information necessary for evaluation in the format outlined. This information should be made available first to eligible faculty members, a college/school committee (if appropriate), then to the dean. The information requested is sufficiently detailed so that a candidate can be evaluated in terms of both potential and achievement. Unit heads and candidates who have questions about material to be submitted should feel free to contact the dean of the appropriate college/school.

#### ***II. Information on the Candidate***

The outline printed below indicates the kind of information each candidate for promotion and his/her unit head should supply and describes the format to be followed in presenting that information.

Guidelines and/or criteria are subject to periodic revision with approval from the appropriate dean's office and the Office of the Provost.

#### ***III. General Instructions***

All lists (of positions held, publications, and, if applicable, courses taught, etc.) should be in reverse chronological order with dates clearly indicated.

Supporting material such as publications, slides, evaluative material (book reviews, published critiques, adjudicated production reviews, practice portfolio, etc.) should be made available for review by the unit head and later by the dean. The candidate and unit head should agree on the selection of material to be made available.

**IV. Information to Be Supplied by the Candidate:**

- A Standard Biographical Data sheet (see Faculty Handbook for form).
- A percent breakdown of the allocation of time and effort as specified by the terms of his/her contract for the past three years.
- A list of honors and awards. Include academic honors, research, clinical, and professional service awards, fellowships (such as NEH, NEA), internal support, election to professional societies, etc.
- A list of scholarly contributions in accord with the following outline. A candidate should present his/her work as informatively and accurately as possible. A candidate should cross-reference work that falls in two areas (e.g.: See X.x.).

**Scholarly Contributions by the Candidate**

1. Teaching

- Actual courses taught for each semester of the past three years including clinical rounds, clinical clerkships/practicums. Indicate lecture/lab, hours per week and enrollment.
- Responsibilities including supervision and evaluation of interns, residents, post-doctoral fellows and/or professional students in a small group, case-oriented teaching hospital environment.
- Teaching students, in small group settings.
- Graduate students whose work has been completed. Indicate degree awarded to the student, year, and, if known, position now held by the student; indicate whether the candidate was the major professor or a committee member.
- Graduate students on whose committee the candidate is presently serving. Indicate whether the candidate is the major professor or a committee member. Indicate the degree the student is working towards and the work that the candidate has done.
- Courses and curricula developed.
- Grants received related to teaching.
- Publications pertaining to teaching. Include textbooks, manuals, and articles on pedagogy.
- Other contributions to teaching.
- Statement of candidate's teaching philosophy and self-evaluation in terms of his or her stated values. This should be no longer than one page.

## **Consideration of the Candidate and the Unit's and College/School Recommendation**

### **A. Consideration of the Candidate**

The candidate's dossier (consisting of the information supplied by the candidate and the information supplied by the unit head) and supporting material shall be available for review exclusively by faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. After the faculty has had time to review the dossier and supporting material, the unit head, as a non-voting participant, shall convene a meeting of all eligible faculty (as approved in written college/school guidelines) to discuss nomination of the candidate. Confidentiality and the right of faculty members to express their viewpoints openly without fear of retaliation shall be the hallmarks of the discussion. Unit deliberations shall be confidential to the extent permitted by law.

### **B. The Unit's and College/School's Recommendations**

After the candidate has made a presentation of his or her credentials if he or she so wishes, and after the faculty eligible to vote have had time to discuss the candidate's qualifications in a closed meeting, a secret ballot shall be taken at the meeting of eligible faculty (as approved in written college/school guidelines) to determine the final recommendation of the department faculty. Faculty members may participate in the recommendation in one of the following ways:

- a) present and voting,
- b) present and abstaining,
- c) absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting, or
- d) absent and not voting (This response does not count as part of the total vote).

The unit head, dean, and any other faculty member serving as an administrator who has an official vote on the candidate at a higher administrative level shall not vote at the department level (if applicable). Faculty members who serve on committees at the school/college level may choose to vote at the department level or at higher levels, but they may vote only once on candidates from their departments. Immediate family members shall excuse themselves from voting.

The unit head shall announce the vote at the meeting. The vote shall be transmitted itemized as a, b, c, and d as listed above in writing, to the dean of the candidate's college or school and the College/School Committee (if applicable) along with the other information requested in this document.

The eligible unit faculty who voted on a candidate's promotion will write a summary letter that reflects the vote and represents all aspects of the discussion leading to that vote. The department head will also write an evaluative letter with a recommendation for or against promotion. In addition to these two required letters, individual faculty members may write letters explaining why they do or do not favor promotion. Where there are fewer than three faculty members in a department who are eligible to write letters of evaluation, the head may ask for letters from faculty members in other departments who have knowledge of the

candidate's professional performance. Letters should address the quality of the clinical work and the candidate's potential for continued work, teaching effectiveness, effectiveness in the area of extension, service contributions.

Faculty should bear in mind that letters are an important source of information. Letters can help all involved to make an informed judgment about the candidate by addressing the candidate's performance of his or her duties within a department. Letters can also help others who may not come from the candidate's field, understand the significance of the candidate's work and make a fair appraisal of it. Faculty, department heads, and chairs should note that, unlike letters from outside reviewers that remain confidential, their letters will be made available to and may be rebutted by the candidate.

The unit head shall communicate the unit's vote to the candidate and also make available to the candidate all letters submitted by the committee, the unit head, and individual faculty members. After reviewing the letters, the candidate has five working days to write a rebuttal if desired. The candidate can also make an informed decision about whether or not to continue with the process of seeking promotion. If the candidate wishes to continue the process despite a negative recommendation, the unit head shall honor the candidate's request.

If there is a college committee, its members will review the dossier, letters, and the candidate's rebuttal (if submitted), and they will vote by secret ballot. The committee will write a summary letter that reflects the vote and represents all aspects of the discussion leading to that vote. The college/school committee will communicate the college/school committee vote and make available to the candidate the college/school committee's letter. After reviewing the letters, the candidate has five working days to write a response letter if desired. If the candidate wishes to continue the process despite a negative recommendation, the committee shall honor the candidate's request.

### **C. Submission of the Candidate's Dossier to the Dean**

Units will submit dossiers in PDF format to the Dean's office in an approved electronic format. Dossiers are to be collated as follows and separated with a title page for each section:

1. Standard biographical data sheet.
2. Information supplied by the candidate.
3. Information supplied by the department head.
4. Evaluations and recommendations from: the college committee (if applicable), the unit head, the director of any relevant funding source (e.g.: the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, the Scott Ritchey Research Center, etc.), faculty members, and outside referees and any response letter from the candidate.

### **D. Schedule**

Nominations for promotion shall be transmitted to the dean by the deadline. The specific date shall be announced in the annual call for nominations from the Provost. The candidate's dean and/or College Committee shall request material early enough to allow for recommendations

from the faculty, the department head and the dean and rebuttals from the candidate to be forwarded with the candidate's dossier. The final decision must be reported to the Provost's Office by the deadline noted in the annual call for nominations from the Provost. As the Chief Academic Officer of Auburn University, the Provost retains the right to review all promotions and act appropriately.

#### **E. The Dean's Final Action**

After the department and college/school review, all dossier materials, including optional letters of response, must be submitted to the Dean for a final action. The dean must inform the candidate, by letter, his/her decision to grant or deny promotion within 15 business days of receiving the dossier. The letter must also include a counseling/development plan for candidates who are denied promotion.

#### **F. Appeal of Promotion Decisions**

Grounds for appeal exist when, in the opinion of the candidate, one or more of the following occurred:

1. The denial of promotion resulted from the fact that all evidence in support of the candidate was not presented at the time of the original consideration.
2. The denial resulted from procedural irregularities concerning advisement and periodic review or a failure to follow promotion procedures of the department, college, school, or University
3. The denial was based significantly on considerations violative of academic freedom.
4. The denial was based significantly on discrimination as described in the University's EEO Policy. In these cases, the appeal should begin with the candidate immediately contacting the Office of Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity at 334.844.4794 as well as following the appeals process below.

A faculty member who contends unjust denial of promotion may choose to discuss the reasons for denial and the appeals process with the Dean. Appeals should be made in writing through the unit head and dean within 14 calendar days of the date of the faculty member's receipt of written notification of denial.

If the faculty member bases his/her appeal on alleged violation of academic freedom or discrimination, the appeal must include a statement of the grounds on which the allegation is based and evidence to support his/her case. If the faculty member succeeds in establishing a prima facie case, it is incumbent upon those who made the decision against continuation to come forward with evidence in support of their decision. Statistical evidence of discrimination may be used by the candidate in establishing a prima facie case.

The Dean shall respond promptly to the faculty member's appeal by forming an Appeals Committee and setting the date, time, and place for the hearing of the appeal.

The Appeals Committee shall be comprised of the following:

- One current member of the College/School Promotion Committee (if applicable), selected by the Promotion Committee.
- Five members of proper rank who represent the college, but not department, of the appealing candidates. If more than five members are needed to represent the appellants, more than five members will be chosen as needed. If the college/school has a college/school level Promotion committee, then past members of that committee should be utilized, if available.

After the merit of the appeal has been judged, the recommendations of the Appeals Committee and all supporting documents shall be submitted to the Dean for final action.

In the appellate process, appeals must be taken, and decisions rendered so as to prevent postponing a promotion decision to the next year.

In the event the candidate fails to achieve promotion, the department chair will explain to the candidate the rationale of the decision to deny promotion. The chair will advise the candidate on professional and career development and his/her options for the future. This discussion will be held at the time that the promotion decision is discussed with the candidate.

**These departmental guidelines were taken from *Provost's Guidelines for Unit Specific Clinical Title Series Promotion Criteria* that were approved by Tim Boosinger, Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and adopted on August 10, 2011. They were approved by the department in August 2011 and approved by the Provost's office on September 23, 2011.**

**Revisions (10/12/2011) to the *Provost's Guidelines for Unit Specific Clinical Title Series Promotion Criteria* were incorporated in this document and approved by the department in November 2011.**

**Revisions to the departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines incorporated into this document were approved by the department 04/21/2021 and approved by the Provost's office on 5/12/2021.**

