

# Committee on Appointments and Promotions

## Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

### Promotion to Full Professor

2018-19

This document describes the timetable and process in considering a nomination for promotion to full Professor of a Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty member. The criteria for promotion are appended below. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) provides this list of documents that are typically the most relevant to the review a faculty member for promotion; however, candidates may submit additional supporting documents at their discretion.

#### Calendar

April/May

- Deadline for the **Nominator's** initial statement of intention to nominate a candidate for promotion to full professor: April 15 – May 1
- Deadline for the **Candidate** to provide the name of an Advocate and six Professional Associates: May 1
- **Joint Promotion Committee** consisting of six members of COAP and the Nominator and Advocate identifies External Reviewers in May

June 5

Deadline for Candidate to submit promotion dossier. The Joint Promotion Committee sends this material to Professional Associates and External Reviewers

Summer

Joint Promotion Committee receives letters of appraisal from Professional Associates and External Reviewers (typically by August 15); Joint Committee sends teaching survey to former students/alumni and collects other material during the summer

Fall

Joint Promotion Committee review of the complete promotion dossier during Term A. Candidates send updates by the beginning of Term B. The committee meets in Term B to make a recommendation on promotion

January

Deadline for Joint Promotion Committee to send recommendations on promotion to the Provost and Dean, in advance of the winter meeting of the Board of Trustees

## Nomination for Promotion to Full Professor

A tenured/tenure-track faculty member must be nominated for promotion to full professor by May 1. By that date, the **Nominator** will submit an initial *statement of nomination* and the **Candidate** will provide the name of an Advocate and a list of six Professional Associates.

The nominator, advocate, and departmental promotions committee should mentor the candidate long before the nomination deadline in order for the candidate to develop a strong promotion dossier and to submit an appropriate list of Professional Associates. Only after the candidate submits the list of Professional Associates can the Joint Promotion Committee identify External Reviewers (described in more detail below). The process of identifying and securing the consent of peers to serve as external reviewers takes time, and the Joint Committee must begin this process as early as possible in May.

The candidate submits their promotion dossier in early June prior to the academic year of the promotion review. On behalf of the Joint Committee, the Faculty Governance Office sends electronic copies of the promotion dossier and the criteria for promotion to the Professional Associates and the External Reviewers early in the summer. These reviewers are asked to submit a confidential letter of appraisal to the committee before the beginning of the academic year of the promotion review (typically by August 15).

All materials to support a nomination for promotion should be sent to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions via Penny J. Rock, Faculty Governance Executive Assistant, [prock@wpi.edu](mailto:prock@wpi.edu).

The following section outlines information to be provided by the Candidate, the Nominator, or the Faculty Governance Office.

### I. Information provided by the Candidate

*By May 1:*

- **Name of Advocate**
  - The *Advocate* is normally a full-time faculty member who agrees to serve with the Nominator as a non-voting member of a Joint Promotion Committee.
- **List of Professional Associates:**
  - Professional Associates are contacted by the candidate at the time of the initial nomination and must agree, at that time, to supply a letter of appraisal when later asked by the Joint Promotion Committee. The six professional associates should include a mixture of internal peers at WPI and external peers in the candidate's areas of expertise. All professional associates must be qualified to evaluate the candidate's promotion dossier, and they must have agreed to write a letter of appraisal when asked by the candidate before they will be sent promotion materials by the Joint Committee.

*By June 5:*

- **Documentation in the Candidate's Promotion Dossier** (see section D.1.3, below, for more detail)
  - Curriculum vitae (in format requested by COAP, below)
  - Personal statement
  - Teaching portfolio
  - Sample scholarly artifacts
  - Citation index and indicators of external impact

### II. Information provided by the Nominator

*By April/May:*

1. Initial **statement of intention to nominate** the candidate for promotion by April 15 – May 1. This initial nomination leads to the formation of a Joint Promotion Committee.

2. **External Reviewer list:** External Reviewers are selected by the Joint Promotion Committee after the candidate has identified the Professional Associates. External reviewers must be competent to judge the candidate's promotion dossier and not have conflicts of interests or close personal ties to the candidate (such as co-author, co-PI, co-advisor, etc.). The candidate may not suggest external reviewers, though the candidate should tell the Nominator if anyone should not be asked, with an explanation. The Nominator and Advocate each identify *potential* external reviewers from which the Joint Committee then develops a priority list of reviewers. On behalf of the Joint Committee, the Nominator invites individuals from this priority list to serve as external reviewers until at least 5 to 6 external peers agree to write an independent letter of appraisal.

By August 15:

3. **A nomination letter** that includes:
  - a. A description and analysis of the quality of the **nominee's teaching**. The committee already has access to student ratings and alumni evaluations, but would welcome additional information on the candidate's teaching.
  - b. A description and analysis of the quality of the **nominee's scholarship** or creative work. As noted in the criteria, scholarship exists along a continuum, and scholarly contributions may combine or cut across traditional categories of teaching, scholarship/creativity and service.
  - c. A description and analysis of the **nominee's service** to the department or programs, the university, the profession, or the community. The CV should list all activities; however, this does not always provide a complete picture of the nominee's contributions to WPI.
  - d. A description and analysis of the positive **external impact** of the nominee's scholarly contributions.
  - e. **Any additional information** that will be helpful to the Joint Committee in its deliberations. When drafting this nomination letter, please keep in mind the advice to reviewers on implicit and explicit bias in Section D.1.4. Standards for Evaluation of the Promotion Dossier.

### III. Information provided by Faculty Governance Office

The Faculty Governance Office collects summary student course ratings for all courses taught by the candidate in the last five years and the Instructional Activity Reports and Sponsored Research Activity Reports for the last five years. In addition, on behalf of the promotion committee, the office will send an invitation to comment on the candidate's promotion to the following:

- *Professional Associates and External Reviewers:* sends electronic copies of the candidate's promotion dossier and WPI's promotion criteria (D1.1 – D.1.4) with a request to submit letters of appraisal by August 15.
- *Former Students/Alumni:* sends a teaching survey to a random selection of former students and alumni whom the candidate has taught in the last five years (the survey has several rating items and space for comments).

The Faculty Governance Office will make the material returned in response to these invitations, as well as the dossier submitted by the candidate, available to all members of the Joint Promotion Committee.

### Procedural Summary

The procedures for review by the Joint Promotion Committee are described below in section D.2.5.

## Curriculum Vitae: Format Requested by COAP

To facilitate the review process, COAP requests candidates for promotion supply the information on their CV in the order below. Please note that candidates are invited and encouraged to use the promotion dossier to make arguments for the quality and impact of their work. Additional categories may be added if those categories are appropriate to the form and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions.

### Professional Experience

1. Education, in reverse chronological order
2. Teaching experience at WPI or other universities (in reverse chronological order)
3. Work experience other than teaching (in reverse chronological order)

### Teaching

4. Teaching innovations at WPI
5. Courses taught at WPI (by term, title, and enrollment)
6. Projects, Theses and Dissertations (Please list each IQP, MQP, Humanities Project/Sufficiency, Thesis and Dissertation, advised or co-advised, with the names of all students and co-advisors)
7. Independent studies conducted at WPI
8. Academic advising at WPI
9. Honors, awards and recognition related to teaching

### Scholarship

10. List of publications or scholarly contributions, with full references and all author names in the original order. Divide the list into appropriate groups, such as: books; book chapters; journal articles (separate into peer-reviewed full manuscripts, peer-reviewed abstracts, not peer-reviewed); conference proceedings (separate as above); other publications. Please arrange these groups in the CV by listing *the most important categories of scholarly publication or dissemination in the candidate's field first*, followed by other categories *in descending order of importance* for this field or discipline or area of expertise.
11. Presentations at conferences, seminars, and colloquia
12. Scholarship in progress, including manuscripts submitted, in press, or in preparation
13. Fellowships and grants received, applied for but not received, or pending, indicating role as PI or co-PI, sponsor, dates, and amounts of award or request, including the name of any PIs or co-PIs
14. Patents awarded or pending
15. Consulting
16. Other Items (such as software packages developed, exhibitions, or other scholarly contributions)
17. Honors, awards and recognition related to scholarship/creativity

### Service

18. WPI administrative leadership, committee assignments, department or campus-wide
19. Memberships and offices held in professional societies
20. Conference organization, editorial and referee services
21. Non-academic contributions to student welfare
22. Significant civic, cultural, religious, and similar contributions
23. Honors, awards and recognition for service

### Other

24. Other jobs and experiences

## Criteria for Promotion in Academic Rank

Faculty Handbook, Part Two, Section D, Promotion

### **D. Promotion** (Approved by the Faculty, February and April, 2017)

The principal reason for establishing academic ranks is to recognize and to encourage the continued professional growth of individual faculty members. The faculty make a variety of scholarly contributions as educators, scholars, innovators and leaders that advance WPI's mission to create, discover, and convey knowledge at the frontiers of academic inquiry for the betterment of society.

#### **D.1.1. The Criteria for Promotion**

The candidate for promotion to associate professor should have demonstrated high quality teaching and high quality scholarship/creativity as well as the promise for continued high quality performance in these areas. Evidence of service at an appropriate level is expected.

The candidate for promotion to full professor should demonstrate continuing high quality teaching and high quality scholarship/creativity as well as a record of scholarly contributions that demonstrates a positive external impact beyond WPI as appropriate to the candidate's area of expertise. Service is a critical responsibility of all tenured faculty; thus, evidence of service at a level appropriate to the rank is expected.

The specific standards of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to full professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor, with the added expectation of scholarly contributions that demonstrate a positive external impact beyond WPI. Contributions to WPI may demonstrate an external impact if they are disseminated and recognized externally. In every case, the high quality and positive external impact of scholarly contributions must be recognized by peers within WPI and by knowledgeable people external to WPI. While it is expected that these criteria describe the great majority of cases, there may be exceptional candidates whose unique contributions, while not conforming to these guidelines, are deserving of promotion.

#### **D.1.2. Definition of Scholarship**

To recognize the full range of scholarly contributions by faculty, WPI endorses an inclusive definition of scholarship. Scholarship exists in a continuum of diverse forms of knowledge and knowledge-making practices. Scholarship may be pursued through original research, making connections between disciplines, building bridges between theory and practice, communicating knowledge effectively to students and peers, or in reciprocal partnerships with broader communities. The common characteristics for any scholarly form to be considered scholarship are: it must be public, amenable to critical appraisal, and in a form that permits exchange and use by other members of the scholarly community.

Candidates for promotion may make contributions to the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and practice, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or the scholarship of engagement. Contributions may be in one area or across multiple areas of the continuum of scholarship. Scholarly contributions to any area or areas are valued equally by WPI.

The following descriptions of the continuum of scholarship indicate the scope of each domain, but they are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive. The forms that scholarship take along this continuum will vary by discipline, department or academic division.

#### **Scholarship of Discovery**

The creation or discovery of new knowledge involves creative and critical thought, research skills, the rigorous testing of researchable questions suggested by theory and practice, or active experimentation and exploration with the goal of adding to knowledge in a substantive way. The scholarship of discovery is

usually demonstrated through publication in peer-reviewed journals and books, presentations at scholarly conferences, inventions and patents, or original creation in writing or multimedia, artistic works, or new technologies.

### **Scholarship of Integration**

The scholarship of integration includes the critical evaluation, synthesis, analysis, integration, or interpretation of research or creative work produced by others. It may be disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or multidisciplinary in nature. When disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge is synthesized, interpreted, or connected, this integrative scholarly contribution brings new insight. Integrative or interdisciplinary work might include articles, policy papers, reflective essays and reviews, translations, popular publications, synthesis of the literature on a topic, or textbooks. The scholarship of integration may be shared through any form such as those typical of discovery, application, teaching, or engagement.

### **Scholarship of Application and Practice**

Scholarship of application involves the use of a scholar's disciplinary knowledge to address important individual, institutional, and societal problems. The scholarship of application and practice might apply the knowledge, techniques, or technologies of the arts and sciences, business or engineering to the benefit of individuals and groups. This may include translational research, commercialization, start-ups, technology transfer, assistive technologies, learning technologies, or applied research supported by industrial or corporate partners or by government agencies. Contributions to the scholarship of application and practice are shared with stakeholders and open to review and critique by stakeholders and by peers.

### **Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

The scholarship of teaching and learning is the development and improvement of pedagogical practices that are shared with others. Effective teachers engage in scholarly teaching activity when they undertake assessment and evaluation to promote improvement in their own teaching and in student learning. Scholarly teaching activity becomes the scholarship of teaching and learning when faculty members make their teaching public, so that it can be reviewed, critiqued and built on by others, through publications, presentations or other forms of dissemination.

### **Scholarship of Engagement**

The scholarship of engagement involves collaborative partnerships with communities (local, regional, state, national, or global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources. Examples of the scholarship of engagement might include, but are not limited to: community-based programs that enhance WPI's curriculum, teaching and learning; educational or public outreach programs; other partnerships with communities beyond the campus to address critical societal issues, prepare educated citizens, or contribute to the public good. Contributions in the scholarship of engagement are of benefit to the external community, visible and shared with stakeholders, and open to review and critique by community stakeholders and by peers.

#### **D.1.3. Documentation in the Promotion Dossier**

The candidate for promotion to full Professor will submit a promotion dossier representative of their overall career, with an emphasis on work since tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate's promotion dossier will include the following: a curriculum vitae (CV); a personal statement of teaching, scholarship, service, and impact; a teaching portfolio to document high quality teaching; sample scholarly artifacts and a citation index and other indicators to demonstrate the high quality and external impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions.

- The CV provides comprehensive documentation of the candidate's professional experience and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service.

- The **personal statement** provides a reflective summary and description of the candidate's professional accomplishments and scholarly contributions. Typically, the personal statement will include sections on teaching, scholarship/creativity, service, external impact, and future plans.
- The **teaching portfolio** provides documentation of the candidate's high quality teaching. A teaching portfolio presents representative teaching materials and evidence of their effectiveness. Typical elements in a teaching portfolio include a reflective statement of the candidate's approach to teaching and learning, samples of teaching materials and teaching innovations, and measures of teaching effectiveness or materials that demonstrate student learning.
- The **sample scholarly artifacts** provide documentation of the high quality and external impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions. For most candidates, the sample scholarly artifacts will be three peer-reviewed articles that have been published since tenure and/or promotion. However, scholarly contributions may be documented and disseminated through a variety of artifacts besides peer-reviewed articles. The continuum of artifacts through which knowledge may be documented and disseminated matches, in its inclusiveness and variety, the continuum of scholarship. Sample scholarly artifacts must be publicly available, amenable to critical appraisal, and in a form that permits exchange and use by other members of the scholarly community.
- **Citation index and indicators of external impact.** All candidates for promotion must submit a citation index and any other indicators of external impact appropriate to their scholarly contributions. The citation index should include all citations of the candidate's publications, presentations or other scholarly contributions. Additional indicators of external impact might include reviews of the candidate's work, press and media coverage, downloads of scholarly materials, awards and recognition, or any other indicators that the candidate's scholarly contributions have had an impact beyond WPI.

Overall, the candidate should use this documentation to present the case that they have achieved the criteria for promotion. **Scholarly contributions may combine or cut across traditional categories of teaching, scholarship/creativity and service.** The candidate is invited and encouraged to use the promotion dossier to make arguments for the quality and impact of their work using these categories or in other ways if those other ways are appropriate to the form and impact of their scholarly contributions.

In addition to the above materials submitted by the candidate, the Joint Promotion Committee will add four **other sources of information** to the complete promotion review dossier: 1) Summary student ratings for all courses and projects taught at WPI in the last five years. 2) Responses to a teaching evaluation sent to a random selection of former students and alumni whom the candidate has taught in the last five years. 3) Instructional Activity Reports and Sponsored Research Activity Reports for the last five years. 4) Letters of appraisal solicited by the committee from internal and external peers for a confidential evaluation of the materials submitted by the candidate for the promotion dossier.

#### **D.1.4. Standards for Evaluation of the Promotion Dossier: Quality, Impact and Peer Review**

The candidate's promotion dossier and the criteria for promotion (sections D1.1 – D.1.4) will be sent to peers within WPI and to knowledgeable people external to WPI for an independent assessment of the quality and impact of the candidate's teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service. These letters of appraisal will be read only by people who are directly involved in the evaluation of the nomination for promotion and they will not be shown to the candidate or to anyone else. This section provides additional guidance to reviewers for this assessment.

An assessment of **high quality teaching, high quality scholarship/creativity, and service** may be based on any and all material in the promotion dossier, including the CV, personal statement, teaching portfolio, peer-

reviewed scholarship, peer reviews of sample scholarly artifacts, or indicators of external impact. Traditional measures to assess quality do not necessarily accommodate all areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Nonetheless, the following six standards have been identified to evaluate quality across diverse areas: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed*, 1997). Since the dossier includes the candidate's reflective critique in their personal statement, peer reviewers are invited to apply these six standards to assess the candidate's teaching, scholarship and service in the promotion portfolio.

**External impact** beyond WPI should be assessed based on the relevant standards in the areas of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Thus, the starting point to assess external impact is the candidate's personal statement, which should identify the area or areas of their scholarly contributions across teaching, scholarship and service and indicate examples of external impact beyond WPI. While quantitative measures such as the number of refereed publications and citations or the level of external funding will remain important indicators of quality and impact for many scholars, WPI recognizes that the weight assigned to such measures varies widely between academic fields as well as along the continuum of scholarship. Thus, evidence of external impact beyond WPI might include: funding from multiple sources; peer-reviewed articles or presentations in well-regarded journals or conferences; books; reviews, citations or impact factors; downloadable curriculum; patents; films, broadcasts, software, or computer games; discussion of research in legal cases, policy reports, or the media; keynote addresses; workshops for other institutions, regional, national or international societies; artistic exhibitions, performances or productions; K-12 outreach and educational programs; journal editorships; leadership of academic programs or centers; or impact on external communities through teaching, scholarship or service. These examples of external impact are illustrative and do not limit other ways that a candidate might demonstrate external impact.

**Peer reviewers** should be experts in, and therefore appropriate evaluators of, the area or areas of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Where appropriate, external reviewers may include experts whose institutional affiliation is beyond the academy if they are well-placed to testify to or evaluate the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions.

All reviewers—internal and external peers, members of promotion committees, or academic decision-makers—are reminded that **implicit and explicit bias** has been shown to occur in every aspect of a faculty career that is evaluated. Empirical studies have shown that letters of recommendation for women and men differ in gendered ways: letters for women are often shorter, less detailed, and reinforce gender stereotypes. Women faculty and faculty of color also may face bias in student ratings of teaching or in mentoring and sponsorship. The choice of area for scholarly contributions (e.g. interdisciplinary, qualitative, community-engaged, theoretical, or digital) may result in comparatively less funding or fewer citations but nevertheless demonstrate high quality and impact in forms appropriate to that area of scholarship. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions highlights potential sources of bias in this description of the standards for evaluation of the promotion dossier so that all reviewers at every stage of the review process will be aware of potential implicit and explicit bias and take care to limit opportunities for such bias to influence the consideration of each nomination for promotion.

## **D.2. Procedures for Promotion Nomination and Review**

### **D.2.1. Eligibility and Time in Rank**

A candidate for promotion to **Associate Professor** normally will have completed five years as an Assistant Professor before a promotion review in the sixth year. Probationary faculty with initial appointment as Assistant Professor normally receive a combined review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor from a Joint Tenure Committee, as described in Part Two, Section 1.A. Only in exceptional circumstances should an Assistant Professor be nominated for promotion to Associate Professor earlier than the scheduled tenure review.

To be considered for promotion to professor, an associate professor must have demonstrated considerable professional growth. A candidate for promotion to **Professor** normally will have completed at least five years as Associate Professor and at least three years as an Associate Professor at WPI before the year of the promotion review. Only in exceptional circumstances should an Associate Professor be nominated for promotion to Professor at an earlier date.

### **D.2.2. Nomination and the Formation of a Joint Promotion Committee**

A candidate must be nominated for promotion. The **Nominator** is normally the Department Head or a tenured full professor at WPI. Before nomination, the Nominator should discuss with the candidate the strengths and weaknesses of their case based on the promotion criteria and eligibility including time in rank. Departmental promotion procedures should assure equitable treatment of all eligible candidates and should be selective so that only well-qualified candidates are nominated.

The Nominator's initial *statement of nomination* of a candidate for promotion must be received by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions from the Department Head by April 15 or from nominators other than the Department Head by May 1. The nominator must submit a more detailed **letter of nomination**, with a description and analysis of the candidate's teaching, scholarship/creativity, service and impact, during the summer prior to the academic year of the promotion review.

After the initial statement of nomination, the **Candidate** is invited to submit the materials for the promotion dossier (described in section D.1.3), as well as a list of internal and external peers known as Professional Associates (described in section D.2.3) and the name of an Advocate. The **Advocate** is normally a full-time faculty member who agrees to serve with the Nominator as a non-voting member of a Joint Promotion Committee. The candidate should seek advice from the Nominator, Advocate and other mentors well in advance of the nomination deadline in order to develop a strong promotion dossier and to submit an appropriate list of Professional Associates. The candidate submits the name of the Advocate and the list of Professional Associates by May 1. The candidate's promotion dossier is due in June prior to the academic year of the promotion review.

The **Joint Promotion Committee** consists of six voting members from the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) and two non-voting members, the Nominator and Advocate. The selection and recusal of COAP members for a Joint Committee are described in Bylaw One, Section VI.

### **D.2.3. Selection of Internal and External Peer Reviewers**

The Joint Promotion Committee develops a list of peer reviewers to evaluate the candidate's promotion dossier. These peers are 1) six Professional Associates who are selected by candidate; and 2) five to six External Reviewers who are selected by the Joint Committee.

**Professional Associates** are contacted by the candidate at the time of the initial nomination and must agree, at that time, to supply a letter of appraisal when later asked by the Joint Promotion Committee. The six professional associates should include a mixture of internal peers at WPI and external peers in the candidate's areas of expertise. All professional associates must be qualified to evaluate the candidate's promotion dossier, and they must have agreed to write a letter of appraisal when asked by the candidate before they will be contacted by the Joint Committee.

**External Reviewers** are selected by the Joint Promotion Committee after the candidate has identified the professional associates. External reviewers must be competent to judge the candidate's promotion dossier and not have conflicts of interests or close personal ties to the candidate (such as co-author, co-PI, co-advisor, etc.). The candidate may not suggest names for the list of external reviewers, though they should tell

the Nominator if there is anyone who should not be asked, with an explanation. The Nominator and Advocate each identify potential external reviewers and the Joint Committee then develops a priority list of reviewers. On behalf of the Joint Committee, the Nominator invites individuals from this priority list to serve as external reviewers until at least five to six external peers agree to write letters of appraisal.

The Joint Committee sends electronic copies of the candidate's promotion dossier as well as the criteria for promotion to the Professional Associates and the External Reviewers early in the summer. All of these peer reviewers are asked to submit a confidential letter of appraisal to the Committee before the beginning of the academic year of the promotion review (typically by August 15).

#### **D.2.4. Student and Alumni Evaluations and Other Materials**

During the summer before the academic year of the promotion review, the Joint Promotion Committee solicits **student and alumni evaluations** and collects other materials in the summer or the fall, as necessary, to arrive at a fair and equitable evaluation of the candidate.

#### **D.2.5. Review by the Joint Promotion Committee, Dean, and Provost**

The Joint Promotion Committee reviews a nomination for promotion in order to make a recommendation to the appropriate Dean and the Provost.

In Term A and Term B of the academic year of the promotion review, the Joint Promotion Committee meets to consider the merits of the nomination for promotion. The Joint Committee reviews the complete promotion dossier (described in section D.1.3) including the letters of appraisal from Professional Associates and External Reviewers. The welfare of the candidate must be protected by all members of the Joint Committee by observing strict rules of confidentiality during all phases of the promotion review. When all the members of the Joint Promotion Committee agree that there has been sufficient discussion, a vote is taken by the six voting members of the Joint Committee for or against promotion (no abstentions) by means of a secret ballot, with the majority ruling. By the end of Term B, the Joint Committee forwards to the Dean and the Provost a letter conveying the result of its vote as a unitary recommendation for or against promotion and summarizing the salient reasons for its recommendation.

The Provost reviews each case and consults with the Dean and the President. Subsequently, the Provost may ask to meet with the Joint Committee to discuss any of its recommendations, and must meet with the Joint Committee in the case of potential disagreement. Lastly, the Provost sends to the Board of Trustees the names of candidates for whom promotion is recommended. The Provost will inform the candidate of the Board's decision.

In the event of a negative decision on promotion, a joint letter to the candidate discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case for promotion will be written by the Joint Promotion Committee, the Dean, and the Provost. The purpose of this letter is to provide constructive advice to the candidate so that they may address any deficiencies and resubmit the case for promotion consideration in the future. The candidate may meet with the Provost, Dean, or the Nominator to discuss this letter.

If a candidate for promotion wishes to appeal a negative decision, faculty grievance procedures are available to the extent provided by a Faculty Review Committee (Bylaw One, IX).