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Assistant Professors shall be considered for promotion no later than the seventh cumulative year of their service in rank. Associate Professors shall be considered for promotion in the seventh cumulative year of their service in rank, and in the event they are not promoted but extended for three years, no later than the tenth cumulative year in this rank. In exceptional cases, earlier promotion is possible for applicants demonstrating outstanding merit—that is, those whose dossiers would unambiguously merit promotion were they presented in the seventh year in rank. Faculty members should spend a minimum of one year at the University before being eligible to apply for promotion in the course of the second year in residence at AUB, in accordance with the University's faculty promotion schedule. This is so that all concerned can evaluate the individual's contribution to teaching and research in the setting of AUB itself.

All full-time, clinical, research, and practice faculty members should be informed by their department chair or track convener about deadlines for submission of applications for promotion. No candidate is allowed to apply for promotion more than twice within each promotion cycle. The provost will periodically review the annual schedule for promotion procedures and revise interim deadlines as necessary.

The Due Process Monitor

- For purposes of promotion, at the beginning of each academic year each Faculty Advisory Committee will select one full Professor from among its faculty members to serve as a Due Process Monitor (DPM) in another faculty/school during the promotion deliberations of its departments/tracks and Advisory Committees.
- The DPM is a non-voting member of the department/track or the Faculty Advisory Committee whom the provost will appoint randomly from the faculty members chosen by the Faculty Advisory Committees. These DPMs will form a committee and elect a chair.
- DPMs shall report immediately to the provost any procedural or discrimination irregularities that they have witnessed during the deliberations and voting. DPMs shall walk into the meeting with copies of promotion guidelines and procedures and shall point irregularities during the meeting but shall not interfere in the deliberations or their outcome.
- The DPM’s role is to provide an informed reading of the rules when called upon. She/he may interject a caution when, in her/his judgment it seems that a procedure is being violated. The DPM does not act as a final judge. Rather the chair of the meeting, whether at the department, the faculty or the dean’s level, must make the
final ruling on how to proceed. In cases in which the chair of the meeting chooses to ignore the DPM’s advice, the DPM can report the incident to the Provost or record the event and include a discussion of it in her/his report.

The Promotion Process

By September 3 of their penultimate year in rank, candidates for promotion are required to submit, through the chairs/conveners of the departments/tracks, with a copy to the dean, a letter of application for promotion, an updated cv, a personal statement on teaching, research, and service, a list of courses taught during the current term of employment with short descriptions of courses provided, a list of graduate students directly mentored, teaching evaluations, other materials as applicable (demonstration of clinical performance, patents, projects, exhibits, portfolios, etc.), and a list of referees from outside the University whose expertise is closely related to that of the candidate and are therefore qualified to evaluate the application for promotion. Normally, referees should be of rank equal to or above that to which a candidate is applying. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should supply six names, and candidates for Full Professor, eight. Candidates may also list the names of people whom they wish to exclude along with the reasons for exclusion. The candidate will also submit copies of all publications that have appeared during the current promotion cycle, as well as those accepted for publication or in press but not yet published (documentation required for the latter); work in progress can be included if the candidate wishes it to be considered. Four publications deemed by the candidate to be most representative of her/his most recent work, to be designated for sending to referees.

The personal statement is the candidate’s own assessment of the position (s)he occupies in the field and in the department, in each of the following categories: research (2-4 single-spaced pages), teaching (no more than 2 pages), and service (no more than 2 pages). The statement should address such questions as: what research or other forms of professional accomplishment have you realized during the current promotion cycle (since your last promotion or initial appointment)? What is the nature of your present research or practice? How do you contribute to the field at large? What do you see as your most significant contributions? What research plans or professional ambitions do you have for the future, and how do these complement or expand on the work you have already accomplished? What is your general philosophy of teaching and connection to students in the classroom and in one-on-one advising sessions? What is the intellectual rationale of the courses you teach, and what is their contribution and relevance to departmental priorities? How does your research complement your teaching or mentoring of students at AUB? What types of service have you undertaken (department, faculty, and university committees, community service and regional projects, professional groups, international organizations or boards), and how is your service related to your professional
development and interests? Some of these questions may not be applicable to all candidates.

By November 1 of the candidate’s penultimate year, his/her publications will be made available in the dean’s office to departmental members who are voting on promotion; all such faculty members should become familiar with these publications during this initial reading period. Deadlines for the subsequent stages of the promotion process will be disseminated separately by the provost’s office.

The Promotion Committee

The department chair/convener, in consultation with the dean, will appoint a promotion committee consisting of at least three members of appropriate rank for the promotion review and designate a committee chair from within the selected members. If the department chair is of a rank below that to which the candidate is applying, the dean appoints the promotion committee in consultation with the chair. In cases of small departments, the Dean of the Faculty may ask faculty from other departments/tracks to participate, or the dean may designate certain departments within a faculty to deliberate together regularly, in order to achieve appropriate numbers of voting faculty for purposes of promotion, preferably no less than six voting members.

The promotion committee will jointly compile a separate list of referees sufficient to obtain the following numbers of outside letters:

- For promotion to Associate Professor, at least six, preferably a minimum of two letters of reference from the candidate’s preferred list and four from the committee’s list.

- For promotion to full Professor, at least eight, preferably a minimum of three letters of reference from the candidate’s preferred list and five from the committee’s list.

Potential referees should be contacted to assure their willingness to take on the task. The promotion committee should then supply this list to the dean. Letters of reference should be from scholars of an equal or higher rank than that to which the applicant is applying. Taking into consideration both their own list and the list provided by the candidate, the committee should also recommend which six (associate) or which eight (full) should be contacted first along with a brief explanation. No more than fifty percent of this recommended list should come from the candidate’s suggestions. Note that not all possible outside referees are equally appropriate: members of the candidate’s dissertation committee should not be included in the referee lists, nor should active collaborators, and no more than two letters should come from previous collaborators or personal acquaintances. At the discretion of the promotion committee, an explanation about the
contribution of the candidate could be sought from collaborators through the dean. Referees should be asked to enclose a copy of their own CV with their letters of evaluation.

To assist the referees in their evaluation, supplemental information on the academic circumstances at AUB, including information on faculty appointment, teaching loads, research resources, and promotion criteria/system at AUB, will be provided to the referees. Copies of the four or five publications designated by the candidates will be sent to each referee who has agreed to provide an outside evaluation. In inviting referees, the dean should emphasize that the contents of the letters and the names of their senders will be kept in strict confidence. It should be clear why a letter is being requested and the rank for which the candidate is being considered. The request may include, but is not limited to the following questions:

- What is your relationship to the candidate, if any?
- What are the most significant contributions of the candidate to the field, in terms of research and service?
- What important contributions has the candidate made in the current promotion cycle and over the course of her/his entire career?
- To what other scholars in the field would you compare the candidate?
- Does the quantity of the candidate’s publications support the case that quality of research is matched by a purposeful trajectory in terms of real and/or potential impact on the field?
- Would you recommend the candidate for continuance/promotion in your own department?

The dean will solicit reference letters according to the lists presented by the promotion committee. The dean’s office will coordinate receipt of reference letters and keep a log of referees, listing the names from both the candidate’s and the committee’s list, indicating who were asked for references, who replied in the affirmative, and who responded in the negative and—in the latter case—the reason given, if any.

The promotion committee should then include in the file:
- Evaluation letters by graduate students, especially advisees, solicited by the promotion committee, if applicable.
- ICE scores for all courses taught during the current promotion cycle, obtained from the dean’s office. Additional teaching assessments, if available, such as peer reviews and records of classroom visitations.
- Enrollment records for courses taught, or statistical data reflecting clinical performance or journal impact information, if applicable.
- Internal letters solicited from AUB faculty in cases where the candidate has been engaged in inter-faculty research and activities.

In cases where the requisite minimum number of letters is not received in time, the dean should inform the candidates and promotion committee to try to identify additional reviewers.

Upon receipt of the referees’ letters, the promotion committee will review the candidate’s complete dossier, including the most recent annual evaluation, and then compose a recommendation, to be signed by all its members. The committee’s recommendation is one of the most critical items in the dossier. It should be a closely argued document of at least 4-5 pages that contains a brief description of the candidate’s recent career as well as the scholarly assessment of it, gleaned from all the documentation received from the candidate, from sources within AUB, and from external referees. The committee members are expected to become intimately familiar with the candidate’s dossier, including published research materials, those that have been accepted for publication, and substantive work in progress, if submitted by the candidate. The committee members should also assess the objectivity and independence of the referee letters. Their memo should include separate sections that evaluate the candidate’s research, teaching, service, and clinical practice, as appropriate, emphasizing the candidate’s professional trajectory and future potential for the home department and faculty. The committee should be sure to explain the basis of its own evaluation of the case. Both positive attributes and negative points should be frankly acknowledged and addressed, and clear arguments should be made regarding the pertinence or relevance of such issues to job performance. It is not necessary to quote at length from the outside referee letters, but only to refer to them.

Note that the recommendation memo should not overly dwell on the quantitative measures of a candidate’s achievement in terms of scoring, impact factors, or number of articles in print: many of these are evident from the documentation assembled and may provide base data from which an assessment can begin. What is needed is a qualitative assessment of the individual and his/her interactions and promise at AUB. The memorandum will recommend approval or rejection of the candidate’s application for promotion without recommending the duration of the contract upon successful promotion. If the promotion committee’s recommendation on an application for full professor is not to promote, the committee may make a second recommendation for extension (three more years at the rank of associate) or termination. If there are disagreements within the committee about a candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, these are preferably addressed in the committee’s report rather than reserved for a minority report. No voting is required at this stage.
All materials other than what the candidate submits, including letters of external referees shall be kept in hard copies in the candidate’s file in the dean’s office, and must not be circulated electronically by email.

The complete confidential file (CV of the candidate, a personal statement of teaching, research, and service; teaching evaluations; referees' responses; copies of all publications; the promotion committee recommendation, and the log of referees) will then be placed in the dean's office for study by department/track members eligible to vote on the case. The members of the promotion committee vote on the promotion case during the departmental promotion meeting. Reading the full dossier by all eligible departmental members is essential to responsible self-governance and conscientious voting. For departments that have an insufficient critical mass of eligible voting faculty members (defined as three members not including the chair), the dean may ask faculty members from closely related fields to participate in the departmental evaluation and vote.

The Department/Track Meeting:

At the call of the chair/convener, the faculty members eligible to vote on the promotion case will convene and, after an affirmative motion is made and seconded, deliberation of the case will follow, and votes will be cast. The Departmental/Track meeting will be attended by a DPM, and the candidate’s file will be available for reference during the meeting. The chair of the department should make every effort to hold the departmental promotion meeting at a time when all eligible voting members who are not on leave can attend. In rare cases, if an eligible member with a valid excuse (approved by the dean) is unable to attend, the member can submit written comments to be read to the voting members of the departmental promotion meeting and included in the minutes. The original letter will become a permanent part of the promotion file.

The Chair’s Report

The chair/convener (unless s/he is a candidate) will communicate the details of the Department/Track meeting, including the vote result and the promotion committee report, along with his/her recommendations on the candidate’s qualifications to the dean in a separate written memorandum, making either a positive or negative recommendation on promotion. The chair’s memorandum provides a description of the faculty deliberation and details of the vote on the candidate’s case, adding whatever candid comments (s)he may wish to make on the candidate’s contributions to the department, including a summary of the mentoring process employed with the candidate. The memorandum is not meant to be a rehash of the case, but a chance for the chair to add a personal perspective of his/her own, ending with an endorsement of the faculty vote, or a rejection of it. The memorandum represents the chair’s vote in the case. A copy of the minutes of the department/track meeting signed by all faculty members who attended the meeting will
be appended to the chair’s/convener’s recommendation. The minutes of the departmental promotion meeting are confidential and must not be circulated electronically.

If the chair/convener is of a rank below that to which the candidate is applying, s/he should still provide to the voting members of the department a report evaluating the candidate’s contribution to the department’s teaching and service activities. In such cases, the chair will not attend the voting meeting; rather, the dean will appoint a chair from among the eligible voting members who will act in lieu of the chair: she/he will not vote but will turn in a separate recommendation.

The Advisory Committee Meeting

Subsequently, the complete confidential file (CV of the candidate; personal statements on teaching, research, and service; a copy of the teaching evaluations; referees’ responses; copies of all publications, the log of referees; the promotion committee report; the recommendation of the chair/convener, and the signed minutes of the department/track meeting) will be placed in the dean's office so that members of the Faculty Advisory Committee can review the file.

The dean will subsequently convene the Faculty Advisory Committee for discussion and voting on each case.

For purposes of promotion, the Advisory Committee of each faculty/school is increased to include three additional voting AUB faculty members in the rank of full Professor, selected from outside the Faculty or School concerned. Additional faculty members to an Advisory Committee cannot serve consecutive years on the same Faculty Advisory Committee. These additional faculty members will participate in the Advisory Committee's evaluation of the candidate's record and take part in the final voting.

A list of these additional faculty members will be drawn up by the provost on an annual basis and will include faculty members from throughout the University who have an excellent record of research and teaching. The criteria for selection will include prominence in research (publication of articles in international peer-reviewed journals and/or books in respected academic presses) and an established record of commitment to teaching.

The dean’s office will keep a log in regard to outside referees. The log should include the promotion committee deliberation explaining the choice of referees, how reviewers were initially contacted (usually via e-mail), copies of the responses from referees (who accepted, and who refused and for what reason), and a copy of the formal request letter explaining AUB’s expectations in the case.
The meeting of the expanded Faculty Advisory Committee will be attended by a DPM from another faculty/school. The DPM should report in writing to the provost any procedural or discrimination irregularities that he/she has witnessed during the deliberations and voting.

The Dean’s Report

The dean then transmits to the provost the complete confidential file (as specified above and including the Faculty Advisory Committee meeting) along with a form containing the substantive assessment of the advisory committee, and the results of the advisory committee vote containing the signatures of the Faculty Advisory Committee members, and her/his observations on the candidate’s qualifications in a separate written memorandum, making either a positive or negative recommendation on promotion. The dean’s letter is a personal assessment, written after consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee, the members of which must become familiar with the candidate’s dossier. In borderline cases the dean may require the committee to obtain additional outside referees’ letters or request such letters after the advisory committee’s deliberations are complete. The memorandum represents the dean’s vote in the case.

The BOD Meeting

The provost will subsequently convene the academic deans to deliberate on all promotion cases, whether positive or negative.

In the discussion of promotion cases, the provost and academic deans are increased to include three additional non-voting AUB faculty members in the rank of full Professor to assist in the evaluation of the candidate's record. Normally, these additional members are selected by the provost from a list of eighteen faculty members, three elected by each Faculty/School's Advisory Committee from among faculty not currently serving on the expanded Faculty Advisory Committees. As above, the criteria for selection will include prominence in research (publication of articles in international peer-reviewed journals and/or books in respected academic presses) and an established record of commitment to teaching. Faculties without an adequate number of eligible full Professors to be elected to this list may submit less than three names or no names to the provost, and no faculty can submit the names of more than three candidates.

The provost will act as moderator for the meeting, and each case will be presented by the dean of the relevant faculty. The presenting dean, after answering any pertinent questions, will subsequently recuse himself/herself from further deliberation in the case. After discussion of each case, the academic deans shall vote on promotion cases, with the exception of the dean presenting the case.
The DPM who has been elected as chair of the DPM Committee will attend the deliberations of the provost and the academic deans. The DPM chair attending this meeting will report to the president any procedural or discrimination irregularities that he/she has witnessed during the deliberations and voting.

The Provost’s Report

The provost will refer the files of all candidates considered by the academic deans to the president, along with his/her own recommendation for or against promotion. The provost will also provide a table that provides the tally of votes taken at all levels, as well as the positive or negative recommendations contained in the letters of the chair/convener and the dean.

The President’s Recommendations

The president will then review all cases for promotion, whether carrying positive or negative recommendations. Those positively endorsed by the president are then referred to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for its own endorsement.

The BOT Decision

The full Board of Trustees will then vote, based on the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee.

In considering promotions to Associate Professor and full Professor, the University – without being bound by any rule of equivalence – may take into account the academic record of the candidates and their service in other institutions.

Successful applicants will be informed by the provost in writing within one month of the Board of Trustees' decision. Each dean will inform all unsuccessful applicants in writing within one month of the Board of Trustees' decision. In their meetings with unsuccessful candidates, deans will verbally communicate only the reasons that the application for promotion was unsuccessful. This meeting may be attended by a DPM upon request of the applicant. Other information, such as the results of votes taken and the contents of evaluation letters, are strictly confidential.
Annex:

Important Notices:

1. A voting faculty member, Dean, or Vice President cannot vote more than once on a specific case of promotion. Normally, voting occurs at the lowest level of procedural deliberation.

2. Chairs of departments/tracks are not voting members in department/track meeting.