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To maintain its status as a distinguished college of education and human development, Peabody College depends upon the contribution of outstanding persons in varied fields. The College is determined to support academic quality and to protect the individual rights of those faculty whose work is representative of this dedication. Further, the College believes that those personnel actions affecting the work and future of these individuals should be based on criteria, standards, and procedures developed and reviewed by colleagues at appropriate levels. These policies and procedural guidelines are outlined in this document.

The Faculty Manual (2003 edition) of Vanderbilt University contains rules and procedures for appointments, renewals, promotions, and tenure. It is authoritative. The guidelines that follow are intended to augment those standards by specifying rules and procedures particular to Peabody College.

I. Titles and Terms of Appointment

A. The titles Instructor and Assistant Professor designate non-tenured positions in the tenure-track, unless specified as non-tenure-track at the time of appointment. Service in these positions is counted as part of the probationary period leading to a review for tenure. Instructors are appointed to a one-year term, renewable once or twice, or in extraordinary circumstances, three times. Assistant Professors are appointed to an initial term of three years. An earned doctorate is required for appointment at the level of Assistant Professor. Those in the process of completing their doctoral work may be appointed as Instructors.

B. The title Associate Professor denotes a tenured position unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment. Initial appointment as Associate Professor is possible; promotion to this rank carries tenure. The title of Professor signifies tenure, unless specifically noted otherwise in the letter of appointment.

C. Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Adjunct (rank) Professor, Visiting (rank) Professor, (rank) Professor of the Practice, Clinical (rank) Professor, and Research (rank) Professor are titles that signify non-tenure-track positions. Academic titles at Vanderbilt University are explained in Part II, Chapter 1, of the Faculty Manual. The term of Lecturer may not exceed one year. Visiting and Adjunct Professor, Senior Lecturer, Clinical Professor, and Professor of Practice positions usually carry a three-year term. The term of a
Research Professor is usually consistent with that of the research project to which the position is tied. These appointments are requested by the Dean upon the advice of the departments and must be approved by the Provost.

II. Initial Appointments

A. Criteria

1. Appointments to tenure-track positions as Instructor or Assistant Professor assume academic competence and achievement at the level described for the position.

2. Appointments to a tenured position require that the candidate meet those conditions as set forth in Section III.B of this document.

3. Persons appointed to non-tenured multiple-year positions of senior Lecturer or (rank) Professor of the Practice must have a distinguished record of achievement in their fields of expertise and must demonstrate a capacity for teaching at a high level of effectiveness. Those appointed must be recognized for their performance by intramural and extramural peers.

4. Appointments to the rank of Lecturer may be made under the criteria in II.A.3 above with the following exceptions. The appointee may be completing his or her doctoral studies and recognition of achievements may be limited to intramural peers.

5. Appointees to the rank of Research (rank) Professor are expected to have attained recognition for scholarly investigation. Excellence in systematic analysis or creative expression is expected.

B. Recruitment

1. Authorization to fill full-time tenure-track positions or those with rank of Lecturer or (rank) Professor of the Practice must be granted by the Dean with the prior approval of the Provost.

2. Recruitment for tenure-track and non-tenure-track multiple-year appointments requires a search committee appointed by the Dean in consultation with relevant department chair(s) and principal investigator(s). Affirmative action goals are central to the deliberations in any recruitment effort.

3. A change to tenure-track status for a currently employed non-tenure-track faculty member also requires a full national search in which the currently employed faculty member will be a candidate.

C. Search Committees
1. Proposals for a faculty position are initiated by the department in which that appointment would be housed. Authorization for a search must be granted by the Dean before a search committee is formed. Search committees for faculty positions are appointed by the Dean in consultation with the appropriate department chair and, in the case of Research titles, the principal investigator involved. This committee usually includes a person from outside the department making the appointment. Each committee must include a person who acts as liaison to the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity.

2. The committee is charged with identifying qualified candidates by means of a national search that may include advertisement in appropriate publications, personal contacts, review of vitae and publications of candidates, and recommendations of knowledgeable persons at other institutions. A visit by the candidate is normally required prior to appointment.

D. Search Procedure

1. A candidate file compiled by the search committee must include (a) the candidate’s curriculum vitae, (b) the summarized recommendation of the committee, (c) at least three letters of reference from persons approved by the Dean (the number is increased to six to support a candidate being considered for a tenured position), and (d) appropriate evidence of teaching ability.

2. The search committee forwards to the chair of the department (a) the files of those identified as the top three candidates, (b) the files of the highest ranking female and highest ranking minority candidate, and (c) its recommendation.

3. The chair of the department reviews the committee report, adds her or his recommendation, and transmits both recommendations together with the files noted in II.D.2 above to the Dean.

4. The Dean decides whether to accept the recommendations as presented. Invitations to candidates to visit the campus may be extended only upon authorization of the Dean.

E. Position Offers

1. Following the visits of all invited candidates, the chair of the search committee will forward to the department chair its recommendation. The chair will bring the recommendation to the departmental faculty, who then vote.

2. Tenure-track and tenured positions
   a. Approval by a simple majority of the voting faculty (see section VI, below) is required to recommend appointment to the Dean.
b. Offers of tenured positions require one or more additional votes in which a majority of the tenured departmental faculty ranked at or above that of the proposed appointment must approve such an offer (see page 60 of the 2003 Faculty Manual). For example, appointment at the rank of professor requires a vote of all tenured departmental faculty followed by a vote of the department's tenured professors.

3. Non-tenure-track positions

   a. Approval by a simple majority of the voting faculty (see section VI, below) is required.

   b. Offers of positions above the assistant rank require one or more additional votes in which a majority of faculty (including clinical/practice, research, and tenure-track titles) ranked at or above that of the proposed appointment must approve such an offer.

4. The recommendation of the department is reported by the chair to the Dean. If the recommendation is accepted by the Dean, the candidate’s file and recommendation are forwarded to the provost. With the approval of the provost, an appointment is executed with appropriate terms. All tenure appointments must be approved by the Board of Trust.

5. Non-tenured faculty at the level of lecturer, or other single-year appointments, may be recommended to the Dean by the department chair.

6. Persons appointed to non-tenure-track positions supported by external funds must be acceptable to the principal investigator involved, who also will approve the individual's designated duties.

III. Tenure and Promotion Procedures

A. Timing of Reappointment and Review

   1. The pretenure appointments of a tenure-track Assistant Professor generally consist of an initial three-year appointment, a two-year appointment, and a second three-year appointment, with reviews following the schedule noted below:

      a. A departmental review conducted in the second year of service will result in a positive or negative recommendation for a two-year extension of the initial three-year appointment.

      b. In the fourth year of service, a second review using appropriate criteria (see Section III.B) will be conducted and lead to a positive or negative recommendation for a second three-year appointment.
c. In regard to each of the above reviews, the *Faculty Manual* (2003, p. 46) specifies that "Tenure-track faculty members should be recommended for reappointment only if their performance provides a reasonable basis on which to project continued progress that could ultimately enable them to qualify for tenure. The evidence needed becomes more weighty with continued time in rank. Some degree of evidence is needed at each renewal period."

d. A complete tenure review will be undertaken for assistant professors no later than the seventh year of service unless an extension of the probationary period has been granted by the Provost.

e. In the event that tenure is not granted, the candidate will have one year remaining in his or her second three-year appointment.

2. Any deviation from the standard appointment and review sequence described above must be clarified in the original letter of appointment (see *Faculty Manual*, 2003, pp. 51-52).

3. Review for promotion and tenure may occur early at the request of the candidate. This is advisable only when the candidate's *curriculum vitae* is exceptionally strong.

4. The department chair should begin to assemble tenure dossiers for those eligible for tenure prior to the seventh (or tenure review) year and should initiate procedures leading to appropriate evaluation (see section III.C) of the candidate in the penultimate year.

B. Criteria for Appointment to a Tenured Position and for Promotion with Tenure

1. Tenure appointments at Peabody College require a high level of effectiveness in teaching and excellence in scholarship so as to gain favorable recognition in one’s field or discipline at a national level. Appropriate service to the University, the faculty member’s field or discipline, and the larger professional community also are expected.

2. While it is expected that the faculty of Peabody College will be involved in varying scholarly activities that produce different products, those products are evaluated by a set of common criteria to establish whether the candidate’s scholarship embodies: (a) substantive contribution to new knowledge that may include contributions to theory, practice, and the development of analytical methods; (b) creative interpretation and use of ideas; (c) appropriate and logical rigor or methodology that is consistent with best practices in the conduct of research; (d) logical scope and progression of scholarship with a well-defined and sustained program of research; (e) integrity; and (f) importance as determined by professional peers. These products must be public; that is, scholarship represents intellectual and creative work that is reviewed and validated by peers. Standards of rigor, originality, and importance may vary from
one field to another and are interpreted in the context of the candidate’s field or discipline; however, in each case, Vanderbilt expects the level of quality and achievement to be equivalent to that required for tenure in leading departments of other major research universities.

3. The dissemination of knowledge through effective teaching has many manifestations, including classroom instruction and a broad range of faculty-student relationships, especially the faculty role of undergraduate advisor. An evaluation of each candidate’s instructional activities will establish that (a) the candidate’s courses are developed according to appropriate teaching goals, theory, and methodology; (b) the content of the candidate’s courses reflects current knowledge and practice of the field; (c) the candidate’s students gained and/or demonstrated use of appropriate and/or relevant knowledge, skills, abilities, and/or attitudes about the particular field of study; (d) the candidate has earned respect from students for honesty, integrity and the ability to facilitate learning and convey knowledge; and (e) the candidate has been attentive to and respectful of the individual needs of students with regard to intellectual development. Other evidence of effective teaching also can be provided, e.g., colleague or peer review and recognition of colleagues in the profession through invitations to conduct classes, inservice workshops, or seminars.

4. Tenure-track faculty members have an obligation to make contributions to the intellectual climate of Peabody College and the University as a whole. In addition, administrative activities of a more general nature are important to the overall functioning of the College and the University and are expected of all faculty members, including those in untenured positions. Service of this type may include, but is not limited to: (a) undertaking to review and comment on manuscripts of colleagues and advanced students (including extraordinary service on student committees); (b) organizing seminars, conferences, or workshops; (c) assuming leadership roles in curriculum or program development or in academic personnel recruitment; (d) engaging in activities inside and outside the University which have major impact upon policy decisions affecting the fields of education and human development; (e) assuming leadership roles of professional stature; (f) engaging in consultation activities that enhance one’s professional status and make significant contributions to the field; (g) participating on review panels for granting agencies or accrediting agencies; (h) serving on editorial boards and as reviewers for refereed journals; and (i) presenting papers at professional meetings or before other audiences.

C. Tenure Review Process

1. Tenure dossier — The tenure dossier must contain an inclusive curriculum vitae, references from external peers, and sufficient documentation to support the criteria for scholarship, teaching and service as outlined above. A summary of the contents of the tenure dossier recommended by CAPT, the Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (1997) has been supplied to each department and is available from the Associate Dean for Faculty and Programs.
a. The **candidate** is responsible for providing the departmental review committee with all documentation to give an accurate perspective on his/her activities both within and outside of the College community. Such materials should include:

1. **Published scholarly writing.** Publications should meet at least the criteria a through e listed in section III.B.2. Evidence of the significance of this work could be provided in such materials as a statement of the reputation of the publications, a summary of peer evaluations, a summary of citations, and indication of the number of adoptions in the case of textbooks, and/or copies of invitations requesting the candidate to write or present this work at seminars or conferences. In the event of multiple authorship, evidence should be presented that clarifies the candidate’s contributions.

   Published scholarship that appears in academic journals, books, book chapters, government publications, and/or journals aimed at practitioners will be considered in assessing a person’s contributions to knowledge. The content of the publication (see section III.B for evaluation standards), as well as the type of publication, should be the basis for assessing qualifications for tenure and promotion.

2. **A research plan that indicates the candidate’s past, current and future scholarly goals and the methods used to accomplish these goals.** The candidate can include unpublished manuscripts and work in progress as well as projected products. The evidence of the impact of this plan can be judged according to its relevance to, and continuance of, the candidate’s current research program.

3. **When preparing materials to document excellence in teaching,** the candidate presents evidence of the special quality of his or her teaching. Since the judgment of teaching quality must be context dependent, it is the responsibility of the candidate to highlight the areas (e.g., classroom teaching, student supervision) where he/she determines the best performance is obtained. Evidence is not limited to, but should include, information, if appropriate, about the following activities:

   a. **Classroom instruction,** with descriptive information that indicates the number of courses taught and their enrollments, the type (e.g., seminars, practica, large classes) and level of courses taught, any student evaluations, and, when available, colleague observations.

   b. **Learning and accomplishments of students** (e.g., conduct of research, implementation of school curriculum, publications) as evidenced through the candidate’s self-report, student projects, reports and/or publications, and testimonials from past students.
(c) Research guidance, with statements that identify the nature of the candidate’s interaction with and support for students completing advanced degrees. The candidate could indicate how he/she has supported the student’s research or training projects and dissertation research. Examples of students’ scholarly writing that have received professional recognition should be reported. Opinion statements from students and colleagues can be submitted to document the candidate’s contributions.

(d) Instructional improvement and innovations, as evidenced by textbooks or other publication or software, that are used to aid instruction, course materials and grants to support instruction. Self-reports and student evaluations, in addition to peer review, can be included to support evidence of the candidate’s contributions.

(e) Student advising, with statements that indicate how the candidate has assisted students in achieving educational goals and counseled students to be responsible members of the University and their chosen profession.

(4) A written statement is submitted by the candidate to indicate how a high level of effectiveness has been achieved within the candidate’s designated instructional responsibilities. The committee also should summarize and draw conclusions with regard to the quality of the candidate’s teaching.

b. The departmental review committee is responsible for adding to this file at least six letters from referees external to the University. Three letters are solicited from a list of referees proposed by the candidate. The remaining letters are solicited from a list of external reviewers selected by the committee and approved by the Dean. The referees should be selected not only on the basis of their credentials (generally, full professors from top-25 universities), but also because their reviews would be expected to be unbiased. The referees should have no professional or personal interest in the candidate's promotion or tenure, as might be expected of a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-investigator on a grant, co-author, classmate, former colleague, etc. Relationships between the candidate and any of the referees should be indicated in the biographical descriptions of the referees included in the candidate's dossier.

(1) Letters from external reviewers are requested by the department chair and/or the department review committee chair. Names of the final panel of reviewers and the letters submitted by the reviewers are not available to the candidate during either the Vanderbilt review or appeal process, absent any legal proceedings. Letters should contain evaluative information consistent with section III.B of this document and the Faculty Manual.

(2) External reviewers are to be informed of (a) the departmental procedure used to select reviewers, (b) the departmental policy of no access by the candidate,
(c) the departmental policy of access limitation to those College and University members involved in the actual review process.

2. Evaluation Responsibilities — Evaluation of each candidate’s professional qualifications for tenure occurs sequentially at four levels: the candidate’s department of primary appointment; the Dean of Peabody College, who is advised by the Peabody College Committee on Tenure and Promotion; the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee; and the Provost of the University. Procedures for review at University-wide levels are spelled out in the Faculty Manual.

a. Department-Level Review

(1) A department review committee will be formed by the chair with the advice of his/her faculty and in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty and Programs. In cases where the candidate’s teaching and/or research transcends the department of primary appointment, one or more persons from other departments will be asked to serve on the review committee.

(2) Unsolicited letters from faculty members outside the department or school will be included in the candidate’s file only if they are provided to the department chair for review by the tenured faculty prior to the vote.

(3) The review committee brings together the evidence and submits a report to the tenured faculty.

(4) After all members of the department who are eligible to vote on the matter (see section VI) have had the opportunity to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the candidate’s file, a meeting of the eligible faculty is held and a vote taken. A positive recommendation by an absolute majority of those eligible to vote is required for an affirmative decision.

(5) By the end of the second business day after the vote, any faculty member eligible to vote may write a letter to the department chair for inclusion in the candidate’s file expressing his or her views on the deliberations by the faculty. These letters are made available to all faculty who are eligible to vote.

(6) The department must prepare minutes or a summary of the faculty deliberations that will be added to the candidate’s file, after first being circulated to the voting members of the faculty. Any faculty member who believes that the minutes or summary does not fairly reflect the deliberations at the meeting may submit a letter to the department chair before the end of the second working day after distribution of the minutes or summary. All such letters will be made available for review by the faculty eligible to vote and will be included in the candidate’s file.
(7) The department chair writes a letter of transmittal that reports his or her views of the full range of faculty deliberations, including the vote (see section VI). Within ten business days of the vote, the department chair’s letter and the candidate’s file are forwarded to the Dean, who shares them with the Peabody College Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

(8) In the event of a negative decision, the candidate must be notified in writing in a timely manner, ordinarily within one business day. The candidate may then submit a statement for inclusion in the file to be transmitted to the Dean.

b. College-Level Review

(1) The College Committee on Tenure and Promotion serves in an advisory role to the Dean. It has the responsibility for assuring that the preparation, process, and substance of any tenure review are carried out within the guidelines of the College.

(2) The College committee consists of at least five tenured faculty whose primary appointments are within Peabody College. Membership of the committee represents each Peabody department and, as much as possible, is equally distributed across all departments. Any member of a candidate's department must recuse him- or herself from the discussion and vote on that particular case.

(3) The committee members are appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. The committee elects its own chairperson. Appointment to the committee is for two-year staggered terms.

(4) The committee is available to offer advice with respect to procedure and general standards in response to requests from departments prior to the initiation of the review process.

(a) Initially, at least two committee members (one as primary, the other as secondary reviewer) evaluate the departmental process by reviewing materials that are sent forward from the department and present an oral summary of the department’s review process to the full committee and the Dean.

[1] In an effort to apply uniform procedures and criteria, the committee votes to endorse the process or indicates problems with the process and recommends changes to extend the department’s prior review.

[2] If the department, upon request by the committee, can supply additional information to rectify any problems that arose during the review process, the committee considers that information.
(b) Secondly, the committee members evaluate the candidate’s documentation materials and present a complete summary of these materials to the full committee and the Dean. The committee votes either to endorse or not to endorse the candidate for tenure or promotion. The voting results and an explanation for the recommendation are shared by the Dean with the department and candidate. Written notification is not required.

(c) A former member of the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure may be selected by the candidate early in the process as an advisor in order to guide the preparation of materials for the review.

(d) At any time prior to the initiation of the departmental review process, the candidate’s advisor and/or candidate’s department may choose to consult with the College review committee.

(e) At any time during the review process, the candidate may choose to withdraw his or her name from consideration.

c. The Dean’s Review

(1) Upon receipt of a negative departmental recommendation, the Dean may either accept the department’s decision or return it to the department for reconsideration. When the department either reaffirms or changes its recommendation, the Dean may decide, after consulting with the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure, to accept a negative decision or recommend the candidate to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

If the department’s recommendation is positive, the Dean will consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Following such consultation, the Dean may recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure, or may decline to do so. If the Dean decides to recommend promotion or tenure, the Dean will prepare a letter to accompany the file explaining the reasons for the recommendation. This letter will be available to, but not copied to, members of the College Committee.

Should the Dean decide not to endorse the positive recommendation of the department, the department may appeal the Dean’s decision. This appeal requires an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the faculty members eligible to vote on promotion or tenure.

(2) When tenure is recommended by the Dean, the Provost’s Promotion and Tenure Review Committee will evaluate the recommendation on the basis of the recommendation’s consistency with the statement of standards and procedures of Peabody College and with the Faculty Manual.
(3) The award of tenure requires a positive recommendation from the Provost’s Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. (For additional appeal procedures and for grievance procedures see *Faculty Manual*, 2003, pp. 58-59 and 132-135.)

D. Promotion to Full Professor

1. Promotion to the rank of full Professor at Peabody College of Vanderbilt University requires excellence in scholarship, teaching at a consistently high level of effectiveness, and satisfactory performance in service. While the scholarship standards that are described in Section III.B are used as minimum guides to evaluate the contributions of each candidate for promotion, the work that is evaluated for the scholarship criterion should be more completely developed than the work reviewed for tenure decisions. Consistent with University guidelines, the evidence of excellence in scholarship should indicate clearly that the candidate’s research program is well-directed and recognized at a national or international level.

2. The procedures for promotion to full Professor are the same as those for awarding tenure, except that only tenured full professors will vote on the departmental recommendation to be transmitted to the Dean.

IV. Promotion and Reappointment of Non-tenure Track Faculty

A. Timing of Reappointment and Review

1. Non-tenured faculty who have renewable one-year appointments will be notified of renewal or non-renewal prior to March 1: absent such notification, the appointment is terminated. Those with appointments exceeding one year will be notified of non-renewal prior to June 1 of their penultimate year.

2. Review of non-tenured faculty with multi-year appointments will occur in the spring of the penultimate year of appointment. Review for contract renewal or promotion for those with one-year appointments will be at the discretion of the chair of the department but will be no less often than every three years. Reviews normally will be completed by February 1. Unless there are grounds for disciplinary action (*Faculty Manual*, Part IV, Chapter 1), no faculty member with a multi-year appointment can be terminated at the end of his or her review year. Departmental review is a prerequisite for promotion of non-tenured faculty.

3. In the event that the external grant funding for a research (Assistant, Associate) Professor position ends, and other research funding is not available, this individual may be recommended for reappointment in the position, at the discretion of the chair of the department, department faculty, and Dean for a period of no longer than a calendar year, in anticipation of return to research activities when funding becomes available.
B. Criteria for Renewal and Promotion

1. The performance of persons with Professor of the Practice and Lecturer titles will be evaluated by criteria consistent with standards outlined at the time of hire. These factors may include, but are not limited to, (a) instruction and student advisement, (b) program development, and (c) contributions to the field.

Specific weighting of factors will be indicated at the time of appointment, and appointees will be advised if changes are made in the criteria of the approximate weights given them during the term of appointment.

2. Persons holding Research titles are expected to conduct research and publish at the same levels of excellence as are persons at equivalent stages of appointment and rank on the tenure track. Performance of Research Professors in non-research roles may be considered in evaluating performance, but significant responsibilities other than research should be approved by the Associate Dean for Faculty and Programs prior to the review of the individual’s performance. Reappointments will be based on the candidate’s performance as a researcher and, when appropriate, satisfactory performance in his/her negotiated non-research role(s). Criteria for promotion follow the same guidelines as those for tenured faculty, including documentation of accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service (see section III.B).

C. Review Process

1. Non-tenure-track faculty whose primary assignment is departmentally based will be reviewed by a faculty committee appointed by the department chair in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty and Programs. In such cases where the primary assignment is to a center, the appointment of the review committee will require consultation with the center director and/or principal investigator, as appropriate.

2. The review committee evaluating performance of non-tenure-track faculty will solicit information (see criteria in section III.B.2) from the candidate, his/her peers, and departmental documentation giving evidence of effective teaching, creative expression, and research productivity consistent with standards for the position and the relative importance of factors as communicated to the candidate in writing at the time of his/her appointment by the department chair, center director or principal investigator, and/or the Dean.

3. The review committee evaluating performance of a non-tenure-track faculty member for promotion will solicit, in addition to the above, at least six letters of reference from persons external to the University. Three letters will be solicited from a list of reviewers nominated by the candidate and approved by the Dean. The remaining letters will be solicited from a list of external reviewers nominated by the committee and approved by the Dean. The reviewers should be selected not only on the basis of their credentials (generally, full professors from top-25 universities) but also because their reviews would be expected to be unbiased. The reviewers should have no
professional or personal interest in the outcome of the evaluation, as might be expected of a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-investigator on a grant, co-author, classmate, former colleague, etc. Relationships between the candidate and any of the reviewers should be indicated in the biographical descriptions of the reviewers included in the candidate's dossier.

The evaluation procedure for the promotion of (Assistant, Associate) Professors of the Practice whose responsibilities are exclusively intra-college (e.g., teaching, advising, program development) and which provide no opportunities for external persons to observe or to evaluate the professor’s work, need not include external evaluators.

4. When external and internal reviewers are used, the confidentiality of the reviewers will be protected in so far as legally possible. The final list of the panel of reviewers who have submitted letters will not be available to the candidate. If the review report is to be shown to the faculty member under review, the report will not include references to names of external or internal reviewers.

5. The recommendations of the review committee are voted upon by faculty in the department in which the person is appointed (see Section VI).

6. The committee report, including a brief biographical sketch of each reviewer, the department vote, the recommendation of the department chair and, where appropriate, the principal investigator, are forwarded to the Dean.

V. Notification

A. Recommendations from departmental review committees, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean will be in writing, though these recommendations will not necessarily be available to the candidate.

B. Approval or denial of promotion to a tenured position is communicated to the Provost by the Provost’s Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

C. In the event of a negative decision on tenure by the faculty of a department, the candidate must be notified in writing of the decision in a timely manner, ordinarily within one business day. The candidate may then submit a statement for inclusion in the tenure dossier, which is transmitted to the Dean, ordinarily within ten business days of the department's decision. The Dean may (a) accept the negative faculty decision, thereby ending the matter, or (b) return it to the faculty for reconsideration. If the original negative decision is reaffirmed by the faculty, the Dean, if he or she favors tenure, may send a positive recommendation to the Provost’s Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. If this committee acts favorably, its recommendation is sent to the Provost. A negative decision by the Provost’s Promotion and Tenure Review Committee terminates consideration unless the Dean appeals to the Provost.
D. In the event of a negative departmental decision on reappointment or promotion of a non-tenure-track faculty member, the chair of the department will inform the candidate in writing of the department’s decision. In each case of renewal or promotion, the Dean will communicate the final disposition of the matter in writing to the department and the faculty member.

E. If requested by the candidate, subsequent to the final decision, the department chair will transmit to the candidate a written statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate as judged by the department.

VI. Voting

A. Except with restrictions as noted below, voting members of the Peabody College Faculty are those persons holding at least half-time appointments in Peabody College with the titles of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor; Instructor in the Practice, Assistant Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and Professor of the Practice; Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor; Research Instructor; Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor; and Senior Lecturer; but without the prefixes Adjoint, Adjunct, or Visiting. A simple majority prevails.

B. Restrictions

1. Except for the initial vote on position offers (see sections II.E.2.a and II.E.3.a), eligibility to vote is defined as at or above the rank that is the subject of the vote.

2. Eligibility to vote on decisions to create tenure-track positions is restricted to tenured faculty.

3. Because there is no equivalent rank, senior lecturers are eligible to participate only in the initial vote on position offers.