

Capital College

Guidelines and Criteria for Promotion for Full-Time Non-Tenure Line Faculty

Preamble

In support of its mission, Capital College, hereafter referred to as Penn State Harrisburg, shares the knowledge and expertise of its faculty with the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the nation, and the world.

The purpose of this document is to establish criteria for the promotion of non-tenure line faculty (i.e., Teaching, Research, Clinical) at Penn State Harrisburg. These criteria are intended to supplement Policy AC21 – Definition of Academic Ranks.

Constituting a Committee

The majority of the College Non-Tenure Line Faculty Promotion Committee members are elected by the non-tenure line faculty. The Chancellor then appoints 1-3 faculty members to ensure a balance across disciplines and appropriate rank needed for the review process. The Chancellor utilizes the 1-3 appointed faculty members to enhance the diversity of the Non-Tenure Line Faculty Promotion Committee as well. If there is an insufficient number of appropriately ranked faculty, then non-tenure line faculty from academic units outside Penn State Harrisburg will be appointed. In keeping with the AC21 policy, the College non-tenure line Committee will be populated first. Then, Schools will proceed to populate their committees. In all cases, we will strive to balance membership on all committees between disciplines, ranks, and by diversity.

In case elected member(s) of the Committee do/does not complete their term, a special college-wide election is held to select a replacement from a slate of candidates nominated by the non-tenure line faculty of the College to complete the original member's term. The replacements are selected to ensure that all schools are represented on the committee, and the above-mentioned distribution pertaining to faculty representation is maintained.

Committee members may be recused only when there is a legitimate conflict of interest, such as a relative being considered for promotion or tenure. Conflicts of interest are to be declared in advance of discussion about a candidate. If there is a recusal, the reason might be noted in the evaluative statement. A committee member who is recused shall not be present for the discussion and the vote.

Faculty members on leave of absence are prohibited from participating in non-tenure line promotion committees.

I. Terms

- A. Non-tenure line faculty – all full-time (standing and fixed-term) faculty who are not tenured or on the tenure-track.
- B. Terminal degrees – all doctoral level degrees or equivalent as determined by the discipline.

II. Definition of Academic Ranks

Faculty members with non-tenure line appointments may possess a master's degree, a doctoral or another advanced degree, depending upon assignment and rank. Required educational qualifications should be determined by the individual schools in consultation with the Chancellor's/Dean's Office.

At the time of appointment, a) faculty with terminal degrees in a field relevant to their teaching assignments should be given the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor for teaching faculty or Assistant Research Professor for research faculty and Assistant Clinical Professor for clinical faculty b) faculty with non-terminal degrees should be given the rank of Lecturer, Researcher, or Clinical Lecturer, respectively.

Ranks for Non-Tenure Line Teaching/Clinical Faculty

- A. Faculty with terminal degrees:
 - . Assistant Teaching/Clinical Professor – should possess a terminal degree in an academic field related to their specialization.
 - . Associate Teaching/Clinical Professor – should possess a terminal degree in an academic field related to their specialization; must have exceptional ability as a teacher or clinician (and advisor for teaching faculty); and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter.
 - . Teaching/Clinical Professor – should possess a terminal degree in an academic field related to their specialization; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a teacher or clinician (and advisor for teaching faculty); and must have shown evidence of professional growth, scholarship, and/or mastery of subject matter at a level of distinction beyond that of an associate teaching/clinical professor.
- B. Faculty with non-terminal degrees:
 - . Lecturer/Clinical Lecturer – This title should be applied when faculty are hired without a terminal degree, where a terminal degree is

possible; or where faculty possess a terminal degree in a field other than that which they were hired.

- . Lecturers/Clinical Lecturers can advance in ranks to Assistant Teaching/Clinical Professor and Associate Teaching/Clinical Professor.

Ranks for Non-Tenure Line Research Faculty

A. Faculty with terminal degrees:

1. Assistant Research Professor - The assistant research professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to their research; must have demonstrated ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in their discipline.
2. Associate Research Professor - An associate research professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to their research; must have demonstrated ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in their discipline at a level of distinction beyond that of the assistant research professor.
3. Research Professor - A research professor should possess a terminal degree or its equivalent in an academic field related to their research; must have demonstrated exceptional ability as a researcher; and must have shown evidence of professional growth and scholarship in their discipline at a level of distinction beyond that of associate research professor.

B. Faculty with non-terminal degrees:

1. Researcher - The researcher should possess a master's degree or its equivalent, or be an active candidate for a terminal degree, in an academic field related to their research.
2. Researchers can advance in ranks to Assistant Research Professor and Associate Research Professor.

III. Career Progression

For Teaching/Clinical Faculty:

A. With terminal degree

- . Assistant Teaching/Clinical Professor
- . Associate Teaching/Clinical Professor

- . Teaching/Clinical Professor
- B. Without terminal degree, first level is a Lecturer/Clinical Lecturer
 - . Lecturer/Clinical Lecturer
 - . Assistant Teaching/Clinical Professor
 - . Associate Teaching/Clinical Professor

For Research Faculty

- A. With terminal degree
 - . Assistant Research Professor
 - . Associate Research Professor
 - . Research Professor
- B. Without terminal degree, first level is a Researcher
 - . Researcher
 - . Assistant Research Professor
 - . Associate Research Professor

IV. General Criteria

Because non-tenure line faculty members have specific assignments, it is important that appointments and promotion decisions are based on the performance of each candidate relative to their specific duties and responsibilities. However, there should also be consistency in performance expectations for such faculty members, as there is for faculty members on tenure-line appointments. Expectations should be determined and enforced by the individual school.

The same general principles as those used for tenure-line or tenured faculty shall be used for evaluating qualifications for appointment and promotion of non-tenure line faculty members. These will pertain to the specific duties and responsibilities that have been assigned and will include the following:

- A. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; (may not apply to research faculty)
- B. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishment; and
- C. The Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and Profession.

V. Appointment in the Ranks

- A. All appointments will be made by the hiring school director after consultation with the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) and upon approval of the dean.
- B. Candidates must meet the minimum criteria for rank as defined in University Policy AC21.
- C. Supporting documentation should include an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae (CV) with biographical data, education and prior appointments, publications, a personal

statement describing teaching and/or research accomplishments, relevant data pertaining to service/outreach.

- D. The initial non-tenure line appointment will be for one-year. Appointment to a multi-year fixed-term position shall be considered when there is evidence of successful prior performance, hiring at a higher than entry-level rank, or specific needs of the discipline.

VI. Criteria for Promotion

The same general principles as those used for tenure-track or tenured faculty shall be used for evaluating qualifications for appointment and promotion of non-tenure line faculty members. These will pertain to the specific duties and responsibilities that have been assigned and will include one or more of the following, as defined in section II of University Policy AC 23, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations:

- A. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (may not apply to research faculty);
- B. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishment; and
- C. The Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and Profession.

The performance of the candidate for non-tenure line faculty promotion must consistently demonstrate, as appropriate within one's professional assignment pertain to the specific duties and responsibilities in teaching, research and scholarship and service as appropriate to each category of non-tenure line faculty:

1. **Excellence in teaching and teaching-related activities:** For non-tenure line teaching faculty this is the most important category of the evaluation and should be weighted higher than research, service or professional development. Evidence of demonstrated excellence in teaching should include, but is not limited to, student evaluations and written student comments, peer evaluations, and other documentation of participation in curriculum support activities beyond teaching. Clinical faculty performance in this area will be similar but commensurate with the involvement and type of instruction and advising associated with the position.
 - a. *Student evaluations and written comments* – cumulative data should be evaluated that include not only student quantitative evaluation results, but also specific student comments. This data will be in the same format as is currently available for the tenure-line faculty promotion and tenure process.

Review of Student Feedback

The following outlines how the review of student feedback will be incorporated into each candidate's dossier. The goal of this approach is to provide a holistic review of the SEEQ/SRTE student feedback that minimizes bias. This review of student feedback will replace the current summary of quantitative and qualitative student feedback on teaching effectiveness in formal promotion and/or tenure review materials.

- Each School at the first level of review will identify a minimum of two individuals to serve as student feedback reviewers consistent with the criteria below:
 - At least one individual selected from a list of two or more Penn State faculty members nominated by the candidate
 - One member selected from the School promotion review committee at the first level

The reviewers are charged with

- Examining student feedback from available courses for the period from a candidate's last formal review and/or covered by the review (whichever is the shortest)
- Writing a one-page single-spaced report (no more than 750 words) describing insights about the candidate's teaching effectiveness derived from quantitative and qualitative Student Feedback Survey responses across the courses taught during the review period
- Incorporating, as applicable, the elements of teaching such as effective course design, effective instruction, inclusive and ethical pedagogy, reflective and evolving practice
 - NOTE: Reviewers are advised to consult with the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Effectiveness for guidance for how to interpret student feedback
- The report will be sent to the respective School Director and will be included in the dossier or promotion materials reviewed by the candidate. If a candidate perceives that the report inadequately represents teaching effectiveness based on student feedback, candidates may revise their narratives to address the perceived discrepancy.
- Student Feedback Survey scores will be included in an appendix to the dossier. The delivery mode of the course and the distribution, mode, and median for the Student Feedback Survey items will be provided for each course.
- All candidates have the option of including raw data student feedback from the Student Feedback Surveys in their supplemental materials.
- As long as the principles articulated here are adhered to, academic units are free to incorporate this work into existing structures, such as teaching review committees.

b. *Peer evaluations – according to each school's Peer Review Guidelines*

- c. *Teaching-related activities – candidates are encouraged to provide evidence of participation in curriculum or teaching support activities that go beyond simply teaching assigned classes and labs. These activities may include (but are not limited to) course development or revision, course hybridization (developing part of the course for online delivery), course coordination, etc.*

Academic advising -- There must be evidence of accessibility and responsiveness to students that goes beyond merely meeting with assigned advisees. Candidates are encouraged to provide evidence of the quality of advising regarding program curriculum, career guidance, and assisting students to navigate the University's support infrastructure. There may be documented evidence to support the improvement of advising skills, such as leading or participating in advising workshops, webinars, or related professional development activities. The candidate for promotion to third level (i.e., to Associate level for a candidate initially employed at a Lecturer/Researcher level and to the Professor level for a candidate holding a terminal degree and hired at the Assistant level) is expected to have demonstrated performance at a level of distinction above that expected at the second level as suggested by the following:

- a. Sustained excellence in teaching at all levels, including undergraduate and/or graduate, relevant to the faculty member's teaching assignments. (primarily applicable for teaching and clinical faculty)
- b. High quality and sustained mentorship through supervision of student projects, scholarly paper/project/thesis advising, and career/internship guidance.
- c. Leadership in curricular development (primarily applicable for teaching faculty).
- d. Utilization of innovative teaching techniques that enhance pedagogy. (primarily applicable for teaching and clinical faculty)

In providing evidence of activities in any of the above areas, the candidate should explain the impact of their activities. For example, if course coordination is used as evidence, the candidate should briefly describe the specific responsibilities and accomplishments over an appropriate period of time.

- . **Excellence in research and scholarship:** Candidates for promotion must demonstrate an ability to stay abreast of their academic discipline and/or pedagogical scholarship through regular, active participation in professional development activities. These can be documented through a variety of scholarly activities such as those presented by the faculty member in the Annual Evaluation for Faculty Performance. For all non-tenure line faculty, they may include (but are not limited to):

- a. Publication in refereed publications (journals, proceedings, books, technical reports, etc.)
 - b. Scholarly activities that support teaching and learning, such as pedagogical research,
 - c. Active participation in scholarly research, including presentations, and leadership roles in professional workshops or seminars,
 - d. Creative work and accomplishments, including patents, inventions, grants, entrepreneurship, and other intellectual property.
 - e. Application of research to their field of expertise to improve practices,
 - f. Achieving and maintaining professional certification
 - g. Appointments to the graduate faculty for those programs with graduate degree(s) and serving on graduate student committees.
 - h. Pursuit of competitive external funding (required **for research faculty**)
- . **Excellence in service:** Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service requirements and opportunities for non-tenure line faculty are similar to those of tenure-track faculty. Service can be evidenced demonstrated in many ways, including (but not limited to):
- a. Participation in committees at the program, school, college, or university level
 - b. Participation in faculty governance at the college or university level
 - c. Part-time administrative assignments within the program, school, or college
 - d. Curriculum assessment activities (for teaching and clinical faculty)
 - e. Activities to support program accreditation
 - f. Judging at university-sponsored student competitions
 - g. Service to student clubs and athletics.
 - h. Service Leadership roles and service within professional societies (not mere membership)
 - i. Coordination and/or delivery of faculty seminars

- j. Community, regional or national service that brings value to the University and is representative of the University's mission and values.

Candidates for promotion to third level are expected to have demonstrated performance at a level of distinction above that expected at the second level as suggested by the following: Excellence in several areas of engaged research and scholarship some of which are noted above; Recognition both within Penn State and externally as a subject matter expert. In providing evidence of activities in all three areas, the candidate should explain the impact of each activity on the institution. Research faculty must demonstrate the level of publication and external funding that is significant in their rank and discipline.

VII. Promotion Review

- A. As stated in AC 21, positions above the first rank are designed to be promotion opportunities. Non-tenure-line faculty become eligible for promotion to the second rank after five years in rank. Change of title due to earned advanced degree will not impact the time in rank. There shall be no required time in rank for promotion to the third rank. Reviews for promotions should be conducted solely with regard to the merit of the candidate. Please refer to Section III for definition of Progression in Rank.

In exceptional cases, faculty with many years of employment prior to the adoption of this document may be eligible for accelerated promotion. Faculty will still be required to proceed through each academic rank and may not skip ranks to accelerate the promotion process. At least one year should separate promotion for each academic rank. Faculty should work in conjunction with their school director and school level promotion committee to determine whether or not accelerated promotion is warranted.

- B. Recommendations for promotion are expected to involve a salary increase and multi-year contract, to be determined by the academic unit head and the dean. Any salary increase will be effective either at the time of re-appointment or start of the next fiscal year (July 1) unless special arrangements are made with the dean. A three-year contract may be granted for those individuals who are promoted to the second rank. A five-year contract may be granted for those promoted to the third rank. Budgetary considerations may alter the contractual period and renewal depending on performance and needs of the College as determined by the dean. As stated in AC21, if a multi-year contract is not granted, then factors that shaped this decision shall be communicated to the non-tenure line faculty member at the time when a new contract is offered.

VIII. DOCUMENTATION

All non-tenure line faculty promotions require the assembly of a formal dossier, including supplemental material, to be reviewed by a school level committee and a college-level committee approved by the dean. The appropriately organized dossier should include:

- A. A Biographical Data Sheet.
- B. An up-to-date professional résumé or curriculum vita.
- C. Annual performance evaluations for the preceding five years.
- D. Job Description.
 - . The job description should outline duties and expectations, if applicable, in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The job description should be included in the candidate's dossier.
 - . Job descriptions should be revisited by the academic unit head/supervisor and the faculty member as needed or when job duties change.
- E. A personal statement describing teaching, research, and professional accomplishments (as applicable to the rank and position), present work and future goals.
 - . Personal statements should include the candidate's contributions to the school and the University. The candidate should also provide evidence of efforts to remain current in their field.
 - . If the assignment includes other duties (e.g., administrative responsibilities) the statement is an opportunity to describe and discuss contributions in this area as well.
 - . The length of this statement should be no more than 2000 words or three pages. (in at least 11-point font)
- F. Teaching: Candidates engaged in teaching should assemble information pertinent to the scholarship of teaching and learning as itemized in the University Guidelines from the time of last promotion or for up to the past five years, whichever is most recent. This section may not be applicable to research faculty. The dossier should describe:
 - . Teaching assignments and include documentation regarding teaching assignments and enrollments in the courses.
 - . Any teaching innovations that have been implemented.
 - . Impact on student learning, and written peer evaluations of on-line and residency teaching, including student evaluation.

- . Evaluation of teaching includes residence teaching, on-line teaching, hybrid courses, honors advising, independent studies, and supervision of research.

- . Student open-ended comments as summarized according to the University established procedure.

- . Efforts to improve teaching.

G. Research, Scholarship, and Creativity that supports teaching and informs pedagogy is expected for teaching/clinical faculty. Given the comprehensive nature of the college, each academic school will establish clarity of research and scholarship and creativity expectations necessary for promotion. The dossier should describe:

- . All published works – both refereed and non-refereed

- . Any presentations, panels, posters, workshops etc. given

For the research faculty, it is expected to demonstrate success in the following:

- . Internal and external grants or awards received

H. Service: Candidates engaged in service should describe and document any service at the Program, School, College, University, and society level. Service that should be documented may include, for example, contributions to program leadership and support, faculty governance, curricular review, community engagement, consulting, and membership and tasks related to professional and scholarly associations.

The Academic School guidelines for promotion of non-tenure line faculty should detail expectations in each of the three criterion areas of teaching, research, scholarship and creative accomplishments and service and make the necessary distinction for teaching/clinical/research faculty expectations as needed and appropriate for each school.

IX. Penn State Harrisburg Teaching Peer Review Guidelines (not applicable to research faculty)

A minimum of two current (within the past year) peer teaching assessments should be provided for each candidate at each review. The faculty should work with their relevant administrator to collaborate on choosing reviewers, with the administrator making the final decision.

- Faculty should be allowed to submit the names of potential reviewers.
- Faculty could reject proposed reviewer(s) after consultation with their administrator.

- Reviewers may be selected from either within or outside the unit but should have knowledge and expertise within the discipline of the faculty member undergoing review.

The content of each evaluation should include only evidence-based observations. That is the assessment (i.e., evaluation and conclusion) should be based on corresponding evidence. Although current policy AC23 and its Administrative Guidelines use the term “peer review,” peer observation is not a required element of peer review. Summative peer review of teaching ideally consists of more than one source of assessment that may or may not include class observations. Faculty should have access to peer reviews prior to insertion into the dossier.

X. Promotion Review Committees

- A. Each academic school will establish a review committee to conduct promotion of non-tenure line faculty members in that unit.
 - Review committees shall have at least three members from the non-tenure line faculty serving within the school. Faculty serving on the college level committee should not serve simultaneously on the school review committee.
 - School review committees should be set up according to the expectations of each individual school. This includes the number of members and terms of service.
- B. The college will establish a review committee to conduct promotion reviews for non-tenure line faculty who are recommended by the academic schools.
 - Only full-time, non-tenure line faculty members are eligible to serve on and vote for the members of the review committee.
 - The committee shall be composed of one member from each academic school, exclusive of the library. Members will serve one-year terms, with the possibility of renewal at the discretion of the college.
 - Only faculty of higher rank (or same rank if promoted to the said rank) than the candidate may make recommendations about promotions. Until a sufficient pool of higher-ranked faculty is established through the promotion process, the college dean/chancellor should seek waiver to this requirement from the Office of Faculty Affairs/the Senior Vice Provost to use tenured faculty on the review committees.
 - To avoid tie votes, it is recommended that committees have an odd number of members.

- . It is recommended that one or more alternate members are selected in such cases that a selected member cannot be present to make a recommendation.
- . The dean will appoint the chair of the committee.

C. Conflict of Interest

- . In situations where a legitimate conflict of interest exists (e.g., committee member is a relative, partner, or significant other to the candidate being considered for promotion), the committee member will abstain and not be present for the discussion or vote.
- . In situations where the conflict involves the School Director, the School Director will be excused from providing a recommendation to the dean.
- . The dean shall select the substitute School Director from other college academic administrators.

D. Responsibilities

- . The college dean's office will oversee and coordinate this process.
- . A candidate's school director is responsible for recommending a candidate for promotion.
- . The school directors should clarify the candidate's responsibilities in case of special assignments to all committee members, in writing, before the review is undertaken.
- . There is a shared responsibility between the faculty member and the school director for the preparation of materials. The candidate is expected to supply, in a timely manner, complete and accurate materials for the documentation (dossier). If the unit is using Activity Insight to generate the dossier, it is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure this information is entered into Activity Insight in accordance with the timeline specified. The school director will be responsible for presenting the candidate's documentation.

E. Review Process

- . The school director will discuss with the dean the names of the candidates being considered for promotion prior to beginning the review process.

- . After the materials are compiled, the school committee will review them and write a review and recommendation based on the candidate's responsibilities. The committee vote will be included in the review, as well as a minority opinion statement, if the vote is not unanimous. The materials and the written review of the unit committee will then be submitted to the school director.
- . The school director will, in turn, write a review and make a recommendation and then will forward all of the materials to the dean for submission to the college committee.
- . The college committee will review the dossiers and write a review and recommendation based on the candidate's responsibilities. The committee vote will be included in the review, as well as a minority statement, if the vote is not unanimous. When their report is completed, all materials will be forwarded to the dean for review.
- . The college dean will review the candidate's dossier and prior level recommendations and make a decision.

F. Consultation

At any stage of the review process, if a level of review disagrees with the prior, consultation must occur before a decision is made and the fact that the consultation took place along with what was discussed should be noted in writing in the review by the person or group that initiated it, so that there is a record documenting that the appropriate process took place.

G. Confidentiality

The Committee shall conduct its activities in a way that guarantees an individual's right to privacy not only during the committee's deliberations but forever thereafter. Committee members should not retain any personal notes about promotion and tenure cases once the work of the committee has concluded.

XI. Feedback

A. Letter from the College Dean

- . Feedback to the candidate will complete the review process. The dean's letter of evaluation shall be addressed to the candidate, with copies forwarded to the appropriate School Director.

B. Meeting with Candidate

- . The school director is obliged to discuss the results of any formal review with the faculty member. These sessions are to be held as soon as possible after the review process is completed and before the end of the academic year.
 - . At this session, the school director discusses the results of the review with the candidate. Access to all review letters should be made available to the candidate.
- C. Documentation of the meeting date and the participants shall be sent from the school director to the dean.

XII. Appeal and Reapplication for Promotion

- A. If promotion is denied, the school director for the appropriate school should notify the faculty in writing the reasons for denial. The school director should meet with the faculty to create an improvement plan to address the area(s) in which the faculty needs to improve. The plan should be specific to address the stated areas of concern.
- B. If reapplication is desired, a minimum of one academic year should pass prior to reapplication. The new dossier should include information on how the plan developed has been implemented, and subsequent improvements made.
- C. Denial of promotion should NOT affect employment status.
- D. All appeals for promotion should be worked through the college ombudsperson who will consult with the candidate and, if necessary, help the candidate to move the appeal to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee as per AC26.
- E. Denial of appeal should NOT affect employment status.
- F. Denial of appeal does NOT mean that faculty cannot re-apply for promotion at a later date as outlined above. At least one academic year should pass between applications for promotions.

XIII. Timeline for Promotion

- A. Requests for promotion may occur once per year.
- B. In general, the timeline for promotion of non-tenure line faculty would be similar to that of tenure-track faculty. The school directors should announce the timeline every year at the time of annual review.

Nomination Process for Non-Tenure Line Faculty Promotion to Third Level

1. During annual reviews of second level non-tenure line faculty, school directors should address progress toward promotion to third level and reflect their assessment of strengths and areas for improvement in writing. Although ongoing conversations regarding the promotion timeline are encouraged, an option for nomination during the third year (see item 6) and ultimately nomination for promotion five years after moving to the second rank should be discussed and documented.
2. Candidates who believe they meet requirements for promotion to the rank of Full Teaching/Clinical or Research Professor (or those being promoted to associate level as their third rank) should communicate their interest to their School Director by January 15 of the spring semester prior to the academic year of the review cycle for which they wish their promotion application to be reviewed.
3. Candidates should submit their curriculum vitae (CV) and other relevant material to the School Director no later than February 1 to allow the School Director adequate time to assess and review the candidates' credentials according to the criteria.
4. The School Director can choose to consult with other Full Teaching/Clinical or Full Research Professors in or outside the College regarding the candidate's qualifications and preparedness for promotion to the next rank.
5. The School Director, as *the Academic Administrator*, will make the determination if the candidate should or should not be nominated for promotion to third level by February 15.
 - . If the School Director determines that the candidate does not meet the School criteria for promotion to third level, they must provide written feedback to the candidate by February 15.
 - . If the School Director determines that the candidate meets the School criteria for promotion to third level, they will notify the candidate and Chancellor's Office of their nomination and to follow the process for preparation of their full dossier according to the School and College guidelines.
6. A candidate completing 3rd year (and thereafter) in the second rank may choose to accept the feedback from their School Director and work on the areas identified as needing improvement **or** decide to pursue *an alternative nomination process (see item b. below)*.
 - . Should the candidate accept received feedback to address the noted concerns, they can express interest in promotion to third level by January 15 of the subsequent year.
 - . A candidate completing at least the 3rd year (and thereafter) in rank of Associate Teaching/Clinical or Associate Research Professor (or in their second level rank) may choose to pursue an alternative nomination for promotion. In such a case, the candidate would need a minimum of two full Teaching/Clinical or Research professors in their discipline (related to their field of scholarly work) to provide written nomination letters. These professors may be within or outside the candidate's School but must be within the University. Nomination letters should be sent to the School Director no later than March 10. Acceptance of such a

nomination will be within the prerogative of the Chancellor who will notify the candidate by March 30.

- . Candidates who are denied promotion or withdraw their application during the process must wait for at least two years before being able to pursue promotion. The two-year period is intended to ensure there is sufficient time to address feedback and concerns received by the candidate.
- 7. Candidates who are either in or beyond their fifth year as an Associate Teaching/Clinical or Associate Research Professor (or in their second level promoted rank) can self-nominate to undergo a review for promotion to the third level without a nomination by the School Director, unless they are in the two-year waiting period (**see item 6c above**). Candidates who wish to self-nominate should indicate their intention to do so to the Chancellor's Office and School Director by March 10 of the academic year prior to the promotion review.

The full Administrative Guidelines for AC23 Promotion and Tenure Procedures can be found on the [Office of Faculty Affairs/the Senior Vice Provost](#) website.

Unanimously approved by the Academic Council on May 5, 2018

Approved by Capital College on May 18, 2018

Revised and approved by Capital College on November 7, 2018

Revised per the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs – October 1, 2022

Academic Council review and approval on April 25, 2024

Revisions due to the changes in University requirements, effective starting with the 2025-26

Academic Year cycle. Approved by the Academic Council, April 10, 2025.