Justin Jacobs, Chair, Committee on Faculty Actions
Monica Jackson, Deputy Provost and Dean of Faculty
American University Colleagues
Instructions for Submitting Faculty Files for Action
February 2024

Candidates for relevant categories of reappointment, promotion, or tenure (see 1.1), faculty coordinators, and all internal reviewers should carefully follow these instructions for submitting Files for Action to the Committee on Faculty Actions (CFA)

Thethe relevant faculty guiuses a separate review process. WCL Action do not pass through the CFA, and WCL faculty do not

Candidates for reappointment, promotion, or tenure submit relevant File for Action Filing for designated procedures of their teaching or academic unit internal reviewers evaluate the File for Action following criteria specified in the *Faculty Manual* [1], unit guidelines, and

Process:Faculty ManualPro

Hard copies are no longer required at the CFA level and above (see "Scholarly Appendix" below). Units that wish to continue requiring hard copies of Files for Action for reviews at the unit level must replicate the digital copy exactly.

Only the candidate and/or those who submit written material as part of the established process detailed below (e.g. unit coordinators who add internal memos from previous evaluations) may include material in the candidate's File for Action. Internal reviewers may add only their own memo to the file. No one may remove or replace any part of a file, except to make minor, non-substantive grammatical or typographical corrections.

Candidates are encouraged to add new information on significant accomplishments to their File for Action that occur during their review process. A candidate wishing to update a narrative or curriculum vitae, once submitted, should submit a new dated version of it with "_revision1" added to the end of the file name. For subsequent revisions, the candidate should use the same procedure and label the element "revision2," "revision3," etc.

All internal reviewers who have contributed to the candidate's file up to that point need to be notified of additions by the candidate or the unit coordinator, with information redacted if necessary.

Note: All levels of internal review may ask the candidate about the status of scholarship in progress. Section 11(g) of the *Faculty Manual* states, "The provost, in consultation with the dean of faculty, will review the file and may request clarifying or additional information from relevant persons or committees involved in the review at earlier stages. In extraordinary circumstances, the provost may request additional external review letters that will be reviewed at the previous levels. Such requests and any responses (or summaries thereof) must be included in the file." In extraordinary circumstances, and with knowledge that doing so may delay the process, deans, the CFA chair, or the DOF may delay(c)11 (e)1 (s)-/ayuhe(t)2 (r-0.002 Tc 0ac)1 (u)410 (i)-7 (s)-5 (w (t)1 (h)D441)-1 ((t)13 (l)-11 (ty)TJ0 Tc (

Section 2 below discusses the file components that the candidates are responsible for preparing, including a comprehensive narrative as well as the scholarship, teaching, and service components.

Section 3 discusses the components of a File for Action for each candidate, including instructions for securing internal and external reviews of the candidate's materials and adding those reviews to the candidate's file.

Section 4 describes the procedures for internal reviews. Section 5 describes procedures for external reviews.

      Files for tenure-track reappointment undergo internal review only.

      Files for tenure and files for term, continuing appointment, or tenure-track/tenured promotion to associate or full professor undergo both internal and external levels of review.

Section 6 provides additional notes on CFA reviews of faculty actions for

      Senior promotions and hires

      Term or continuing appointment faculty actions involving disagreements at the unit level.

The candidate is responsible for assembling the following six basic components that comprise their

> Teaching narrative section: describes teaching philosophy, addressing achievements (including engagement with students beyond the classroom), charting improvement, and establishing areas of growth; this section should also discuss efforts by the candidate to incorporate DEI. Continuing Appointment-line Library faculty, who do not teach courses, must address "primary responsibilities" as per unit guidelines, including DEI-related contributions.
>
> Service narrative section: describes engagement with the university community, profession, field, discipline, and/or public life related to scholarly expertise, including any efforts to address DEI in their service records.

Note on narrative for internal reviews: All candidates submitting a File for Action must include a Comprehensive Narrative. Because the Comprehensive Narrative will be read by AU colleagues both inside and outside of the candidate's discipline, candidates are encouraged to write for a broad, interdisciplinary audience. Candidates want to explain the significance and impact of their activities and accomplishments to others who may not be familiar with their field. Candidates are encouraged to consult with senior faculty and other resources in preparing drafts of their Comprehensive Narrative.

> Filename: candidatelastname_cv.pdf
> SharePoint document type: "Curriculum Vitae"

The candidate prepares a discipline-appropriate curriculum vitae (CV). The CV should be dated. All publications including article and book chapter entries must provide full citations including authors, title, dates, and page range or number of pages. Professional and creative productions should be annotated with basic information on the scope, venue, and dates of the project. If a candidate has work in progress near completion, such as a manuscript, the candidate may list the work on the CV, noting that it is work in progress, and include the work in the "Scholarly Appendix."

> Filename: candidatelastname_scholarship.pdf
> SharePoint document type: "Scholarship"

As a supplement to the comprehensive narrative, the "Information on Scholarship" section documents the impact of the candidate's scholarly accomplishments. This section typically includes information on the significance of publication or distribution venue (such as acceptance rates, impact factor, and rank of journals; number of downloads, if available; status and scope of publishers, distributors, galleries, etc.); information on the nature of collaboration in co-authored works (e.g., the candidate's role and contributions in the project); relevant peer reviews (such as readers' reviews if work is still unpublished), documentation of acceptance by publishers or distributors; published reviews; and, if appropriate, evidence from relevant citation indices, using the unit's criteria. Some candidates have opted to organize this information as charts or bullet points. Please include a summary Table of Contents, annotated where necessary. Candidate should not write an additional narrative; the scholarly section in the comprehensive narrative is sufficient.

Note on placement of scholarly materials: Please do not put the actual publications or other original scholarly, professional,

It must include any earlier evaluations, even from unsuccessful or withdrawn attempts at promotion. The materials should be arranged chronologically from oldest to newest.

Please note: Do not include annual reviews or merit reviews that remain internal to the academic or teaching unit in the file.

> Filename: candidatelastname_internal.pdf
> SharePoint document type: "Internal Letters"

The "Internal Evaluations" contain the current unredacted internal memos arranged chronologically in the order listed below. Should the candidate respond to any of the memos, the candidate's response immediately follows that memo.

a) Report of the reading committee, or senior faculty committee (if applicable)
b) Report of the Rank and Tenure/Personnel/Faculty Action Committee (with separate faculty vote)
c) Chair's Memo (if applicable)
d) Dean or University Librarian's Memo
e) CFA Memo (added by Faculty Senate Operations Coordinator after CFA review)

The CFA and DOF strongly recommend that internal evaluations be limited to 2000 words, except in extenuating circumstances where extensive explanation is required.

> Filename: candidatelastname_externalletters.pdf
> SharePoint document type: "External Letters"

The "External Letters" section contains the unredacted (and, of course, confidential) versions of letters submitted by the external reviewers (i.e., outside of AU). The individual letters should be compiled into one file. Should a candidate choose to respond to evaluations from an external reviewer, the candidate's response comes at the end of the file, after the last letter.

Each external review letter is designated as "letter 1," "letter 2," etc. by writing a number on the upper right-hand corner of each page of each letter. Numbers must be consecutive. A

The "External Correspondence" section contains all correspondence with the external reviewers. This includes all written and electronic correspondence soliciting and accepting evaluations as well as the list of documents sent to them. Materials should be arranged chronologically from oldest to newest for each external reviewer.

> Filename: candidatelastname_disqualifiedletters.pdf
> SharePoint document type: "External Letters"

If needed, any disqualified letters are included in the "Disqualified Letters" section, along with accompanying CV andcorrespondence.

> Filename: candidatelastname_guidelines.pdf
> SharePoint document type: "Guidelines"

Each unit's current guidelines for tenure and promotion are posted at the following links on the DOF's website:

> Tenure-track and tenured and Library continuing appointment faculty guidelines
> [Term and continuing appointment faculty guidelines](#).

According to the Memorandum to Deans Council from the DOF and CFA, dated April 8, 2021 (as amended by the deans):

<u>Tenure-track and tenured faculty</u> may choose between 2 sets of guidelines for evaluating their tenure/promotion files for action:

> Their academic unit's current/newest guidelines posted on the DOF website at the time of the submission of their File for Action, OR
>
> Unit guidelines in place at the time of their second contract and pre-tenure review. (Note that faculty whose tenure clocks were extended due to COVID may have pre-tenure review in year 4 or 5 instead of year 3.)

<u>All other faculty</u> seeking promotion will be evaluated using the guidelines for their academic units that were posted on the DOF website at the time of the submission of their File for Action. All faculty listed below should include current guidelines:

> Term or continuing appointment faculty seeking promotion without tenure to associate professor or professor
> Tenured faculty seeking promotion to full professor.

> Filename: candidatelastname_votes.pdf
> SharePoint document type: "Votes"

The "Votes" section should include all vote counts from the current action, including numbers of Yes votes, No votes, Abstentions, and Recusals. If there are multiple committees voting on the candidate's record, the votes should be reported on separate sheets, inchronological order from earliest to most recent.

Please note that the standardized voting contains 4 elements: scholarship, teaching, service, and an overall assessment. Candidates for tenure include an additional vote on tenure.

The voting choices are: Yes, No, Abstain, or Recuse.
For pre-tenure reappointment
  a) The candidate is making satisfactory progress on scholarship
  b) The candidate is making satisfactory progress on teaching
  c) The candidate is making satisfactory progress on service
  d) Overall, the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion

For promotion to associate or full professor:
  a) The candidate has met the criteria for scholarship
  b) The candidate has met the criteria for teaching
  c) The candidate has met the criteria for service
  d) Overall, the candidate has met the criteria for reappointment and/or promotion

For tenure:
  a) The candidate has met the criteria for scholarship
  b) The candidate has met the criteria for teaching
  c) The candidate has met the criteria for service
  d) Overall, the candidate has met the criteria for promotion
  e) The candidate has met the criteria for tenure

This section discusses the levels of internal review and general guidelines for preparing and submitting internal reviews.

Written evaluations are required from the three following levels of internal review before a File for Action can be submitted to the CFA:

This can be the rank and tenure, faculty action, or personnel committee at the teaching/academic unit, or a group of senior faculty, as the unit defines. Please note that the evaluation memo must be signed by an individual heading or representing the committee for the purpose of correspondence. Unsigned memos from "Rank and Tenure Committee" or "Senior Faculty" are unacceptable. The unit-level committee memo is added to the "Internal Reviews" section of the file and their vote is recorded in the "Vote" file.

This can be the appointed head of the teaching unit, or equivalent, as appropriate to the academic unit. The letter should include a recommendation on reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure for the appropriate rank.

The letter should include a recommendation on reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure for the appropriate rank.

All reviews, internal and external, are analytic and specific. CFA strongly recommends brevity, suggesting a word limit of 2000 words in cases where extended explanations are not needed.

Internal review memo should briefly describe in the opening paragraph any conflict of interest that goes beyond the customary cooperation expected among unit colleagues and why the conflict of interest does not prevent an objective assessment or warrant recusal. As section 11(a) of the *Faculty Manual* states: "Faculty members should always avoid conflicts of interest involving the evaluation of individual faculty members for appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The university expects the provost, deans, university librarian, members of the Committee on Faculty Actions, teaching unit chairs, and all other internal faculty reviewers to acknowledge such conflicts openly and to abstain from participation whenever such conflicts arise."

Memos at the unit level are each independent evaluations of the candidate's performance in scholarship, teaching or primary responsibilities, and service; the candidate's response to previous evaluations; areas of needed improvement and growth; and promise of continuing activity in scholarship, teaching, and service. Reviewers will use the criteria in the unit guidelines for the rank to which the candidate has applied when evaluating the file.

The memos will address in detail the nature and quality of the candidate's scholarship. They will address questions that may arise for non-specialists later reading the file, for instance the meaning of a co-authorship or the prestige level of a particular grant or patent. They will identify the rank and significance of venues in which the candidate's work has appeared. Memos should follow unit guidelines and address the criteria in the unit guidelines. The memos should address the teaching record *beyond student evaluations* and provide context that may help those outside the unit to interpret data.

The internal review memos will address any issues flagged in earlier reviews. Quotations from other memos cannot substitute for the internal reviewer's own analysis, though quotations may be included. Any references to external review letters must strictly preserve the anonymity of those reviewers, avoiding even descriptors (e.g., gender, rank, department, type of university, etc.), since they may in many cases significantly narrow the pool of possible reviewers.

Evaluation memos must include a recommendation for or against the faculty action. When a reviewing body is not unanimous, the memo must include the reasoning of both the majority and minority.

Within the unit, the reviewing body (e.g., a department, rank-and-tenure committee, or faculty action committee) reviews the File for Action and holds a secret-ballot four-part vote regarding the scholarship, teaching/or primary responsibilities, and service record of the candidate, as well as the overall action. Members of reviewing bodies may vote yes, no, abstain, or recuse. Abstentions should be a rare exception. Abstentions or recusals cannot be used to signal that the voter did not read the

material or is refraining from participating in the review process. No person has more than a single vote in the process of evaluation of a faculty member. If an evaluator has more than one possible opportunity to vote (e.g., a faculty member on the CFA), the *Faculty Manual* requires that the evaluator vote only once and at the lowest level possible (e.g., in the unit rather than in the CFA). The numerical results of the faculty vote are included after the appropriate unredacted internal letter. If the vote is not unanimous, the internal letter must contain both the majority and minority viewpoints. The CFA will not review a file if the internal memos are missing any of these components. The CFA chair will ask the unit to provide them.

The dean's evaluation memo will provide an evaluation of the candidate's performance and role within the unit, university, and their field, and indicate where the dean agrees or disagrees with unit reviewers and why. The dean's evaluation memo must include a recommendation f1 (h)4 (e)1(s)TJ0 (v)3 (i)13 (e)0.9 (w(.)-2/ f)7 candidate and to all previous authors of internal reviews or desi memos will be delivered via e-mail. All vo n(r)e7coun n(r)s are that go to the candidate and all prvio.a0.0011 (s)TJ0 Tc 0 Tw 1(elec n(r)ronicall (l5-.)TJ0 Tc 0 Tw 5.28 0 Td(A)-3 stage before the dean'semo sd consult the unit coordinator rega so. A candidate choosing to respond to a dean'semo sd address the Committe on Facult (5i)137Astiond send it to facul n(r)y (m

_____ and send copiesto all

prvio.a0.001.(m)s l3 -2 (v)10 (e)-2 (ls)-4 (o)1 (f)4 (r)oview A candidate wisng to respond to a CFA memo suld addres response to the DOF and send copieso all previous levels review. to verify (m) receipa response memo.

assessment, and (3) they hold an academic rank equal to or above that for which the candidate is applying.

Customarily, the majority of these letters must be from faculty members, typically full professors, who are affiliated with highly regarded institutions. In most cases, and appropriately to the discipline, at least two of the letters should come from someone outside the narrower niche within which the scholar works—such a person can provide assurance that the work rests on a solid foundation underlying the narrow area and meets the standards of the field or profession.

The identity of external letter writers remains confidential before, during, and after the review process. Academic units decide whether external letters are completely closed to the candidate or strictly redacted, such that potential identifying characteristics of the author are removed.

At a minimum, five external reviewer letters are required in the Files for Action for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. Soliciting more than five is prudent because of possible disqualification or uncompleted letters. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the file.

Each academic unit should obtain qualified external reviewers before internal reviews begin. The file should contain a minimum of five letters solicited by the chair, teaching unit/academic unit committee chair, or dean.

The candidate may suggest names, but only a maximum of two of these can be used as actual external reviewers. The candidate may also provide names of persons whom the unit should   contact as potential reviewers because they are inapeyyyna4by u g(r)7 (s)ʃ (o)4la4by v 2.4r(u)10 g(v)8.9 (u4l)-1 Ro0 (11 BTo (a)

A template for a request letter to external reviewers is available from the AU portal (myau.american.edu) or on the DOF's website, under "Tenure-track Faculty Reappointments and Promotions."

It is recommended that units solicit letters from external reviewers by the end of the spring semester, for submission at the beginning of the subsequent academic year when the candidate will submit a File for Action. The spring timeline is encouraged in order to ensure ample time to find willing reviewers. It also gives the reviewers the summer to do the review and to send their written evaluations by the time the academic unit begins the internal review of the candidate in the Fall. Internal levels of review begin only after all external letters have been received.

Tenured, continuing appointment, and Library continuing appointment candidates seeking promotion to full professor or librarian submit a File for Action following the outline and format described above, with two

Evidence of teaching experience and quality, e.g.,