

ARTICLE 18
PROMOTION POLICY AND PROCEDURES

18.§1 **STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE.** Western Michigan University recognizes the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor for traditionally-ranked faculty and of master faculty specialist, faculty specialist II and faculty specialist I for faculty specialists. Promotion is the advancement of a faculty member from one of these ranks to the next higher rank. There shall be no restriction on the rank distribution in the University, in any college or division, or in any department, or in the number of promotions granted in any one year. The parties recognize that:

18.§1.1 *Merit-based.* Promotion shall be based on merit, not solely on years of service. Merit can be fairly assessed only after a faculty member has spent a reasonable period in a particular rank.

18.§1.2 *Scope.* Only those faculty with tenure or on tenure-track appointment and those on grants and/or outside funding are eligible for promotion to associate professor or professor or master faculty specialist.

18.§1.3 *Procedures.* Promotion applications shall be considered using the procedures provided for in this article. These procedures are intended to provide for thorough and fair consideration of promotion applications.

18.§1.4 *Administrators Seeking Promotion.* Administrators who hold faculty rank and are considered for academic promotion may be reviewed according to this article in the department of the designated rank. Article 17.§9, Tenure Policy and Procedures, notwithstanding, prior to the letter of offer to an administrator, or the promotion of an administrator, the department representing the administrator's discipline shall be consulted and asked to recommend the academic rank for that administrator. Department faculty shall have the option of declining participation in the promotion reviews of administrators.

18.§1.5 *Relationship Between the Tenure Award and Promotion to Associate Professor.* For faculty in rank at the level of Assistant Professor, promotion to the level of Associate Professor shall be concurrent, and automatically conferred, with the granting of the tenure award. No separate review shall be required. For faculty specialists, separate reviews are required for promotion, even if seeking promotion in the same year as the final tenure review.

18.§1.6 *Categories of Review.* Two categories of criteria shall be considered in promotion decisions – qualifying requirements and judgmental criteria.

18.§2 **QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS.** To be eligible for consideration for promotion, a faculty member must meet minimum qualifying standards in educational attainment and number of years in rank. Meeting the qualifying requirements establishes eligibility, but does not ensure promotion. Exceptions to these criteria are possible, as specified below.

18.§2.1 *Educational Attainments.* In most disciplines, the earned doctorate constitutes the conventional terminal degree for traditionally-ranked faculty. For faculty specialists, the terminal criteria are likely to differ. For faculty for whom the doctorate is not normally required, appropriate alternate criteria must be determined and approved as follows:

18.§2.1.1 Departments shall submit their proposed educational attainment criteria as part of the Department Policy Statement in conformance with those procedures outlined in Article 23, Faculty Participation in Department Governance. The appropriate chair, dean, and the provost shall be responsible for ensuring the basic equivalence among departments of educational attainment criteria, and their adherence to the general guidelines of the policy.

18.§2.1.2 The department's approved educational attainment criteria will be official department policy and shall become part of the Department Policy Statement.

18.§2.2 *Length of Service in Rank.* Length of service in rank refers to the number of years that a faculty member has spent in his/her present rank. Faculty service at the same or higher rank at other educational institutions may be included, except that it is limited to a maximum of seven (7) years. Such prior service credit shall be determined at the time of initial appointment and included in the initial appointment letter. To be eligible for promotion to assistant professor, a faculty member shall have been an instructor for at least three (3) years. The exception is for tenure track faculty members who are hired as instructors because they are in the process of completing their terminal degree. They shall be upgraded to assistant professor in the semester following the completion of that degree. To be eligible for promotion to associate professor, a faculty member shall have been an assistant professor for at least six (6) years. To be eligible for promotion to professor, a faculty member shall have been an associate professor for at least seven (7) years. To be eligible for promotion to faculty specialist II, a faculty member shall have been a faculty specialist I for at least three (3) years. To be eligible for promotion to master faculty specialist, a faculty member shall have been a faculty specialist II for at least six (6) years.

18.§2.3 *Exceptions.* Exceptions to the requirements of educational attainment and length of service in rank may be requested by a faculty member no later than February 1 (see Article 18.§11 for specific date) of the preceding academic year. Faculty desiring an early promotion review shall notify their department chair no later than February 1 (see Article 18.§11 for specific date) of the preceding academic year, who in turn shall inform the Department Promotion Committee (DPC).

18.§2.4 *Notification.* All faculty eligible for promotion shall be notified in writing of such eligibility by the department chair by January 15 (see timetable in Article 18.§11 for specific date) of the academic year preceding the year in which the review takes place.

18.§3 JUDGMENTAL CRITERIA. No later than October 15 of the academic year of the review, all faculty who are eligible for promotion on the basis of qualifying criteria and who wish to be evaluated for promotion by the department shall submit their promotion files to their department chair. A faculty member who is eligible for promotion in a given year but who does not submit his/her file shall be removed from consideration for promotion during the said year. The promotion files, when submitted, shall contain at least the faculty member's current vita, as well as any additional materials called for by this Agreement and by an approved Department Policy Statement and/or requested by evaluators (e.g., department promotion committee, chair, dean, or provost). In the case of faculty specialists, the letter of appointment shall be included in the file. Areas to be evaluated include professional competence, professional recognition, and professional service for traditionally-ranked faculty, and professional competence and professional service for faculty specialists. The review shall include achievements in prior ranks and in the present rank. The department's policy statement shall clearly state the criteria and standards that department faculty must meet. The same standards may not be appropriate for different disciplines. Criteria specified in this section and in approved Department Policy Statements shall be used in making promotion recommendations:

18.§3.1 *Professional Competence*. Competence in teaching is a necessity for promotion for teaching faculty. Although student evaluations of faculty are intended primarily for use in faculty self-improvement, numerical summary data of student ratings shall be included and considered in all promotion decisions. No single item or small subset of items on student rating forms shall be used as the sole basis for a promotion decision. Student ratings should not be the sole source of information about teaching competence, and it is the responsibility of the faculty to provide additional evidence of competence. Western shall seriously consider all such evidence submitted by the faculty member in conjunction with numerical summaries of student ratings in making promotion decisions. Insofar as they are related to the individual faculty member's teaching of assigned courses, successful efforts by the faculty member at curriculum development, teaching innovations, and continuing self-education shall be included in the evaluation. Competence in performance of other professional duties appropriate to certain disciplines (such as faculty in the University Libraries, Counseling Services at Sindecuse and other similar units), is correspondingly a necessity for the promotion of faculty whose responsibility is other than classroom teaching. Attainment of various levels and forms of licensure and certification may be considered as constituting professional competence. Competence in the supervision of master's theses, doctoral dissertations, clinical and practicum work, as well as the general tutelage of graduate students, shall also be considered. Competence in the supervision of master's theses, doctoral dissertations, clinical and practicum work, as well as the general tutelage of graduate students, shall also be considered. Competence in performing assignments contained in the letter of appointment is especially important for faculty specialists.

18.§3.2 *Professional Recognition*. Professional recognition comes in many forms and may vary with the faculty members' disciplines, but is a necessity for promotion. In all fields, research, publication, and/or evidence of creative work are considered valuable. Consequently, the publication of scholarly books, monographs, and articles constitute the most usual output that should be recognized. Refereed scholarly material in electronic

form shall be considered as evidence of professional recognition. In the areas of literature and the fine and performing arts, creative artistic production is also a primary vehicle for achieving professional recognition. In many fields, working with schools, providing consultation for external agencies, serving as a research consultant for colleagues and advanced graduate students, and preparing scholarly projects are appropriate bases for recognition. In addition, holding office in national, regional, and state professional associations and contributing papers or services to such organizations constitute professional recognition. The preparation of professionally-sound proposals and/or acquisition of externally-funded grants constitute a form of recognition.

18.§3.3 *Professional Service.* The knowledge and skills of the faculty constitute a resource to the community, region, state, and nation in the name of the University. Faculty service to academic units, colleges, the Faculty Senate, the University, and the Chapter provides these skills and abilities for professional and academic accreditation, and University governance and planning. Professionally-relevant service in any of these venues, both inside and outside of the institution, shall be an important consideration for granting promotion.

18.§3.4 *Professional Conduct.* The standards of Professional Conduct as delineated in Article 21 of this Agreement may be considered in evaluating the three areas of performance.

18.§3.5 *Additional Judgmental Criteria.* If departments wish to propose additional or more particular judgmental criteria, they shall be developed in accordance with the procedures employed in establishing the Department Policy Statement. If approved, such additional criteria will be official department policy and shall become part of the Department Policy Statement.

18.§3.6 *Interpretation of Judgmental Criteria.* No single statement of criteria can be sufficient for all academic units and disciplines within the University. Each academic unit, through its Department Policy Statement, must interpret and apply these judgmental criteria by the currently prevailing standards of the relevant field/discipline/profession. Departments without an approved promotion policy interpreting judgmental criteria will have their applications for promotion evaluated by faculty committees and administrators on the basis of the general meanings attributed to these criteria.

18.§3.7 *Application of Judgmental Criteria to Traditionally-ranked Faculty.* In considering candidates for promotion; professional competence, professional recognition, and professional service are all important. For the purpose of clarification in the promotion review process, the following terms are presented ordinally, from high to low: *outstanding; substantial; significant; satisfactory, unsatisfactory.* A faculty member whose major achievement is outstanding achievement as a teacher may be promoted to assistant or associate professor. Similarly, a faculty member whose primary responsibility is other than teaching who achieves outstanding success in his/her primary non-teaching capacity may be promoted to assistant or associate professor. A competent faculty member whose major achievement is outstanding professional recognition may be

promoted to assistant or associate professor. For promotion to full professor, a faculty member must have:

- (a) achieved outstanding professional recognition and a satisfactory record of professional competence; or
- (b) achieved outstanding success in professional competence and gained substantial professional recognition; or
- (c) gained substantial professional recognition, a satisfactory record of professional competence, and rendered significant professional service.

18.§3.8 *Application of Judgmental Criteria to Faculty Specialists.* In considering candidates for promotion, professional competence and professional service are both important. Expectations relative to these two areas will be delineated in the letter of appointment.

18.§4 DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION.

18.§4.1 *Development of Criteria.* Each department faculty must, in the Department Policy Statement, develop and make known to its members the department criteria for the application and relative importance of the University standards in the three areas of performance. Each academic unit, through its Department Policy Statement, must interpret and apply these criteria to the three University standards using the prevailing standards of the relevant field/discipline/profession. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated according to the University standards and standards developed by the department for the relevant field/discipline/profession. The same standards may not be appropriate for different disciplines. Department needs have traditionally been considered in promotion decisions, and the particular skills, expertise, and accomplishments of the faculty member as they relate to the needs of the department shall continue to be considered.

18.§4.1.1 These criteria will be submitted by each academic unit, according to the process for approving policy statements, for approval by Western and the Chapter. Departments without an approved promotion policy interpreting criteria for promotion evaluation will have their applicants for promotion evaluated by faculty committees and administrators on the basis of the general meanings attributed to these criteria as specified in the current Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement.

18.§4.2 *Additional Stipulations.* While the University standards interpreted through the department criteria constitute the minimum University stipulations, departments may propose additional or more particular stipulations. If departments wish to propose additional or more particular requirements, these shall be developed in accordance with the procedures employed in establishing the Department Policy Statement. Departments

that write such stipulations should consider the effects of the changes, if any, upon probationary faculty hired prior to the changes.

18.§4.3 *Unaffiliated Academic Units.* The provost shall ascertain that those procedures incorporating the principles set forth in this article are employed in those academic units not affiliated with a college.

18.§5 EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS. External review in the area of professional recognition for traditionally-ranked faculty may be initiated by the candidate, the DPC, or the department chair, for a candidate's promotion review. Reviewers external to the faculty of Western Michigan University shall be appropriate to the promotion candidate's specialty area. By mutual agreement of the candidate and the chair of the DPC, one reviewer may be from Western Michigan University, but external to the department.

18.§5.1 *General Process.* If the external review process is initiated, procedures in the department policy statement shall be followed. Those procedures shall, at a minimum, specify the minimum number of recommended external reviews, with a recommended minimum of four external reviewers. Department policy statements shall describe the process by which professionally capable external reviewers will be obtained. In the absence of an approved external review policy in the department policy statement, the recommended minimum of four shall prevail, where practicable, and the process will follow the guidelines found in this section of the Agreement. The candidate and the chair of the DPC shall identify the names of the recommended number of mutually acceptable external reviewers. If they are unable to reach agreement on the recommended reviewers, each will be responsible for identifying an equal number of external reviewers until the recommended number has been obtained. Materials sent to the external reviewers should include a vita and other items that demonstrate professional recognition. The candidate and the chair of the DPC should attempt to reach mutual agreement as to these materials. If they are unable to reach agreement, the chair of the DPC shall make the final decision. The department chair will be responsible for sending the materials to the external reviewers. A letter clearly indicating the purpose of the external review and who shall have access to the letters of recommendation shall be sent by the department chair, with a copy to the candidate, to any potential external reviewer selected by the promotion candidate and the chair of the DPC to participate in the external review process (see Appendix E, External Review Process--Promotion and Tenure). The department chair's request to an external referee must include Western's statement on confidentiality: "Your letter of evaluation, as part of an official review file, will be held in confidence and will not be disclosed to the faculty member under consideration or to the public except as required by law or University policy. In all such instances, the information made available will be provided in a form that seeks to protect the identity, privacy, and confidentiality of evaluators." Nothing in the above is intended to prevent a candidate from soliciting external letters. External letters of recommendation shall be made part of the adjunctive promotion file, but shall not be placed in the promotion candidate's permanent personnel file. Upon conclusion of the promotion review, the adjunctive file containing all existing copies of the external letters of recommendation

shall be returned to the promotion candidate, with removal of institution identifiers and name of reviewer. [Copies of edited letters shall be made available to promotion candidates if a formal appeal is made at any stage in the promotion review process.] Western shall not release the external letters of reference to the public except as Western deems necessary to comply with law, court order, subpoena, or pursuant to any legal, administrative, or arbitration proceeding.

18.§5.2 *Timetable*. The timetable for external review, if applicable, shall be as follows.

In the academic year preceding the candidate's promotion review February 15, 2012 February 15, 2013 February 17, 2014	The latest date for the candidate, the DPC, <u>or</u> the department chair to call for external review
In the academic year preceding the candidate's promotion review March 15, 2012 March 15, 2013 March 17, 2014	Latest date for the candidate and DPC to submit the list of external evaluators to the department chair.
In the academic year preceding the candidate's promotion review April 16, 2012 April 15, 2013 April 15, 2014	Latest date for the department chair to solicit external reviewers, and for the candidate to present materials for the external review process to the department chair.
In the summer preceding the candidate's promotion review August 15, 2012 August 15, 2013 August 15, 2014	Latest date for the department chair to send materials to the external reviewers.
In the academic year of the candidate's promotion review October 3, 2011 October 1, 2012 October 1, 2013	Date requested of external reviewers for returning their reviews.

18.§5.3 Exceptions to the above timetable may be granted by mutual agreement of the candidate and the chair.

18.§5.4 External reviews arriving late shall be immediately added to the candidate's promotion file (See Article 11.§3.1),.

18.§6 PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS.

18.§6.1 *Notification of Eligibility.* The department chair shall notify faculty, in writing, of their promotion eligibility no later than January 15 (see Article 18.§11 for specific date) of the preceding academic year.

18.§6.2 *Promotion File.* No later than October 15 (see Timetable in 18.§10 for specific date), all faculty who wish to be considered for promotion review shall submit their promotion files to their department chair. At a minimum, the promotion file must contain those materials specified by the office of the provost. The promotion file of the candidate with collateral documentation shall be held in the office of the dean until the final recommendations are submitted by the provost to the Board of Trustees, and at that time it shall be returned to the candidate. Collateral documentation refers to the books, reprints, artistic work, syllabi, and other products of performance that usually accompany applications.

18.§6.2.1 Copies of all guidelines supplied by the provost to department and college committees shall be sent to the Chapter.

18.§6.2.2 If the dean reverses a previous recommendation, the file and all collateral documentation shall be forwarded by the dean's office to the Provost's Office for the provost's review.

18.§6.3 *General process.* Department faculty members at or above the rank sought by the promotion candidates shall have the right and responsibility to make negative and positive recommendations, with supporting data, for promotions of colleagues according to this article, the Department Policy Statement, and in accordance with the established criteria and contractual timetable. Each promotion committee shall explicitly state whether it is a positive or a negative recommendation for promotion, with substantiating narrative. For purposes of promotion, the rank of associate professor is considered equivalent to the rank of master faculty specialist, the rank of assistant professor is considered equivalent to the rank of faculty specialist II, and the rank of instructor is considered equivalent to the rank of faculty specialist I. Traditionally-ranked faculty at the rank of assistant professor will be promoted to associate professor with the awarding of tenure. Faculty specialists are not automatically promoted with the award of tenure and must submit separate promotion applications when seeking promotion to the next rank.

18.§6.4 *Joint Appointments.* For faculty holding joint appointments, recommendations from the secondary department or unit promotion committee, as well as the recommendations of the chair of the secondary department or unit must be submitted to the home department no later than November 1 (see Article 18.§11 for specific date) of the review year. The review letters from the secondary department and chair shall become part of the faculty member's file; they must be considered by the primary department when formulating its promotion recommendations and in all subsequent reviews. Professional competence, professional recognition and professional service in

both departments must be considered explicitly by both departments during the review process; for faculty specialists holding joint appointments, only professional competence and service are required for consideration. The home department must take these recommendations into consideration in making its promotion recommendation (see Article 14. §. 2.3).

18.§6.5 *Department Review*. Designated department faculty members shall have the right and responsibility to make recommendations, with supporting data, concerning the promotion of their colleagues, according to this article, the Department Policy Statement, and in accordance with the established criteria and contractual timetable. Only department faculty members at or above the rank sought by the promotion candidates shall be eligible to participate in the review of candidates for promotion, and in the development and rendering of the department promotion recommendations. If a department has fewer than three (3) full professors to serve on the DPC, a promotion committee with no fewer than four (4) full professors shall be formed by appointing full professors from other units to the DPC. These faculty shall be determined by mutual consent of the department chair and the full professors in the department. Within the guidelines contained herein, it is the responsibility of the faculty of each department to determine: (a) the evaluation methods to be used; (b) the procedures to be followed; and (c) that promotion evaluations are conducted and the results transmitted, in a timely fashion, to the persons evaluated and to those individuals and groups entitled to make promotion recommendations. DPCs shall contain a majority of traditionally-ranked faculty. Candidates for promotion shall not be ranked by either the DPC or the CPC.

18.§6.5.1 Within the guidelines contained herein, it is the responsibility of the faculty of each department to: (a) recommend the evaluation methods to be used; (b) recommend the procedures to be followed; and (c) ensure that promotion evaluations are conducted and the results transmitted, in a timely fashion, to the persons evaluated and to those individuals and groups empowered to make promotion recommendations.

18.§6.5.2 It is the responsibility of the faculty of each department to develop their own procedures for making timely recommendations to the department chair and the college promotion committee (CPC) in accordance with the procedures contained in the Department Policy Statement and in compliance with the timetable as stipulated in 18.§8. These procedures shall contain a provision allowing candidates to appeal a recommendation by the DPC prior to the committee's presentation of recommendations to the chair and dean. Faculty members shall be informed, in writing, of the evaluation of their professional performance in those areas that were found insufficient by the faculty of the department, as well as those areas found to be satisfactory. This correspondence shall include complete copies of all recommendation letters and appended supplementary materials, positive or negative, that the DPC proposes to send forward to the department chair and the dean, so that the faculty member has the opportunity to appeal before the recommendation is sent forward. DPCs shall include in their considerations material submitted by candidates and appropriate

evidence solicited from and/or submitted by other sources subject to the provisions in Article 11, Faculty Records.

18.§6.5.3 **Notification of Recommendation.** The names of faculty members recommended for promotion and those not recommended shall be forwarded to the department chair and the CPC along with all supporting data (see Article 18.§11 for specific date). To allow affected faculty to appeal to the Department Promotion Committee (DPC), the DPC chair shall provide written notification to each affected faculty member of the DPC's positive recommendation or negative recommendation prior to the deadline for transmittal to the department chair and the CPC (see Article 18.§11 for specific date). This notice shall include complete copies of all recommendation letters and appended materials, positive or negative, that the DPC proposes to send forward to the department chair and the CPC so that the candidate has the opportunity to review and respond to all recommendation documents before they are sent forward. This notice shall, in the case of a negative recommendation, advise the affected faculty member of the areas in which his/her professional performance was found to be insufficient for promotion. Department Promotion Committees shall include in their considerations material submitted by candidates and appropriate evidence solicited from and/or submitted by other sources subject to the definition in Article 11, Faculty Records. Candidates may remove their names from the promotion process at this or any other time. A candidate who withdraws from consideration for promotion prior to the forwarding of files to the dean may remove from his/her faculty record any documentation pertaining to the aborted review.

18.§6.6 ***Chair's Review.*** The department chair shall have the right and responsibility to make recommendations concerning the award or denial of promotion to department faculty. Such recommendations shall be in accordance with established criteria and the timetable as stipulated in the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement.

18.§6.6.1 Faculty members shall be informed, in writing, of the evaluation of their professional performance in those areas that were found insufficient by the department chair, as well as those areas found to be satisfactory. This correspondence shall include complete copies of all recommendation letters and appended supplementary materials, positive or negative, that the chair proposes to send forward to the dean, so that the faculty member has the opportunity to appeal before the recommendation is sent forward.

18.§6.7 ***College Promotion Committee.*** The college faculty shall have the right and responsibility to make recommendations to the dean concerning the award or denial of promotion to college faculty who hold tenure-track appointments. Such recommendations shall be in accordance with established criteria and the timetable as stipulated in the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement.

18.§6.7.1 Membership. A College Promotion Committee (CPC) shall be established in each college (exclusive of the Honors College and the Graduate College). The College of Arts and Sciences shall have a separate CPC for each of its three divisions: humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. Each CPC shall be composed of one representative from each department who is a tenured full professor elected by the department faculty. Each CPC shall elect its own chair. The chair of each CPC shall notify the dean and the Chapter of the names of the members and chair of the CPC.

18.§6.7.2 Election Procedures. Committee members shall serve three-year terms. Terms shall expire on October 1. Departments whose representative's term expires shall nominate and elect a replacement by September 15 of the same academic year.

18.§6.7.3 Responsibilities. The CPC shall consider all promotion recommendations received from departments and present its recommendations, along with supporting data, to the dean no later than the January deadline (see Article 18§.11 for specific date). To allow affected faculty to appeal to the CPC, the CPC chair shall provide written notification to each affected faculty member of the CPC's positive or negative recommendation prior to the January deadline for transmittal to the dean (see Article 18.§11 for specific date). This notice shall include complete copies of all recommendation letters and appended materials, positive or negative, that the CPC proposes to send forward to the dean so that the candidate has the opportunity to review and respond to all recommendation documents before they are sent forward. This notice shall, in the case of a negative recommendation, advise the affected faculty member of the areas in which his/her professional performance was found to be insufficient for promotion. Any CPC member may, without prejudice, decline the opportunity to participate in the promotion review of an administrator.

18.§6.8 *Dean's Review.* The dean shall have the right and responsibility to make recommendations to the provost concerning the award or denial of promotion to college faculty who hold tenure-track appointments. Such recommendations shall be in accordance with established criteria and the timetable as stipulated in the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement.

18.§6.8.1 Faculty members shall be informed, in writing, of the evaluation of their professional performance in those areas that were found insufficient by the dean, as well as those areas found to be satisfactory. This correspondence shall include complete copies of all recommendation letters and appended supplementary materials, positive or negative, that the dean proposes to send forward to the provost, so that the faculty member has the opportunity to appeal before the recommendation is sent forward.

18.§6.8.2 At the time the promotion recommendations are forwarded from the dean's office to the provost, all of the supporting material shall be included for

each faculty member when the dean has overturned any of the preceding decisions.

18.§6.9 *Provost's Review.* The provost shall have the right and responsibility to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees concerning the award or denial of promotion to faculty who hold tenure-track appointments. Such recommendations shall be in accordance with established criteria and the timetable as stipulated in the Western/WMU-AAUP Agreement. If the provost reverses an affirmative recommendation of the Department Promotion Committee, chair, or dean, he/she shall provide written notification to the faculty member, the chair, and the dean before presenting the recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The notice to the faculty member shall advise him/her of the area(s) of his/her professional performance found to be insufficient for promotion.

18.§6.10 *Appeals.* A faculty member has the right to appeal recommendations by the DPC, the chair, the dean, and the provost. DPCs shall inform each affected faculty member of the DPC's recommendation, so that the faculty member may appeal in writing to the DPC before the DPC's recommendation is forwarded to the chair (see 18.§10). Appeals to the DPC shall be in accordance with policies which shall be developed by the departments in accordance with Article 23, Faculty Participation in Department Governance. Chairs shall inform each affected faculty member of the recommendation of the chair so that the faculty member may appeal to the chair in writing before the chair's recommendation is submitted to the dean. Deans shall inform each affected faculty member of the recommendation of the dean, so that the faculty member may appeal to the dean in writing before the dean's recommendation is submitted to the provost. The provost shall inform each affected faculty member of his/her recommendation, so that faculty may appeal to the provost in writing before the provost's recommendation is forwarded to the Board of Trustees. In the case of an appeal by the faculty member to the provost, the provost and the President shall consult before the provost renders a decision. At all levels of review, the faculty member shall be given a complete copy of the proposed letters of recommendation and appended supplementary materials, positive or negative, prior to sending that recommendation forward to the next reviewer. In cases where an appeal results in a revised recommendation, the original recommendation and the candidate's request for an appeal will be removed from the promotion file unless the candidate requests otherwise. In cases where the appeal does not result in any change or results in partial change, the original recommendation and appeal materials will remain a part of the promotion file.

18.§7 PROMOTION DECISIONS.

18.§7.1 *Notification of Promotion.* Following action by the Board of Trustees, faculty members who are promoted shall receive timely written confirmation thereof.

18.§8 IMPLEMENTATION. Promotions approved by the Board of Trustees and the subsequent salary increase shall normally be effective on July 1 for fiscal-year faculty and with the beginning of the fall semester for academic-year faculty.

18.§9 GRIEVANCE. Final decisions made by Western shall be subject to the grievance procedures in this Agreement as stipulated in Article 12, Grievance Procedure.

18.§10 BOARD PREROGATIVES. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to prohibit the Board of Trustees from conferring academic rank and tenure upon persons occupying administrative positions. However, Western will solicit and consider the recommendations of the department to which the administrator would be appointed before granting tenure. Sole power to confer tenure rests with the Board of Trustees, which awards tenure by official action approving the President's tenure recommendations. Under no circumstances shall tenure be acquired by default.

18.§10.1 *Board Promotion Denial*. In cases involving the denial of promotion by the Board of Trustees, the department faculty shall have the right to make a recommendation to the Office of the Provost within ten (10) business days of the Board's action. Western shall have the responsibility for the final decision

18.§11 TIMETABLE. The timetable related to promotion shall be as follows:

January 17, 2012 January 15, 2013 January 15, 2014	Latest date for department chair to notify faculty members of eligibility for promotion consideration in the next academic year.
February 1, 2012 February 1, 2013 February 3, 2014	Latest date for faculty desiring an early promotion review to notify their department chair who in turn shall inform the department promotion committee (DPC)
In the academic year preceding the candidate's promotion review February 15, 2012 February 15, 2013 February 17, 2014	If applicable, the latest date for the candidate, the DPC, or the department chair to call for external review
In the academic year preceding the candidate's promotion review March 15, 2012 March 15, 2013 March 17, 2014	If applicable, latest date for the candidate and DPC to submit the list of external evaluators to the department chair.
In the academic year preceding the candidate's promotion review April 16, 2012 April 15, 2013 April 15, 2014	If applicable, latest date for the department chair to solicit external reviewers, and for the candidate to present materials for the external review process to the department chair.
In the summer immediately preceding the candidate's promotion review August 15, 2012 August 15, 2013 August 15, 2014	If applicable, latest date for the department chair to send materials to the external reviewers.

In the academic year of the candidate's promotion review October 3, 2011 October 1, 2012 October 1, 2013	If applicable, date requested of external reviewers for returning their reviews.
October 17, 2011 October 15, 2012 October 15, 2013	Latest date for department chair to convene the first meeting of the DPC.
October 17, 2011 October 15, 2012 October 15, 2013	Latest date for faculty member to submit promotion file to department office
October 25, 2011 October 25, 2012 October 25, 2013	Latest date for secondary DPCs and department chairs to inform faculty member of recommendation.
October 27, 2011 October 29, 2012 October 28, 2013	Latest date for faculty member to inform secondary DPC or department chair, in writing, of appeal.
November 1, 2011 November 1, 2012 November 1, 2013	Latest date for recommendations from secondary DPCs and department chairs to be submitted to the home department of the candidate.
November 15, 2011 November 15, 2012 November 15, 2013	Latest date for DPC to inform faculty member of recommendation.
November 18, 2011 November 19, 2012 November 18, 2013	Latest date for faculty member to inform DPC, in writing, of appeal.
December 2, 2011 December 3, 2012 December 2, 2013	Latest date for DPC recommendations, together with supporting data, to be presented to the department chair and to the college promotion committee (CPC).
December 2, 2011 December 3, 2012 December 2, 2013	Latest date for the dean to convene the first meeting of the CPC.
January 11, 2012 January 10, 2013 January 10, 2014	Latest date for department chair to inform faculty member of recommendation. Latest date for CPC to inform faculty member of recommendation.
January 17, 2012 January 14, 2013 January 13, 2014	Latest date for faculty member to inform chair or CPC, in writing, of appeal.
January 23, 2012 January 22, 2013 January 21, 2014	Latest date for DPC and CPC recommendations, with the separate recommendations of the chair appended, together with supporting data, to be presented to the dean.
February 24, 2012 February 22, 2013 February 21, 2014	Latest date for the dean to inform faculty member of recommendation.

February 27, 2012 February 25, 2013 February 24, 2014	Latest date for the faculty member to inform dean, in writing, of appeal.
March 5, 2012 March 4, 2013 March 3, 2014	Latest date for the dean to present the recommendations of the DPC, CPC, and the chair, with the dean's separate recommendations appended, and with the promotion checklist, to the provost. All supporting material submitted by a faculty member shall be held in, or returned to, the office of the dean until the final recommendations are submitted to the Board of Trustees, and, at that time, shall be returned to the faculty member. At the time the promotion recommendations are forwarded from the dean's office to the provost, all of the supporting material shall be included for each faculty member where the dean has overturned any of the preceding decisions.
April 23, 2012 April 23, 2013 April 23, 2014	Latest date for the provost to inform faculty member of recommendation.
April 30, 2012 April 30, 2013 April 30, 2014	Latest date for the faculty member to inform provost, in writing, of appeal. In addition, a faculty member who requests an appeal hearing with the provost may also request that the supporting material be forwarded to the Provost's Office for review prior to the scheduled hearing.
May 23, 2012 May 23, 2013 May 23, 2014	Latest date for the provost to inform the candidate of final recommendation.
May	The recommendations of the provost shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees, to be acted upon at its next regularly scheduled meeting, which shall be held no later than July 31. For fiscal-year appointments, promotion will be effective July 1. For academic-year appointments, promotion will be effective at the beginning of the fall semester.

18.§11.1 *Standard Schedules for Tenure and Promotion Reviews.* The table below indicates the standard schedules for tenure and promotion. The eligibilities listed assume successful review at each stage, as well as required years in rank. The actions in the table are based on an assumption of initial appointment as either assistant professor or faculty specialist I, with no years credit for rank.

	Year	Tenure	Promotion
Traditionally-Ranked Faculty	Year 1	Initial Appointment	Initial Appointment
	Year 2	2 nd Year Review	
	Year 3		
	Year 4	4 th Year Review	
	Year 5		
	Year 6	Final Tenure Review	Promotion to associate professor is automatic with the award of tenure
	Year 13		Eligible to apply for promotion to full professor
<hr/>			
Faculty Specialists	Year 1	Initial Appointment	Initial Appointment
	Year 2	2 nd Year Review	
	Year 3		Eligible to apply for promotion to faculty specialist 2
	Year 4	4 th Year Review	
	Year 5		
	Year 6	Final Tenure Review	
	Year 9		Eligible to apply for promotion to master faculty specialist
	Year 15		Master Faculty Specialist may apply for step increase