Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, Appeal

Tenured and Tenure Stream Faculty

I. INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth the criteria and procedures used in the evaluation of tenured and tenure stream faculty at the University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown (Pitt-Johnstown) for appointment, reappointment, and promotion, and the procedures for appealing a denial of promotion or reappointment. These criteria and procedures were developed to meet the special needs of the Johnstown campus and are consistent with the present role and future goals of the campus. They are also in accordance with the general policies established by the University for all academic units. A copy of the University policy on faculty reviews and appeals is included in Section VI (page 16) of this document. The University of Pittsburgh Faculty Handbook is attached as Appendix A. Office of the Provost’s Guidelines on Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Nonrenewals, Promotions, and Conferrals of Tenure are included as Appendix B.

II. ROLE OF THE CAMPUS

Pitt-Johnstown was established in 1927 as a regional campus of the University of Pittsburgh. Its primary role was to provide the freshman and sophomore years of a limited number of degree programs offered at the Pittsburgh campus. In 1970, Pitt-Johnstown became a four-year campus of the University. Pitt-Johnstown offers degree programs as well as a wide variety of minors and certificates across seven academic divisions, including the Divisions of Business and Enterprise, Education, Engineering and Computer Sciences, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Nursing & Health Science, and Social Science.

The mission and goals of the University of Pittsburgh are stated in the Plan for Pitt: Making a Difference Together, Academic Years 2016-2020. The mission of Pitt-Johnstown is “to offer a high-quality educational experience in a supportive living-learning environment, that is grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, that is current, and that is responsive both to our students’ personal and professional needs and to our communities’ need.” Our vision is to be “the regional leader educating for success in the real world.”

Our mission demands that we place the attainment of teaching excellence above all other goals. Appropriately demonstrated research, scholarship and creative works ensure the vitality of the faculty, promote currency in the faculty members’ disciplines, and make evident a level of professional engagement commensurate with university faculty status. Suitable service to
the campus and community adds evidence of commitment to the institution in all its
dimensions. Demonstration of such activity at an appropriate level is, therefore, expected as a
qualification for faculty promotion.

III. CAMPUS CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

Minimum criteria for appointment, reappointment and promotion are presented in the University
document attached in Appendix B, *(Faculty Handbook)*. These criteria are general in nature and
allow for interpretations which are in keeping with the role and goals of Pitt-Johnstown and the
academic divisions within the campus.

The campus standards and criteria discussed below are consistent with the minimum criteria
established by the University. Although the criteria are discussed without reference to rank, it is
understood that a faculty member’s performance should meet increasingly higher standards for
Instructor through Professor appointments. The attainment of rank within the tenure stream is
progressive and is judged utilizing the same increasing standards.

It should be clearly understood, at the outset, that attainment of reappointment, tenure and
promotion in rank are all accomplishments of considerable status and are not granted for simply
routine performance of faculty responsibilities. They represent a commitment by the university
and recognition by faculty colleagues and administrators of the campus of both past excellence
and promise for consistent growth and contributions in the future. Such recognition requires the
candidate to provide unequivocal demonstration of having met or exceeded the campus’s criteria
in every aspect and at each level of review.

All faculty at Pitt-Johnstown are expected to demonstrate excellence in undergraduate teaching
and the related academic endeavors such as student academic advising, course and curriculum
review, and design and assessment. Faculty are also expected to demonstrate a strong
commitment to their own professional development. Peer reviewed success in research and
scholarship in the discipline taught, including the pedagogy of that discipline, is a primary
criterion for judging professional competence among academics and, as such, will be a primary
criterion for granting reappointment, promotion and tenure at Pitt-Johnstown. In appropriate
cases and disciplines, creative activity (e.g. essays, fiction prose, poetry, art, music composition
and performance, theatre) may be interpreted as research and scholarship. Additional
professional development activities include advanced study, presentations and attendance at
professional conferences and symposia, and contributing significant service to professional
associations.

The relative emphasis placed upon each of these criteria will vary among divisions, disciplines,
and individual faculty. This variance is necessary and desirable because of the differing nature
and role of disparate disciplines and because of the inherent strengths and interests of individual faculty. However, the requirement for effective teaching must always be satisfied.

In addition to these criteria concerned with the individual faculty member’s performance, Appendix B (Provost’s Office Guidelines), Section IIB contains the following statement regarding the needs of the institution: The work of the University requires a wide variety of talents, balanced among specialized fields. Because these needs change over time, the University must be capable of responding to these changes. Therefore, all recommendations of appointment and promotion not only must be evaluated in terms of the individual merits of the candidate, but also must take into account the current standards of the relevant discipline or profession at large and the requirements of the candidate’s department or school at the time of the recommendation and for the then-foreseeable future.

A. Teaching

Excellent teaching begins with a sound foundation of knowledge and mastery of the discipline. Excellent teaching is a faculty responsibility and requires constant review and study of important new developments within the discipline and its pedagogy. It requires careful preparation and periodic updating of course content and materials, and a clear and effective presentation of the material. Excellent teaching should stimulate students to acquire knowledge and to utilize their knowledge to think critically and cogently. Faculty should assist students in the acquisition of new concepts while fostering a learning environment marked by both an openness to discourse as well as acknowledging the professor’s role as an expert in the field. Excellent teaching should also assist in developing skills applicable directly or indirectly to the student’s future academic and career goals.

Closely associated with the responsibility for one’s own teaching excellence is the process of curriculum development. At Pitt-Johnstown the curriculum and the courses which make up the curriculum are periodically reviewed as the need arises. All faculty are expected to contribute to this process at all levels: individual courses, curriculum within their discipline and the undergraduate curriculum across the campus.

Academic advising is a responsibility of all faculty at Pitt-Johnstown. Successful advising requires a thorough knowledge of general curriculum and graduation requirements, the more specified curriculum and academic regulations of one’s own discipline, and a general familiarity with those of other programs at the campus. It requires the advisor to understand the interests and special problems of each advisee, counsel students on the selection of courses and important procedural matters, and bring to the student’s attention other options compatible with his/her academic and career goals.
B. Professional Development and Scholarship

Whereas teaching excellence is the fundamental goal of the campus, this goal cannot be reached unless faculty maintain an active interest in their disciplines and continue to expand and refine their knowledge and understanding of their fields. In recognition of this requirement, Pitt-Johnstown expects faculty to demonstrate scholarly achievement, research, and creative endeavors for peer review or public scrutiny by means appropriate for their disciplines. These can include, but are not limited to, books, articles in refereed journals, exhibits of art or other creative work, performance for the public or established adjudicators, application for and receipt of grants and awards, project and technical reports, and presentations at professional conferences or symposia. Consulting is not considered as scholarship unless it can be brought into the classroom and subsequently reported in a scholarly manner or reported in a scholarly manner without being tested pedagogically. The criteria by which these achievements are evaluated will emphasize clear evidence of progress and refinement of professional growth and development as evaluated by peers within the discipline.

C. College, University and Community Service

Every faculty member should participate in the conduct of business of his/her division, campus and university. This should include service on division, campus, or University committees. To be effective, this will require a faculty member to be conversant with the goals and problems of the campus and to assume an unselfish attitude reflecting the interests of the institution while assisting in the planning and management of the campus. One of the most important institutional responsibilities of all faculty is the evaluation of colleagues for reappointment and promotion.

Pitt-Johnstown is committed to serving the needs of the community, the region, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This service is performed primarily through formal academic instruction; however, within the limits of available time and resources, the campus encourages its faculty to offer their expertise to better the quality of life in the community. It is understood that some areas of academic expertise lend themselves to this type of service more readily than others, and not all faculty can be expected to engage in this type of service. In all cases where service to the wider community is offered as evidence for reappointment, promotion or tenure, the service should be related either to the candidates’ academic or research discipline or to their expertise as professional educators. Activities of general service to the community of an unrelated nature, such as supporting charitable causes or participating in service clubs, while commendable, will not constitute support for academic advancement.

In circumstances where individual faculty render voluntary service to the community, within the realm of their academic expertise, the campus should recognize and support such activities.
Individual faculty should be encouraged to present materials pertaining to community service when being reviewed for reappointment and promotion.

D. Division and Discipline Criteria

Statements of particular criteria for appointment, renewal of contract and promotion may be developed by each division of Pitt-Johnstown. These criteria reflect the special needs and nature of the individual academic units and may refine, but not supersede or undercut, those stated above. It is the responsibility of division chairs to provide each faculty member in the division with documents concerning the explicit requirements of the division for renewal of contract and promotion. Further policies and procedures may be developed by individual disciplines, but they must be consistent with University, campus, and divisional policies, and they must obtain administrative approval before they are implemented.

IV. GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

The decisions to appoint, renew contract, and promote are among the most important decisions made by the institution. They affect not only the present operation of the campus but also the quality of the institution in the future. Reappointment and promotion are given not only as a reward for past effectiveness in teaching but also in recognition that the candidate has been judged by colleagues to possess the expertise, ability, and motivation to continue to provide significant contributions in the future, consistent with the needs and goals of the division and the campus.

Because of the difficulty of making evaluative judgments about faculty performance, there may be a misguided tendency to base judgments solely on quantitative considerations, such as years of service and the number of committee assignments, courses taught, papers published and professional society memberships held. In order that a review of faculty performance provide meaningful information, it must be based on fair and considered judgments of the quality of the candidate’s credentials and accomplishments made by faculty peers with expertise similar to that of the candidate for reappointment or promotion. Thorough and proper evaluations are difficult and sensitive, but this responsibility is a fundamental responsibility of all faculty and must not be abdicated.

A. Faculty Portfolio

As an aid to the review process, a portfolio shall be maintained by each tenure-stream faculty member. The portfolio will contain materials which bear on the faculty member’s ability in teaching, course development, advising, professional development, and campus and community service. This portfolio will become the foundation of the renewal and/or promotion dossier. The
division chairperson shall inform every faculty member of his/her obligation in regard to keeping his/her portfolio current and complete.

Information on teaching effectiveness should include – at a minimum – a teaching philosophy, a list of courses taught for each term (including numbers of sections and enrollment in each), course development, course materials, self-evaluation, colleague evaluations, and measures of student opinion. It may contain grade distributions for courses taught and examples of critiqued or evaluated student work (e.g. papers, exams, directed projects).

The portfolio should also contain evidence of the faculty member’s commitment to professional development as demonstrated through scholarly and/or creative activity. The portfolio should include a current curriculum vita including a summary of the faculty member’s significant professional activities and evidence of professional recognition. Since tenure and promotion decisions are based upon judgments not only of past accomplishments but also of potential for future contributions, the portfolio should contain plans for continued scholarly work that is relevant to the discipline and its pedagogy. Such a plan should demonstrate a continuity of effort, past, present, and future that may lead to promotion to Professor.

Similarly, the portfolio should contain a current record of the faculty member’s service to the division, the campus, and the community. This record may include a summary of committee memberships, elective posts held, community activities, etc., as well as an explanation of the significance and pertinence of such posts or services.

Materials contained in the portfolio may not be copied or distributed without the written permission of the faculty member, except those copies maintained temporarily for examination by faculty members of review committees and those sent to the Provost and other University administrators in the normal review process.

B. Annual Performance Review

An important part of the review process is the annual meeting of the faculty member and the division chairperson. During the first term of employment, each faculty member will meet with the chairperson of the division in which he/she holds an appointment to discuss the substantive standards employed in decisions affecting renewal and promotion, the procedures used in the review of performance, and the timing of the various events associated with the reviews for renewal and promotion. On an annual basis thereafter, the chairperson (or designated representative) will meet with each faculty member to discuss his/her performance in respect to the criteria for reappointment or promotion: specifically, the reviews will address progress in teaching, scholarship and service, attainment of goals from the past year and future goals as they pertain to the three areas of evaluation. A written summary of the discussion, signed by the division chairperson, shall be placed in the faculty member’s file and copies sent to the faculty
member and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA). For faculty members in the tenure stream who have not yet been awarded tenure, all copies shall be initialed by the faculty member as an acknowledgment that he/she has reviewed the written summary. Every effort should be made to assist the candidate to improve areas of his/her performance which are judged weak, and to inform the candidate of his/her chances for renewal of contract or promotion. Annual reviews may, at the discretion of the candidate, be included in the dossier for promotion and tenure. Annual Performance Reviews will be placed in the dossier for promotion by the VPAA, prior to sending the dossier to the Campus President.

C. Teaching Evaluation

In the evaluation of teaching, information will be gathered from the faculty member’s colleagues and from students. Faculty who take part in the evaluation of teaching will thoroughly familiarize themselves with the candidate’s teaching abilities and activities through an examination of course materials and suitable measures of student opinion of teaching effectiveness. The evaluating faculty should arrange for visitation of the candidate’s class, if agreeable to the candidate. Student Opinions are valued, though it should be recognized that these opinions provide an indication of student perception of the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. As such, particular attention should be paid to patterns of comments regarding the teacher’s effectiveness emerging in said student’s opinions. Student opinion will not be used to judge the value, content, or relevance of the course.

D. Evaluation of Scholarship and Professional Development

The evaluation of a candidate’s efforts toward professional development and scholarship must be a quality judgment made by colleagues with expertise in the candidate’s field. In the evaluation of evidence of professional development and scholarship submitted by the candidate, special attention should be given to the candidate’s awareness and understanding of recent developments in his/her field and to the originality of presentation. Suitable evidence may include published scholarly or creative documents, papers presented at professional conferences or symposia, creative work (e.g. essays, fiction prose, poetry, art, music composition and performance, theatre), reviews of performances or public presentations, or course materials resulting from pedagogical investigations or research. Scholarly or creative works submitted for review but not yet accepted or published may be submitted, but will carry less weight than material which has met the test of scrutiny by professional reviewers or editorial boards. Proposals for professional development projects and grants that have not yet been initiated or awarded will be considered as an indication of a plan for future direction of scholarship or creativity. Funded grants should include the proposal, results, applicable publications, and accounting of expenditure. Consulting, which may be considered professional development, will not be considered as scholarship in and of itself. Faculty members are encouraged to pursue the highest levels of scholarly achievement, research and creative endeavors and seek peer review on every scholarly or creative endeavor.
IV. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT AND REVIEW

Note: In this document the term "Campus Status Committee" refers to a standing committee of the Pitt-Johnstown Faculty Senate and is so recognized in the Pitt-Johnstown Faculty Senate by-laws. The thirteen member committee is constituted as follows: Chair, Vice-Chair, and Past Chair all elected by the Faculty Senate for a three-year term; one representative from each of the seven Academic Divisions elected by the respective Division for a 3-year term; and three additional individuals from the Senate membership approved by the ten aforementioned members to serve a one-year term.

A. Initial Appointment

The search to fill a new position or a position vacancy should be as comprehensive as possible within the constraints of budget and time. Search committees will be appointed from the discipline and related fields. The search committee will prepare dossiers on those candidates who satisfy the basic requirements for the position. The dossier should include letters of recommendation, curriculum vitae, appropriate educational and professional credentials (e.g. transcripts, certificates, etc.) and may contain examples of scholarly work and course materials. When the dossiers have been reviewed, the prime candidates will be invited to visit the campus and all faculty of the division shall have the opportunity to meet and interview them, and to provide input to the search committee. As a part of the interview process, the candidate will be asked to teach a class in his/her field of expertise and interest. When the division chairperson and search committee are convinced that the best candidates have been identified, they will submit their recommendations and supporting materials to the VPAA. The VPAA will make a recommendation to the Campus President. The appointment is made by the Provost, who takes into account the recommendation from the Campus President. In cases where the recommendation includes the granting of tenure, the VPAA will consult with the Campus Status committee prior to making his/her recommendations to the Campus President. Appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor with tenure or probationary appointments require prior approval of the Chancellor of the University acting upon the recommendation of the Provost. In cases where initial appointments are made at a rank above assistant professor, faculty candidates typically bring substantial teaching experience and scholarly achievement and recognition, and may have earned tenure at another institution. For these cases, review committees up to and including Campus Status Committee should consider the totality of the record in making tenure and/or promotion recommendations.

B. Review for Renewal of Contract or Promotion

The timing of required notification to faculty of renewal of contract, promotion or termination is specified in the University of Pittsburgh by-laws, Chapter II (see Appendix A or B). A review
by the Peer Review Committee, Division Status Committee, Faculty Status Committee, VPAA, and Campus President will be conducted prior to the formulation of a recommendation to the Provost of the University. The division review will be initiated by the division chairperson in sufficient time to allow subsequent review actions to be completed prior to the established deadline dates. The “rank above” principle will be followed for all cases and at all levels of the review. Tenured faculty within the candidate’s division not meeting the “rank above” principle will have an opportunity to provide input to the Peer Review Committee; however, individuals not meeting the “rank above” principle are not to have access to the confidential materials in the dossier, nor are they allowed to vote at any level.

For faculty hired in the tenure stream at a rank above assistant professor, review for promotion and tenure may occur earlier during the original contract period. As noted in section IV A above, review committees up to and including Campus Status Committee should consider the totality of the record in making tenure and/or promotion recommendations.

Although special criteria and procedures may be imposed by divisions, and discussed in the policies and procedures documents of the division, the following policies and procedures are common to all divisional reviews.

1. Peer Review Committee

Three to five faculty from the candidate’s discipline and/or related fields will be appointed by the division chairperson, after consultation with the candidate, to form the Peer Review Committee. The Peer Review Committee will review each candidate for renewal of contract, promotion and tenure. In the case of disciplines where there are few faculty in the discipline, the committee should be chosen among faculty with related disciplines or those with experience in the field. During this consultation, the candidate may challenge the appointment of any peer reviewer; however, the final authority rests with the division chairperson. Peer reviewers from related disciplines may also be appointed. The Peer Review Committee members will be selected on the basis of their qualifications to judge the quality of the various areas of faculty responsibility and performance; however, care must be taken so as not to create a potential conflict of interest situation. For example, a co-author of the candidate’s published work would not be an appropriate person to serve on the Peer Review Committee. The goal is to form a committee of individuals who will perform the task in a professional manner. One of the members of the Peer Review Committee will be designated by the division chairperson as the chair. When a candidate is being reviewed for promotion to professor, all Peer Review Committee members must possess the rank of professor; however, they must seek input from persons of all rank. (Note: Additional procedural guidelines for promotion to the rank of professor are included on pages 13-15 of this document). All Peer Review Committee appointments should be made at least one full term prior
to the scheduled term for the presentation of the Peer Review Committee report to the division chairperson.

2. External Referees

The primary responsibility for conducting the review and evaluation rests with the Peer Review Committee. However, evaluation of the candidates’ record of scholarship and professional development by suitably qualified experts from outside the Johnstown Campus of the University of Pittsburgh is also required. The division chairperson will make the arrangements for this review. In the case of contract renewal there must be a minimum of one external referee chosen by the division chairperson in consultation with the candidate. In cases for promotion and/or tenure, there must be a minimum of six. In tenure and promotion cases, three or more will be selected by the division chairperson from a list provided by the candidate; an additional three or more will be selected by the division chairperson without discussion with or input from the candidate. The resulting written evaluations, assessing the candidate’s professional performance and potential will be sent to the division chairperson for inclusion in the candidate’s renewal or promotion dossier. The candidate, however, will not be allowed access to the external referees’ letters.

3. Steps in the process of review for renewal of contract, promotion and tenure

a. The division chairperson will provide the Peer Review Committee members with a copy of the university, Pitt-Johnstown and any division policies and procedures for renewal of contract, promotion and tenure.

b. The Peer Review Committee members will familiarize themselves with all aspects of the candidate’s responsibilities and performance through personal observation of classes, review of scholarly works and review of the candidate’s dossier. The chair of the Peer Review Committee will extend an invitation for comment to all tenured faculty members in the division. The Peer Review Committee will summarize the input and include it in its written report. The Peer Review Committee will meet to discuss the case and develop a written report on the candidate’s past performance and potential for contributions in the years ahead. This report will include reference to all materials used in the evaluation, without identifying the originator of any comment or recommendation. These materials will consist of primary documents supplied by the candidate along with the letter(s) from external referees. The Peer Review Committee report will normally conclude with a recommendation for support or non-support for contract renewal, promotion and/or tenure. The report should be extensive, detailed and thorough, as it is the primary basis upon which others will form their judgments. No vote will be taken at this time.
document may include a minority report; however, all Peer Review Committee members sign a single document (report). The Peer Review Committee report will be given to the division chairperson.

c. The division chairperson will make the candidate’s dossier, including the Peer Review Committee report, available to all tenured faculty members within the division. This group of tenured faculty - the Division Status Committee - must have a chairperson who is selected according to procedures established by the division. After reading the materials in the dossier, all tenured faculty members will be invited to meet and discuss the case. They will vote by secret ballot and the result of this vote is recorded in a report written by the chairperson of the Division Status Committee. The report should provide a summary of the discussion of the case by the members at the committee meeting. If there is disagreement, an effort should be made to represent the range of opinion to the satisfaction of all. If that is not possible, dissenting statements may be appended. The signature of the committee chair affirms that all members who were in attendance had an opportunity to read the final version.

If the Peer Review Committee members are members of this division, they have the right to vote at the division level, as they did not vote as members of the Peer Review Committee, since the Peer Review Committee is a recommending body. (As in all promotion and tenure votes, the principle of “rank above” must apply.) Division Status Committee members who are also members of the Campus Status Committee but are not Peer Review Committee members may participate in the divisional discussions, but their votes are cast only at the Campus Status Committee. Division members who are members of the Campus Status Committee and are Peer Review Committee members may cast their votes only at the Division Status Committee. (This is because it would be inappropriate for an individual to review his/her own report.) The Division Status Committee report is sent to the division chairperson who puts it into the dossier.

d. The division chairperson – in addition to his/her own comments – shall prepare a summary of the Peer Review Committee and Division Status Committee reports in detail without identifying the originator of any comment or recommendation and shall conclude with his/her own recommendation for renewal or non-renewal of contract, or promotion or non-promotion.

e. The division chairperson will discuss his/her recommendation with the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of his/her summary letter. In discussing the results of the review with the candidate, the division chairperson will not associate individual reviewers with specific comments. The summary letter is also put into the candidate’s dossier and a copy placed in the candidate’s file. All copies will be initialed by the candidate as an acknowledgment that he/she has reviewed the summary letter.
f. At the time established by the Campus Status Committee, the division chairperson and Peer Review Committee chairperson will appear before the Campus Status Committee to answer questions regarding the material presented and the recommendations. The committee will review the material and ensure that the policies and procedures delineated in this document have been followed, and that uniform standards of excellence as established by Pitt-Johnstown and the University are being upheld. A vote is taken and the result of this vote is recorded in a report written by the chairperson of the Campus Status Committee. Committee members who are also Peer Review Committee members may participate in committee discussions but cannot vote. During its review, the committee may request further information – including clarification from the Division Status Committee chairperson and/or Peer Review Committee chairperson. After its review, the committee shall forward the materials used in the review and a recommendation to the VPAA. The committee will recommend support or non-support for contract renewal, promotion and/or tenure. The committee will also inform the division chairperson and the candidate when it has made its final recommendation to the VPAA.

g. The VPAA will review the materials and recommendations submitted by the Campus Status Committee. The VPAA will recommend to the Campus president support or non-support for contract renewal, promotion and/or tenure. The VPAA may ask for further information – including clarification from the Campus Status Committee, the Division Status Committee Chairperson, or the Peer Review Committee chairperson. In cases in which the VPAA’s recommendation differs from that of the Campus Status Committee, the VPAA will come before the committee to discuss his/her recommendation prior to submitting his/her recommendation to the Campus President. Following the review, the VPAA will send to the President a recommendation along with all of the materials which have been assembled in the review process. The candidate will be informed of the VPAA’s recommendation.

h. The Campus President will review the case and notify the candidate of his/her recommendation. The president’s recommendation will be sent to the Provost of the University.
V. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR (revised September 2018)

The following steps will be followed in the review for promotion to the rank of Professor:

1. A candidacy for promotion to the rank of Professor is initiated by the faculty member by notifying his/her respective division chairperson in writing.

   (1a). If the division chairperson does not hold the rank of Professor, the VPAA will appoint a qualified surrogate from the faculty to perform the duties listed in items 1-5.

   (1b). If the VPAA does not hold the rank of Professor, the President will appoint a qualified surrogate from the faculty to perform the duties listed in items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6.

Duties of the division chairperson include:

a. *Consultation* with the faculty member regarding the appropriateness of the candidacy, based on recent annual evaluations of the faculty member’s position in rank and progress toward consideration for promotion. In the event a surrogate is serving as division chairperson, the current chairperson will make those annual evaluations available to the surrogate.

b. *Direction* of the faculty member on the content of a dossier he/she must submit to initiate the consideration. As a rule, the faculty member’s complete dossier should be submitted to the division chairperson by March 1 of the year prior to its review, so as to allow solicitation of external letters and deliberations by appropriate review bodies (below) in due time as specified in these Guidelines. If a dossier is not completed by March 1, its consideration should be deferred until a subsequent year.

c. *Solicitation* of external letters from a set of outside referees such that when the dossier is compiled, there are at least six (6) external referee letters from qualified peers holding the rank of professor or equivalent. The solicitation should result in a dossier in which half or more of the external letters must be from referees not suggested by the candidate. In this process, the faculty member will be asked to submit the names of qualified peers he/she might recommend to serve as external letter writers, with specification of any collaboration or other professional association with them, in order that a maximum of three (3) letters from the candidate’s list be obtained. The other letters will be requested of peers in areas of expertise germane to the candidate’s field, exclusive of those names provided by the candidate. Letters must be received by September 1 of the year of the review so as to allow the Peer Review Committee to conduct a thorough and timely review of the entire dossier.
d. **Appointment** of a Peer Review Committee of at least three (3) members of the Pitt-Johnstown faculty, all holding the rank of Professor, and designation of a chairperson among them, to conduct the primary evaluation of the candidacy and submit to the chairperson a letter documenting their findings and a recommendation on promotion. That review should begin September 1 of the year of the review and be completed in a timely fashion in order to facilitate review of its recommendations beginning after January 1 by the Committee of Professors (COP). The candidate will be notified of the composition of the Peer Review Committee and have the opportunity to challenge any member for cause in writing to the division chairperson or his/her surrogate. Responsibility for resolution of such a challenge rests entirely with the division chairperson.

e. **Notification** of the VPAA that a complete dossier, including at least six (6) external referee letters, is ready for review by the Peer Review Committee.

2. When notified by the division chairperson that a complete dossier is ready for review by the Peer Review Committee, the VPAA will notify the Committee of Professors (COP) that a candidacy is being reviewed at the Peer Review Committee stage and will be available for their review by January 1.

   a. The COP will be composed of all active Pitt-Johnstown faculty members holding the rank of Professor, excepting any holding full-time administrative appointment or serving as division chairperson for the review.

   b. The COP will be convened and charged by the VPAA after which the COP will designate one among its number to act as chairperson. The chair will not be serving as a Peer Review Committee member for the case under review.

   c. In order to review a case, the COP will require a quorum of at least 50% plus one (1) of the total number from 2.a. above.

3. The Peer Review Committee will conduct its review thoroughly and in a timely fashion, adhering to all principles of confidentiality. It may request additional information from the division chairperson regarding the dossier and its contents. It will present a detailed letter of findings, along with a recommendation on the candidacy, signed by all members, to the division chairperson in a timely fashion so as to allow review by the COP to begin January 1.

4. The division chairperson will conduct an independent review of the dossier and the findings and recommendation of the Peer Review Committee and submit a letter of his/her own findings and recommendation to the VPAA. The division chairperson is free to solicit additional information and/or to review the Peer Review Committee findings with them. Should the division chairperson come to a different recommendation than the Peer Review Committee, he/she will meet with the
members of the Peer Review Committee to discuss his/her recommendation before submitting his/her recommendation. Then the dossier, including the external letters, the Peer Review Committee letter of findings and recommendation, and the division chairperson’s letter, will be forwarded to the VPAA to be made available for review of the COP by January 1. The division chairperson will provide the candidate with a copy of his/her letter of findings and recommendation.

5. The designated chairperson of the COP will direct all members of the COP to review the dossier in a timely manner and convene a meeting at which the division chairperson, accompanied by the chairperson of the Peer Review Committee, will present and discuss his/her findings and recommendation with the COP. The COP will then deliberate and submit a letter of its own findings and recommendation to the VPAA. The letter will include the results of a vote on the question of whether to recommend promotion. The letter will bear the signatures of all members of the COP. The COP will inform both the division chairperson and the candidate of its recommendation.

6. The VPAA will review the dossier and recommendations submitted by the COP and recommend to the President either support or non-support of the candidacy. The VPAA may solicit any needed additional information or clarification from the respective parties in relation to the review process. In the event the VPAA’s recommendation differs from that of the COP, he/she will come before the COP to discuss his/her recommendation prior to submitting his/her recommendation to the President.

7. The President will review the case and make a recommendation to the Provost of the University. The President may solicit any needed additional information or clarification in relation to the review process. The President will notify the candidate of his/her recommendation in a timely fashion.
VI. PROCEDURES FOR APPEALING DENIAL OF PROMOTION, TENURE, OR REAPPOINTMENT

The general appeal policy and procedure are stated in University Policies and Procedures: Faculty Review and Appeals, 02-02-10 (http://cfo.pitt.edu/policies/policy/02/02-02-10.html and http://cfo.pitt.edu/policies/procedure/02/02-02-10.html). See, in particular, Section IV.B. of Procedure 02-02-10. The Procedure provides for informal means of review and appeal through the division chairperson. The Procedure also provides for formal means of review, which may include requesting a written statement of reasons for the denial, requesting reconsideration from the campus President, appealing to the Provost, and/or appealing to the Chancellor, and which may utilize an Appeals Panel and/or a Hearing Board. If an appeals panel is constituted at Pitt-Johnstown, it will draw from all tenured faculty according to the “rank above” principle, with the exception of the following: division chairs, VPAA, campus President and faculty who have been involved in the faculty review process at any level. If an Appeals Panel is constituted by the Provost, or a Hearing Board is constituted by the Chancellor, the process described in Procedure 02-02-10 will be followed.
APPENDICES

A. Faculty Handbook (revised November 2011)

https://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty-handbook

B. Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Nonrenewals, Promotions, and Conferrals of Tenure - Revised January 1998

https://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty/faculty-appointments-reappointments-nonrenewals-promotions-and-conferrals-tenure