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1. Preamble

This document is intended to provide guidance to faculty and administrators in the College of Visual and Performing Arts (CVPA) regarding the standards and processes involving the consideration of candidates for promotion and tenure (P&T). Individual units (schools and programs) within CVPA are responsible for defining the discipline-specific criteria in their areas within the broader framework of this document, and will make local procedures and guidance available to unit faculty. Units may choose to incorporate relevant elements from promotion and tenure documents developed by disciplinary associations, accrediting bodies, etc. in their guidance to candidates and as considerations for program-level review.

In all cases, the units and the college are bound by the policies in the Faculty Handbook, the most relevant portions of which are appended here for ready reference, along with the current Provost Office Casebook Template and the procedures of the CVPA P&T committee.

2. What is Tenure (a.k.a. appointment without term)?

The purpose of tenure in higher education is to confirm and sustain a mutually beneficial relationship between a faculty member and an institution. The tenured faculty member is promised a full measure of academic and artistic freedom, along with a reasonable expectation of continuous employment, in return for a consistent commitment to the institution’s excellence and achievement as reflected through teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.

3. Tenure in the Arts

In the American college and university environment, the arts are both well established and relatively new when compared to traditional core disciplines and their evolutionary offshoots. Considered together with the inherently qualitative and subjective nature of evaluating much artistic work, this relative newness poses distinctive challenges to faculty and administrators when considering a faculty member’s creative production (here asserted to be the equivalent of scholarship and research as commonly understood in the academy) for the purposes of reappointment, promotion, and tenure. This document offers some general principles to assist candidates and evaluators in this important process.

4. Tenure in CVPA

In the College of Visual and Performing Arts, the central factor in determining suitability for reappointment, promotion, and tenure is the well-informed evaluation and judgment of the candidate’s work by faculty peers and outside adjudicators (from both the academy and the profession, where possible) who are experienced practitioners, distinguished teachers, established scholars, or recognized critics in the candidate’s discipline or a closely related field.
In CVPA, all tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to be active in the practice of their discipline or a related field, and/or in multi- or trans-disciplinary projects, leading to a regular rhythm of production, exhibition, or publication (broadly defined) beyond the university. The college further expects its faculty members to be engaged and effective teachers, continually renewing their pedagogy as to content and approach, and to participate in appropriate service activities. Service appropriate to rank is expected from all, and may take place at a variety of levels including unit, college, university, community, and professional field, as agreed to by the local unit director and the Dean.

The college values quality and impact of work as well as quantity and frequency, and recognizes the long arc of development that some significant creative and scholarly work requires. The college further recognizes that the work of creative artists in many fields is inherently collaborative and interdependent, and every effort should be made by candidates and evaluators to place the "quality and impact" and "quantity and frequency" standards in an appropriate balance and context for the nature of the work being presented. Successful generation of sponsored activities (e.g., projects funded by grants, commissions, or contracts) is also a relevant indicator of professional activity and impact.

In all cases, the clear expectation, for both tenure and promotion, is a consistent engagement with the discipline that both looks beyond the university (with scope and impact appropriate to the rank being sought) and continuously informs and invigorates teaching. The expectation of commitment to the life of the institution through consistent engagement with service generally rises with tenure status and rank.

5. Elements of a case: Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity, Teaching, and Service

To achieve tenure and/or promotion, a candidate must demonstrate (in the words of the Faculty Handbook) “genuine excellence” in either research/scholarship/creative activity or teaching, and “high competence” in the other. In the area of genuine excellence, “significant impact beyond the boundaries of this university” is required.

A meaningful level of service to the unit, college, institution, community, or field is expected of tenure-track and tenured faculty members at all stages of their career at the university, and will be considered as an element of a candidate’s overall portfolio of accomplishment.

The following paragraphs discuss some relevant considerations in evaluating the three elements of a case. These are by no means exhaustive (or limiting) in scope, but rather intended to offer some internally consistent guidance to begin the process.
Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

In the visual and performing arts, the evaluation of a candidate’s achievement of “genuine excellence,” “high competence,” and “significant impact…” in research/scholarship/creative activity is a highly nuanced process with many considerations particular to individual disciplines and career paths. In pursuit of fairness to all candidates and some measure of internal consistency, this process necessarily involves both internal and external measures of validation.

**Internal measures** include:
- comparing the candidate’s own statements and plans for productivity (as agreed to with the unit director, representing the expectations of the unit) with actual results;
- peer evaluation by university colleagues of the quantity, quality, and impact of the work;
- evidence of future trajectory;
- and such other factors as the candidate may advance for consideration or the reviewers may bring to bear in their exercise of professional judgment.

**External measures** include:
- the context and stature of the venues at which the candidate’s work is performed, exhibited, or published;
- critical commentary, with consideration of the quality of the outlet;
- media visibility;
- downstream impact (citation, subsequent production/exhibition, influencing other work and/or pedagogy in the field, etc.);
- peer evaluation by qualified external reviewers of the quantity, quality, and impact of the work;
- and such other factors as the candidate may advance for consideration or the reviewers may bring to bear in their exercise of professional judgment.

It is important for tenure-track faculty to pay consistent attention to documenting their work, providing appropriate interpretive and contextual guidance where necessary, capturing external evidence such as reviews in reputable outlets, whether in print, on line, or in other electronic media, assembling evidence of impact beyond the university as an artist and/or scholar appropriate to the rank being sought, and evidence of success as a teacher, including, where relevant, impact beyond the classroom and/or institution, and documentation of appropriate service.

**Teaching**

Some specific guidance regarding evaluating “genuine excellence” in teaching is available at:
Service

Participation in faculty governance at the school/program and college levels is expected of all full-time faculty (Faculty Handbook 2.1.9.) This participation expresses itself, at a minimum, in the form of regular attendance and participation in faculty meetings at both levels as well as in committees when elected or assigned to such.

Service to the school/program, college, or university beyond the required minimum is strongly encouraged. Such service may take many forms, from informal student or collegial mentorship to participation in special events, fundraising or public engagement activities, ad hoc committees or task forces, and other manifestations. Senior faculty mentorship of junior colleagues in the tenure and promotion process, and subsequent career development, is particularly valuable. Documentation and reporting will vary according to the nature of the service undertaken, but is important in all cases.

Service to the professional field or discipline is a valuable exercise of faculty expertise, and is considered as a positive factor in personnel actions. Such service may take many forms, including peer review, adjudication, panel service, positions held with professional societies, and other manifestations. Documentation and reporting will vary according to the nature of the service undertaken, but is important in all cases.

Three levels of review

CVPA relies on the three levels of peer review (Unit, College, and Dean) to apply the relevant, appropriate, and (insofar as possible given the differences in successful practice between artistic disciplines or even artists within a discipline) consistent standards of judgment to each candidate’s body of work as an artist and/or scholar, teacher, and university citizen.

Review committees and the Dean are expected to discuss and evaluate “quality and impact” and “quantity and frequency” of artistic and scholarly work with due regard for contemporary professional practice in the field; teaching, with appropriate openness to varieties of successful pedagogical practice and caution against overreliance on any single type of data; and service, according to university expectations and prevailing local unit norms, and based on the candidate’s documented record.

Each level of review is both informed by the prior levels and considers the candidate anew, to ensure that the final recommendation to the Provost is as complete, fair, and equitable as possible.

Units begin mentoring tenure-track faculty members from the beginning of their careers at Mason. Senior, tenured faculty members from within the discipline, or if necessary from a related arts discipline, should be assigned to assist junior faculty in navigating the six-year journey. Unit directors should monitor tenure-track candidates’ progress on a consistent basis, advise as to possible areas of concern, and alert the candidate to relevant opportunities for research, scholarship, or creative activity. In promotion to Full Professor cases, mentors should be senior faculty of that rank.

CVPA takes the third-year reappointment review very seriously as a chance to assess, validate, and if necessary, correct a candidate’s trajectory towards the tenure review. As the Handbook provides, some candidates are renewed for two rather than three years in order to provide another pre-tenure opportunity to assess a candidate’s dossier. In all successful renewal cases, candidates can expect some guidance as to the committee’s assessment of strengths and weaknesses in the dossier as the tenure decision approaches.

Decisions to grant tenure and promotion are never taken lightly, and are not based solely on a static body of work, no matter how vast or compelling, and/or prior pedagogical accomplishment. The successful candidate must also make a convincing case for a trajectory of continuing contribution to the field and to the life of the university.

7. The dossier

The Office of the Provost has moved to an all-electronic dossier submission, and the college is supporting that process by requiring electronic materials for, at the latest, the college-level P&T committee review. The current Provost Office Casebook Template is attached to these Guidelines. Candidates, mentors, unit directors, and review committee members should consult this template frequently and follow its instructions closely. The CVPA college P&T committee procedures document is also attached here for reference, and is a good guide as to the process at that level. The Dean’s Office maintains the digital portal for the submission and review of the electronic dossier, currently on Blackboard.

In preparing teaching and research statements, candidates should be aware of the variety of audiences for the dossier, and the wide range of specific familiarity with their work – and their discipline – likely to be represented. The same lens should be trained on any explanatory or contextualizing materials that accompany work samples included in the dossier. Candidates should assume a sophisticated readership, but one in which not all readers will be conversant with the particularities of the highest-level discourse in their field.
8. A Note on External Letters

The Casebook Template (appended below) stipulates a minimum of five letters from external reviewers, with the important proviso that “Units may allow candidate to suggest up to 40% of the outside referees; they may also allow candidate to name one or two individuals to exclude; candidates in no case will see the final list of referees.” Experience teaches that the sooner this process is engaged, the better, and that having a longer list than five may be a wise precaution. CVPA welcomes letters from highly qualified reviewers from both inside and outside the academy.

The unit should include the CV or bio of the referees along with their letters in the dossier, as well as a sample copy of the letter of invitation from the unit director. In that letter, it is good practice to ask the referee to state the extent of their personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate, if any. The external letters should include several from sources with whom the candidate does not have a personal or close professional relationship. The external reviewers should not be asked to speculate as to whether the candidate would receive tenure and/or promotion at their institutions. The Office of the Provost offers templates of letters to external reviewers.

9. Promotion to Full Professor

To achieve the highest academic rank, a faculty member must demonstrate continued and growing excellence in either research/scholarship/creative activity or teaching, and progressively higher competence in the other area. Full Professors are expected to be creating, performing, exhibiting, publishing, and/or contributing to the pedagogy of their fields at a level such that they have achieved and are maintaining national and/or international recognition for their work. The “quality and impact” threshold, as attested by prominence of venues, influence on the field, and/or critical reception, for example, will be higher for promotion to full Professor than for initial tenure and promotion to Associate. Furthermore, as senior members of the community, full Professors play valuable roles as mentors to colleagues and resources to their unit, college, and university, all of which fall under the category of service appropriate to status and rank.
10. The Provost’s timeline

Every fall, typically on or before the first week of September, the Provost’s Office issues the timeline for submissions for that academic year. A typical schedule looks like this, using 2017-18 as the reference year:

By October 6, 2017: A list of cases for promotion and tenure from each unit is emailed to the Provost’s Office.

By February 9, 2018: A complete dossier for each candidate based on the attached template, to include first-level and second-level committee recommendations, chair/director recommendation (where relevant), and dean/director recommendation, should be uploaded to the Provost’s Office.

May 3, 2018: Board of Visitors will meet and take action on Promotion and Tenure recommendations.

11. CVPA’s timeline

Within CVPA, each unit is responsible for managing their cases such that the college level committee can complete its work and forward its recommendations to the Dean no later than two weeks prior to the deadline for submission to the Provost. A typical case in CVPA follows this timetable (again, using 2017-18 as reference year):

By end of Spring Semester 2017: Candidate informs program director of intention to apply for Tenure and/or Promotion. Dossier reviewed by faculty mentor. Program and CVPA colleagues generate list of external reviewers. Program director or unit P&T chair solicits external reviewers (see [8] above for guidance).

By July 24, 2017: Dossier completed by candidate and made available (electronic or physical) to external referees by Program Director.

By September 25, 2017: Letters from reviewers received and uploaded to electronic dossier for review. Dossier is now substantially complete and may be added to only in consultation with Program Director and Dean.

By November 27, 2017: Letter from program committee forwarded to tenured faculty in program; tenured faculty vote. Program letter and results of faculty vote uploaded to electronic dossier for review by CVPA P&T Committee.

By January 27, 2018: CVPA P&T Committee letter forwarded to Dean.

By February 9, 2018: Complete dossier with all levels of review uploaded to Provost.
12. What happens next?

See the excerpt from the Faculty Handbook (appended below) for the complete sequence of the review process including the actions of the Provost, President, and Board of Visitors. Unsuccessful candidates have the option of a “terminal year” of employment, and there is an appeals process available, documented in the Faculty Handbook.
(2.4) Candidates for renewal, promotion and tenure will be evaluated in light of the missions of the University which are teaching; research and scholarship, both theoretical and applied; and service (as defined in Section 2.4.3). Peer review plays a central role in the evaluation of individual achievement in each of these areas. Although candidates are not expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in each of these areas, high competence is expected. Genuine excellence must be exhibited either in teaching or in research/scholarship. High competence must be exhibited in both areas. The primary consideration in the evaluation of the candidate's achievements will be the extent to which these continue to improve the academic quality of the University.

Levels of expectation will vary with the type of decision. While tenure-track appointments will, to some extent, recognize perceived potential rather than achievement, appointment without term or promotion in rank will be based on achievement rather than potential. Appointment without term should leave no doubt about the candidate's value to the University over an extended period.

As defined above, candidates need to exhibit levels of competence and excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and service. In addition, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must provide evidence that their contributions in their area(s) of genuine excellence have had some significant impact beyond the boundaries of this University. If the primary strength is teaching, there should be evidence that the candidate's contributions have influence beyond the immediate classroom; if in theoretical or applied research and scholarship, there should be evidence that the candidate's contributions have significant influence on colleagues at other institutions in this country, and where applicable, abroad.

Candidates seeking promotion to the rank of full professor must maintain high competence in teaching, research and scholarship, and service while
also maintaining genuine excellence in teaching and/or research and scholarship. In addition, evidence of significant impact beyond the boundaries of the University must be much more substantial than in cases involving tenure or promotion to the rank of associate professor. Clear and convincing evidence must be provided of an established external reputation in the primary field, based on consequential achievements in teaching, research and scholarship, or professional activities directly related to teaching and research and scholarship.

In addition, evaluation for promotion or tenure should consider the candidate's adherence to professional ethics (see Section 2.10.2).

Only the criteria described in this handbook can be used in evaluations of faculty.

George Mason University Faculty Handbook - July 1, 2017 pp. 33-35

(2.7.3) The procedure for considering promotion and tenure cases is as follows:

1a. Departmental review is initiated by the local first-level promotion and tenure committee, which may be a committee of the whole. The committee communicates the results of its review to the tenured members of the department who then vote. Only full professors vote in cases involving promotion to the rank of professor. The department chair does not vote with the tenured faculty. The committee transmits the departmental recommendation, including the division of the vote, to the department chair. The department chair transmits to the second-level review committee: (1) the candidate's dossier and related materials; (2) the recommendation of the departmental committee with appropriate justifications; and (3) his/her own recommendation and justification. Notification of the recommendation of the local academic unit and copies of the accompanying justifications are sent to the candidate and to the faculty who participated in the deliberations before the dossier is sent to the second-level committee.

The candidate is evaluated in like manner by the second-level review committee, which forwards its recommendation along with all preceding reports and recommendations to the Dean. Notification of the
recommendation of the second-level review committee is sent to the faculty who participated in the deliberations at the first level of review. Copies of the statement of justification are sent to the candidate and the department chair.

If the second-level review committee's recommendation differs from that of the first-level review committee, the second-level review committee's recommendation and accompanying justification are sent to the first-level review committee.

1b. The process is analogous in non-departmentalized units, except that the role assigned to department chairs is omitted.

2. All materials are reviewed by the Dean of the candidate's college/school. The recommendation of the Dean is forwarded to the Provost. Notification of the recommendation is sent to the faculty bodies who participated in deliberations at the first and second levels of review and a copy of the accompanying justification is sent to the candidate and the local unit administrator (the latter copy to be retained in the candidate's permanent file).

If the Dean’s recommendation is different from that received from the second-level review committee, the reasons for that difference should be specified in the recommendation, which is sent to the candidate, to the faculty bodies participating in the decision-making process, and to the Provost.

3. All relevant materials are reviewed by the Provost. The Provost may consult with other academic administrators who have direct knowledge of one or more aspects of the candidate's professional performance. The Provost makes a recommendation as to whether promotion or tenure should be granted. Notification of the Provost's recommendation is sent to the faculty bodies who participated in deliberations at the first and second levels of review, and a copy of the accompanying justification is sent to the Dean, the candidate and the local unit administrator. The justification shall be retained in the candidate's personnel file.

If the Provost's recommendation is different from that received from the second-level review committee, the reasons for that difference should be
specified in writing and sent to the candidate and to the faculty bodies participating in the decision-making process.

4. If the Provost recommends tenure or promotion be granted, the candidate's dossier, with all previously generated recommendations, is forwarded to the President. If the Provost recommends tenure or promotion not be granted, the recommendation is not forwarded to the President.

5. The President makes a recommendation as to whether tenure or promotion should be granted. If the President recommends tenure or promotion be granted, such recommendation is forwarded to the Board of Visitors. If the President recommends tenure or promotion not be granted, the recommendation is not forwarded to the Board of Visitors.

6. Tenure, and promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor, can only be conferred by the Board of Visitors. If the Board of Visitors decides to grant promotion or tenure, the candidate will be notified in writing by the Secretary of the Board of Visitors.

7. If either the Provost or the President recommends that tenure or promotion not be granted, the candidate will be notified of the decision on or before May 1. Upon receiving notice of the Provost's or President's decision, the candidate may:

   a. accept the decision; or

   b. appeal the decision according to the procedure described in Section 2.8.

In the event tenure is not granted in a faculty member's final year on the tenure-track, the faculty member will be offered a one-year terminal appointment for the next year with workload expectations essentially unchanged from the previous renewal contract.

8. Tenure and promotion are never granted by default.
APPENDIX B

Provost Office Promotion and Tenure Casebook Template:

(Additional Items and Supplementary books should be submitted only if requested.)

c. Letter of recommendation from Dean/Director will include summaries of prior reports, evaluations of performance in research, teaching, and service and evaluation of probable future trajectory. Letters should clearly indicate candidate’s intention to be considered for “Genuine Excellence” in scholarship, teaching, or both.

d. Letters of recommendation from first and second level committees evaluating the case, and from school directors/department chairs (where relevant). Letter should include a roster of committee members at each level. Letters should clearly indicate candidate’s intention to be considered for “Genuine Excellence” in scholarship, teaching, or both. NOTE: Dean and committee letters should normally NOT quote directly from outside letters or cite referees by name, as opposed to summarizing content. Brief quotes (though not be named) can be included when important for the case.

e. Candidate's employment chronology, particularly at GMU to include: date of hire, date when appointed to a tenure track position and tenure and promotion dates, prior to full professorship.

f. Candidate’s vita, including clear evidence about research – publications, grant and contract awards, conferences and invited talks, etc. Evidence of relevant entrepreneurial activities may also be provided for consideration toward promotion or tenure.

g. Candidate's statement about teaching and research, including future plans (not to exceed 8 pages).

h. Outside letters:  a. Minimum of 5  b. This section should also contain the letter sent to the referees, and evidence of referee credentials.  c. Units may allow candidate to suggest up to 40% of the outside referees; they may also allow candidate to name one or two individuals to exclude; candidates in no case will see the final list of referees.
i. Evidence of teaching quality:  a. Student course evaluations  b. When applicable, theses and dissertations supervised; mentoring and advising activity  c. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness such as:  (1) Class visits by peers  (2) Random sample letters  (3) Student comments based on the whole population, not selected samples  (4) Alumni letters  (5) Student focus groups.

j. Other supporting evaluative materials (testimony about service or outreach, evidence of academic entrepreneurship, etc.) -- not to exceed 8 pages.

PLEASE NOTE: An electronic copy of the procedural checklist for Promotion and Tenure Cases can be found on the Office of the Provost website.
APPENDIX C

CVPA Promotion and Tenure Committee Procedures

November 2017

Scope

k. These procedures comply with and append the CVPA Bylaws governing the CVPA Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee) and the GMU Faculty Handbook.

l. The P&T Committee reviews and votes on all CVPA tenure cases and all CVPA promotion cases, including those of tenure-related, term, and administrative faculty.

m. The P&T Committee should include three or more Full Professors.

Communications

1. The Dean’s Office copies the P&T Chair on the memo to the Provost’s Office on RP&T actions for the AY.

2. The Dean’s Office sends two additional items to the P&T Chair:
   a. A memo listing each case to go before the P&T Committee;
   b. The Provost’s Office Promotion and Tenure Schedule for that AY.

3. The Director of the unit where a case originates notifies the P&T Chair when dossiers are delivered from units to the Dean’s Office.

4. The Director of the unit where the case originates promptly notifies the P&T Chair if a case is withdrawn at any point during the review process.

5. For each case brought before the P&T Committee, the P&T Chair provides a memo to the Dean reporting on the P&T Committee’s discussion and vote. The candidate and the Director of the unit where a case originated are copied on this memo.

6. When the Provost’s Office reports final decisions about promotion and tenure-and-promotion to the CVPA Dean’s Office, the Dean’s Office reports that information to the P&T Chair.
Guidelines

1. Every member of the P&T Committee is expected to review all of the materials for every case that they are eligible to vote on in that AY.

2. As outlined in CVPA Bylaws governing the P&T Committee, promotion to Full Professor cases will be reviewed and voted on only by members of the Committee who are Full Professors. However, those cases will be presented before the whole P&T Committee.

3. Committee members are expected to keep all materials confidential and to refrain from discussing anything about the case or the materials presented with any faculty, staff, or administrator outside of committee. Concerns about a case should be brought to the attention of the P&T Chair promptly.

4. Every case brought before the P&T Committee will be voted on by an individual, anonymous vote. Immediately after they have been taken, votes are counted by the P&T Chair along with one other member of the Committee.

Administration

1. When the dossiers for cases coming forward during the current AY have been delivered to the Dean’s Office, the P&T Chair reviews them to ensure that they are complete, and notifies committee members that they are available for review.

2. If any problems with a dossier or other materials arise (e.g., missing materials, questions about external reviewers, etc.), the P&T Chair promptly reports the nature of the problem to the Dean’s Office and unit Director. In addition, the P&T Chair should report to the Committee that the dossier may be updated, and to postpone their review.

3. With administrative support from the Dean’s Office, the P&T Chair ensures that materials are assembled in such a way as to promote confidentiality.
   
   a. Materials assembled for **promotion to full** cases must be clearly marked and separate from materials to be reviewed by the whole P&T Committee.

4. After reviewing the dossiers under consideration, the P&T Chair assigns a spokesperson for each case. The spokesperson will briefly present the strengths and weaknesses of the case to the P&T Committee.
a. Typically the spokesperson will be the Committee member from the unit where the case originates.
b. Promotion to Full Professor cases must have a spokesperson who is a Full Professor, even if that person is from a unit other than the unit where the case originates.
c. The P&T Chair will present all Administrative Faculty promotion cases.

5. After the P&T Committee votes on a case, the P&T Chair assigns contributors to the P&T Committee memo, one for each section (scholarship, teaching, service). The Committee member from the unit where the case originates serves as coordinator of this working group. Only Full Professors may contribute to the memo for promotion to Full Professor cases. Working group members will provide memo sections to coordinators, who compile them and provide these materials to the P&T Chair.

6. For each case, a memo on the discussion and vote is drafted by the P&T Chair and sent for review to the full Committee. That memo must include the name, position, and unit of all P&T Committee members who voted on the case and the date when the vote took place. If any committee member abstained from the discussion and vote, that fact should be indicated. The memo is signed by the P&T Chair on behalf of the Committee.

Schedule for Term Faculty Promotion Cases

1. Promotion dossiers for Term faculty should be expected at the Dean's Offices early in October.

2. Once the dossiers have been reviewed by the P&T Chair and have been determined complete, a meeting of the P&T committee is scheduled. That meeting must be held in mid-October.

3. The P&T Committee will vote on all Term faculty promotion cases brought forward during the AY at its October meeting.

4. Typically, memos for term faculty promotions are due at the end of October.

Schedule for Tenure-related Faculty Cases

1. Promotion and tenure-and-promotion dossiers for Tenure-related faculty should be expected at the Dean’s Offices in the beginning of December.

2. Typically, memos for tenure-related cases are due at the end of January. A meeting of the P&T committee should be scheduled to allow the committee to meet that deadline in a timely manner. The P&T Committee will vote on all
promotion and tenure-and-promotion cases brought forward during the AY at that meeting.