CFA Schedule for 2022-23

Feb. 9, 2022 12-1pm Open CFA Meeting

Sept. 14, 2022 12-1pm Open CFA Meeting

Oct. 19, 2022 Deadline for submitting files to the CFA for full university review for all pre-tenure reappointments and Professorial Lecturer sequence actions with disagreement at the unit level

Jan. 11, 2023 Deadline for submitting all faculty files for tenure (if applicable) and promotion to Associate Professor to the CFA

Feb. 8, 2023 12-1pm Open CFA Meeting

Feb. 15, 2023 Deadline for submitting all faculty files for promotion to Full Professor to the CFA

A. INTRODUCTION

Candidates, faculty coordinators, and all internal reviewers should carefully read these instructions for submitting Files for Action for reappointment, promotion, or tenure to the Committee on Faculty Actions (CFA)**.**
The CFA and Dean of Faculty (DOF) have prepared these instructions in accordance with the current [American University Faculty Manual](). Candidates, faculty coordinators, and all internal reviewers should also carefully read the *Faculty Manual* (and continuing appointment supplement where relevant) and the guidelines for reappointment, promotion and tenure (tenure-line faculty) or guidelines for reappointment and promotion (term and continuing appointment faculty) of the candidate's assigned teaching or academic unit, which are posted on the [Dean of Faculty's website]().

B. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE FILE FOR ACTION

Candidates for reappointment, promotion, or tenure submit a File for Action using the designated procedure of their teaching or academic unit. Candidates should prepare their file in accordance with their unit's guidelines, and any additional instructions that the unit provides. Internal reviewers evaluate the File for Action following criteria specified in the *Faculty Manual*[1]*,* unit guidelines, and (where relevant) this memo. Once the file has moved through the appropriate levels of review within the unit, the dean or University Librarian[2] will then review the file, make a recommendation, and send it forward to either the DOF or the CFA based on the type of file, as explained below.

- **Term faculty reappointment files, applications for promotion on the professorial lecturer sequence, and Library continuing appointment files** go directly to the DOF and

---

[1] Continuing appointment-line Library faculty should consult the relevant supplement when the *Faculty Manual* is referred to in this document.

[2] All references to "dean" in this memo refer to the deans/heads of all academic units, including the University Librarian and the unit leads for the Office of Graduate and Immersive Studies and Office of Graduate and Professional Studies, as found in the *Faculty Manual's* Glossary.

do not need to follow this memo's specifications. The CFA does not review these files unless there is a disagreement at the unit level, as per the *Faculty Manual*. (Also see section C.4 of this memo.) Term faculty going up for promotion or reappointment on the professorial lecturer sequence and continuing appointment-line librarians should contact their deans' offices and ask for the "checklist" document, which contains instructions for preparing those applications.

> ➢ Faculty in these categories can disregard the remainder of this memo.

- In cases of **tenure, tenure-line promotion, and term associate and professor promotion**, files are forwarded to the Faculty Senate office for university-level review by the CFA and then by DOF. These files then go to the Provost for final review. In the case of a positive decision from the Provost, a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion goes forward to the Board of Trustees, which has the final decision-making authority. A decision by the Provost to deny promotion or tenure terminates the process. A faculty member can grieve the decision using the procedure specified in the *Faculty Manual*.

> ➢ The **specifications in these instructions are required for all tenure, tenure-line promotion, and term associate and full professor promotion files**, and the deadlines are final.

A File for Action documents the faculty member's activities and accomplishments in three categories – scholarship, teaching (or primary responsibilities for librarians), and service – as generally defined in the *Manual* and more specifically defined in the candidate's unit guidelines. (The *Manual* states that "scholarship or scholarly refers to research, scholarship, and creative or professional activity." Glossary, p. 9.) In each of these three categories, candidates will address activities and achievements, areas where improvement was made, areas where there needs to be further improvement, plans for growth and development, and projected future outcomes.

Materials in the File for Action are to be concise, meaningful, and clearly related to the candidate's performance or accomplishments. The Files for Action will *not* overwhelm reviewers with extraneous material, such as multiple syllabi that all convey the same pedagogy. Candidates are encouraged to use their comprehensive narrative to demonstrate how they have met the unit's criteria for promotion. Having outlined how they have met the criteria for promotion, candidates are further encouraged to discuss works in progress that show a sustained and even accelerated level of productivity post promotion. If a candidate has work in progress near completion, such as a manuscript, the candidate may list the work on the curriculum vitae, noting that it is work in progress, and include the work in the Scholarly Appendix. If a work in progress is significant for the case, the CFA encourages the candidate to include it in the Scholarly Appendix so that it can be evaluated by internal and external reviewers.

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

Candidates are encouraged to add new information on significant accomplishments to their File for Action that may occur during the review process. A candidate wishing to update a narrative or

curriculum vitae, once submitted, shall submit a new dated version of it with "_revision1" added to the end of the file name. For subsequent revisions, the candidate should use the same procedure and label the element "revision2," "revision3," etc.

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

Please follow these guidelines closely. The CFA does not review incomplete files. Each academic unit provides a checklist of the material required in a File for Action. The office of the Dean of Faculty prepares templates for checklists annually.

Please note: All levels of internal review may ask the candidate about the status of scholarship in progress. Section 11 (g) of the *Faculty Manual* states, "The provost, in consultation with the dean of faculty, will review the file and may request clarifying or additional information from relevant persons or committees involved in the review at earlier stages. In extraordinary circumstances, the provost may request additional external review letters that will be reviewed at the previous levels. Such requests and any responses (or summaries thereof) must be included in the file." In extraordinary circumstances, and with knowledge that doing so may delay the process, deans**,** the CFA chair, or the DOF may request additional information from the candidate, earlier internal reviewers, and/or external reviewers. When seeking revised or new external letters, the request must be submitted via the chair, dean, or University Librarian. If the deans, CFA, or DOF request such information, earlier reviewers must also be given an opportunity to review and comment upon the file in light of the additions and, if necessary, revise their earlier judgments, and, if relevant, take a new vote.

C. COMPONENTS OF A FILE FOR ACTION

1. *Components of a File for Action for Tenure-Track Reappointment or Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, or Term Promotion to Associate Professor*

Candidates will submit a File for Action in digital format. **Hard copies are no longer required at the CFA level and above (see "Scholarly Appendix" below).** Units that wish to continue requiring hard copies of Files for Action for reviews at the unit level must replicate the digital copy exactly. Candidates will submit their electronic copy to their Faculty or Library Coordinator who is responsible for uploading the candidate's file to their own unit's Sharepoint Team Site.

FILE STRUCTURE AND CONTENTS

Each File for Action **in digital format** must have the following elements in the order specified below. Wherever possible, a document saved as a searchable PDF is always preferable to a scanned paper document saved as a PDF image.

WHAT THE CANDIDATE WILL DO

The candidate will prepare the file as a set of PDF files with the body of text in 12-point type and one-inch margins. Please use the exact file names and Sharepoint document types specified below.

Please use illustrations, graphs, or other aids sparingly, only if they significantly enhance the reader's understanding of the file.

I. Comprehensive Narrative
Filename: candidatelastname_narrative.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Narrative"

Candidates are to write a single, comprehensive narrative that is no more than 3,000 words long (including footnotes, appendices, and any other matter). Candidates must use double-spacing, 12-point type, and 1-inch margins. The narrative should show how the candidate has met the unit's criteria for promotion and/or tenure, if applicable. It will include the following three sub-sections in this order:

- Scholarship sub-section: describes with detail and specificity major scholarly accomplishments, objectives, and goals, including a discussion of the candidate's future scholarly agenda, such as future projects and venues and general trajectory toward the next promotion. If applicable, candidates should also discuss future funding prospects and any efforts they may have made to address Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) in their scholarly records.[3] Librarians will describe achievements and future agenda, and DEI contributions where relevant, associated with primary responsibilities.
- Teaching sub-section: describes teaching philosophy, addressing achievements (including engagement with students beyond the classroom), charting improvement, and establishing areas of growth; this section shall also discuss efforts by the candidate to incorporate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Please note: As part of their teaching, Term faculty must address "currency in the field" as per unit guidelines. Continuing Appointment-line Library faculty, who do not teach courses, must address "primary responsibilities" as per unit guidelines.
- Service sub-section: describes engagement with the university community, profession, field, discipline, and/or public life related to scholarly expertise, including any efforts to address Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in their service records, and referencing unit criteria.

II. Candidate's CV
Filename: candidatelastname_cv.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Curriculum Vitae"

It is up to the candidate to provide the field-appropriate format for the CV, with these requirements: **Candidates must put a date on the CV.** All article and book chapter entries must include full citations including dates and page range or number of pages; annotate professional and creative productions with basic information on the scope and dates of the project.

---

[3] American University's Plan for Inclusive Excellence states in Goal 5 that the university offers an inclusive curriculum that "advances a holistic learning experience and demonstrates AU's values of critical inquiry, intellectual engagement, and respectful discourse across diverse perspectives."

III. Information on Scholarship
Filename: candidatelastname_scholarship.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Scholarship"

As a supplement to the comprehensive narrative, the Information on Scholarship section provides documentation for the context of the candidate's scholarly accomplishments. Begin with a one-page Table of Contents, annotated where necessary. The candidate should not write additional narrative text beyond the one-page TOC. This section includes information on the significance of publication or distribution venue (such as acceptance rates, impact factor, and rank of journals; number of downloads, if available; status and scope of publishers, distributors, galleries, etc.); information on nature of collaboration in co-authored works (e.g., the candidate's role and contributions in the project); relevant peer reviews (such as readers' reviews if work is still unpublished), documentation of acceptance by publishers or distributors; published reviews; and, if appropriate, evidence from relevant citation indices, using the unit's criteria. Please do <u>not</u> put publications or other original scholarly/professional/creative material here; put that material in the Scholarly Appendix.

IV. Teaching Portfolio (for teaching faculty) OR Information on Primary Responsibilities (for Library Faculty)
Filename: candidatelastname_teaching.pdf OR candidatelastname_primary.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Teaching Portfolio/Primary Responsibilities"

For Library faculty: please consult with Librarian's office about content of this section, which is a supplement to the comprehensive narrative.

For teaching faculty: as a supplement to the comprehensive narrative, term and tenure-line faculty will have a separate "Teaching Portfolio" that provides additional information and documentation for the candidate's teaching accomplishments as outlined in the "Beyond SETs Guidance" document on the [DOF website](). Please include a one-page Table of Contents, annotated where necessary. The Teaching Portfolio consists of required five components: (1) the teaching narrative (included in the comprehensive narrative described above meet this requirement); (2) self-assessment of teaching; (3) peer assessment of teaching; (4) student assessment of teaching beyond numerical student evaluation of teaching (SET) scores; and (5) numerical SET scores. All five components are required. Please consult "Beyond SETs Guidance" at the DOF website link above for details. Regarding numerical SET scores, files should include the numerical portions of all student evaluations and a table summarizing the scores for each course and comparing them to teaching unit and academic unit benchmarks (and other data, such as medians or quartiles, as supplied by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment via faculty coordinators). The Portfolio may include references to the candidates' efforts to address diversity, equity, and inclusion.

V. Information on Service
Filename: candidatelastname_service.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Service"

As a supplement to the comprehensive narrative, the Information on Service section documents the candidate's service contributions. This section includes any relevant documents associated with

service to AU and external service, including candidate efforts to address Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Begin with a one-page Table of Contents, annotated where necessary.

VI. Scholarly Appendix
<p align="center">Filename: candidatelastname_scholarlyappendix.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Scholarly Appendix"</p>

A final Scholarly Appendix contains the candidate's publications or other original scholarly/professional/creative material. "Scholarly" is a term encompassing traditional academic research, creative and professional work. The academic units themselves provide guidance to candidates on the form in which scholarship/creative/professional work is digitized for the Scholarly Appendix, and whether it is submitted as a link to a resource or as digitized material itself. The CFA encourages candidates to use links and cloud-based services as much as possible for videos or other files too large for Sharepoint. Books, either electronic or hard copy, are not necessarily submitted but may be requested by the DOF or Provost.

<p align="center">WHAT THE DEAN'S OFFICE WILL DO</p>

The faculty coordinator of the candidate's academic unit will create a Faculty Package in Sharepoint for the candidate's File for Action. The name of the candidate in the Sharepoint form should be preceded by the year of reappointment (i.e. 2020 Jane Smith.)

The Dean's Office shall provide to the candidate a table summarizing the student evaluation scores for each course and comparing them to teaching unit and academic unit scores for inclusion in the supplemental Teaching Portfolio.

The following documents should be created and added to the file:

VII. Checklist
<p align="center">Filename: candidatelastname_checklist.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Checklist"</p>

This is the File for Action checklist drawn up by the DOF. The dean's office/office of the University Librarian is responsible for ensuring that all items are included.

VIII. Additions
<p align="center">Filename: candidatelastname_addition #.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Addition"</p>

Additions, if any, that occurred during the unit review process may include correspondence regarding manuscript acceptance, new service appointments, etc. Label the file "_addition 1," "_addition 2," etc. Please do not place candidate response memos here, they should be included in "Internal Evaluations."

IX. Previous Internal Evaluations
<p align="center">Filename: candidatelastname_previouseval.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Internal Letters"</p>

Previous evaluations, that is, internal unredacted memos, vote counts, and any candidate responses from previous faculty actions including re-appointments, if applicable, along with any relevant paperwork such as communication waiving years of prior tenure service or delay of tenure, any earlier evaluations, even if from unsuccessful or withdrawn attempts at promotion, arranged chronologically with the earliest first and the most recent last. Please do *not* include annual reviews that remain internal to the academic or teaching unit in the file.

X. Internal Evaluations
Filename: candidatelastname_internal.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Internal Letters"

This year's unredacted internal letters, interspersed with any responses from the candidate, arranged chronologically in the following order:
    i. Report of the reading committee (if applicable)
    ii. Report of the Rank and Tenure/Personnel/Faculty Action Committee (with separate faculty vote)
    iii. Chair's Memo (if applicable)
    iv. Dean or University Librarian's Memo
    v. CFA Memo (added by Faculty Senate Operations Coordinator after CFA review)

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

XI. External Evaluations
Filename: candidatelastname_externalletters.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "External Letters"

Unredacted (and, of course, confidential) versions of external letters with any candidate's responses to the redacted versions of these letters, where applicable. Each letter shall be designated as "letter 1," "letter 2," etc. by writing a number on the upper right-hand corner of each page of each letter. Numbers must be consecutive. Any missing numbers must be for disqualified letters included in the disqualified letters file.

XII. External CVs
Filename: candidatelastname_externalcvs.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "External CVs"

The curricula vitae of the reviewers in the same order as the letters themselves.

XIII. External Correspondence
Filename: candidatelastname_external correspondence.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "External Correspondence"

All correspondence with the letter writers (e.g. soliciting and acceptance of the letter), including a list of documents sent to them.

XIV. Disqualified Letters
Filename: candidatelastname_disqualifiedletters.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "External Letters"

If needed, any disqualified letters shall be included here, along with accompanying CV and correspondence.

XV. Unit Guidelines
Filename: candidatelastname_guidelines.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Guidelines"

Per the Memorandum to Deans Council from the DOF and CFA, dated April 8, 2021 (as amended by the deans), candidates may use the following guidelines:

Pre-tenure faculty will be allowed to choose between 2 sets of guidelines for evaluating their tenure/promotion files for action:
- Their academic unit's current/newest guidelines, OR
- Unit guidelines in place at the time of their second contract and pre-tenure review. (Note that faculty whose tenure clocks were extended due to COVID may have pre-tenure review in year 4 or 5 instead of year 3.)

All other faculty seeking promotion will be evaluated against the guidelines that are current for their academic units at the time of application. This includes:
- Tenure-line and term faculty seeking promotion to full professor,
- Term faculty seeing promotion to associate professor without tenure, and
- Term faculty seeking promotion on the professorial lecturer sequence.

XVI. Vote Counts
Filename: candidatelastname_votes.pdf
Sharepoint document type: "Votes"

All vote counts from the current action, reported on separate sheets, shall be included here, in chronological order from earliest to most recent.

2. *Components of a File for Action for Tenure-Line Faculty Promotion to Full Professor or Librarian, or Term Faculty Promotion to Full Professor*

This File for Action follows the outline and format described in item C.1 above, with two differences: (1) only student evaluations for a maximum of six previous years of teaching are needed, and (2) only previous external and internal recommendations for most recent promotion and tenure (if applicable), including faculty votes, are needed. These letters must be unredacted. Internal letters for reappointment without promotion need not be included.

External letters for promotion to Full Professor or Librarian shall not come from reviewers who provided letters for a previous promotion.

The File for Action for those seeking promotion after a prior denial of promotion must be as complete and detailed as any File for Action being submitted for the first time. For such a file, **new** external letters must be provided from reviewers who have not previously evaluated the candidate, and the old external letters must also be included in the file. The Dean's Office/Office of the University Librarian must provide unredacted internal letters with faculty votes from the denial as well as from the candidate's promotion/tenure when submitting a subsequent file for promotion to full professor.

3. Components of a File for Action for Faculty Entering the University at a Tenured or an Associate or FullProfessor Rank

The content of these files will depend to some extent on the uniqueness of the individual case. In general, the CFA expects that the relevant unit will submit a curriculum vitae for the candidate; relevant correspondence from the candidate, e.g., a submission letter explaining interest, experience and credentials; any internal letters, including a letter from the relevant dean or University Librarian and reporting on off-list reference checks by whichever person or committee was responsible for them; external evaluations, which could include evaluations provided for a recent promotion or evaluations solicited in the process of hiring; and evidence of teaching experience and quality, e.g., student evaluations, list of courses taught, statement of teaching philosophy or syllabi. In an appendix, the unit will also provide examples of scholarly/creative/professional work. The unit will use the DOF's checklist for senior hires with tenure. In exceptional cases, if one of the above-suggested items is missing, the unit will provide an explanation in the form of a separate memorandum from the dean or University Librarian.

4. Faculty Actions that Usually Do Not Go through CFA Review

I. Library **Continuing Appointment-Line** faculty reappointments and promotions, unless there is a disagreement between the University Library Committee on Faculty Actions and the University Librarian. Such files should include a statement of professional contributions or scholarship as appropriate. No external letters required. Check with the Office of the University Librarian for details.

II. Faculty in the **Washington College of Law**.

III. **Professorial Lecturer** sequence reappointments and promotions, unless there is a disagreement among previous levels of review. No scholarship section and no external letters required. See your dean's office's "checklist."

D. Procedures for Reviewing Files

1. Internal Reviews

The following internal letters at a minimum are required before submission to the CFA; individual unit requirements may mandate more:

- an evaluation from any other designated review committee, such as the rank and tenure or personnel or faculty action committee at the teaching/academic unit or a group of senior faculty, as the unit defines (n.b.: The memo must be signed by the individual heading or representing, for the purpose of correspondence, the committee in its letter, e.g. "Jane Smith, Chair, Rank and Tenure Committee"; letters from "Rank and Tenure Committee" or

"Senior Faculty" are unacceptable);

- an evaluation from the head of the teaching unit, or equivalent as appropriate to the academic unit;
- an evaluation from the academic unit dean or the University Librarian.

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

Memos at the unit level are each independent evaluations of the candidate's performance in scholarship, teaching or primary responsibilities and service, the candidate's response to previous evaluations, areas of needed improvement and growth, and promise of continuing activity in scholarship, teaching and service. Reviewers will use the unit criteria for the rank to which the candidate has applied when evaluating the file. The memos will address in detail the nature and quality of the candidate's scholarship. They will address questions that may arise for non-specialists later reading the file, for instance the meaning of a co-authorship or the prestige-level of a particular grant or patent. They will identify the rank and significance of venues in which the candidate's work has appeared. They will consider the teaching record *beyond student evaluations* and provide context that may help those outside the unit to interpret data. For continuing appointment-line faculty, internal reviews will provide context for assessing primary responsibilities.

All reviews, internal and external, are analytic and specific. They must include a recommendation either for or against the action. When a reviewing body is not unanimous, the memorandum of recommendation must include the reasoning of both the majority and minority. The CFA also strongly recommends brevity, suggesting a word limit of 2000 words in cases where extended explanations are not needed.

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

In the case of professional and creative work, memos need to engage not only the substance of material addressed but also the aesthetic and craft decisions chosen by the candidate, and the way in which those choices locate and position the candidate within their field.

The dean's or University Librarian's evaluation will provide an evaluation of the candidate's performance and role within the unit and university and their field, and indicate where they agree or disagree with unit reviewers and why.

2. Vote Count

Within the unit, the reviewing body (e.g., a department, rank-and-tenure or faculty action committee) reviews the File for Action and holds a secret-ballot four-part vote regarding the scholarship, teaching/or primary responsibilities, and service record of the candidate, as well as the overall action. Members of reviewing bodies may vote yes, no, abstain or recuse. Abstentions should be a rare exception. Abstentions or recusals cannot be used to signal that the voter did not read the material. No person has more than a single vote in the process of evaluation of a faculty member. If an evaluator has more than one possible opportunity to vote (e.g., a faculty member on the CFA), the *Faculty Manual* requires that the evaluator vote only once and at the lowest level possible (e.g., in the unit rather than in the CFA). The numerical results of the faculty vote are included after the appropriate unredacted internal letter. If the vote is not unanimous, the internal letter must contain both the majority and minority viewpoints. The CFA will not review a file if the internal memos are missing any of these components. The CFA chair will ask the unit to provide them.

3. External Reviews

At minimum, five external reviewer letters are required in the Files for Action for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. Soliciting more than five is prudent because of possible disqualification or uncompleted letters. We recommend soliciting letters from external reviewers by the end of the spring semester, for submission at the beginning of the subsequent academic year, when the candidate will submit a File for Action. This ensures ample time to find willing reviewers (and gives them the summer to do the review) while allowing sufficient time for internal levels of review that begin only after all external letters have been received. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the file. Candidates submitting Files for Action do not solicit letters for their own files. The candidate may suggest names, but only a maximum of two of these can be used as actual external reviewers. The candidate may also provide names of persons whom the unit should not contact as potential reviewers because they are inappropriate given insufficient arm's length or other reasons. The teaching unit chair or designated committee suggests a majority of reviewers' names. Each candidate decides, in conjunction with the unit, how much of the candidate's work is relevant to put forward to the reviewer. In general reviewers expect to read a strong representative sample of the work, but not everything on the curriculum vitae.

External reviewers are nationally or internationally respected individuals whose areas of expertise qualify them to speak with authority about the candidate and whose professional and personal relationship with the candidate is such that the external reviewers can provide an objective review. Customarily, the majority of these letters must be from faculty members, typically full professors, who are affiliated with highly regarded institutions. In most cases, and appropriately to the discipline, at least two of the letters should come from someone outside the narrower niche within which the scholar works, who can provide assurance that the work rests on a solid foundation underlying the narrow area and meets the standards of the field or profession.

The identity of external letter writers remains confidential before, during, and after the review process. T Academic units decide whether external letters are completely closed to the candidate or strictly redacted, such that potential identifying characteristics of the author are removed. Those soliciting outside evaluation letters for promotion and/or tenure will consider the following, and so

properly inform outside reviewers, in order to minimize the hazard of having letters disqualified or reviewers asked for further information:

- External reviews must be obtained from *individuals who have no direct professional or personal interest in the outcome of the faculty action* and are thus able to offer an independent judgment. Please consult the Provost's December 6, 2018 memorandum titled,"Standards for Obtaining Objective External Letters for Tenure and/or Promotion," https://www.american.edu/provost/academicaffairs/upload/Standards-for-Obtaining-Objective-External-Letters-for-Tenure-and-Promotion.pdf.
- This is a task of evaluation, grounded in analysis of scholarship/professional/creative work. The reviewer is also asked to comment on the candidate's service to the profession. A recommendation either for or against the candidate's action, based in the evaluation, will conclude the evaluation. **If a recommendation is not in the letter, it is the <u>unit's</u> responsibility to contact the reviewer and ask for a recommendation, which can be made in an e-mail or other correspondence that can serve as an addendum to the letter.** The reviewers will provide a context for the discussion of the candidate's work to aid those who are not expert in the field and analyze the specific work.
- Outside letters explicitly address the specific criteria as stipulated in the unit guidelines that are associated with the rank. The external reviewer **must be given a copy of unit guidelines** as well as *Faculty Manual* language on tenure expectations.

A template for a request letter to external reviewers is available from the AU portal (myau.american.edu), on the Academics/Dean of Faculty's page, under "Tenure-Line Faculty Re-appointments and Promotions."

4. Communications in the File for Action review process

At each level of review, authors of internal review memos must send copies of the memo to the candidate and to all previous authors of internal reviews or designee (i.e. unit coordinator). These memos will be delivered via e-mail. All vote counts are redacted in the copies of the review memos that go to the candidate and all previous internal levels of review.

Candidates have the option to respond to the internal memo produced at each level of review. They have seven calendar days to do so from the date and time that the memo is sent to them electronically. A candidate wishing to respond to a review memo within the candidate's unit at any stage before the dean or University Librarian's memo should consult the unit coordinator regarding the procedure for doingso. A candidate choosing to respond to a dean or University librarian's memo should address the response to the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Actions and send it to facultysenate@american.edu, and send copies to allprevious levels of review. A candidate wishing to respond to a CFA memo should address the response to the Dean of Faculty and send copies to all previous levels of review. Reviewers to whom the candidate is responding do not comment on the candidate's response. It is up to the candidate to verify receipt of a response memo.