



William & Mary Arts & Sciences

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

April 22, 2020

To: Faculty of Arts & Sciences

From: Kate Conley, Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences *Kate Conley*

Subject: Arts & Sciences Procedures on Tenure, Promotion, and Interim Review Processes

This memo amplifies the policies laid out in the *Faculty Handbook*, incorporates and supplements the Provost's Retention, Promotion, and Tenure policy, and supersedes all previous Arts & Sciences procedures on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. In this memo, "Tenure" refers to tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, "promotion" refers to promotion to the rank of full professor. The "RPT Committee" refers to the elected Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences. References to the Dean mean the Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences and not one of the "contact" Deans unless so specified. References to the Chair refer to the Chair of the Department or of a departmental/program Personnel Committee if the department assigns the latter primary responsibility for overseeing tenure, promotion, or interim reviews. (Note: the items below are numbered consecutively, exclusive of their position in the Roman numeral outline.)

I. Procedures for Promotion & Tenure

A. Compiling the Dossier

1. The use of Blackboard is required for all electronic dossiers. For guidance on compiling the dossier, use of the dossier template, and procedures for using Blackboard electronic dossiers, please:
 - a. Log into Blackboard at <http://blackboard.wm.edu>
 - b. Click first on the Blackboard Course Generator tab and then on the "Request a Faculty Dossier" site and fill out the form to create a dossier. The dossier will then appear on the creator's Blackboard course list, which includes all necessary directions.
2. Each dossier submitted to RPT should contain the following items:
 - a. The complete and current curriculum vitae of the candidate that clearly distinguishes between scholarship that is published, accepted for publication, and currently under review. Dates and page numbers for publication are mandatory. Peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications and other creative activities should be clearly distinguished. In cases of co-authored, co-edited, or edited work, candidates should indicate their contributions to the publication. A list of grant proposals both submitted and/or funded should be included in the CV. Sources of external funding should

- include the candidate's role on the project, the total amount of the award, and, in the case of a collaborative project, the amount of funding awarded to the candidate.
- b. Scholarly material as outlined in item 7.
 - c. Peer-reviewed publications about teaching should be included in the dossier, either as research or teaching, but not both. The department will make this decision in consultation with the candidate. An explanation as to why the publications have been so considered should be included in the department report or the Chair's letter. The RPT Committee and the Dean will consider such publications in whichever category they are classified.
 - d. A narrative statement, referred to in the Provost's memo as a "self-evaluation" by the candidate, should consist of an evaluation by the candidate of his/her own scholarship, teaching, and service. This should include a statement of future plans in all three areas. The narrative should be no more than 8 single-spaced pages or the equivalent double-spaced.
 - e. A minimum of four letters from external reviewers with full or abbreviated CVs along with a sample of the letter sent to the external reviewers from the Department, solicited as described in Section B.
 - f. Evaluation of teaching as described in Section C.
 - g. The report of the faculty meeting at which the recommendation of the faculty committee is discussed and voted upon. The vote totals, the number of faculty eligible to vote, and the date of that vote must also be included (see Section E). The report should be limited to no more than 8 single-spaced pages, excluding supplemental tables. The report should articulate departmental expectations for tenure or promotion, including those pertaining to varied types of scholarly work (e.g., sole author monograph, edited book, first-author or peer-reviewed article) and external grants. The report should provide a context for the candidate's dossier. It should not simply summarize the candidate's narrative statement or the external reviewers' letters, but should give the committee's independent assessment of the candidate's dossier.
 - h. The report of the department Chair (see items 21 and 22).
 - i. A copy of the department's standards for tenure and promotion.
 - j. Candidates may include any additional relevant materials they wish in the dossiers, including letters from William & Mary faculty, colleagues, and students, and letters from colleagues or students elsewhere. Such materials, however, must be clearly distinguished from external review letters. With the exception of solicited external reviews or other letters required by departmental/program procedures, all other letters can be excluded by the candidate.

- k. If a candidate's date for mandatory review for tenure has been changed since the time of appointment, or if the candidate has been approved for early tenure, this change must be clearly documented and a copy of the Provost's approval must be included in the dossier. In the case of early tenure, candidates must indicate that they realize that they will have only one opportunity to be considered for tenure.
- l. Candidates and their department Chair should review the entire dossier, except for the external reviewers' original letters, their CVs, and the letter concerning how the reviewers were chosen. (The list or table of contents does not need to itemize every document but should account for each dossier folder and subfolder as appropriate.) They should sign and date a list of contents of the dossier attesting that the dossier contains all the items and that the candidate has seen them. This attestation is signed by the department Chair as the representative of the Dean.
- m. If the candidate seeks to add new material to the dossier after it leaves the department, this request will be honored, but the Dean and the RPT committee reserve the right to ask the department to redo its evaluation in light of the new material. Everything in the dossier must be attributed.

Timelines

- a. The candidate can add relevant material to the dossier at any time before it is sent to external reviewers.
- b. Once the dossier is out for review to the external reviewers, the candidate cannot add materials to it, until all the redacted external letters have been added to the file.
- c. The candidate will have at least one week to review and respond to redacted external letters before the department begins its deliberation.
- d. The candidate will have at least one week to review and respond to both the department's letter and the Chair's letter before the file is sent to RPT. The candidate may apply to the Dean for an extension of this period.

B. External Review of Scholarship

Selection of External Reviewers

- 3. The minimum number of external letters to be included in the dossier is four. The candidate should put together a list of possible external reviewers. The department should compile a second list. All members of the department may contribute to this list, regardless of rank, unless prohibited by departmental procedures. Moreover, unless prohibited by departmental procedures, the candidate may be allowed to see the department's initial list and exclude individuals from that list for reasonable cause. Under normal circumstances, at least one reviewer will be chosen from the list produced by the candidate and at least one chosen from the list created by the department. If all letters are from the candidate's list or if all are from the department's list, this must be explained in the department's letter about how the reviewers were chosen. All letters received must be put in the candidate's dossier. At no time should candidates see a final list of the external reviewers.

4. External reviewers should come from programs, institutions, or agencies of a quality commensurate with the reputation and standards of the College of William & Mary. Letters should be solicited whenever possible from individuals at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires to be promoted. A copy of the solicitation letter should be included in the candidate's dossier (in the Secure Materials folder).

The following statement must also be included in the original solicitation letter sent to external reviewers:

“The University will, to the extent permitted by law, hold your letter (or statement) in confidence. The Virginia Freedom of Information Act permits the university to withhold confidential letters and statements of recommendation respecting applications for employment or promotion. The letter may be disclosed within the university if necessary in connection with an internal investigation into allegations of discrimination or the like, and will be disclosed as required under subpoena or other legal process. The candidate will be allowed to view redacted versions of the external reviewer letters.”

5. External reviewers must be wholly disinterested, i.e., what has traditionally been known as “arms-length.” According to the Provost’s memo, “individuals with whom a professional or personal relationship exists such as might reduce the objectivity or perceived objectivity of the review” are *not* at “arms-length.” The test for being wholly disinterested is that potential reviewers should not have even the appearance of a vested interest based on their own careers, nor a personal interest in the career advancement of the faculty member under review. For example, external reviewers should not have mentored, financially supported, or taught the faculty member during the faculty member’s graduate education or post-doctoral experience, be a former colleague or supervisor, or have collaborated closely with the faculty member on publications or grants. They may have been in contact with and/or served with the faculty member in editorial roles, on review panels, in conferences and professional organizations. In some fields or cases, this may mean trading a degree of expertise for added distance, and in some cases, especially where there are many authors, exceptions to this standard may be appropriate. If a department has a question as to whether or not a proposed reviewer is wholly disinterested, the Chair should contact the Dean in advance of soliciting letters who will then discuss the case with the Chair of the RPT Committee and, if necessary, the Faculty Affairs Committee. The final decision rests with the Dean.
6. If, after a letter is received, the department finds that the external reviewer is not, in fact, “arms-length,” it must include a statement in the dossier that the letter was solicited and received but did not contribute to the department’s decision. If the RPT Committee, in the course of its reading of the dossier, finds that an external reviewer is not “arms-length,” the committee will inform the Dean and the department, and request permission from the Dean not to consider the letter. If this is approved by the Dean, the Dean will inform the department, and the letter will remain in the dossier with a statement added that the letter did not contribute to the committee’s decision. The department may request that the Dean reconsider the decision. If this results in fewer than four letters that are “arms-length,” the department must obtain a replacement and reconsider the dossier as soon as possible.

Information Provided to External Reviewers

7. The goal of external review is to obtain an unbiased assessment of scholarship that has been vetted or approved by peers, and this should be noted in the solicitation letter. Work accepted for publication (in press) must have an acceptance memo or contract accompanying it. Only the following items are to be sent to and considered by external reviewers:
 - a. A copy of the candidate's complete and current CV.
 - b. The entire narrative statement, including the evaluation of scholarship, teaching, and service.
 - c. Articles that are published or accepted for publication in journals. Publications in on-line journals or venues will be considered by departments and reviewers in the same manner as those in print journals consistent with standards in the discipline and department.
 - d. Book chapters that are published or accepted for publication in edited volumes.
 - e. Books, book manuscripts that have been accepted for publication, or book manuscripts with an advance contract, with the prospective publisher clearly indicated.
 - f. Conference proceedings that have been peer-reviewed.
 - g. Appropriate examples of creative work such as CDs, photographs, exhibition catalogs, video, musical scores, etc. which document performances, compositions, artwork, and technical artistic work.
 - h. Editorial work if considered in the category of scholarship by the candidate in consultation with the department.
 - i. Additional scholarly materials, for example, grant proposals, computer software, or websites may be included.
 - j. Articles and book manuscript not yet accepted for publication, provided that the status of each piece is accurately described (in progress, submitted, under review, etc.), and explained and evaluated by the department and/or program personnel report.
8. External reviewers will be asked to provide information on their relationship to the candidate in a manner that will allow this information to be kept confidential from the candidate. They will also be asked to provide a full or abbreviated CV.

Departments must also instruct the reviewers to use one of the following:

- a. A separate letter attached to the letter evaluating the candidate
 - b. An initial paragraph of the letter evaluating the candidate
 - c. A final paragraph below the signature line of the letter evaluating the candidate
9. Departments must also instruct the reviewers that only the evaluative text of their letters will be shared with the candidate and that any identifying information about them or their institution in the evaluative letter will be blocked out.

Including External Reviews in the Dossier

10. Two options are available for providing materials to external reviewers:

- a. Copies of scholarship materials are mailed or emailed to reviewers and external letters are mailed/emailed back to the department.
- b. External reviewers are added as users to a copy of the Blackboard site, and they upload letters themselves.

For option a, once the letters are received by the department, they will be redacted and the redacted letters will be added to the “External Evaluation (Redacted)” folder on the Blackboard site to which the candidate has access. The original external reviewers’ letters, their abbreviated or complete CVs, and a report on how the reviewers were chosen will be uploaded to the “Secure External Materials” section of the Blackboard site to which the candidate does not have access.

For option b, the reviewers will upload their own materials (letter and abbreviated or complete CV) to the “Secure External Materials” section of the Blackboard site, created by the department after the faculty member up for review signs the Table of Contents, makes a personal copy of the site, and is then removed from the “Course.”

The “Secure External Materials” folder may be shared only with those voting on the case, but not with the candidate. Any revelation of the names of these outside reviewers will be treated as a serious breach of confidentiality.

The original reviewers’ letters will be submitted to the Dean’s office in hard copy in addition to the electronic dossier.

11. The Chair’s letter or departmental report on behalf of the candidate may use quotations from the external reviewers’ letters but it should not attribute those quotations to specific reviewers or name their institutions.

C. Assessment of Teaching

12. A description of the kinds of courses offered by the candidate, such as survey or introductory, upper level, or seminar must be included in the report of the Chair, the department, or the departmental personnel committee. Any gaps in teaching must be clarified (e.g., junior leave, SSRL, FLMA). This may be done in the candidate’s CV, the department report, or the Chair’s letter, and in the section listing courses taught.
13. A second means of evaluating the faculty member’s teaching must be included besides student evaluations. A unit’s failure to comply with this College policy may delay a candidate’s evaluation. The department report must state the nature of the second method of assessment (e.g., review of exams and syllabi, peer observation) and contain an evaluation of these materials.
14. Candidates for tenure will include all evaluations for each course taught since they arrived at the College and those for promotion will include all student evaluations for each course taught since tenure or for the previous eight consecutive years, whichever is

shorter.¹ The department is required to provide a single table summarizing the candidate's scores for all courses on the question "what is this instructor's overall teaching effectiveness." The department should also include in this table a specified numerical comparison (e.g. the departmental mean) to other departmental courses. Additionally, the department must include the comments from the student evaluations in one of the following forms: a PDF of the complete evaluations or a compilation of all student comments, clearly identified by course, semester, and year.

D. Service

15. Service on departmental committees and service on committees outside the faculty member's department or in other activities for the College such as first-year advising are expected of all candidates considered for tenure. Editorial work and membership on editorial boards shall be considered as either service or scholarship depending on the decision of the candidate, in consultation with the department. This categorization should be clearly spelled out in the department's report or the Chair's letter.

E. Departmental Review

16. Faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion should participate in the departmental review. Untenured faculty members may not participate in decisions on promotion and tenure in any formal way.
17. Whether the Chair votes as a member of the department will depend on departmental personnel policies. When the Chair votes, the Chair's letter will be primarily descriptive of the process. When the Chair does not vote, the Chair will provide an independent assessment of the candidate in the Chair's letter.
18. Departments with fewer than three faculty members of the appropriate rank (associate and full professors for tenure and only full professors for promotion) will have faculty members of the appropriate rank added to the existing personnel committee from other William & Mary departments or schools by the decision of the Dean. The Dean will discuss with the Chair of the department appropriate faculty members to be added and may discuss this with the Chair of the RPT Committee and with the Faculty Affairs Committee. The final decision on whom to add rests with the Dean. The added members need not participate in the decision to choose the external reviewers, but if fewer than three members of the department are on the committee, then the committee will seek input from other members of the department (see item 3). In all respects, members added by the Dean are full members of the personnel committee and shall vote upon the candidate's file.
19. In departments where there is a strong division of opinion on a candidate, i.e. if there is a minority of at least one third of the members voting, departments must provide minority

¹ By default, faculty will omit course evaluations for the spring semester of 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic disruption to the academic year. Faculty may, however, choose to include those evaluations, and those who do so should clearly indicate this election in their dossier.

and majority reports that are signed by all supporting faculty members. If a minority report is not submitted because the minority is fewer than one third of voting members, the departmental report or the Chair's letter must fully explain the division of opinion. Candidates must be given adequate time to respond to these reports (see Timelines), with an extension if it is requested by the candidate and approved by the Dean.

20. Faculty members jointly appointed in programs or other departments must have their dossiers considered according to the provisions of their Joint Appointment Memorandum of Understanding [JAMOU] regarding the role of the department and the program. The letter of the interdisciplinary program Director or second department Chair shall be part of the candidate's dossier with the same status as that of the tenure department. The tenure department shall take account of this letter in its deliberations. If any faculty member is eligible to vote in both the candidate's tenure department and secondary department/program, that faculty member may only cast one vote.

The nature of the second appointment (formal JAMOU or affiliated faculty) must be clearly stated.

For JAMOUs, separate department/program reports and Chair/Director letters must be included. There must be two separate and distinct reports unless the department and program intentionally collaborate on a single joint report signed by both the tenure department and the joint program director. Reports should be commensurate with the expectations of the candidate within the department or program. For example, if the JAMOU calls only for teaching and service in the program, the report from the program need only address those contributions.

Faculty members who have a significant involvement in an interdisciplinary program or another department outside of their tenure department that is not governed by an existing JAMOU may request from the Dean in writing that the interdisciplinary program or other department be allowed to review their dossier and provide a letter summarizing the contributions of the faculty member to the program or second department.

Departmental Chair's Report

21. Department Chairs are expected to provide their assent or disagreement with the departmental vote as well as a brief summary of the reasons for their decision. If they do not wish to take a position on the case, they must state their abstention clearly in their letter in the dossier. In the case of joint appointments or significant activity in an interdisciplinary program, program Directors are expected to do the same. This report should be 1-2 singled-spaced pages maximum. The Chair's report should put the department discussion into context, validate the vote, and state whether the Chair agrees or disagrees with the majority vote and why.
22. The departmental or Chair's report on a candidate must clearly indicate the extent of the candidate's record that is based on work done at William & Mary. Teaching, service, and research—the latter including publications accepted and grants received—from before the candidate came to William & Mary will be considered in the decision on the

candidate, but the case must be made that the candidate has demonstrated that he or she has established an ongoing, sustainable research, teaching, and service program since arriving at William & Mary. Candidates coming in at the rank of Associate Professor who receive tenure upon their hire are evaluated based on their previous record.

F. Review by RPT Committee

23. The RPT Committee bases its decision only on the materials and letters that are part of the regular departmental evaluation process. The weight given to material other than the mandatory materials by the RPT Committee will depend in large part on the department's or program's letter that references or uses these materials in the case for or against tenure or promotion. In its review of the scholarship, the RPT will apply the standards adopted by a majority vote of the candidate's department (and approved by the Procedural Review Committee and the Personnel Policy Committee), as well as applicable College standards as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*.
24. The RPT Committee's report is advisory to the Dean. It will be provided to the candidate by the Dean simultaneously with the Dean's letter to the Provost. The RPT report and the Dean's letter will both be added to the dossier.

G. Review by the Dean of Arts & Sciences

25. The Dean bases his/her decision on the materials and letters that are part of the regular departmental evaluation process and the report from the RPT.
26. The Dean's letter to the Provost on each tenure and promotion case will be copied to the candidate, the Chair of the candidate's department, and to the program Director where appropriate. The appropriate contact Dean or Deans, and the Chair of the RPT Committee will have access to it on the Blackboard site. The candidate has the right to respond to the RPT report and the Dean's letter by submitting a letter to the Dean which will be included in the dossier.
27. The process of reading dossiers for tenure and promotion in the Dean's office is as follows:
 - a. The RPT Committee reads the dossier and provides a report with a vote to the Dean.
 - b. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences, the Dean for Educational Policy, the Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of Honors and Interdisciplinary Studies all read and discuss the dossiers. Reading the files and discussing them with the Dean is part of the job description of these Deans.
 - c. The Dean of the Faculty makes his/her recommendation as a letter to the Provost.
 - d. The dossiers are made available to the Provost, who will write a letter and copy it to the Dean, the candidate, and the Chair of the candidate's department. This letter will also be posted to the Blackboard site by the Dean's office.

II. Procedures for Candidates Hired with Tenure

28. Tenure earned elsewhere is not transferred; tenure is awarded by William & Mary. Departments hiring external candidates with tenure or with a promotion in rank, from associate to full, must compile a dossier that closely approximates the typical William & Mary tenure or promotion dossier. The exception is that a sample of student evaluations, rather than all evaluations, may be used. Alternatively, if such evaluations are not available, a report on teaching, such as a class taught during the interview, may be used with the Dean's permission. Course syllabi should be included in any case, and they may be used as part of the required second means of evaluation. Any other changes must be approved in writing by the Dean and Provost.
29. Letters used by the candidate as part of the application process are generally unacceptable as part of the tenure file, although in some instances it may be possible to use the same individuals as tenure references. No more than two external tenure review letters from a recent tenure process at the candidate's home institution may be used to support a William & Mary grant of tenure, unless the Provost determines that compelling cause exists to permit more than two letters to be used.

III. Procedures for Promotion to the rank of Professor

30. Consideration for promotion to the rank of professor (or "full" professor) will normally take place in no less than the sixth year after tenure. Promotion to full professor after less than six years may be possible, based on exceptionally strong performance in research, teaching, and service. Consideration for promotion after six years shall not be taken as a weakness in the candidate's file nor be taken a reason to hold the candidate to a different standard. In the case of promotion to full professor in less than six years after tenure, the candidate file must indicate that this is early consideration.
31. A candidate for promotion to full professor must have maintained at least the level of achievement in research and teaching generally expected of a candidate for tenure. For promotion, however, the faculty member's national or international standing should have grown in a fashion appropriate to 12 or more years of continued productivity. Candidates for promotion to full professor will be expected to have an attested record of significant and effective service to the College and the profession.
32. Departments may recommend faculty members who have produced some research since receiving tenure but do not meet the research expectations for promotion if the faculty member has a sustained record of exemplary teaching and service over a long period, usually at least 15 years since the award of tenure. The faculty member's research, even though it may be smaller in quantity than is normally the case and would not normally be judged to meet expectations for promotion, will also be considered as part of the case for promotion. External reviewers will be provided with a copy of this paragraph to clarify that they are being asked to review a candidate for promotion under special circumstances. The evidence that the faculty member's contributions in service and achievements in teaching are unusually strong will be crucial to obtaining a favorable recommendation by the RPT Committee and the Dean.

33. When a departmental Chair is the candidate for promotion, the departmental personnel committee will appoint a proxy chair for all promotion cases that year. The proxy chair will not vote as a member of the department but will provide an independent assessment of the candidate in a separate letter, instead, as outlined in item 17.

IV. Procedures for Interim Reviews

34. The Dean's letter of intent will schedule an interim, or pre-tenure review, except in cases where a tenure review is scheduled during the first three years of service at William & Mary. Under normal circumstances, all pre-tenure faculty members must have an interim review in their third year of service in a tenure-eligible line in Arts & Sciences.
35. The goal of interim review is to provide pre-tenure faculty members with as complete a reading as possible of their progress towards tenure. Candidates must be informed about those aspects of their record in scholarship, teaching, and service which demand significant strengthening over the subsequent period before tenure consideration in order for them to be more confident of a successful tenure consideration. The vote of the department's tenured faculty recommending whether or not the candidate should be retained and proceed towards tenure consideration must be recorded and reported in the department report or the Chair's letter. If the Provost reaches a negative decision, the candidate will be given notice of termination according to the schedule set out in the *Faculty Handbook* (section III.B.2).
36. The basic elements of the interim review should closely align with those of the tenure review with the exception of external letters, in order to aid candidates in assessing what they need to concentrate on in the following years before tenure consideration. Candidates will be evaluated for tenure purposes, however, on their performance during the entire probationary period.

The department will work with the candidate to provide the following for the interim review:

- a. The complete and current curriculum vitae of the candidate that clearly distinguishes between scholarship that is published, accepted for publication, and currently under review. Dates and page numbers for publications are mandatory. Peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications and other creative activities should be clearly distinguished. In cases of co-authored, co-edited, or edited work, candidates should indicate their contributions to the publication. A list of grant proposals both submitted and/or funded should be included in the CV. Sources for external funding should include the candidate's role on the project, the total amount of the award and, in the case of a collaborative project, the amount of funding awarded to the candidate.
- b. Scholarly material, including unpublished work that candidates wish to be considered can be submitted as evidence of a creditable pipeline of their forthcoming scholarship

- c. Publications about teaching should be included in the dossier, either as scholarship or teaching, but not both. This decision will be made by the candidate in consultation with the department.
 - d. A narrative statement by candidates evaluating their own scholarship, teaching, and service. This should include a statement of future plans in all three areas. The narrative should be no more than 4-5 single-spaced pages or the equivalent double-spaced. The CV and statement will make clear which publications or research have been based on work done since arriving at William & Mary.
 - e. Evaluation of teaching as described in Section C.
 - f. The report of the faculty meeting at which the recommendation of the faculty committee is discussed and voted upon. The vote totals, the number of faculty eligible to vote, and the date of that vote must also be included (see Section E). The report should provide a context for the candidate's dossier. It should not simply summarize the candidate's narrative statement but should give the committee's independent assessment of the candidate's dossier.
 - g. Candidates with formal joint appointments must be evaluated by both departments or the department and the program. Candidates who have significant involvement in an interdisciplinary program or another department outside their tenure department that is not governed by an existing JAMOU may request from the Dean in writing that the interdisciplinary program or other department be allowed to review their dossier and provide a letter summarizing the contributions of the faculty member to the program or second department.
 - h. The report of the department Chair (see items 21 and 22).
 - i. Candidates and their department Chairs should review the entire interim dossier. They should sign and date a list of contents of the dossier attesting that the dossier contains all the items and that the candidate has seen them. This attestation is signed by the department Chair as the representative of the Dean.
37. The Dean will summarize his/her evaluation of the candidate's interim review file in a letter to the candidate, copied to the department Chair or program Director as appropriate, and the Provost, which will include the Dean's recommendation on whether or not the candidate should be retained and proceed towards tenure consideration. In the case of a recommendation not to retain the candidate, the final decision rests with the Provost.