

## **MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW HANDBOOK**

### **UNM DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY**

**(Spring 2007 version)**

The Department is bound by the University's "Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure" in *The University of New Mexico Faculty Handbook*. The electronic version of October 2003 maintains the most recent policies (<http://handbook.unm.edu/newhb.html>). It constitutes the official text for all University tenure and promotion action and the basis for appeal.

**Criteria:** Candidates and review committee members should familiarize themselves with the Faculty Handbook policy in sections B-1 ("Professional Activities of Faculty and Criteria for Evaluation") and B-4 ("Faculty Reviews") and with appropriate sections of "Information for Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences" (<http://www.unm.edu/~artsci/faculty/index.html>). *University of New Mexico Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, adopted on January 19, 2007, is considered a part of this handbook.

## **THE REVIEW PROCESS: OVERVIEW**

*The Department Review and Recommendation:* The candidate prepares a dossier for the review committee. The review committee prepares a report that is advisory to the faculty (and ultimately the chair), and the faculty reads the committee report and the dossier. At a late January faculty meeting the candidate's case is presented and a provisional ballot cast by tenure-track faculty in attendance. The Chair subsequently notifies the candidate of the overall (non-numerical) result of that unofficial balloting. Individual, confidential ballots from all tenure-track faculty are then submitted, tabulated by the Chair, reported on the official transmittal form, and included in the dossier. The faculty votes are advisory to the Chair, whose own vote, which may differ from the majority, is recorded separately and whose report constitutes the official department recommendation. The candidate receives a redacted version of the Chair's report.

*The College Review and Recommendation:* The Junior Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews dossiers of all candidates for mid-probationary review. (The function, membership and process of this committee is available on-line in the 2004 "By-Laws of Arts and Sciences UNM.") Usual practice is to have each dossier read by all committee members but in depth by two, who present the case (without a committee member from the candidate's department present). The committee chair summarizes the discussion in a report to the Dean, but votes are individual and individually conveyed to the Associate Dean for Faculty, who reads all the dossiers. If there is a problem, one or both of the other associate deans (for Curriculum and Instruction, for Research) may also read the dossier. The Associate Dean for Faculty makes a recommendation to the Dean, who makes the official assessment and recommendation and forwards the dossier (without supplemental materials) to the Provost's office. The candidate receives notification of the College decision.

*The Deputy Provost's Review and Recommendation:* The Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs reads all dossiers (except those from their own department) and may or may not convene an advisory committee of senior faculty members for additional input and may or may not consult other associate provosts in making a recommendation to the Provost.

*The Provost's Review and Final Decision:* The Provost reviews the dossiers (except where there is a conflict of interest) and the recommendations of chair, dean, and deputy provost. According to the Faculty Handbook: "The Provost provides written notification of the [final] decision to the faculty member no later than June 30 of the review year, exercising the personnel authority of the Regents delegated by them for this purpose."

## THE MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

According to the *UNM Faculty Handbook*, 4.6.1, the purpose and standards for mid-probationary review are as follows:

(a) The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to enable the department to evaluate progress towards tenure, to inform the probationary faculty member of his or her strengths and weaknesses, and to decide whether or not to continue the faculty member's appointment. The review entails evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in the four categories of teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics, according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit.

(b) The mid-probationary review requires identification of the specific areas of strength and weakness demonstrated by the faculty member and the evidence supporting conclusions to that effect. The aim of the required identification of areas of strength and weakness is to give the faculty member a clear picture of the performance levels by which he or she is to be judged and offer the opportunity to correct any noted deficiencies prior to subsequent reviews. The existence of some identified deficiencies in this review are considered normal, as it is not anticipated that the probationary member will have fully attained the standards required for the award of tenure by the time of the mid-probationary review.

(c) For a positive mid-probationary review there should be demonstration of, or at least clear progress toward, the competence or effectiveness in all four evaluation categories expected of tenured faculty, as well as promise of excellence in either teaching or scholarly work. If the University concludes that insufficient progress toward tenure has been made and that deficiencies are unlikely to be corrected in the time remaining before the tenure decision, then a negative mid-probationary decision is both appropriate and necessary.

### REVIEW COMMITTEE

*Responsibility:* Department Chair

*Due:* During late August, by the Friday before Labor Day

The department chair appoints the review committee during late August, by the Friday before Labor Day of the Fall semester before the scheduled January review. The committee comprises four members: two faculty from the candidate's subfield, one faculty from a different subfield, and one graduate student from a different subfield. The committee chair is tenured, at or above the candidate's rank, and in the candidate's subfield. Other faculty committee members must be tenured. The department chair notifies the president of the Anthropology Graduate Student Union (AGSU), who appoints the graduate student member before the second Friday in September. That

graduate student and the faculty member from a different subfield are responsible for the teaching section of the committee report.

The review committee is responsible for the report to the faculty. They should follow the procedures herein and use the standardized forms of communication as presented below. **The utmost confidentiality is essential.**

---

In what follows, responsibilities are detailed using these abbreviations: RC = review committee; CA = candidate; CC = review committee chair; CM = committee member from the candidate's subfield; CT = committee member from outside the candidate's subfield, evaluating teaching; GS = graduate student member evaluating teaching only; DA = department administrator; FH = *Faculty Handbook*; IFF = on-line "Information for Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences."

Responsible parties must themselves fulfill their responsibilities as detailed and not impose on staff or other faculty members. In no case, except for the teaching section, should any student (GA, TA, RA, work-study, whatever) be involved in any way during this highly confidential faculty matter. Photocopying not done by the faculty member should be routed through DA.

Exact due dates will be issued by the department chair on a separate sheet. **The CC, and not the DA, is responsible for timely completion of all requirements and/or making sure all deadlines are met.**

---

#### Previous materials available to CA and RC:

(a) CA must request and receive permission from faculty member(s) who have undergone a similar review at the same rank before DA will photocopy that person's CV, brief statement, and/or expanded statement of accomplishments and goals. CC will make no recommendations about which documents CA should consult in seeking exemplary or cautionary models. Any RC comments to CA about other faculty review processes are inappropriate.

(b) RC faculty (not GS) receive copies of all CA's previous annual reviews. For mid-probationary reviews RC members may *not* request copies of any other faculty member's committee report or other records. This Handbook is the current guide.

### **OUTSIDE REVIEWER LETTERS**

Mid-probationary reviews do not require outside reviewer letters.

## TEACHING REPORT GRADUATE STUDENT LETTERS

The Teaching Report is a separately signed document which is the responsibility of CT, who instructs and oversees GS and who coordinates with DA. CC and CM are not involved in this process.

Graduate student letters are read *only* by GS and CT. GS is responsible for handling these letters, which must stay with DA for safekeeping, until the separate teaching report has been written and signed. GS then seals all the letters in an envelope, signs/dates the sealing, and delivers it directly to the department chair. (Note: When necessary, use the department office shredder machine.)

*Responsibility: CA*  
*Due: By mid-October*

CA to CT, electronic and hardcopy: List of all past and present graduate students within and outside the department (UNM and other universities) with full contact particulars (if known; if unknown, so indicate). In the case of students who have received their degree, indicate their current or last known position/whereabouts.

*Responsibility: GS*  
*Due: By the third Friday in October*

GS to CT then DA, electronic: Addresses and text for letters to CA's present and former graduate students. DA prepares letters for GS signature and mails them. Sample letter text:

The Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico is conducting a mid-probationary review of Professor xxx's progress toward eventual tenure at the rank of Assistant/Associate/Full Professor of Anthropology OR eventual tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Anthropology. As part of the review process, the mid-probationary review committee solicits evaluations of Professor xxx's teaching and mentoring from graduate students who have worked with her/him in a teaching and/or research capacity. We would be very grateful for your participation in this important deliberation.

We are requesting candid evaluations that specifically address the following points [list them on separate lines]: (1) your relationship with Professor xxx and the extent of your knowledge of her/his work; (2) your characterization and assessment of the quality of her/his teaching and mentoring; (3) her/his impact on your own professional development. Clear statements with concrete examples would be greatly appreciated.

If you are willing to assist us, we will need your letter by November xx, 20xx (by 5:00 p.m. if hand-delivered or so postmarked). These evaluations will be kept confidential to the full extent permitted by law. Throughout the process, they remain in the custody of the department administrator. For the review committee report they are read only by Professor xxx, the member from outside xxx's subfield of xxx, and by myself, the committee graduate student representative from the xxx subfield. Anonymous summaries of your statements will be incorporated into our comprehensive teaching evaluation report, which is a separately

signed part of the committee's report to the faculty. After Professor xxx and I have completed our report I will seal the letters in an envelope and deliver them personally to Department Chair Michael Graves, the only other department member to read your letter. He will use them in his confidential report to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and they will be included in confidential files that go to the college review committee, designated for their eyes only (excluding any Anthropology Department members of that committee).

Please send written, signed statements addressed to me: xxx, Student Representative, xxx [last name] Mid-Probationary Review Committee, Department of Anthropology, MSC01 1040, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-1096. Indicate CONFIDENTIAL on the envelope. Students on campus may deliver them to Graduate Student X mailbox. Please put the sealed, confidential envelope addressed to me inside a manila campus mail envelope also addressed to me but not marked confidential. E-mail statements and unsigned statements will not be accepted; any such received will be deleted or shredded immediately. Do not send FAX statements. I will file all legitimate communications immediately with the department administrator. Please indicate either an e-mail or a postal address where I may send an acknowledgment of receipt.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely, xxx

Sample GS acknowledgment: "I received your confidential evaluation of Professor xxx's teaching and mentoring on xxx [date]. It has been delivered to the department administrator for safekeeping. Professor xxx [CT] and I very much appreciate your participation in this important evaluation process. Sincerely, xxx" If acknowledged by postal mail, GS submits electronic text to DA, who produces letterhead version for signature and mails the letter.

*Responsibility: GS*

*Due: By the first Friday in November*

GS to CT to Graduate Advisor, electronic: The above letter with a second paragraph reading: "Personal letters have already been mailed to Professor xxx's present and former graduate students. In this e-mail I invite comment from any other current department graduate students." The graduate advisor will post this general solicitation to the anthropology graduate student list. The graduate advisor will re-send the e-mail with a reminder of the letter's due date one week before that date.

Graduate student letters are read *only* by GS and CT. GS is responsible for handling these letters, which must stay with DA for safekeeping, until the separate teaching report has been written and signed. GS then seals all the letters in an envelope, signs/dates the sealing, and delivers it to the department chair. (Note: Use the department office shredder machine.)

## **CANDIDATE DOSSIER**

*Responsibility: CA with DA guidance*

*Due:* By the first Friday in December

Specifications for the “Arts and Sciences Promotion/Tenure Dossier” are in IFF. Basically, CA is responsible for assembling Part B (Materials reviewed by the Department), numbers (1) “CV, complete and in College format (*including brief narrative description of research, teaching and service goals*)”; (2) “Candidate’s expanded statement of scholarly professional achievements and future goals” (note that Anthropology requires teaching and service as well); (4a) “Summary of ICES evaluations (College form #2)”; and (5) “List of supplemental materials (College form #3) (*All documents and materials in this section have been provided by the candidate to the [Dept.] Chair. This list should be signed by the [Dept.] Chair, indicating that all items have been received and placed in the file.*)” The List of Supplemental Materials divides these into Books, Articles, Research Grants, ICES summary analyses of individual courses, Course syllabi and exams, Letters, Student Comments on ICES forms, Reviews of proposals or manuscripts, and Other.

DA will help with procedural questions. CC may be consulted about what to include, but CA is ultimately responsible for the dossier contents and their timely placement in the file. CA notifies CC when dossier is complete. Thereafter, CA has no further direct access to the dossier and must submit any changes to DA.

*Responsibility:* CC

*Due:* No later than the first Friday following January 1

CC determines that the dossier is ready for viewing after CA attests that her/his part is completed. CC notifies the faculty and instructs them to follow the viewing procedures set up by DA, who is responsible for maintaining the files’ integrity and confidentiality.

## **CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS**

*Responsibility:* CT

*Due:* During November

By prior arrangement, CT visits one session of each department course and/or seminar taught by CA during the review semester. CT writes up a two/three-paragraph report on each visit.

## **CANDIDATE RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM**

No research colloquium is required for mid-probationary review.

## **REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT**

*Responsibility:* CC, CT, GS, CM, DA

*Due:* By noon on the Monday before the last Friday in January (special faculty meeting)

During December and January CC, CM, CT, GS write and finalize their reports. CC is responsible for the Scholarly Work section and for the final RC report with CC, CM, and CT signatures. (The signature page should be a final, separate page in order to accommodate changes suggested in the special faculty meeting without re-signing the document.) CM is responsible for the Service section. CT, working with GS, is responsible for a separate teaching report.

CC submits the signed, original RC report to DA (and electronically to CM, CT) by noon on the Monday before the last-Friday-in-January faculty meeting to discuss mid-probationary candidates. CT submits the signed (by CT and GS), original teaching report directly to DA (and electronically to CC, CM, GS) by that same noon. DA appends the teaching report to the RC report, photocopies the entire document, and by 4:00 that afternoon puts confidential, sealed envelopes (each containing a single CA's report) in appropriate faculty mailboxes. If possible, DA mails copies to faculty not in residence during the review semester; otherwise, copies are transmitted electronically. **Note:** All reports must be returned to DA following the faculty meeting.

The RC report will go forward and be read at all levels of the review process (faculty, chair, dean, provost). It should follow the format outlined below so that each candidacy is readily informed by the same presentation and accounts of current FH/IFF/departmental criteria, policy and procedure.

### **Overall Structure/Editing of Review Committee Report**

*Responsibility: CC*

- The introductory section of the report is framed thus:

ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE/FULL PROFESSOR XXX

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

January x, 20xx [date of special faculty meeting]

*Committee Members:*

Associate Professor/Professor xxx (Chair, X subfield)

Associate Professor/Professor xxx (X subfield)

Associate Professor/Professor xxx (X subfield – this is CT)

*For the Separate Teaching Report only:*

Graduate Student xxx (X subfield)

Assistant/Associate/Full Professor xxx received her/his doctorate in [field] from xxx University in [date]. Proceed to account for all their positions/time since receiving the doctorate and before coming to UNM. Also include any significant time spent in visiting faculty or temporary research/fellowship positions away from

UNM after assuming the job here. This is the “elsewhere” paragraph.

Dr. xxx joined the tenure-track faculty in the Department as an assistant/associate/full professor in August/January xxxx [if there is some other kind of joint appointment, so state here] and a member of the X subfield. According to the *UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*: “Unless otherwise indicated by contract or other written agreement, the record under consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor/tenure as Associate Professor/tenure as Full Professor is that accrued since beginning the tenure-track position at UNM/promotion to Associate Professor or the previous six years/promotion to Full Professor or the previous six years.” [If this is not the case, quote directly from the contract or other written document.]

- The teaching section of the report follows and is presented thus:

### **Teaching:**

The Department weighs Teaching and Scholarly Work equally (.40/.40) as the most important components of performance evaluations.... The candidate should be involved in teaching at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels. [here insert the wording under Teaching for tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure review wording.] (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

Sample of the single sentence: The Committee concurs with the recommendation in the attached Teaching Report by Professor xxx and graduate student xxx: “CA has met except for etc, etc” [quote the final recommendation sentence(s)].

- The scholarly work section of the report follows and is framed thus:

### **Scholarly Work:**

The Department weighs Teaching and Scholarly Work equally (.40/.40) as the most important components of performance evaluations.... The candidate should demonstrate.... [here insert the paragraph on scholarly work from tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure review wording.]

The Department recognizes two aspects of public anthropology, the translation of anthropology, the translation of anthropological knowledge for the wider public: one evaluated as scholarly work and one evaluated as service. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to advance their work in the appropriate category. Scholarly work in public anthropology involves funding, research, conceptualization, and the presentation of a final product. The candidate documents their role in (1) obtaining external funding to carry out the research, (2) carrying out research to be used in the product, (3) providing a conceptual analysis, and (4) publication or promulgation of the product as well as statements about collaboration with communities, networks, or organizations that were part of the research, training that they may have offered students, community members or organization members, and a discussion of the dissemination of the scholarship (audience reached and significance). (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

[The CC’s report on scholarly work (see below) begins here.] Sample last sentence: The Committee concurs that Professor xxx’s record shows xxx strengths and xxx weaknesses, xxx of which can be remedied and xxx of which probably cannot.

- The service section of the report follows and is framed thus:

**Service:**

Service (.20) is also expected and normally rounds out and complements the qualities presented in research and teaching.... Untenured assistant professors.... or Ongoing service to the University, the profession and the public is expected for promotion to full..... [Follow with the paragraph on service from tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor. If it is a case for tenure as associate or full professor use the post-tenure wording.]

The University recognizes “two broad categories of faculty service: professional and public.”

The former “consists of those activities performed within the academic community that are directly related to the faculty member’s discipline or profession.” It includes department, University, and “beyond the University...service to professional organizations and other groups that engage in or support educational and research activities” (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.3.a.1*). The latter “consists of activities that arise from a faculty member’s role in the University...activities [that] normally involve the sharing and application of faculty expertise to issues and needs of the civic community in which the University is located” (*ibid 1.2.3.a.2*).

The Department recognizes two aspects of public anthropology, the translation of anthropological knowledge for the wider public: one evaluated as scholarly work and one evaluated as service. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to advance their work in the appropriate category.... Public anthropology evaluated as service may be considered professional and/or public service according to the University criteria. (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

[The CM’s report on service (see below) begins here.] Sample first sentence: Professor xxx’s service record with respect to the Department, the University, the profession and the larger community befits [or not, partially or wholly] an untenured assistant/associate/full professor. In developing the four areas of service, include notice of whatever does not befit and where it can/should be improved.

- The concluding section of the report is framed thus:

**Recommendation:**

The Anthropology Department expects faculty excellence in research that contributes to our national and international standing and “effective teaching...[that] provides a student with an increased knowledge base, an opportunity to develop thinking and reasoning skills, and an appreciation for learning” (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.1.b*). Research is expected to inform teaching.... Unless they compromise the Department’s teaching and research mission, Personal Characteristics are considered part of the evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly Work, and Service as influencing “an individual’s effectiveness as a teacher, a scholar, researcher, or creative artist, and a leader in a professional area” (*Faculty Handbook Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure 1.2.4*). (*UNM Department of Anthropology Criteria for Tenure and Promotion*, January 19, 2007)

Sample concluding paragraph: The Committee unanimously recommends that Assistant/Associate/Full Professor xxx receive a second probationary period leading to review for tenure and promotion/tenure in 20xx-20xx on the basis of very good teaching, a good record of scholarly work, and service appropriate to rank. If xxx weaknesses are remedied, there is a strong likelihood that they will successfully pass the tenure review. Modify as appropriate.

## **Signature Page:**

On a separate but numbered page: space for three signatures [CC, CM, CT] with the date for each.

## **Scholarly Work Section**

*Responsibility: CC*

This evaluation is based on the CV, expanded statement of professional achievements/goals, dossier materials, and previous annual reviews.

The first paragraphs of this section constitute a summary overview of the scholarly record: number and kinds of publications, status of work in press and/or in progress, public anthropology work completed or in progress, grants received or under review, other writing, etc. A discussion of that work follows, with attention to shortcomings that need to be remedied before the tenure review.

## **Service Section**

*Responsibility: CM*

This evaluation is based on the CV, expanded statement of achievements/goals, dossier materials, and annual reviews.

Relevant categories should be presented in the following order: (1) subfield, (2) department, (3) University, (4) profession, and (5) public. Strengths and weaknesses should be evaluated in each appropriate category.

## **Teaching Report**

*Responsibility: CT, GS*

This evaluation is based on (1) the CV; (2) expanded statement of achievements/goals; (3) ICES, seminar and other evaluation reports from the entire time period since beginning the tenure track; (4) November class observations by CT; (5) CA's record of student advisement and individual instruction; (6) GS-solicited letters from CA's list of past and present graduate students inside and outside the department and from all current anthropology graduate students; (7) annual reviews, but note that GS *does not have access to annual reviews*.

CT has primary responsibility for the Teaching Report. CC and CM should review this only after it is written. GS writes the section on the graduate student letters and submits it to CT for review. Either GS or CT may raise confidential questions about the letters directly to the department chair only. CC and CM have no involvement with the GS report in any way; its wording remains as

agreed upon between CT and GS (and if necessary the department chair).

The introductory paragraphs of the report constitute a summary of CA's career teaching history at UNM and elsewhere, with the kinds of courses taught in each place and a statement about the research that informs this teaching record. The total number of UNM courses taught during the review period, the titles of each course and the number of times it was taught, a statement about typical enrollments at each level, and the class(es) currently being taught complete this teaching history introduction.

Sections follow in this order:

(1) Teaching Statement: a characterization of (with quotations from) CA's expanded statement on their teaching accomplishments and goals.

(2) Course Evaluations: (a) ICES, including a chart presenting the Form #2 data and general summary statements about the ICES scores and the student comments written on the forms; (b) Graduate seminar evaluations, including a chart presenting the data and general summary statements about the scores and the student comments. Other evaluation forms should be treated similarly.

(3) Classroom Observations by Professor xxx [CT]: CT visits one session of each CA class/seminar taught during the current review semester. Two/three-paragraph evaluation reports on each are included verbatim here.

(4) Student Advisement and Individual Instruction: a chart presenting the number of students in 497, Honors, 597/598, MA committee, MA chair, 697/698, PhD committee, PhD chair, Graduate external grant during the review period, and job placement of graduated students, together with general summary comments on this record.

(5) Graduate Student Letters: This section, after being written and signed by GS, is not subject to any further revision. In writing this evaluation from the graduate student letters, GS must make every effort to guard the anonymity of respondents. Make no reference to the number of letters from a particular subfield or a particular class/seminar. This is a general summation/evaluation of the letters as a group. (a) GS begins by identifying her/himself as an x-year graduate student in x subfield. Also indicate any previous association with CA, e.g., taking a class from CA or serving on a committee with them. (b) Then in a list indicate how many review letter solicitations were successfully mailed (not how many could not be delivered) from CA's list and when that mailing went out. Then indicate when the graduate electronic list was contacted and when the reminder went out. Finally, indicate the total number of letters received and thus used in the evaluation report. This is followed by a discussion of the letters, signed and dated at the end.

(6) General Summary of Teaching: This summation ends with the CT and GS recommendation and is co-signed and dated.

## **SPECIAL FACULTY MEETING ON MID-PROBATIONARY CASES**

*Responsibility:* CC overall and for own section, CM and CT for their sections

*Due:* Special faculty meeting on the last Friday in January

Both tenure-track and research faculty participate in this special, highly confidential meeting, but only tenure-track faculty vote on tenure/promotion cases. No visiting faculty or presenters from outside the department attend. DA attends and takes notes for the chair's eyes only. None of the candidates and no spouses/domestic partners are in attendance for any part of the meeting. If any of these sits on a committee, another committee member must substitute for them.

The order of presentation is junior to senior (assistant, associate, full) and alphabetically within each category. CC introduces the case, followed by separate presentations on teaching (CT), scholarly work (CC) and service (CM). CC concludes the presentation and moderates subsequent discussion, which may include suggestions for revisions to the RC document (except the GS report on the graduate student letters).

The department chair does not vote or participate in the discussion of candidates except for points of order. At the conclusion of discussion about each candidate the department chair (with DA help) conducts a secret, provisional yes/no/abstain ballot and announces the results (afterward conveying them non-numerically to the candidate). Until confidential ballots have been submitted by all tenure-track faculty, this department vote, which is advisory to the chair, is not official. It is possible that some of those voting at the meeting may change their vote before filing the full confidential ballot that goes forward in CA's dossier. (CA will learn the final department recommendation when they receive the redacted version of the chair's report to the dean.)

*Responsibility:* CC and/or CT

*Due:* By 5:00 on the Monday following the January last-Friday special faculty meeting

CC and/or CT make any revisions called for during the special faculty meeting. Signature pages remain the same but a full, new hardcopy of the text (if necessary) must be delivered to DA. Except for submitting individual confidential ballots, the RC has no further involvement in the review process.