

IV. Tenure, Promotion, Reappointment, and Appeals Procedures
For Faculty in the Independent Academic Units and the University Libraries
Whose Appointment is at the Kent Campus

IV. A. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW

2008 - 2009

For Faculty in the Independent Academic Units and the University Libraries Whose Appointment is at the Kent Campus

The granting of tenure is a deliberate and important decision, initiated by a candidate's peers and eventually made by the trustees of the University. Since this decision could result in life-long employment at this institution for a faculty member, it should involve more than a mere survey of the candidate's minimum quantifiable activities. Essentially, those involved in making a tenure decision are asking the question, "Is this person likely to make a positive contribution to his/her discipline, unit, campus, university and community over the long term?" The way that question is answered strongly influences the general quality of the university's faculty and thus the stature and well-being of the university.

*University policy regarding faculty tenure
(effective May 31, 1998) at Section D.*

1. General Observations

Individuals eligible for tenure consideration are those who hold regular full-time probationary tenure-track appointments. Eligibility is further determined by years of service and is differentiated by rank as follows:

Instructor. An instructor is reviewed for tenure in the sixth year of probationary service. If promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor is granted prior to conferral of tenured appointment, no more than three years of service as an Instructor may be applied toward eligibility at the higher rank.

Assistant Professor. An Assistant Professor is reviewed for tenure in the sixth year of service in rank. Since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor automatically confers tenure, an untenured candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must also undergo a formal ("early") tenure review at that time.

Associate Professor. An individual hired to the rank of Associate Professor is reviewed in the third year.

Professor. An individual hired to the rank of Professor who held that rank at another institution may receive tenure with the initial appointment. An individual hired without tenure will stand for tenure review in the third year.

While substantive criteria considered in the tenure review itself are developed at the independent school level, the following University guidelines have been established:

- i. With some exceptions, candidates are expected to possess the terminal degree in their discipline.
- ii. Candidates must submit evidence of continuing intellectual, creative, or professional activity. Only material which has been published, or formally accepted for publication, and creative efforts which have been presented or displayed for critical appraisal, or are formally scheduled for presentation, may be considered.
- iii. Documented evidence of specific expertise in the *scholarship of discovery* (original research and/or creative activity), *integration*, and/or *application* is necessary for the granting of tenure. However, the minimum criteria for tenure are *not* met when the individual seeking tenure has research which is *exclusively* categorized as the *scholarship of application*.

- iv. Candidates are expected to demonstrate an established record of effective teaching (*scholarship of teaching*) and an appropriate level of service (“university citizenship”) to the University and to the community.
- v. Candidates are evaluated on the basis of performance during the entire term of their probationary period.

Although an individual may stand for tenure and promotion in the same year, these are distinct personnel actions which require **separate** procedures, evaluation forms, and recommendations, and which follow separate timetables and guidelines. **Under no condition should a single assessment** by a faculty evaluator or recommendatory letter of transmittal by the responsible academic administrator be submitted for **both** a tenure and a promotion recommendation.

2. Procedures

The following **ten steps** pertain to all faculty of the independent academic units (i.e., Architecture, Nursing, University Libraries & Media Services, and Technology) whose appointment is at the Kent Campus.

a. Independent Academic Unit Level

1. During the Spring semester immediately preceding the academic year for which tenure reviews are scheduled, the dean notifies the independent academic unit faculty by convening the School Advisory Committee (SAC) and announcing the timetable and procedures for tenure review, and by notifying eligible faculty of their status.
2. Each fall, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Curriculum (APFAC) begins the tenure review process by circulating pertinent materials (guidelines, timetables, etc.) to the deans of the independent academic units. The dean should make copies of the procedures for tenure review and pertinent procedures/criteria statements from the unit handbook available to all candidates.
3. Each eligible faculty member then submits to the dean a file containing evidence to support the granting of tenure. This file must be prepared by the *candidate* according to guidelines included in this packet and procedures/criteria specified in the unit handbook. The *dean* is responsible for inserting past reappointment letters and the original offer of appointment in the candidate's file. The dean and faculty member review the contents of the file and both parties sign the *Certification of File Completeness*.
4. Upon receipt and verification of the completed file, the dean shall formally invite written comments on candidates from all tenured faculty who are not members of the Ad Hoc Tenure Committee (TC).
5. The dean then convenes the TC, which is composed of all tenured members of the SAC as well as all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor.¹ The dean serves as the non-voting chairperson of the TC.

¹ Note that the membership of the Ad Hoc Tenure Committee is identical to that of the Ad Hoc Promotion Committee. If the TC, so constituted, has fewer than four members, (exclusive of the dean), a special procedure for expanding it is developed by the dean, after consultation with the SAC and others as appropriate. The recommended augmented TC must be authorized by the APFAC.

6. As part of the deliberations of the TC, the dean will provide a preliminary assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's qualifications and performance relative to tenure expectations, including previous reappointment review information and letters of assessment. The TC then considers all the evidence in support of tenure for each candidate. TC members are excluded from deliberation when they, their spouses, or a relative is under consideration, or (with the single exception of the dean) when a nominee for tenure who occupies a rank higher than their own is considered.
7. The dean asks for a preliminary vote on each candidate, tallies the vote, and reports the results to the TC. The TC deliberates and may vote a second time. Each voting member of the TC then completes and signs the *Tenure Candidate Evaluation Form* (FA-0298C), which must include the reasons in support of the committee member's vote. Approval by a three-fourths majority of the voting members of the TC constitutes formal positive endorsement for tenure.
8. After review and consideration of the advisory recommendation of the TC, the dean makes an independent recommendation, and records this alongside other appropriate information on Form PS-1205B, *Department/School Recommendation for Tenure*.
9. In the case of a *positive* recommendation, the dean notifies the candidate of both the recommendation and advisory vote of the TC, and submits the file and pertinent documentation along with a letter of recommendation to the Office of the APFAC for review by the Provost at the University level. A copy of the letter of transmittal/recommendation is sent to the candidate. In the case of a *negative* recommendation, the notification letter should include a summary of the advisory vote of the TC to the dean, a summary of reasons for the dean's recommendation, and a statement informing the candidate that he or she has the right to consult and secure copies of the signed ballots of members of the TC and that he or she may appeal the recommendation by notifying the APFAC in writing within ten working days after receipt of notification. The dean then includes a copy of this letter with the appropriate transmittal form and forwards these to the Office of the APFAC (EDRC for Technology).

b. University Level

10. After examination and recommendation by the University-wide Tenure Advisory Board conducted by the APFAC and following review, consultation, and advice by the APFAC, the Provost makes a final assessment and determination. In the case of a *positive* decision, the President will notify successful candidates. In the case of a *negative* decision, candidates are to be notified by the Provost no later than March 15. The notification letter shall inform the candidate of the right to appeal the decision to the President, either directly or through the Joint Appeals Board, by notifying the APFAC in writing of the intent to appeal within ten working days of receipt of the letter.

IV. B. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION REVIEW

2008-2009

For Faculty in the Independent Academic Units and the University Libraries Whose Appointment is at the Kent Campus

Promotion shall be viewed as a recognition of a faculty member having contributed sustained and distinguished service to the University, the academic unit and campus to which the faculty member belongs.

*University policy regarding promotion
(effective August 24, 1997) at Section A.*

1. General Observations

Only regular, full-time tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty are eligible for promotion review. While substantive criteria considered in the promotion review itself are developed at the independent academic unit level, the following University guidelines have been established:

- i. With some exceptions, candidates are expected to possess the terminal degree in their discipline.
- ii. Candidates must submit evidence of continuing intellectual, creative, or professional activity. Only material which has been published or creative efforts which have been presented or displayed for critical appraisal may be considered.
- iii. Candidates are to provide documented evidence of accomplishments and professional activities appropriate to the expectations for the academic rank to which promotion is sought in the scholarship areas of *discovery*, *integration*, *application* and *teaching* in accord with the definitions of each contained in Section 2 of the *University policy regarding promotion* (UP 6-08) and the expectations, criteria and weightings of relative emphases specific to the academic unit or academic rank established in the handbook(s) of the academic unit and/or college.
- iv. Candidates are expected to demonstrate an established record of effective teaching and an appropriate level of service ("university citizenship") to the University and to the community.
- v. Candidates for promotion to the ranks of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor are evaluated on the basis of performance during the entire term of their appointment to a tenure-track position at the University. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are evaluated solely on the basis of performance since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, or, for those whose initial appointment at Kent State was at that rank, since employment at the University.
- vi. Documented evidence of outstanding *scholarship of discovery* and/or *integration* is necessary for promotion to (full) Professor.

Although an individual may stand for tenure and promotion in the same year, these are distinct personnel actions which require **separate** procedures, evaluation forms, and recommendations, and which follow separate timetables and guidelines. Under **no condition should a single assessment** by a faculty evaluator or recommendatory letter of transmittal by the responsible academic administrator be submitted for **both** a tenure and a promotion recommendation.

2. Procedures

The following **eleven steps** pertain to all faculty of the independent academic units (i.e., Architecture, Nursing, University Libraries & Media Services, and Technology) whose appointment is at the Kent Campus.

a. Independent Academic Unit Level

1. During the Spring Semester immediately preceding the academic year in which promotion candidacies are to be reviewed, the dean convenes the School Advisory Committee (SAC) for the purpose of securing nominations of faculty to be considered for promotion in rank in the following year. The SAC reviews all eligible faculty below the rank of Professor. In the case of a faculty member with a dual appointment, promotion review is assumed by the unit in which primary appointment is held.
2. The SAC nominates, by simple majority vote, a list of faculty for consideration. Further nominations are also accepted from the dean or any other academic administrator, and from eligible faculty members in their own behalf. The dean then notifies all nominees and invites self-nomination from eligible faculty not formally nominated by the SAC. Faculty members nominated by the SAC may withdraw their names from consideration at this time. The dean compiles a final list of all candidates for promotion and submits a copy of the list to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Curriculum (APFAC).
3. Each fall, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Curriculum (APFAC) begins the promotion review process by circulating pertinent materials (guidelines, timetables, etc.) to the deans of the independent academic units. The dean is responsible for making copies of the procedures for promotion review, including the *University policy regarding promotion* (UP 6-08) and relevant provisions of the independent academic unit (school) handbook, available to all candidates for promotion and also to the faculty who will participate as evaluators in the promotion review process.
4. Candidates are required to submit to the dean a file of evidence in support of promotion by the date specified in the Associate Provost's guidelines. This file must be prepared by the candidate according to guidelines included in this packet and other requirements as specified in the *University policy regarding promotion* and the academic unit (school) handbook. The dean and the candidate together review the file of evidence for conformity with these requirements, and both parties sign the *Certification of File Completeness* form.
5. Upon receipt and verification of the completed file, the dean invites written comment concerning each candidate from all tenured faculty who are not members of the Ad Hoc Promotion Committee (PC).
6. The dean convenes the PC, which consists of all tenured members of the SAC in addition to all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor.¹ The dean serves as the non-voting chairperson of the PC.

¹ Note that the membership of the Ad Hoc Promotion Committee is identical to that of the Ad Hoc Tenure Committee. If the PC, so constituted, has fewer than four voting members, a special procedure for expanding it is developed by the chairperson, after consultation with the FAC, the dean and other officers as appropriate. The recommended augmented PC must be authorized by the APFAC.

7. As part of the deliberations of the PC, the dean will provide a preliminary assessment of the qualifications and performance of the candidate, including previous reappointment review information and letters of assessment. The PC then considers all the evidence in support of promotion for each candidate. PC members are excluded from deliberations when they, their spouses, or a relative is under consideration or (with the single exception of the school dean) when a candidate for promotion to a rank higher than their own is considered. Members of the PC on leave or on authorized absence shall vote by absentee ballot unless granted an abstention.
8. The dean asks for a preliminary vote on each candidate, tallies the vote, and reports the results to the PC. The PC deliberates and may vote a second time. Each voting member of the PC then completes and signs the *Promotion Candidate Evaluation Form* (FA-0298C), which must include the reasons in support of the committee member's vote. Approval by three-fourths of the voting membership of PC constitutes a positive advisory recommendation to the dean for promotion.
9. After review and consideration of the advisory recommendation of the PC, the dean makes an independent recommendation, and records this alongside other appropriate information on the form *Department/School Recommendation for Promotion* (PS-1205B).
10. Notification of the candidate and transmittal of this form, along with its subsequent treatment by the Provost at the University level, varies as follows:
 - i. If either the dean's recommendation or the advisory vote of the PC is *positive*, the dean notifies the candidate of the recommendation and submits the file and pertinent documentation to the Office of the APFAC for review by the Provost at the University level (to the Executive Dean for Regional Campuses (EDRC) for faculty in the College of Technology).
 - ii. If both the dean's recommendation and the advisory vote of the PC are *negative*, the dean notifies the candidate in writing of the recommendation, the advisory vote of the PC, a summary of reasons for the negative decision, and the candidate's option to appeal the recommendation by notifying the APFAC (EDRC for Technology) of the intent to appeal within ten working days after receipt of notification. A copy of the dean's letter is attached to Form (PS-1205B), which is then submitted to the Office of the APFAC (EDRC for Technology), along with copies of Form (FA-0298C), completed by members of the PC.

Copies of the transmittal letter to the Provost (or EDRC for Technology) and of the individual assessments by members of the PC are sent to the candidate.

b. University Level

11. After examination and recommendation by the university-wide Promotion Advisory Board conducted by the APFAC, and following consultation with the APFAC, the Provost makes a final assessment and determination.
 - i. In the case of a *positive* decision, the President shall notify successful candidates.
 - ii. In the case of a *negative* decision, the Provost notifies the candidate of the decision, including a summary of supporting reasons. The notification letter shall inform the

candidate of the right to appeal the decision to the President by notifying the APFAC of the intent to appeal within *ten* working days of the receipt of the letter.²

Copies of the notification letter are sent to the dean.

² Candidates receiving a negative decision at this level following at least two previous unsuccessful promotion candidacies for the rank sought are eligible to appeal the decision to the President through the Joint Appeals Board. (See Article VII, Section 2 (E) of the *Collective Bargaining Agreement*.)

IV. C. ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

2007-2008

For Faculty in the Independent Academic Units and the University Libraries Whose Appointment is at the Kent Campus

1. General Observations

All probationary tenure-track faculty members are subject to reappointment review annually in accordance with the provisions of the University policy and procedures regarding faculty reappointment (hereinafter: *Reappointment Policy*; incorporated in these Guidelines as Appendix C) until the academic year in which they are considered for tenure. Detailed explanations of procedural and notification expectations are found in section E of that document. Term-appointed faculty are subject to a separate and later review as specified in the collective bargaining agreement with the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Unit.

2. Procedures

The following **nine steps** pertain to tenure-track faculty in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, the College of Nursing, the College of Technology, and the University Libraries and Media Services whose appointment is at the Kent Campus and who are in their **second and subsequent years** of probationary appointment:

a. Initiation

1. Prior to the conclusion of the Spring semester immediately preceding the academic year reappointment reviews are to be conducted, the dean of the unit shall remind affected probationary faculty members that a reappointment review will be conducted during the following Fall semester.
2. Each fall, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Curriculum (APFAC) initiates the reappointment review procedure by circulating appropriate guidelines, timetables and other information to the dean, who subsequently informs affected faculty within the academic unit. The dean should make copies of the procedures for reappointment review available to all candidates for reappointment and to the tenured faculty who will be participating in the review(s).
3. Each candidate must prepare a file of evidence in accordance with the expectations contained in the *Reappointment Policy*, the academic unit handbook, and the *information and documentation guidelines* included in this packet. *The dean is responsible for inserting past reappointment letters and the original offer of appointment letter in the candidate's file.* The dean and the candidate review the contents of the file, and both parties sign the *Certification of File Completeness*.

b. Independent Academic Unit Level

4. Once the files have been assembled, tenured faculty of the academic unit who are not members of the committee that will conduct the review are to be informed that the files are available for inspection and invited to provide written comments, which will become part of the reappointment file.
5. The dean then convenes the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, (AC), which includes all tenured members of the School (or College) Advisory Committee (SAC or CAC) and all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor. The AC then deliberates on each candidate and arrives at an advisory recommendation by simple majority vote, voting "yea", "yea with reservations," or "nay" on reappointment. This recommendation, in which both "yea" and "yea with reservations" are regarded as positive votes, is

then entered on Form PS-1622B, *Annual Recommendation for Reappointment of Kent Campus Faculty on Probationary Appointment*. Each member of the AC is to record his or her vote in a signed assessment, which then becomes part of the reappointment file.

6. Once the AC has delivered an advisory recommendation, the dean consults the SAC (or CAC), and subsequently prepares an independent recommendation and a detailed written assessment. This signed assessment should state clearly the candidate's strengths and weaknesses with regard to performance in the scholarship(s) of discovery, integration, application, and teaching and in university citizenship in keeping with the unit's established standards and expectations for a successful tenure review, and may take into account individual expectations worked out with each candidate.
7. This recommendation is recorded on Form PS-1622B, and is submitted along with the dean's assessment and the individual assessments of members of the AC to the Provost (through the APFAC) by the deans of Nursing, Technology, and of Libraries and Media Services. Copies of the dean's assessment and those of the members of the AC are to be provided to the candidate.
8. The dean also extends an invitation to the candidate for a meeting to discuss the recommendation and assessment. (If the recommendation is not unanimously positive for reappointment, this meeting must take place within one week/five working days of the dean's transmittal of the recommendations to the Provost.)
 - i. The candidate is also to be informed of the right to prepare, within one week/five working days of the meeting, a statement responding to any alleged procedural errors or perceived errors of fact that have occurred in the course of the reappointment review or in individual assessments by AC members or the dean. This statement is to be placed in the reappointment file and becomes part of the record of the reappointment review.
 - ii. In the case of a negative recommendation, the candidate may appeal to the Provost within two weeks/ten working days of receipt of notification from the unit.

c. University Level

9. Unless reversed by the Provost at the University level, the recommendation of the dean will stand. All candidates receiving negative recommendation at this level must be notified in writing before the deadlines established in Article XV of the *Collective Bargaining Agreement* currently in effect between the University and the Kent State Chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

3. First-Year Reappointments

Reappointment reviews of probationary faculty in their **first full year of appointment** in the tenure track at the University are conducted at a later date than for those in their second and subsequent years of appointment and, except for the right to appeal a negative recommendation on reappointment, are conducted entirely within the context of assessment within the academic unit. For these faculty, the following **six steps** pertain:

1. No later than two weeks prior to the conclusion of the Fall semester, the academic unit dean shall request the first-year probationary faculty member to prepare a two or three page letter describing his or her accomplishments and plans for the remainder of the academic year relative to the expectations contained in the letter of appointment. This letter, an up-to-date copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the original letter of appointment (provided by the chairperson) and available evidence of performance during the first semester of employment, such as student and peer

evaluations of instruction, will constitute the basis of the reappointment file for a first-year reappointment review.

2. The reappointment file will be subject to candid and confidential discussion by the AC as soon as all materials are available. The AC will make recommendation to the dean, by simple majority vote, whether reappointment to a second year in the tenure track is warranted and consistent with the expectations and understandings under which the original appointment was made.
3. The dean shall complete form PS-1622B and prepare a summary of the discussion, observations, and recommendation of the AC which, along with the dean's own observations and independent recommendation, shall be forwarded to the Provost as the unit's recommendation on reappointment. A copy of this letter shall be provided to the first-year probationary faculty member with notification of the right, within one week/five days of its receipt, to prepare a statement responding to any alleged errors of fact contained in the assessments summarized in the dean's evaluation and recommendation.
4. For faculty in the College of Architecture, the College of Nursing, the College of Technology, and in University Libraries and Media Services, notification that reappointment to a second year in the tenure-track is to be accorded will come from the dean of the independent academic unit. The notifications are to take place no later than March 1.
5. Upon the conclusion of the reappointment process, the academic unit dean shall meet with each first-year probationary faculty member who is to be reappointed to discuss the results of this initial review and expectations for future performance and contributions.
6. In the event of a negative determination on reappointment by the academic unit dean, the first-year probationary faculty member retains the appeal rights and procedures defined elsewhere in the *Reappointment Policy* and as specified in Article VII, Section 2.E. of the collective bargaining agreement currently in effect between the University and the Kent State Chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

4. Procedural Notes .

The following principles and procedural guarantees exist at **all** levels of the reappointment review process:

i. **Response.** Within *one week (five working days)* of receipt of an administrative officer's notification of the recommendation at that level of review with regard to reappointment, the candidate for reappointment may prepare a statement noting and responding to any alleged procedural errors occurring in the course of the reappointment review process at that level and/or to perceived errors of fact contained in the evaluative assessments, including that of the administrative officer. The statement shall become part of the reappointment file prior to its consideration at the next level of review.

ii. **Appeals.** Appeal rights and procedures with regard to negative (non-reappointment) recommendations exist at each level of the reappointment review process and are summarized in Section K of the *Reappointment Policy* (see: *Appendix C* of these Guidelines). A probationary faculty member exercises the appeal right by notifying the administrative officer responsible for the

conduct of reviews at the next higher level of review of his/her wish to do so within *two weeks (ten working days)* of receipt of the notification of the non-reappointment recommendation which is being appealed.

IV. D. PROCEDURES FOR APPEAL OF TENURE PROMOTION, AND REAPPOINTMENT DECISIONS

2008-2009

For Faculty in the Independent Academic Units and the University Libraries Whose appointment is at the Kent Campus.

1. Procedures

The following procedures will be observed for the appeal of any negative tenure or promotion decision. Please refer to the appropriate sections of this document for information regarding specific differences in the procedures through which these decisions are reached.

a. University Level

In the case of a negative decision, the dean notifies the candidate of his or her right to appeal to the Provost at the University level by notifying the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Curriculum (APFAC) within ten working days.

1. The candidate initiates the appeal of a negative tenure or promotion decision by the dean at the University level by notifying the APFAC in writing of his or her intent to appeal with copies to the dean. The appellant will receive subsequent written instructions from the APFAC.
 - i. Upon receipt of the notification of intent to appeal, the dean shall prepare a brief, written summary of the personnel review process affecting the candidacy through the college level and of the considerations governing the successive recommendations through that level and shall transmit that summary, along with the candidate's file, to the Office of the APFAC. A copy of this summary memorandum is to be provided to the appellant.
 - ii. Upon request, made of the academic unit dean, the appellant may review the votes and comments entered on ballots by members of the academic unit promotion or tenure advisory committee.
2. Following receipt of the instructions from the APFAC, the candidate submits his or her appeal *in writing* through the APFAC with copy to the academic unit dean.
3. The APFAC and the University-wide Tenure or Promotion Advisory Board, as appropriate, review the candidate's file, including documents submitted in support of the appeal, after all reviews of positive recommendations from the colleges and independent academic units have been completed.
4. After submission of a written appeal, the appellant will be provided the opportunity to present his or her case to the TAB or PAB. This presentation normally includes the following:
 - i. The candidate is provided the opportunity to present the appeal orally.
 - ii. The candidate may be accompanied at the hearing by a colleague who is a regular member of the faculty.
 - iii. The APFAC or the TAB or PAB may invite a separate presentation by the dean and such additional individuals as are deemed appropriate for the Board to understand the case.

The appeal review process is non-adversarial in nature. All members of the appropriate Advisory Board, or assigned panel thereof, are expected to participate, consider, and advise on all appeals submitted to it unless the appeal is by a spouse or close relative or the member perceives a personal or professional conflict of interest that would make rendering an impartial, professional judgment impossible.

5. The Advisory Board will then review all appropriate material provided by the academic unit and by the candidate. The members of the Advisory Board will discuss the matters raised in these presentations, and, following this discussion, will submit a written ballot with supporting reasons as an advisory vote to the APFAC. The Advisory Board may recommend that the appeal be upheld, denied, or that the case be returned to the academic unit for reconsideration either to correct a procedural oversight or to allow consideration of information which was improperly omitted or ignored.
6. The Provost will review the recommendation of the Advisory Board and, following consultation with and advice by the APFAC, will make a decision.

If the decision is to uphold the appeal, the President will notify the candidate in writing. If the decision is to reject the appeal, the Provost will notify the candidate of the decision and the prerogative to appeal to the President by notifying the APFAC within ten working days.

7. The APFAC will then send instructions to the appellant regarding the conduct of the appeal to the President. The President's consideration of such appeal shall be based exclusively on a review of the candidacy file as it has been developed through the tenure/promotion review process, supplemented only by the appellant's written statement of presidential appeal and such additional information or perspective as the President may deem pertinent and specifically request.