

Principles and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

Tenure and Promotion of Faculty: Candler School of Theology

I. Purpose

Tenure and promotion in Candler School of Theology foster the educational mission of the School, both as a communal work and as a work of each faculty member. To this end, the faculty seek to envision and implement the mission of the school; support individual faculty in teaching, research, and service; and ensure stability for the School's institutional life and academic mission.

1. Envisioning and implementing the mission of the school require a community of scholars who enhance the work of each individual and the work of the whole. Critical to its mission is the scholarly community's ability to make judgments about the direction of its common life and to select people who can critically expand its visions. For these reasons, Candler's hiring practices are rigorous, and the faculty bias is to nurture and encourage every new faculty member toward tenure. At the same time, decisions have to be made again at the time of tenure and promotion, based on the ability of faculty to contribute to the present and future directions of the School.
2. Supporting individual faculty in teaching, research, and service requires a spirit of free inquiry. Exploration of provocative questions and the consideration of unorthodox ideas are the very fiber out of which substantial research and excellent teaching are made. Students flourish when faculty members are engaged in significant research and when they share discoveries and the discovery process itself. Tenure and promotion provide strong institutional support to ensure that the quest for knowledge continues.
3. Ensuring stability for Candler's academic mission and institutional life requires the faculty to be deeply engaged in the disciplines of theology, to carry on a rigorous dialogue across theological and other academic disciplines, to be critically and empathetically engaged with the church and other religious bodies, and to interact with the critical issues that face humankind in a particular moment. Tenure and promotion secure a stable faculty, who over time build a community of focused inquiry, both by collaborative research and teaching and by sustained conversations with one another.

II. Tenure and Promotion within a Professional School of Theology

As members of a professional school within Emory University, Candler faculty engage both the academy and the church through their research, teaching, and service. Consideration of a faculty member for promotion and tenure demands awareness of the tensions inherent in this dual engagement. The evaluation of individual faculty members takes into account the person's contributions to Candler's mission as well as individual accomplishments as scholar and teacher.

1. Theological scholars have responsibility for the preservation and production of knowledge. Integral to the university, the study of theology encompasses the practices and cultural productions of peoples ancient to contemporary; engages literature across five millennia, reflects upon diverse enactments, commentaries, and debates; and interprets the multiple systems of practice and symbol generated by a world-wide, prolific, and fragmented Christianity.

Even when viewed by itself, Christian theology is a vast field of study, encompassing multiple languages, cultural systems, and practices. In fact, however, theology within the university is never an isolated and self-contained scholarship. It intersects every other field in the humanities and social sciences. Theology as studied within the university is inherently interdisciplinary. A theology faculty, therefore, is challenged not only by the requirement of depth but also by the need for breadth. No single scholar can have both qualities in the same degree. Because the Candler faculty makes up the largest portion of a leading Ph.D. program in the study of religion, it must have a number of scholars who excel in historical, theoretical, and constructive theological study and are able to direct the original research of students who help them create new knowledge. Since tenure and promotion within the University as a whole ordinarily focus on such forms of learning, and since there are well-established professional guilds within the various branches of theology, faculty whose work falls mainly within this side of the School's mission have clear standards by which their research can be evaluated, whatever their field.

2. Theological scholars also have responsibility to reflect on and contribute to the church. Candler's faculty thus engages the wide variety of disciplines and practices that support ecclesial reflection and professional ministerial training. The school's largest degree program has as its goal the preparation of men and women for ministry in the church. This preparation necessarily involves education in the theories, methodologies, and practices specific to the arts of ministry, such as preaching, Christian education, liturgy, church administration, and pastoral care and counseling, as well as disciplines closely related to the traditional development of arts and sciences in the university, such as biblical studies, historical studies, systematic theology, and ethics.

Candler considers theological learning to result from a reciprocal process in which all these forms of study and practice are mutually formative. Just as faculty responsible for the traditional disciplines must be informed by engagement with practice, so must faculty engaged in practical theology be conversant with the traditional theological disciplines. A theology school looks to practical theologians to inform ministerial practice theologically, and, equally important, to challenge and inform theological discourse on the basis of religious practices, religious experience, and the church's practice of multiple ministries in the world. Similar to practical theoreticians in Emory's other professional schools, the faculty who focus on practices often have less

access to research funding, fewer venues for publication, and more complex standards of peer evaluation. Their learning and competencies are nevertheless essential for the school to carry out its educational mission.

Within theological education, Candler is distinctive because the entire faculty participate in professional ministerial formation through the program of contextual education. The effective participation of an individual faculty member in this program is an important way of helping Candler fulfill its mission. The faculty have committed themselves to contextual education as a way to embody Candler's engagement with both the university and the church. While substantially improving the theological education of ministers, this commitment can also significantly reduce the time and energy that an individual faculty member, especially one involved in the Ph.D. program, has for other teaching and research. Candler considers, however, that its responsibilities require its faculty to engage the life of the church and the larger culture, to play a role in public discourse, and to represent a theological perspective in issues of public concern.

Within the context of their common endeavor, individual faculty members are inevitably and legitimately drawn more toward engagement with the University or more toward engagement with the church. Fair and responsible review of Candler's faculty demands clear identification of the kind of scholarship done by each faculty person and its contribution to the complex ecology of learning and teaching in this school of theology.

III. Criteria

Each faculty member is expected to embody the standards of teaching, research, and service outlined below and to encourage and support the formation of persons who will exercise leadership in the church.

1. Teaching.

- A. Tenure requires a positive assessment of the candidate's capacity to teach effectively. The assessment includes classroom teaching, whether at the master's or the doctor's level. It also includes teaching that occurs in directed studies or other tutorial settings and in the direction of theses, projects, and dissertations. Because of the importance of contextual learning at Candler, the ability to teach effectively in the contextual education program is part of the evaluation. To that end, a teaching portfolio, required from each candidate for tenure and promotion, should include a brief discussion of the candidate's aims and teaching methods in the contextual courses as well as in other teaching contexts.
- B. The review should assess teaching in the light of several criteria: (1) the ability to demonstrate thoughtful reflection and self-awareness about teaching, as evidenced by the statement of the candidate's philosophy of

teaching and the description of teaching methods and course design in the teaching portfolio; (2) seriousness of preparation for classes, as evidenced in syllabi and course handouts; (3) a concern for the learning of students, as evidenced, for instance, by examples of typical written feedback on student work and by a history of willingness to meet individually with students; (4) and the ability to engage students with the subject matter, as evidenced by statistical and critical summaries of student evaluation forms and by letters solicited from students by the tenure committees. Other evidence might include teaching grants, participation in teaching workshops, and teaching awards.

- C. In addition to student evaluation forms and letters submitted by students, the review committee considers the teaching portfolio prepared by the candidate, assessment by co-teachers in jointly-taught courses, and reports from two faculty members with first-hand knowledge of the candidate's teaching in either the master's or the doctoral programs or both. As part of the tenure review, the School asks pre-tenured faculty to plan two class sessions during their first six years of teaching to which they will invite a senior colleague as observer and consultant. The senior colleague will be asked to write a description of the class (about two single-spaced pages), with attention to the style of lecturing or discussion, the interaction between teacher and students, the material being taught, the syllabus, the reading, the class requirements, and the flow of the class session. One purpose of the exercise is to facilitate a discussion between colleagues about teaching, but the two descriptions will also form part of the candidate's teaching portfolio. The candidate is free to add a written commentary on the descriptions as an additional part of the portfolio.

Candler faculty are expected to administer formal anonymous course evaluations for each course, each semester and to send them to the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs. The teaching portfolio should contain materials that convey the substance of those evaluations.

2. Research.

- A. The faculty are expected to *engage in a continuing pattern of scholarly reflection, research, and writing*. In assessing this scholarship, the relevant committees and Deans place a premium on work that reflects originality in its conception and makes fresh contributions that help advance a field of study.
- B. Ordinarily, the expectation is for articles or books singly written. In some instances, leadership in a collaborative research and writing project in which the candidate is the primary author can help meet this expectation. The review will also assess other collaborative scholarship, editorial work, translations with critical introductions, and original

composition, whether musical, poetic, dramatic, or artistic. An appendix describes the criteria for faculty in music.

- C. Primary consideration is given in the tenure review to evidence that faculty members will continue scholarly work of high quality. This evidence should include published scholarship that has received rigorous peer review. If the earliest published work is a form of the dissertation, the expectation is that the candidate would also present further published work, whether building on the dissertation or taking new directions, that continues or exceeds the dissertation's level of scholarly achievement. In any case, the school expects evidence that points toward a research agenda and a career of scholarship. All work submitted as evidence for research should be in a form that can be evaluated by reviewers able to comment on its potential contribution to knowledge and insight in the field.

- D. The work to be reviewed should include evidence of serious engagement with primary data, knowledge of the methodological issues in the discipline, conceptual depth, the orderly organization of thought, and the capacity to present the results of one's scholarship with clarity and imagination. Writing that primarily presents, applies, or popularizes the original research of other scholars does not meet these criteria unless it is an exceptional work of critique or synthesis recognized by experts in the field as a highly significant if not seminal contribution to a discipline. Within the pre-tenured period, it is reasonable to expect publication of at least a full-length original book or a series of articles of exceptional merit in highly regarded refereed journals. The number of publications, however, is not as important as the quality.

Work presented to professional societies for public scholarly evaluation can be considered in the tenure review, though it should be part of a larger research record that includes publication. Candidates should be aware that for purposes of tenure and promotion a book published by a press with high standards for acceptance of manuscripts will usually carry greater weight than books issued by publishers with less rigorous standards. A refereed article in a top-rated journal will normally be given more serious consideration than an invited article in a festschrift or house journal. In every case, however, the quality of the writing and research is the primary consideration.

Books and articles directed to a broader audience and designed to deepen the insight of the general reader, including books written for the church, will also merit consideration as evidence of the candidate's commitment to a career of productive scholarship if they present theological learning with originality, imagination, and insight.

- E. Promotion to full rank requires a continuing pattern of productivity manifest in further published writings that make the faculty member's work available to a broader community of scholars for evaluation. The expectation is that such publication would have a discernible influence on the advancement of a discipline. Such influence can be measured by citations, reviews, public scholarly discussion of the work, and evaluative statements in the letters of the reviewers. The minimal expectation is another full-length original work or its equivalent in articles.
3. Service.
- A. The faculty and administrative staff must undertake many collegial and administrative responsibilities within Candler and Emory University and provide a variety of forms of leadership within the church. Tenure and promotion decisions inevitably require judgments about the willingness and competence with which the candidate meets the criterion of service.
 - B. Since the work of administering the school is done through a structure of standing and special committees, high-quality participation and leadership in these committees is the most common means through which faculty provide service to the seminary, the Graduate Division of Religion, and the University. This is the one form of service in which conscientious involvement is expected of every member of the faculty. In addition, the school recognizes the value of faculty involvement in community events, especially in the activities conducted through the Office of Student Programming.
 - C. Service to the church can be an opportunity for integrating theology and practice as well as a means of furthering the mission of the school. It can include involvement at the local, regional, conference, national, and international levels; participation in ecumenical activities and organizations; service as consultant, writer, or speaker to boards and agencies; and membership on board and agency committees. It can also include teaching and preaching in congregations, pastors' schools, continuing education events, lay institutes, conferences, colleges, and similar settings.
 - D. Contributions to other parts of the University also help to meet the criterion of service. These contributions can include teaching (in courses either singly or jointly taught), participation on dissertation and examination committees, joint membership in other departments, work on search committees in other schools, and involvement in faculty governance at the university level.
 - E. Service to the scholarly guilds and to other organizations that promote scholarship or learning within a discipline merit consideration in tenure

decisions. This service can include, for instance, membership on committees, organization of sessions, and the reading of papers and responses to papers.

- F. Public service outside the university is also considered. Such forms of service can include involvement in shaping public policy and community action that reflect values integral to the mission of the school.

IV. Procedures for the Tenure and Promotion Review

1. Types of review. Ordinarily, reviews fall into four categories: contract review, peer review, tenure review, and review for promotion to another rank. When persons have both administrative and faculty responsibilities, the definition and allocation of those responsibilities are negotiated with the Dean, and reviews are to be based on a clear understanding of the responsibilities (as reflected in a job description) and the criteria by which performance will be judged.
 - A. Contract reviews occur when a person is hired according to a contract with a specified time limit. At the time of hiring, or renewing the contract, the Dean establishes an appropriate time for the contract to be reviewed. Such reviews are conducted according to the peer review guidelines defined in the Candler Faculty Handbook, with the specific purpose of recommending to the Dean whether the contract should be renewed.
 - B. The peer review process normally occurs in the third year for pre-tenured faculty. Each associate professor will have a review three years after tenure that focuses primarily on research, followed by a full peer review at the seventh year from the tenure review. This review cycle will repeat until promotion to full professor. Each full professor will be reviewed every seven years. The peer reviews consist of consultations with two other faculty colleagues who have read materials submitted by the person under review. The Faculty Handbook describes the procedures and documents required in the peer reviews.
 - C. Tenure reviews occur after a person has occupied a tenure-track position or when the possibility for tenure is established for a position currently held. In every case, the Dean establishes tenure-track positions, with the approval of the University Provost and Board of Trustees. The time for a tenure review is determined according to the guidelines of the University. Ordinarily, a faculty member is reviewed for tenure at the level of assistant professor, and the granting of tenure also becomes a recommendation for promotion to associate professor.
 - D. Review for promotion to another rank ordinarily occurs when a person is being considered for promotion from associate to full professor. The

process for considering such promotions conforms to that used for tenure reviews. The main difference is that the standards employed for such reviews reflect a higher level of performance and maturity appropriate to more advanced standing within the university community and the professional association.

2. Principles and Procedures. The following principles and procedures apply to all reviews involving promotion.
 - A. Principles.
 - i. Respect for the rights of candidates and concern for their professional growth. This includes respect for confidentiality, the right to be evaluated fairly according to procedures clearly defined and publicly known, and the right of appeal.
 - ii. Consultation with peers at all levels. The review will take into account the evaluations of other faculty within the candidate's academic specialty and teaching area as well as in other professional and scholarly contexts.
 - iii. Respect for the needs of the teaching areas, academic disciplines, and sub-disciplines to provide proper coverage for academic fields of study.
 - iv. Respect for the importance of mutuality and constructive critique in a community of scholarship.
 - v. The right of the institution to determine its curricular and scholarly needs and to fill those needs in ways appropriate to its mission.
 - vi. The needs of students for competent teaching in a comprehensive education.
 - B. Procedures.
 - i. Annual Conversations. Each pre-tenured faculty member will have an annual conversation with the Dean and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs to clarify the expectations and processes of tenure decisions at Emory University and to review his or her work in relation to those expectations. Before this conversation, the Dean and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs will consult with senior colleagues in the Area.
 - ii. Oversight of formal reviews. The Dean authorizes all reviews. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs gives administrative oversight to the review process. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs, after consultation with the Dean,

appoints a chair to conduct the review. The chair presents the review report to the Personnel and Academic Policy Committee, which makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean recommends candidates for tenure or promotion or both to the Provost.

- iii. Establishing the time of the review. The timing of a review is determined in accordance with the Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships as approved by the University Board of Trustees.
- iv. Initiating the review. A review may be initiated in one of two ways.
 - a. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs writes a letter (typically in the early spring) to persons according to a schedule established in consultation with the Dean at the time of hiring or re-negotiated after hiring in consultation with the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs. The Personnel and Academic Policy Committee shall review this schedule each fall semester.
 - b. In exceptional cases, persons may be reviewed earlier than scheduled. Initiative for an early review may come from the faculty member, the teaching area in which his or her primary appointment is located, another faculty or administrative colleague, the Personnel and Academic Policy Committee, or the Dean.
- v. Organizing the review. The responsibility for organizing the review rests with the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs as the agent of the Dean. Ordinarily, the Associate Dean requests a report from the teaching area of the candidate's primary appointment. If the candidate is appointed to two teaching areas in the School of Theology, the Associate Dean consults with both areas.

If there is a joint appointment with another School, the University shall designate the School responsible for the review. The secondary school shall participate in the review according to the primary school's guidelines.
- vi. Chairing the review. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs in consultation with the Dean appoints the chairperson for the review. This is usually a faculty colleague from the academic specialty or teaching area in which the candidate serves. Typically the person will be someone other than the chairperson of the area

and must be someone at a higher academic rank than the candidate. If the review is a joint review and the site of the review is another School of the University, the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs shall serve as the agent of the School's interests in the review process, together with the chair of the review committee.

- vii. Gathering evaluations. Evaluations of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service shall be obtained in the following ways.
 - a. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs, in consultation with the chairperson, shall use a standard letter to solicit evaluations of the candidate's teaching from at least four students, two of whom must be current students. Two of these students are to be drawn from a list proposed by the candidate. If the faculty member has a joint appointment in the Graduate Division of Religion, at least one of the four students must be a doctoral student.
 - b. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs, in consultation with the chairperson, shall use a standard letter to solicit written evaluations of the candidates, teaching, research, and service from at least three members of the School of Theology faculty, or, when appropriate, faculty members of other departments of Emory University. At least one of these internal reviewers is to be selected from a list of four persons suggested by the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty reviewers in tenure cases should hold the rank of associate professor or professor. In cases of promotion to the rank of professor, the faculty reviewers should normally be full professors.
 - c. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs, in consultation with the chairperson, shall use a standard letter to solicit evaluations from at least six scholars outside Emory University qualified to serve as authoritative and impartial judges of the candidate's work. University guidelines for reviewers will be used in selecting the outside reviewers. Three are to be selected from a list of six scholars suggested by the candidate. The rest of the reviewers are to be selected from a list of persons drawn up by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs and the chairperson, in consultation with colleagues and prominent scholars in the field. The external faculty reviewers in tenure cases should hold the rank of associate professor or professor. In cases of promotion to the rank of professor, the external faculty reviewers should normally be full professors. The Associate

Dean will keep a list of external reviewers who decline to submit a letter and, if available, the reason. This information is part of the dossier sent to the Provost.

- d. These reviewers will be sent a summary statement of the criteria for teaching, research, and service, a description of the process of evaluation, and copies of the candidate's published work. They will be asked to give a rigorous review of a specific text or texts in relation to the complete corpus of the candidate's publications. This will include identifying strengths and problems of the work, assessing its relationship to the rest of the candidate's work in establishing a trajectory of scholarly effort, locating the candidate's work in the larger discussion of the subject, and providing a candid and impartial appraisal of the candidate's scholarly achievement and promise. In correspondence with the reviewers, the Associate Dean shall be neutral about the candidate. Reviewers will be requested to return their evaluations to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs.
 - e. If additional evidence is needed to assess the quality of the candidate's service, the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs shall use a standard letter to solicit written evaluations from one or more persons especially qualified to appraise the candidate's service. Letters of evaluation shall be sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs.
 - f. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs shall request an evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service from the Area or Areas with which the candidate is identified. Each Area is responsible for organizing this review and preparing a written report to be submitted to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs. To accomplish this task, the Area shall review the candidate's curriculum vitae, teaching portfolio, all relevant published materials, and the candidate's self-profile. All area faculty members are expected to participate in the Area's review of a candidate's file.
- C. Compiling the dossier. Once the review process has been initiated and the chairperson has been appointed, the candidate shall supply the Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs with the following materials to be sent to the various evaluators inside and outside the University.
- i. A complete, up-to-date curriculum vitae.

- ii. A one page summary curriculum vitae.
- iii. Copies of all scholarly works and other published works pertinent to the review.
- iv. A concise personal statement—no more than five double-spaced pages—in language that the non-specialist can understand. This statement shall include a review of achievements in teaching, research and service and shall describe future plans for teaching, research, and service and how they relate to the candidate’s professional growth and development.
- v. A teaching portfolio that includes a statement of the candidate’s philosophy of teaching and a description of teaching methods and course design; the most mature syllabi from each course taught, examples of course handouts, examples of written feedback on student work; statistical and critical summaries of student evaluations; written reports from observations of teaching by two senior colleagues, along with any commentary on those reports that the candidate wishes to include; a description of the institutional and personal processes used to assess teaching effectiveness; and other materials the candidate deems pertinent to the assessment of teaching.
- vi. A statement that defines, describes, and assesses the candidate’s service.
- vii. The completed review dossier shall also include the following items collected from internal and external reviewers.
 - a. At least three letters from faculty within Candler School of Theology.
 - b. At least six letters from scholars outside Emory University.
 - c. When appropriate, the review may include letters from faculty in other Emory departments or Emory-related programs.
 - d. Four letters from students, at least two of whom are current students.
 - e. An evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, research, and service by the members of the teaching area in which the candidate’s review is taking place.
 - f. A written report by the chairperson summarizing the assessments made throughout the review process.

D. Preparing for the review. Once the materials have been collected, the Dean and tenured members of the Personnel and Academic Policy

Committee read the dossier and prepare to receive the report of the chairperson of the review. Pre-tenured faculty and student members of the committee shall be excused from these preparations and the subsequent deliberations. The chairperson of the review prepares a written summary of the evaluations that provides a comprehensive, balanced account of the dossier.

- E. Presenting the review. The chairperson reads the report to the Dean and tenured members of the Personnel and Academic Policy Committee. The chairperson is expected to describe the process of the review, report the recommendations of the reviewers, answer questions about materials in the file, and assess the extent to which the contents of the file meet the criteria for tenure or promotion or both. The chairperson's written report becomes part of the candidate's dossier.

- F. Deliberation and recommendation concerning promotion. All deliberations are confidential and intended for the use of the Chairperson, Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs, Dean, and tenured members of the Personnel and Academic Policy Committee. The tenured members of the committee vote by secret ballot when they make their final recommendation to the Dean. The Dean may consult with other administrators of the University. If the faculty member teaches in the Ph.D. program, the Dean normally sends the file to the Dean of the Laney School of Graduate Studies, who may then submit an advisory letter to the Candler Dean.

The Dean, after reviewing all of the materials, decides whether to accept the recommendation of the Personnel and Academic Policy Committee. The Dean then presents his or her recommendation in a letter to the Provost. This letter shall include a summary of the process, deliberations, and conclusions, together with whatever special considerations might assist the Provost in assessing the candidate's file. After the review of the Provost and the Presidential Advisory Committee, the materials are normally forwarded to the President and the Board of Trustees Executive Committee. After final action is taken on promotion, the materials are returned to the Dean's office and become part of the candidate's confidential file. Only the candidate's writings and published materials are to be returned to the candidate.

- G. Summary of Timetable. Reviews are typically organized and conducted with a view towards final approval being given by the Board of Trustees at its meeting in April. To accommodate this schedule, the following deadlines will guide the review.
 - i. The review shall normally be initiated by September 15 of the academic year prior to the expected promotion. The review committee chair shall be named by the first of October.

- ii. The candidate's portion of the tenure file shall be completed by June 1.
- iii. External, internal, and student reviewers shall be identified and recruited by January 1.
- iv. Materials will be sent to reviewers by June 15.
- v. Letters from all reviewers and the report of the teaching area are due by September 15.
- vi. The Personnel and Academic Policy Committee shall review the dossier and receive the report from the review chair at its November meeting.
- vii. The Dean's recommendation and the full dossier shall be sent to the Provost by the first PAC submission date in January.
[timeline updated and approved by faculty: 2.6.12]

H. Compiling the dossier for the review of the provost. A checklist prepared by the Provost's office will be used to prepare the final dossier for submission to the Provost with the recommendation of the Dean.

V. Appeals

Candidates have the right to appeal a decision. In order to appeal, they must indicate to the Dean in a letter their desire for an appeal and their reasons for seeking it. Such an appeal must be made within thirty days of the Dean's notifying the candidate of the decision.

Upon receiving the letter of appeal, the Dean shall appoint a review committee constituted of three tenured faculty members who have not been directly involved in the tenure or promotion review of the candidate. The committee shall have access to all of the materials compiled in connection with the candidate's review. The committee's task shall be to review these materials and the procedures by which they have been compiled and the basis on which the recommendation was made.

Candidates will have the right to appear before this committee and present their cases for appeal. On the basis of their review, the chairperson of this committee shall prepare a written report for the Dean indicating whether it sustains earlier decisions and the reason for its judgment. The Dean shall send a copy of this report to the candidate.

Any appeal from the decision of the Dean shall be made in writing to the Provost, who shall determine the procedures to be employed in any further review of the case