

**OFFICE OF THE PROVOST, HOWARD UNIVERSITY**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR 2009-2010 REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR APPLICATIONS**  
**FROM CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE**

**FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2009:** Deadline for candidates for promotion **and/or** tenure to submit completed application files and supporting documentation<sup>1</sup> to the department chairperson. [All reviews are to include the recommendations of four external reviewers<sup>2</sup> who are experts in the same discipline as the candidate. These external reviews should provide an evaluation of the quality of the candidate's research, creative work and publications and the impact or potential impact on the scholarship of the field—two reviewers are recommended by the candidate **and** two by the committee of all tenured departmental faculty and the department chair. Also, documentation of teaching success in the form of summaries of the results of student course evaluations is **required**.]

**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 2:** Deadline for completing reviews<sup>3</sup> at the departmental level and notifying candidates in writing of the recommendations of both the department chairperson and the department APT committee. If the recommendation is to deny tenure/promotion, the department chair also informs the candidate of the right to request reconsideration.<sup>4</sup>

**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16:** Deadline (prior to referral of file to the Dean) for submitting to candidates a written statement of the reasons for a negative departmental decision, unless candidates expressly relinquish this right in writing to the department chairperson.

**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23:** Deadline for candidates who are denied a positive recommendation for tenure/promotion to submit a written request for reconsideration—including any “new information”—of negative decisions at the departmental level.

**FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11:** Deadline for written explanations of departmental final decisions after reconsideration and the reasons for these decisions to be provided to candidates.

**MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 2010:** Deadline for the department chairperson to submit to the dean of the college/school— for transmittal to the college/school APT committee—the completed files and supporting documentation of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure, along with the recommendations<sup>5</sup> concerning promotion and/or tenure and the written evaluations of both the department chairperson and the department APT committee of each candidate's performance in the areas of (1) research, creative activity and publications, (2) teaching/instruction, (3) service and (4) professional development. [*The files of **all** candidates for promotion or tenure, irrespective of whether the recommendations are positive or negative, are submitted for review at the college/school level, unless a candidate expressly requests in writing that her/his application be withdrawn from consideration.*]

**OFFICE OF THE PROVOST, HOWARD UNIVERSITY**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR 2009-2010 REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR APPLICATIONS**  
**FROM CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE**

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1:** Deadline for candidates for promotion or tenure to be notified of the recommendations<sup>6</sup> of the dean and the college/school APT committee.

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12:** Deadline for candidate to request a written explanation of a negative decision by the dean or the college/school APT committee.

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26:** Deadline for the dean or the college/school APT committee, as applicable, to provide written explanations of their decisions to candidates for promotion or tenure.

**FRIDAY, MARCH 5:** Date for receipt in the Office of the Provost of the completed application files<sup>7</sup> (including all supporting documentation, recommendations and written evaluations from all prior review levels) of **only** those candidates for tenure and/or promotion who did **not** receive negative recommendations from either the dean or the college/school APT committee.

**FRIDAY, MARCH 12:** Deadline for candidates to submit to the dean written replies to negative recommendations at the college/school level.

**FRIDAY, MARCH 19:** Deadline for the dean to communicate to the candidate in writing the final decision from any reconsideration of a negative recommendation at the college/school level.

**WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24:** Deadline for candidates reviewed for tenure or promotion to **appeal** a final negative decision from either the dean or the college/school APT committee. The appeal **must** be filed in writing with **both** the dean **and** the Faculty Grievance Commission (FGC) and **must** be based on one or more of the grounds stipulated in Section 2.8.4.B. of the *Faculty Handbook*. The files of candidates who have filed appeals with the FGC are **not** transmitted to the Provost until the grievance process is completed.

**FRIDAY, MARCH 26:** Date following the completion of reconsideration of all negative recommendations at the college/school level for receipt in the Office of the Provost of the remaining completed application files<sup>7</sup>, with supporting documentation and recommendations and evaluations from all prior review levels, of candidates for tenure and/or promotion. The files of candidates who have filed appeals with the FGC are **not** transmitted to the Provost until the grievance process is completed. However, the files of all other candidates, irrespective of whether the recommendations are positive or negative, are submitted to the Provost for review, **unless** a candidate expressly requests in writing to the dean that her/his application be withdrawn from consideration.

---

<sup>1</sup> The documentation required of all candidates is described in the *Faculty Handbook*, Section 2.7.4.5. The Provost requires submission of this documentation by candidates for either tenure or promotion.

<sup>2</sup> External reviewers from universities must be at or above the rank to which promotion/tenure is sought. For external reviewers from non-university settings who are recommended by the faculty candidate, the candidate is to provide an explanation of their qualifications, which focuses on their professional competence in the discipline and the reasons for their selection rather than that of reviewers from a university setting. A similar explanation is to be provided by the department APT for such reviewers who are recommended by the tenured faculty and/or department chair.

<sup>3</sup> The department APT and the department chair each conduct and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's research, creative activity and publications; teaching; service; and professional development.

<sup>4</sup> The candidate's file is not transmitted to the dean for review at the college/school level until any reconsideration is completed at the level of the department.

<sup>5</sup> For a recommendation of either tenure or promotion, the department APT committee also provides the results of its vote for each decision; i.e., number for, against or abstaining.

<sup>6</sup> In addition to a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure, both the college/school APT and the dean conduct and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's research, creative activity and publications; teaching; service; and professional development. Actual written assessments of performance in each of these areas are required and not simply minutes of action taken by the committee.

<sup>7</sup> The college/school APT and the dean each conduct and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's research, creative activity and publications; teaching; service, and professional development. For a recommendation of either tenure or promotion, the college/school APT committee also provides the results of its vote for each decision; i.e., number for, against or abstaining. APT committees are cautioned to take care NOT to include with the completed file of a candidate the results of action pertaining to the application of another candidate.