

June 7, 2023

Memorandum to: Chancellor Strom, Provosts, Deans, Directors, and Department Chairs

From: Prabhas V. Moghe  
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Distinguished Professor

Subject: **2023-2024** Academic Promotion Instructions For Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Appointments in Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS)<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

These instructions govern non-tenure track faculty promotions equivalent to the rank of Associate Professor and above for faculty in Rutgers Biomedical Health Sciences (RBHS) for the academic year **2023-2024**. These instructions are also available on the internet at <https://facultyaffairs.rbhs.rutgers.edu/appointments-promotions/academic-reappointment-promotion-instructions/> where they can be downloaded in Microsoft Word format.

Form NTT-1 is available from the output menu of the online Faculty Survey Database (<https://oirap.rutgers.edu/Facsurv/>).

#### I. Instructions

- A. Applicability of these Instructions
- B. Promotion Materials
- C. Persons Responsible for Initiating Actions
- D. Notification to Candidate
- E. Responsibilities of the Candidate
- F. Letters of Evaluation
- G. Materials to be Used in Review
- H. Additions to the Packet and the Right to Rebut or Respond
- I. Responsibilities of the Initiating Department
- J. Responsibilities of the Department Chair
- K. Responsibilities of the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions
- L. Responsibilities of the Dean
- M. Final Levels of Review
- N. Notification of Final Action
- O. Withdrawal from Consideration

---

1. These instructions do not apply to faculty in the School of Pharmacy or to faculty in School of Nursing, in the AAUP-AFT bargaining unit

- P. Special Guidelines for Faculty Affiliated with More than One Department, Center, Bureau, Institute, Decanal Unit or Degree-Granting Program
- Q. Technical Resources for Assembling Packets

## II. Forms

- RBHS Form NTT-1 Recommendation Information Form for Non-Tenure Track Faculty
- RBHS Form No. 2 Criteria Applicable to the Candidate.
- RBHS Form No. 3 Report on Confidential Letters
- RBHS Form No. 3-a Confidential Letter Cover Sheet
- RBHS Form No. 4 Narrative Summary of Departmental Recommendation
- RBHS Form No. 5 Narrative Summary of Dean's Recommendation
- RBHS Form No. 6 Narrative Summary of Chancellor's Recommendation *(for denials only)*

## III. Appendices

- Appendix A RBHS Policy Concerning Notice of Non-Reappointment
- Appendix B Evaluation Pathway for Academic Promotions Not Involving Tenure or the Tenured Ranks
- Appendix C RBHS Policies and Guidelines Governing Appointments, Promotions, and Professional Activities of the Faculty
- Appendix D Statement on Professional Ethics (Rutgers Policy 60.5.1)
- Appendix E Sample 30-Day Notification Letter to Individuals to be Considered for Promotion
- Appendix E-I Sample Letter - Preliminary Solicitation of Service as Confidential Referee
- Appendix E-II Sample Letter – Solicitation of Confidential Evaluation for Faculty Members on the Teaching, Research or Clinical

Track who are Candidates for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor

Appendix E-III Sample Letter – Solicitation of Confidential Evaluation for Faculty Members on the Teaching, Research or Clinical Track who are Candidates for Promotion to the Rank of Distinguished Professor

Appendix E-IV Sample Letter – Solicitation of Confidential Evaluation for Faculty Members on the Professional Practice Track who are Candidates for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor

Appendix E-V Sample Letter – Solicitation of Confidential Evaluation for Faculty Members on the Professional Practice Track who are Candidates for Promotion to the Rank of Distinguished Professor

Appendix F Sample – Inventory Listing of Materials to be Included in Package for Promotion

**The schedule for receipt of all promotion recommendations will be set by the RBHS Chancellor.**

Questions concerning these instructions should be directed to the RBHS Office of Faculty Affairs (973-972-7595 or [rbhsfacultyaffairs@ca.rutgers.edu](mailto:rbhsfacultyaffairs@ca.rutgers.edu)).

The purpose of these instructions and the difficult and time-consuming process undertaken by the University as described herein is to provide for a rigorous and fair review of the qualifications and accomplishments of candidates for promotion within the non-tenured ranks equivalent to the rank of Associate Professor and above. In turn, members of the faculty have an obligation to cooperate fully with their University colleagues in the evaluation process and to meet their responsibilities, as outlined in these instructions, in a timely and professional manner.

A. Applicability of these Instructions

These instructions are applicable for all non-tenure track promotion recommendations equivalent to the rank of Associate Professor and above. Evaluations for all non-tenure track reappointments to the same rank and promotions up to and including the rank of Assistant Professor are governed by the [Short Form](#).

For faculty members who report directly to a Center: where these Instructions refer to a Chair, the director of the center shall appoint an individual faculty member to serve in that role. Where these Instructions refer to a Dean, the director of the center shall assume that role.

#### B. Promotion Materials

A candidate's promotion packet shall consist of the appropriate forms, those materials generated pursuant to Sections F, G and H below, and those supplementary materials submitted by the candidate pursuant to Section E below. In addition, the packet shall include a copy of the candidate's current appointment letter, the candidate's c.v., and any other documentation that may be required by the department/unit.

All of the information requested shall be provided carefully, and judgments at each level of evaluation shall be independent, shall be based on all the evidence submitted to that level, and shall not merely rely on or concur in judgments made at earlier levels. For availability and distribution of materials, refer to Section E, Responsibilities of the Candidate, and Section J, Responsibilities of the Department Chair.

Supplementary materials will be returned to the candidate when they are no longer needed for the evaluation or for a re-evaluation of the same candidacy.

#### C. Persons Responsible for Initiating Actions

Department chairs, in consultation with the appropriate faculty members of their departments, are normally responsible for initiating recommendations for non-tenure track faculty promotions. However, a faculty dean, the RBHS chancellor, or a departmental or similar personnel committee may request that a department evaluate an individual for promotion. The unit Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions may also make such a request, but only by directing that request to an appropriate dean. It shall be the obligation of the department to complete the appropriate forms even when the candidacy has been initiated at a level other than the department.

All other requests from non-tenure track faculty members may be granted at the department's discretion.

**A minimum of six faculty members at or above the rank for which candidates are to be considered for promotion are required to vote on the recommendation with respect to each candidate.** This may include non-tenure track faculty members, as determined by the department. Such determination shall apply to all non-tenure track promotion cases under review by that department during the promotion cycle. All eligible faculty within the candidate's department who are at or above the appropriate rank are expected to participate in the departmental review. **Faculty members who have a conflict of interest with the candidate should be recused from the meeting.** The departmental recommendation must include a list of those eligible members that participated, and a list of those who were unable to attend, together with a brief explanation of each absence. Eligible faculty serving at another level of review, and those

who recuse themselves due to a conflict of interest between themselves and the candidate, should be included in the list of faculty unable to attend.

If necessary, the dean shall appoint an appropriate number of faculty members at or above the appropriate rank from related disciplines in the same faculty, college, or school or from the same discipline in other units of the University, to act as ad hoc members of the department for the purpose of obtaining and reviewing documented evidence of the candidates' professional qualifications. Such ad hoc department members, together with any faculty member of the department of appropriate rank, shall total not fewer than six voting persons. In selecting the ad hoc members, the dean shall consult with the chair of the department. In instances in which the majority of the departmental members are ad hoc, such members may wish to meet with the candidate before making their recommendation.

When a candidate is the department chair, the departmental members constituting the appropriate "peer group" for evaluation of the candidate (that is, those who hold appointment at or above the academic rank for which an individual is to be considered for reappointment or promotion) will agree upon a senior faculty member within the department to fulfill all of the functions of the department chair described in these procedures.

#### D. Notification to Candidate

Each faculty member who is to be considered for promotion shall be notified by the department chair at least thirty (30) days in advance that such consideration will take place, and shall respond appropriately within the thirty (30) day period.

#### E. Responsibilities of the Candidate

A specific responsibility of the candidate is to ensure the accurate preparation, presentation, and certification of Form NTT-1, Recommendation Information Form, which is to be signed by both the candidate and the chair and circulated to the appropriate departmental peer group by the chair.

In preparing Form NTT-1, the candidate is responsible for ensuring that:

- 1) the distinction is made on the form between refereed and other publications;
- 2) the status of material in process of review or publication is precisely characterized, attaching available documentation;
- 3) publications are cited in full and in the form standard for the candidate's discipline (including the names of all authors in the order of appearance in the publication), with volume, year, page numbers (or for a book, number of pages), and explanation of the candidate's responsibility for jointly authored works. The candidate should also

- ensure that the form fully presents his/her clinical (if applicable), teaching and service activities;
- 4) in the case of foreign publications, there is sufficient explanation of the value or quality of the journal or press, especially if the publication is important to the candidacy.

The candidate shall provide the department chair with a signed and completed Recommendation Information Form (Form NTT-1).

At the time the faculty member submits a signed Recommendation Information Form, he/she shall submit to the department chair one copy of any documents or materials he/she wishes to have considered. Candidates are required to include evidence of effective teaching and/or mentoring in applications for promotion. Student instructional ratings scores (such as SIRS) are considered an essential component of this evidence but are not sufficient to satisfy this requirement. One or more additional pieces of evidence of effective teaching must be provided. Examples include, but are not limited to: peer review, mentoring, scholarship of learning, statement of teaching philosophy, and/or a teaching portfolio. A teaching portfolio and a brief personal statement identifying the candidate's major contributions may be in the materials submitted, but are not required. While not required, a personal statement is helpful to levels of review that may not be familiar with the discipline or specialization of the candidate. The personal statement should speak to all relevant criteria for promotion (e.g. teaching, scholarship, service). Departments are advised to send the personal statement, together with the candidate's CV and samples of scholarship, to the external evaluators to assist with their review of the candidate. A list, compiled by the faculty member, of the documents submitted to the chair shall be attached to the promotion packet (Appendix F).

If applicable<sup>2</sup>, the candidate may suggest potential evaluators and may discuss with his/her department chair qualified persons from whom letters may be solicited. The candidate, in addition, may prepare a list of persons in his/her field from whom he/she prefers letters of evaluation not be solicited. The candidate shall provide a written explanation for the exclusion of each person on that list. If a letter of evaluation is solicited from an individual on the candidate's "not for" solicitation list, the candidate's written explanation shall be attached to the individual's letter of recommendation. A department chair or dean may, at his/her discretion, also attach an explanation for his/her decision to solicit a letter from the individual. Such attachments, whether prepared by the candidate, the department chair, or the dean, shall be held, like the letters to which they refer, in confidence.

If the faculty member wishes to include a lengthy unpublished manuscript and requires copying services, he/she should contact his or her dean or department chair at least 30 days prior to the

---

2 See Section F "Letters of Evaluation"

date on which copies are needed. The faculty member will be charged the prevailing rate for services so provided. If the service cannot be provided, the candidate will be notified promptly.

#### F. Letters of Evaluation

Except for those being considered for promotion within the Professional Practice Track, a minimum of four external arm's length confidential letters of evaluation from qualified persons shall be obtained by the candidate's department chair and/or by the candidate's dean. Arm's length letters are defined as those from external referees who are NOT the candidate's dissertation or thesis chair or mentor, the candidate's coauthor or collaborator, the candidate's former professor, a family member of the candidate, or a personal friend of the candidate. Ordinarily, letters from individuals with whom the candidate has worked closely in the past would not be considered arm's length. If a non-arms's length letter is included, the department chair should indicate the reason for soliciting the letter from that individual on Form 3-a. **Referees should be selected on the basis of their standing in the field and the institutions with which they are associated, and should normally be at the rank of full professor or above, but must be at least at the candidate's proposed rank or equivalent.** All confidential letters obtained in regard to the candidacy must be included in the promotion packet and forwarded to all levels of review. Preliminary solicitation letters and the responses thereto, unsolicited letters, and letters from within the University are not included within this category.

Arm's length letters of evaluation are not required for promotion within the Professional Practice Track; however, a department/unit shall solicit up to a minimum of four non-arm's length confidential letters of evaluation from qualified persons internal and/or external to the University. If any external referees are solicited, these confidential letter writers are to be solicited in accordance with the provisions set forth below. If the department/unit chooses to solicit confidential letters of evaluation from any internal referees, the candidate may suggest potential internal referees and may discuss with his/her chair qualified persons from whom letters may be solicited; however, the selection of internal referees must be made by the department chair. The department chair will request, in writing, a confidential letter of evaluation from the internal referee. A faculty member serving as an internal referee shall not participate in any manner in the consideration of that candidate at any other level of review.

Prior to the solicitation of **external** confidential letters, the chair creates a list of experts relevant to the candidate. The candidate then meets the chair to informally discuss any experts the candidate contemplates recommending on their list, which they will then provide to the chair for consideration. The candidate also submits to the chair a list of persons from whom they prefer letters not be solicited. The only experts deemed "recommended by the candidate" will be those included in the list submitted to the chair for consideration that do not already appear on the chair's list. The department chair shall first verify that the list of referees satisfies the eligibility criteria stipulated in the guidelines, and then submit it to the dean, accompanied by a clear explanation of the suitability of the referee, the relationship of the referee to the candidate and his/her field of study, and documentation demonstrating the referee's professional standing. The

department chair shall make available to the dean any list submitted by the candidate of persons from whom he/she prefers letters not be solicited. Chairs, in developing lists of appropriate referees to submit to the dean, shall consult the candidate about appropriate experts in his/her field of study, but the selection of external referees must be made by the department chair and dean.

After consultation with the candidate and dean, the department chair shall send a preliminary solicitation letter (Appendix E-I through E-V) to individuals he/she has selected to serve as external referees (preliminary solicitation letters are not used for internal referees; see Section F, paragraph 2). The preliminary solicitation letter may be sent via e-mail to external referees. **The text of the preliminary solicitation letter shall not be modified and use of the preliminary solicitation letter is required.** The preliminary solicitation letter and the responses thereto do not become part of the promotion packet. It is the chair's responsibility to keep a copy of the preliminary solicitation letters or e-mails, a list of recipients of the preliminary solicitation letter, dates sent, and responses, confidentially, in the department until evaluations, grievances, remands, etc. are completed. Under no circumstances shall the candidate contact experts whose names he/she has submitted for consideration, or engage in any substantive discussion about his/her promotion case with any individual whom he/she knows to be serving as an external referee. Similarly, the Chair and other faculty members shall not engage in any substantive discussion about the candidate's promotion case with any individual whom he/she knows to be serving as an external referee. The presumption is that a chair and his/her dean will reach a consensus as to an appropriate list of referees. However, in the event of a disagreement, a chair is neither obliged to solicit, nor prohibited from soliciting, any particular referee. Similarly, in conducting his/her evaluation of the candidacy as set forth in Section L. below, the dean, at his/her discretion, may solicit letters from additional external referees. Such additional letters shall be submitted to evaluative bodies in accord with the procedures set forth in Section H and become a part of the packet.

Sample letters of solicitation are attached in Appendices E-I through E-V. Solicitation letters may be sent via e-mail. Letters of solicitation for confidential outside letters of recommendation shall be consistent with the promotion criteria applicable to the candidate. A department chair, with the prior approval of the dean and chancellor, may modify the text of the sample letter of solicitation.

No reference which might identify the writers of the confidential letters shall be made in any portions of the promotion materials. Letters will be numbered and referees should be referred to by their respective number only in the narrative statements. Letters of solicitation shall be sent to referees early enough to permit the referee to complete an appropriately analytical and informative review of the candidate's credentials and to permit reviewing bodies adequate time to consider evaluators' responses.

The original confidential letters of evaluation, together with a brief explanation of the suitability and professional standing of the referee and the relationship of the referee to the candidate (Form



3-a), and one copy only of the sample letter of solicitation (attached to Form 3), must accompany the original promotion packet forwarded to the dean. Submission of an e-mailed or faxed copy of the confidential letters of evaluation is acceptable provided that the e-mailed or faxed copy is on official letterhead with the referee's electronic signature. Do not include the vitae of referees. All letters received must be submitted for review to all levels of evaluation, except that letters which are received after the deadline for submission to the chancellor will not be considered unless the dean has requested such additional letters during his/her consideration of the packet.

Confidential letters solicited in a previous year may be used again and included under Form 3. However, selectivity of such letters is not permitted even if the candidacy was later withdrawn pursuant to Section O; therefore, either all or none of the letters solicited in a previous year must be included, and they must be covered by a copy, supplied by the dean's office, of the earlier Form 3. Preliminary solicitation letters and the responses thereto are not included in this category. If new letters are solicited and if any of the referees solicited in a prior year are solicited again, then all of the referees previously solicited (excluding those who declined to evaluate the candidate in response to the preliminary solicitation letter) must be resolicited when the prior solicitation occurred in either of the two immediately prior years.<sup>3</sup>

In all circumstances, copies of the confidential letters are to be maintained by the department chair as part of the chair's records, and the chair shall inform the appropriate voting members of the department that such letters are available for review.

#### G. Materials to be Used in Review

With the exception of letters of evaluation solicited in accordance with these Instructions and those documents that are generally public knowledge such as published student evaluations, published articles, and other similar documents, **only those materials in the official personnel file, the written peer reviews(s) of the candidate's teaching, the teaching portfolio (if submitted), and other materials added to the packet as described in Section H below may be used in conducting the review.** The official personnel file for each faculty member is maintained in the office of the appropriate dean/director. Form 5 (the dean's narrative) contains boxes to check to certify that the dean has reviewed the contents of the personnel file and the written peer review of teaching.

Documents bearing on the candidate and his/her evaluation which are introduced in the review process are subject to the strictures outlined in the next Section.

#### H. Additions to the Packet and the Right to Rebut or Respond, and Updates to the Packet

---

<sup>3</sup> If there is good cause for an exception, it can be made only with the approval of the chancellor, upon the recommendation of the dean.

### Documents Added to the Packet

If any document or documents, other than letters of evaluation, the official promotion forms, continuation pages added to these forms as described in these instructions, reports of reading committees, supplements to confidential letters (Section E, paragraph 5), and materials submitted by the candidate, are added to the promotion packet during the evaluation, a copy of said document(s) shall be transmitted immediately to the candidate; the candidate shall have the right to submit a response or rebuttal within six (6) working days. The response shall be directed to that level of the evaluation at which the added document was received and shall become a part of the promotion packet. Any documents that are (1) physically present during the evaluation and (2) specifically referred to during the deliberations of the evaluative body and (3) which a majority of the evaluative body agrees have a direct bearing on the evaluation are considered additions to the packet within the meaning of this Section and thus the above-prescribed procedures must be followed.

### Evidence of a Significant Change in the Status of Materials

Subsequent to the commencement of the evaluation and prior to final recommendation of the chancellor, the department chair shall, upon request of the candidate, add to the packet evidence of a significant change in the status of materials originally included in the packet if: 1) the department chair concurs that a significant change has occurred; and 2) such change has occurred since the initiation of the evaluation. If there is a dispute between the candidate and the department chair as to whether a significant change has occurred in the status of materials originally submitted by the candidate, the Dean shall make the final determination as to whether evidence of the change shall be added to the packet. The Recommendation Form (RBHS NTT 1) submitted by the candidate shall not be changed to reflect such additions to the packet. The evidence of the significant change shall be added to the packet by way of an addendum.

Updates to the packet, as provided above, shall be submitted to all earlier levels of review so that each earlier level may revise its evaluation should it deem such revision warranted by the addition. However, no updates to the packet may be submitted within 10 working days before the packet is due to the chancellor.

Except as provided above, no other materials or documents may be introduced by the candidate after the review process has commenced.

### I. Responsibilities of the Initiating Department

The departments have the specific responsibility to meet in appropriate peer groups (see Section C, Paragraph 3) to evaluate the candidate for promotion: only faculty members with voting rights who are at the rank of Associate Professor, Professor or Distinguished Professor shall meet to evaluate candidates for promotion to the non-tenure rank equivalent of Associate Professor; only faculty members with voting rights who are at the rank of Professor or Distinguished Professor

shall meet to evaluate candidates for promotion to the non-tenure rank equivalent of Professor. Only faculty members with voting rights who are at the rank of Distinguished Professor shall evaluate non-tenure track candidates for that rank. The only exception to these provisions is the chair of the department, who will participate in all promotion deliberations in the department and who will be responsible for completing the evaluation forms in consultation with the relevant peer group. Chairs will vote on all personnel actions except those concerning ranks higher than their own.

It is the responsibility of the appropriate peer group to arrive by vote at a recommendation with respect to each candidate. A positive departmental recommendation requires a positive vote by a minimum of two-thirds of those voting. A minimum total of six peer group votes is required (total votes include those voting positively, negatively, or abstaining.) Chairs should ensure that faculty members who have a conflict of interest with the candidate are recused from participating in the discussion or vote; recusals must be listed with faculty not attending the meeting and do not count towards the total votes. If fewer than two-thirds of those voting support the candidacy, the recommendation of the department shall be recorded as a negative recommendation. Meetings held to consider a candidate may be conducted via video conferencing provided the identity of each faculty member can be verified. Only those faculty members whose identity can be verified are to be accorded a vote. A vote by an absent faculty member is not permitted under any circumstances.

#### J. Responsibilities of the Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for ensuring that a thorough, rigorous and appropriately informed process of evaluation takes place for each candidate.

Within ten (10) days of the department chair's receipt of the candidate's completed Form NTT-1, the department chair will sign and return the Form to indicate concurrence with its content, or, if there is a dispute between the department chair and the candidate as to the content of the Form which they are unable to resolve, the department chair shall so indicate in the space provided above his/her signature, attaching an explanation to the Form

It shall be the responsibility of the chair to circulate Appendix F and all documents or materials submitted by the candidate, together with any other relevant material to the appropriate reviewing bodies.

Other specific responsibilities of the department chair, in regard to the provision of notice to candidates, the preparation of materials for the evaluation, and the solicitation of letters of evaluation, are set forth in Sections D and F above.

The department chair has additional responsibilities in regard to the matters set forth below:

Applicable Criteria - Form 2: The department chair shall complete and sign Form 2, which specifies the criteria applicable to the candidate, and obtain the signature of the candidate.

Reading Committee: The department chair, in consultation with faculty members who hold voting rights in the department, shall determine whether there should be a reading committee and who should be appointed to it. The process by which such faculty members of the department are consulted is within the department chair's discretion. Whichever approach with respect to the utilization of a reading committee a department determines to follow shall apply to all candidates in that department on the same track (i.e. teaching or research track) or on the same clinical pathway (i.e. clinical educator or clinical scholar) for promotion in that year. If the expertise regarding the scholarship of the faculty member being evaluated is lacking within the Department, the evaluation of the scholarship by a reading committee of experts is strongly recommended to aid in assessing the quality of the candidate's scholarship.

The reading committee report, if there is one, may be either (1) confidential for the sole information of the department, or (2) an attachment to the department report. The function of a reading committee is to review the candidate's scholarly work and prepare a written assessment of that work for the department's consideration. The reading committee shall not make a recommendation on the promotion.

Department Evaluation: The department chair has the responsibility to convene the department, as set forth in Section I above, and to encourage as open and complete a discussion of the candidates as possible. The department chair should be a vigorous participant in such discussions, sharing his or her views with colleagues and providing them with an opportunity to respond.

Departmental Report: The department chair has the responsibility to draft the departmental report, reflecting both majority and minority views if there is a division, describing the candidate's contributions to collaborative efforts and adding any explanatory commentary the chair deems necessary for later levels to understand the departmental proceedings and viewpoints. **The report must address any negative votes or abstentions.** While the narrative should be structured to present a rigorous evaluation of the candidate's record it need not comment on every item listed on Form 1. However, the departmental report shall present specific evaluations of the candidate's contributions to and performance in, as applicable, 1) undergraduate instruction and research supervision and 2) graduate or postdoctoral instruction and research supervision, as indices of effective teaching mentoring, training, and/or career development. Summaries of teaching evaluations and evaluations of teaching effectiveness in the narratives shall reflect accurately the teaching evaluations for the appropriate period of time available for scrutiny. **The summaries shall reference, where available, evidence concerning the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher, including measures of teaching performance through such means as peer reviews of teaching, evaluations of teaching portfolios and syllabi, and other evidence of the quality of the candidate's teaching, in addition to student evaluations over the entire period under consideration.**

The departmental report shall also provide a written assessment of the candidate's scholarly work and service contributions, if applicable. The chair shall provide to all participants in the department evaluation the opportunity to review the final departmental report prior to its submission. In the case of candidates **partially budgeted to or affiliated with other departments, centers, bureaus, institutes, decanal units or degree-granting programs**, the chair shall implement the instructions set forth in Section P below (solicitation of letters and report from the secondary departments, centers, bureaus, institutes, decanal units or degree-granting programs).

The departmental report should acknowledge, and where possible explain, any negative votes or abstentions. Faculty members who were absent from the meeting should be listed and a brief explanation of the absence included.

Department Representative: The department chair shall serve as the representative of the department in communications with the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions and with the dean.

Distribution of Packet: Subsequent to completion of the departmental report, the department chair shall forward the original packet to the office of the dean.

Notification to Candidate of Department's Action: It is the responsibility of the department chair to notify the candidate, in writing, of the recommendation of the department within five working days after the department has met and voted on its recommendation. This notification will be the only notice to the candidate until final notice described in Section N.

Provision of these Instructions: It is the responsibility of the department chair to inform each candidate for promotion of the uniform resource locator (URL) where a copy of these Instructions can be accessed by the candidate.

#### K. Responsibilities of the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions<sup>4</sup>

Upon receipt of a candidate's official packet from a department, the dean of the candidate's academic unit shall forward all documents to the appropriate Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions for review and recommendation. The Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions is advisory to the dean. Its responsibility is to conduct a substantive and independent evaluation of the candidacy as presented in the packet prepared by the department, including the supplementary materials. In the course of its review, the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions, at its discretion, may invite the department chair to meet with the committee to amplify the department's report. Due to the impact of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Certain units of the University do not have Advisory Committees on Appointments and Promotions.

COVID-19 pandemic, A&P committee meetings may be conducted via video conferencing provided the identity of each individual can be verified. Only those committee members who are physically present at the meetings in which the candidate is considered are to be accorded a vote; a vote by an absent A&P committee member is not permitted under any circumstances. A vote by an absent member is not permitted under any circumstances.

The Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions shall meet with the dean to provide its advice about the candidate and shall incorporate that advice in a detailed written report, in the form of a memorandum to the dean, explaining its recommendations. The memorandum shall include the names of all members of the A&P Committee and the date of the meeting.

Members of the Committee who participate in the review of candidates in their own department at the departmental level shall not participate in any manner in the consideration of those candidates by the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions. A&P Committee members must be at or above the rank for which candidates are to be considered for promotion.

#### L. Responsibilities of the Dean

It is the responsibility of the dean to ensure that a thorough, rigorous and appropriately informed process of evaluation takes place for each candidate. Accordingly, before the commencement of each reappointment and promotion cycle, the dean shall ensure that each faculty evaluative body has received and has reviewed the criteria for the candidates under review, as set forth in Appendix C of these Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions, including the text of the University's Statement on Professional Ethics, as included in University Policy 60.5.1.

Following the recommendations of both the department and the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions, the dean shall make his/her independent recommendation and report it on the Dean's Recommendation Form (No. 5). All pertinent information on a particular candidate must be considered, including information contained in the candidate's personnel file, and the dean must check the box on Form No. 5 that they have reviewed its contents and the dean shall provide specific justification based on the record for his/her recommendation. The dean shall have primary responsibility for ensuring the quality and the rigor of evaluations in his or her unit. However, if a dean intends to make a recommendation different from that of the department, prior to completing his or her recommendation, the dean will meet with the department chair to discuss the matter. The dean will include the written advice of the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions as an attachment to the dean's recommendation. In those instances where neither the department nor the dean has recommended the candidate, the packet is not forwarded to the chancellor.

When the promotion evaluations have been completed as described above, the dean shall forward the packet to the office of the chancellor. The packet shall include the following: Form NTT-1; Form 2; if applicable, Forms 3, 3-a, one copy of the sample letter used to solicit external confidential evaluations (Appendix E-II, E-III, E-IV or E-V) and the letters of evaluation; Forms

4 and 5; the report of the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions (if applicable); a copy of the candidate's current appointment letter; the personal statement (if applicable); evidence of effective teaching; teaching portfolio (if applicable); peer teaching observation reports, if available; the candidate's CV; and inventory listing (Appendix F). Deans may notify departments of any additional requirements specific to their units.

For responsibilities of the dean upon completion of the evaluation process, see Section N, Notification of Final Action.

M. Final Levels of Review

The dean shall be the final level of evaluation for all personnel actions when both the departmental recommendation and the dean's recommendation are negative. All other non-tenure track faculty promotions equivalent to the rank of Associate Professor and above require the formal approval of the RBHS chancellor (or his/her designee).

N. Notification of Final Action

Deans are responsible for notification to candidates in all cases. In cases where both the department and decanal levels of review are negative, the candidate must be notified in writing by the dean or director (or his/her designee) within ten (10) working days of the final decision. In cases that proceed beyond the dean's or director's level of review, deans and directors will be notified by the chancellor of final decisions, and shall notify the candidates within ten (10) working days of receipt of such notification. For unsuccessful candidacies, the notification to the candidate shall include an invitation to meet with the dean or director and a written statement from the RBHS Chancellor as to the reason for the denial. In the case of a denial, the Chancellor will complete Form 6.

O. Withdrawal from Consideration

Prior to consideration by the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions, the promotion evaluation of any candidate may be withdrawn by mutual consent of the candidate and department chair after the chair consults with both the candidate and the appropriate voting members of the department. Subsequent to the commencement of consideration of the packet by the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions, withdrawal of a candidacy requires the approval of the Chancellor. (Withdrawal after a candidate has requested promotion evaluation and signed Form NTT-1 constitutes an evaluation.) In the event of a decision to withdraw, the department chair shall advise the dean, in writing, of the decision, with a copy of the letter sent to the chancellor.

P. Special Guidelines for Faculty Affiliated with More than One Department, Center, Bureau, Institute, Decanal Unit or Degree-Granting Program

These guidelines are intended to ensure that the total assignment of a faculty member is considered during the promotion process.

Faculty Currently Affiliated with More than One Department, Center, Bureau, Institute, Decanal Unit or Degree-Granting Program:

A personnel action may be initiated for a faculty member by his/her primary department or by the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit, or degree-granting program in which the individual has a significant or principal assignment. In both instances the primary department shall have responsibility for the personnel action in consultation with the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program as described herein. If applicable, the choice of external confidential evaluators for such candidates shall be made by the candidate's primary dean, in consultation with the primary chair and the applicable chair or director of the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program. The letters from external evaluators shall be jointly solicited by the primary chair and the applicable chair or director of the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program. The applicable chair or director of the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program shall evaluate the candidate in consultation with the appropriate peers in the department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program and shall forward the evaluation, in the form of a memorandum, for consideration by the candidate's primary department. The evaluation shall be included as an attachment to the primary department's report. Faculty members who participate in the evaluation of the candidate at the primary department, unit or program level shall not participate in the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program evaluation.

In those instances where a primary department intends to make a recommendation different from that of the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program, the primary department shall provide the applicable chair or director of the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program an opportunity to meet with the primary department to discuss the candidate.

Faculty Previously, but Not Currently, Affiliated with More than One Department, Center, Bureau, Institute, Decanal Unit or Degree-Granting Program:

If the candidate does not currently have an affiliation with a secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program, but did so for a substantial part of the interval since the last promotion, the candidate's chair will solicit an evaluation of the candidate from the applicable chair or director of the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program. The applicable chair or director of the secondary



department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program shall evaluate the candidate in consultation with the appropriate peers in the department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program and shall forward the evaluation, in the form of a memorandum, for consideration by the candidate's primary department. The evaluation shall be included as an attachment to the primary department's report. Faculty members who participate in the evaluation of the candidate at the primary department, unit or program level shall not participate in the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program evaluation. (In instances where the period of affiliation with a secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program was not substantial, the candidate's chair may, at his/her discretion, seek an evaluation from the applicable chair or director of the secondary department, center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program.)

**Q. For Candidates: Technical Resources for Assembling Packets**

To facilitate assembling your packet, you may input your data to the online Faculty Survey Database: <https://oirap.rutgers.edu/Facsurv/>. You can use the output menu to produce the official promotion form with one click. When you are ready to produce the final version, choose Word format output and save it to your local drive as a .doc file. You can also output a customized CV or Personal Web Page, both with a permanent link (the Web Page will have a search box to your SOAR publications).

For recommendations regarding teaching portfolios, please visit [https://otear.rutgers.edu/wiki/pages/D8A0H32/Improving\\_the\\_Evaluation\\_of\\_Teaching.html](https://otear.rutgers.edu/wiki/pages/D8A0H32/Improving_the_Evaluation_of_Teaching.html).

Whenever possible, promotion packet material, including supporting documents, should be made available in electronic format, e.g. include the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) or a link to the full text publication in your citations.

Because external web links often change, it is recommended that you deposit your publications in SOAR (Scholarly Open Access at Rutgers): <http://soar.rutgers.edu>. Go to the SOAR website, click Deposit your work, and you will receive a unique permanent link (DOI) that can be added to your citation. For further information, contact the SOAR Librarian (848-445-5950) or email [SOARhelp@rutgers.edu](mailto:SOARhelp@rutgers.edu)

**Chart 1 - STEPS FOR PROMOTION OF RBHS NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND ABOVE**

Track	Department Reading Committee*	Department Recommendation** (Form 4)	School Advisory Committee on Appointments & Promotions***	Dean's Recommendation (Form 5)	Chancellor
NTT – Clinical Track	X	X	X	X	X
NTT – Teaching Track	X	X	X	X	X
NTT – Research Track	X	X	X	X	X
NTT – Professional Practice Track		X	X	X	X

\*Department reading committee may be used at the discretion of the chair to evaluate scholarship (See Section J of Instructions)

\*\*A minimum of six faculty members at or above the rank for which candidates are to be considered are required to vote on the recommendation with respect to each candidate

\*\*\*Faculty members voting on any action must be at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered. Members of the department committee who participate in the review of the candidate in their own department shall not participate in any manner in the consideration of those candidates by the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions.

**Chart 2 – MINIMUM NUMBER AND TYPE OF LETTERS REQUIRED FOR PROMOTION OF RBHS NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND ABOVE**

Track/Rank	Associate Professor	Professor	Distinguished Professor
NTT – Clinical Track	4 Arm’s Length*	4 Arm’s Length*	4 Arm’s Length*
NTT – Teaching Track	4 Arm’s Length*	4 Arm’s Length*	4 Arm’s Length*
NTT – Research Track	4 Arm’s Length*	4 Arm’s Length*	4 Arm’s Length*
NTT – Professional Practice Track**	4 Non Arm’s Length **	4 Non Arm’s Length **	4 Non Arm’s Length

\*Arm’s length letters are defined as those from external referees who are NOT the candidate’s dissertation or thesis chair or mentor, the candidate’s coauthor or collaborator, a family member of the candidate, or a personal friend of the candidate. Ordinarily, letters from individuals with whom the candidate has worked closely in the past would not be considered arm’s length.

\*\*Arm’s length letters are not required for promotion within the Professional Practice track; however, a department/unit shall solicit four non arm’s length confidential letters of evaluation from qualified persons internal and/or external to the University.