

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES PROCEDURES AND POLICIES FOR PROMOTION CONSIDERATION

Our policies relating to promotion consideration follow the general regulations for promotion provided [by Academic Affairs](#) and by the CAS [Faculty Roles](#) document. The following summarizes and systematizes those procedures and policies as they apply in the College of Arts & Sciences.

Any policy or procedure in this document which is in conflict with the policies and procedures of Winthrop University as stated in the Winthrop Policy Repository, the CAS *Faculty Roles* document, or subsequent interpretive documents is superseded by the institution-wide policy.

Initiation of consideration

As stipulated by the Division of Academic Affairs, the dean shall send a promotion review form to each eligible faculty member by April 15 as stipulated in the Winthrop Tenure and Promotion [timeline](#). Any faculty member requesting promotion review shall return the form to the department chair by May 15. In the absence of exceptional circumstances, failure to meet that deadline shall constitute waiver of promotion review. Any faculty member who believes that they are ready to be considered for promotion is encouraged to discuss this intent with the department chair. The purpose of this discussion is to provide the faculty member with formative feedback about their readiness for promotion. This meeting is suggested for informational purposes only. The decision to apply for promotion remains with the faculty member. Regardless of the advice of the chair, the faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion may prepare and submit materials for review. Promotion applications are due September 1.

Materials to be submitted for promotion consideration

The candidate to be considered for promotion shall prepare a dossier containing the materials listed below. Candidates must use the online application system in Winthrop's [Watermark](#) system to submit their dossier.

A. Cover sheet

The "Cover Sheet" is a form within Watermark that requests the following:

- Date of original faculty appointment;
- Rank at original appointment (or at Tenure Track appointment, if later);
- Prior service credit granted towards tenure at employment;
- Date/s of prior promotion/s and years in each rank; and
- Checkboxes asking whether you are applying for Tenure and/or Promotion.

B. Current curriculum vitae.

A CV, in a format chosen by the applicant, should be provided to show the depth and breadth of their work.

C. Application letter

An application letter in the candidate's own words requesting consideration for promotion, including an analysis/statement by the candidate explaining how they meet the qualifications for the requested promotion. This letter may present material requested in E, below.

D. Annual reports with supervisor evaluations and course evaluations arranged in chronological order

Candidates for promotion should include (i) annual reports with chair's and dean's comments, including any secondary supervisor evaluations, and (ii) student evaluations of all courses taught for period under review. All materials should appear in chronological order (oldest above newest); all file names should clearly indicate their contents including semester and/or year. It is understood that in some cases, particularly in courses with very small enrollments, a course evaluation may not exist. Candidates whose time in rank exceeds five years must include annual reports, supervisor comments, and course evaluations covering the last five years; they may include additional years at their discretion.

E. Candidate statements

Statements of activities associated with *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, *Professional Stewardship*, and *Academic Responsibility* may be uploaded into the corresponding sections of the Watermark case. Alternatively, these statements may be integrated into the applicant letter as in C, above. In either case:

- Candidates should prepare their statement narratives in consultation of the [CAS Roles Alignment Statements](#) regarding *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, *Professional Stewardship*, and *Academic Responsibility* and the CAS statement on [Types of Undergraduate Research with Respect to Faculty Credit](#).
- The candidate should discuss their activities related to *Student Intellectual Development* and clearly articulate how they meet or exceed the requirements for the faculty rank sought as defined in the [CAS Statement on Student Intellectual Development](#) and, if applicable, in the [Types of Undergraduate Research with Respect to Faculty Credit](#) grid
- The candidate should discuss their activities related to *Scholarly Activity* and clearly articulate how they meet or exceed the requirements for the faculty rank sought as defined in the [CAS Statement on Scholarly Activity](#) and, if applicable, in the [Types of Undergraduate Research with Respect to Faculty Credit](#) grid. The candidate should classify each artifact under *Scholarly Activity* according to the Priority levels defined in the College roles statement.
- The candidate should describe their *Professional Stewardship* activities and relate how these activities meet or exceed the expectations and meet the criteria outlined in the [CAS Statement on Professional Stewardship](#) for the rank in question.
- The candidate should state how they consistently meet the College's expectations in the area of Academic Responsibility as set forth in the [CAS Statement on Academic Responsibility](#).
- The candidate should include additional departmental explanation where applicable.
- The candidate should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities.
- The candidate is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.

G. Evidence to support the activities specified in the candidate's statement.

- Support documentation should be uploaded to the relevant section of the Watermark tenure/promotion application.
- *Annual Reports (as mentioned above)*: All faculty annual reports from the probationary period should be submitted, arranged in chronological order along with chair/supervisor and dean comments.
- *Course Evaluations (as mentioned above)*: Candidates must include all student course evaluations from their review period – to include summary statistics and student comments.
- *Student Intellectual Development*: Candidates should include representative teaching materials such as assignments, exams, handouts, etc., as well as peer evaluations of teaching and other information documenting the candidate's instructional work.
- *Scholarly Activity*: Evidence should include copies of publications, conference presentations, videos, etc. In the case of scholarly activity that is not developed in written form, the candidate should submit materials in an appropriate and accessible form.
- *Professional Stewardship*: Evidence may include letters of appointment or thanks; publications, reports, or other documents generated; letters of support from colleagues; committee rosters; and the like, as they are readily available.
- *Academic Responsibility*: support documentation is not required but may include reference to supervisor evaluations as well as evidence of committee or advising work, participation in meetings, events, etc.
- Candidates may request reference letters from former students, colleagues, research collaborators, and others with whom they have worked, at their discretion. The College recommends that such letters be sent directly to the department chair, or in the case that a department chair is a candidate for promotion, directly to the dean for uploading into Watermark.
- Other supporting documents pertinent to the review.

H. Course syllabi

Upload a pdf copy of the syllabus from each course that you taught during the period under review. Ensure that file names clearly indicate the course and term (with year) in question.

I. Peer evaluations (optional)

You may include evaluations of your work from peers – in any area or areas of review.

J. Other supporting documents (optional)

You may upload any further documents to your Watermark application that you deem valuable to evaluation of your candidacy.

K. Goals and Plans

A statement of the candidate's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years. This statement should be uploaded to the Goals and Plans section of the Watermark case.

Organizing the portfolio

While much of the organization of the portfolio is provided by the structure of the Watermark

application, it remains the responsibility of the candidate to organize materials within Watermark for effective review. In the application letter and other narrative statements, the applicant is encouraged to guide the reviewer's review of the portfolio, directing them to its various sections and documents as these create the applicant's case for promotion.

Once submitted to Watermark, the Department Chair (or Dean, in the case that the candidate is a Department Chair), will review the portfolio for completeness and forward to the administrative step for confirmation that all reviewers have completed the confidentiality form. Once confirmed, the portfolio is opened for Departmental committee review.

Departmental committees

In each year when persons request consideration for promotion, the department chair, in consultation with the candidate and dean, shall appoint a departmental personnel committee consisting of no fewer than five tenured faculty members, all of whom hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and none of whom is a person whose own promotion is a matter of consideration in that year. The department chair shall name one member of the committee as chair. Committee members will be provided appropriate access to application materials within Watermark.

The department chair, in consultation with the candidate and dean, may appoint an interdepartmental committee if there are insufficient qualified faculty members within a department to constitute a committee of the required size, or if for other reasons it is desirable to the candidate to have extra-departmental representation. A majority of the members of this committee should, whenever possible, be members of the candidate's home department. The department chair shall name one member of the committee as chair, preferably a member from the candidate's home department.

Faculty who are serving on the CAS Personnel Advisory Committee or the University Personnel Advisory committee should not also serve on a department level personnel committee whenever possible. Faculty members who are serving on the University Personnel Advisory Committee should seek guidance from the Division of Academic Affairs before accepting appointment to a department-level committee. Faculty members may not serve on the University Personnel Advisory Committee and the CAS Personnel Advisory Committee simultaneously.

Faculty members invited to serve on any personnel review or advisory committee at any level may recuse themselves if they have reason to believe they cannot objectively evaluate a candidate's application.

If a department chair is to be considered for promotion in his or her capacity as a faculty member, the dean, in consultation with the candidate and the chair of the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee, shall appoint a special committee to consider the case. This committee shall meet the number and eligibility requirements stated above and shall ordinarily include at least one member (if eligible) from within the department. At least one member will be another department chair in the College of Arts & Sciences. Additional members shall be from outside the department. One member of the committee shall be named chair by the dean when the appointments are made. This committee shall make its recommendation directly to

the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee and the dean. The dean fulfills the role of the department chair as described in the procedures below.

Committee procedures

1. The committee shall consider all materials submitted by the candidate and any reference letters solicited by the candidate. However, neither the candidate nor any other individual may appear in person before the committee.
2. Individual members of the committee should not seek or receive information beyond what is contained in the portfolio. Committee members with relevant disciplinary knowledge (i.e. disciplinary norms, selectivity of a journal, prestige of a conference presentation, competitive nature of an award) may use and share this knowledge in the evaluation of a candidate. Requests for clarification or additional information shall be made by the chair of the departmental committee to the department chair. The department chair, in turn, will forward the request to the candidate via email. The candidate shall respond to the department chair with copies to the Dean's and Provost's office. The Provost office will then unlock the Watermark case to enable the addition of relevant materials by the candidate.
3. The committee shall consider the materials in the portfolio without regard to time in rank, other than to focus on the record compiled in the last five years for candidates with more than five years in rank.
4. No minutes of transactions or deliberations of the committee shall be kept.
5. The committee in its formal deliberations shall sit alone without the department chair present. The committee may meet with the department chair to present the results of its deliberations.
6. All deliberations of the committee shall be confidential and shall not be revealed to the candidate under consideration or to other outside agents except those persons who later participate in the evaluation process.
7. The committee shall evaluate the candidate in accordance with the criteria in this document, in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statements](#), and in the general regulations for promotion provided [by Academic Affairs](#).
8. The committee shall review all materials and after deliberation, make a recommendation for or against promotion of the candidate under consideration. A positive recommendation requires a majority vote.
9. After making its decision, the committee shall make a written recommendation explaining in detail the reasons for recommending for or against promotion. The written report must contain an analysis of the extent to which the candidate's activity complies with the criteria for the rank in question stated in the College's alignment statements. With respect to *Scholarly Activity*, the report should include a count of scholarly artifacts by Priority Level.

10. The committee's response must include a clear statement indicating the recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies.
 - When the decision of the committee is not unanimous, the report should indicate the areas of disagreement. If a single report cannot adequately represent the evaluation of all committee members, a minority report must be submitted along with the primary report.
 - All committee members must sign either the primary report or minority report.
 - The committee's report/s are to be uploaded to Watermark.
11. Departmental promotion committee letters are due to Watermark on October 1. The letter will be shared with the candidate via Watermark and the candidate has the option of submitting within five calendar days a letter responding to the department committee's letter.¹ The response letter is also uploaded to Watermark and becomes part of the portfolio thereafter.

Actions of the department chair

When the department chair receives a report from a departmental committee, they shall add to the Watermark dossier their independent judgment for or against promotion of the candidate. No additions to the portfolio can take place after completion of the departmental review.

Department chair letters are due October 15. The candidate has the option of submitting within five calendar days a letter responding to the chair's letter. The response letter is due to the Dean's office by October 20; the Dean's office uploads the response letter to Watermark.

Actions of the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee

The Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee shall meet to consider all candidates submitted by chairs as well as those coming from special committees. This committee shall then follow the general procedures specified above for departmental committees, except for making reports via Watermark to the dean instead of to the department chair. The committee recommendation may refer to previous recommendations and documents from the department committee and chair.

The College Personnel Advisory Committee's recommendation is due by November 15. The candidate has the option of submitting within five calendar days a letter responding to this committee's recommendation. The response letter is due to the Dean's office by November 20; the Dean's office uploads the response letter to Watermark.

In cases where a personal or professional relationship precludes a fair evaluation of a candidate, an Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee member may recuse himself/herself from the deliberation of a candidate. This decision should be made in consultation with the dean.

¹ As per [university policy](#), the response letter shall not exceed 1000 words. The response letter is to be a direct response to issues raised by the department committee in order to clarify the candidate's original portfolio submission or correct factual errors in the department committee and/or minority letter. Similarly below.

Actions of the Dean

The dean shall formulate an independent judgment for or against promotion of the candidate that is uploaded to Watermark.

The dean's recommendation is due to Watermark by December 15. The candidate has the option of submitting within five calendar days a letter responding to this committee's recommendation. The response letter is due to the Provost's office by December 20; the Provost's office uploads the response letter to Watermark.

The candidate may choose to withdraw from consideration for promotion at any point in the process up to this point.

Confidentiality of the review process

During the period of consideration of a faculty member for promotion, all actions and recommendations of the various committees, the department chair, and the dean will be held in complete confidence, except as noted above.

Notification of final decision

Once the process of review has been completed at the institutional level, the President (via the chief academic officer) will share the final decision with the candidate no later than fifteen business days prior to May 15.

Timeline for promotion reviews

Candidates, departmental committees, department chairs, the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee, and the dean will submit materials via Watermark as specified by Winthrop tenure and promotion [timeline](#).

Instructor and Senior Instructor Ranks

The application process will follow similar portfolio preparation and submission processes associated with faculty promotions. The candidate's portfolio will be judged primarily on accomplishments with regards to Student Intellectual Development. Portfolios must also show evidence of Professional Development and Service. Senior Instructors are expected to maintain exceptional performance scores in the area of Student Intellectual Development on their annual evaluations and to continue their Professional Development and Service. Promotion to Senior Instructor is accompanied with a pay increase. For further information on promotion to Senior Instructor, please see here: <https://www.winthrop.edu/uploadedFiles/Policies/policy-pdfs/academics/2.2.38.pdf>

Grievance Policy

A promotion candidate who has reason to suspect discrimination may file a grievance using the procedure stated in Winthrop University policy, here: [Grievances and Appeals—Faculty](#).

This policy updated July 2026 to conform to new Watermark environment and recent changes to the candidate response periods.