



Rank and Status Professorial Faculty Review Procedures

College of Computational, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences

These procedures are to be used in conjunction with the [Rank and Status Policy](#). They establish procedures for evaluating professorial faculty members in the initial (third-year) review for continuing faculty status (CFS) candidacy, the final (sixth- or seventh-year) review for CFS, and reviews for rank advancement. They also set forth the timetable for the scheduled reviews. Additionally, they outline faculty members' responsibility to prepare the materials to be evaluated in the reviews, as well as the roles to be played in the review process by department review committees, department faculty, department chairs, college review committees, deans, and the university-level Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status. Attached as appendices to these procedures is a list of materials that should be included in the faculty member's portfolio, a waiver statement to be signed by the faculty member before external or internal reviews are solicited, and a sample letter for use by chairs in soliciting external reviews of a faculty member's work.

1. Content of the Portfolio

Faculty members are responsible for preparing the portfolio to be used in their initial, final, or rank advancement review. Departments, colleges, the Faculty Center, and others may provide resources to assist or guide faculty members, but those resources cannot substitute for the faculty member's professional achievement and thoughtful presentation of the portfolio.

1.1 Materials to Include in the Portfolio

Evidence to be included in the portfolio is summarized in [Appendix A](#). The faculty member should be thoughtful and measured about what to include in the portfolio, because the portfolio itself is an indicator of professional maturity. A portfolio that is professional, thorough, and concise is especially persuasive. Letters from students should not be included. A copy of the portfolio prepared for the initial review should be retained by the department and made available if requested during the final CFS review.

1.2 Additional Information

Information included in the original portfolio cannot be altered or removed after the review process commences. However, reviewers at any level may request, receive, or obtain additional information from the faculty member or others after the candidate submits the portfolio. Such additions include but are not limited to documents indicating the acceptance of additional publications, additional student evaluations, and late-arriving external review letters. If a reviewer believes the additional information materially affects the reviewer's recommendation, it should be dated and added to the portfolio as an addendum, and it must be shared with prior levels of review unless it appears that the new information would not change their



recommendations. For example, documents that strengthen the portfolio need not be shared with prior review levels that made positive recommendations, and documents that weaken the portfolio need not be shared with prior review levels that made negative recommendations.

Appeal or rebuttal statements from the faculty member may not be added to the portfolio following a negative recommendation at the department or college level. Such materials may be submitted only as part of an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation. (See [Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures](#).)

In the College of Computational, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences (CMS), the rank-and-status review committee, the associate dean for faculty development, or the dean may request additional clarification from departmental review committees or chairs in addition to requesting other additional documents. These will be added as addenda prior to forwarding the portfolio to the university.

2. The Rank and Status Review Process

2.1 Mandatory Pre-CFS Reviews

2.1.1 Initial (Third-Year) Review

The initial review will assess the faculty member's performance and promise in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including efforts to begin mentoring students within one or more of these areas. The same procedures apply to initial and final CFS reviews, *except that external reviews of scholarship are not required for initial reviews*. Faculty members who successfully demonstrate that they are making satisfactory progress in the initial review will be granted CFS candidacy. Faculty members who are not granted CFS candidacy, or who do not submit a portfolio, will not receive another contract after the existing contract year ends. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

The CFS timetable begins with the start of the first fall semester that the faculty member is employed in a CFS-track position at BYU. The initial review will take place during winter semester of the third year, unless a different timeline is established in the hiring offer letter (see [Faculty Hiring Policy](#), section 3.16) or the CFS clock is extended for approved personal or parental leaves or other extenuating circumstances (see [Rank and Status Policy](#), section 5.4).

The deadline by which a faculty member must submit a portfolio to the department is established by the department. Barring unforeseen circumstances, the calendar for subsequent levels of review is as follows:



Department reviews to colleges:	No later than March 1	CMS: February 15
College reviews to university:	March 20	
Decisions to faculty:	June 1	

2.1.2 Final (Sixth- or Seventh-Year) Review

The final CFS review will assess the faculty member’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including student mentoring within one or more of these areas. To receive CFS, faculty members must clearly demonstrate that they meet the department, college, and university standards set forth in the relevant rank and status documents. Faculty members who are not granted CFS or who do not submit a portfolio will be notified that they will not receive another contract after the current contract year ends. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

The final review will take place during fall semester of the sixth year (or seventh year, in colleges that have adopted a seven-year review period, see Rank and Status Policy section 5.3), unless a different timeline is established in the hiring offer letter (see Faculty Hiring Policy, section 3.16) or the CFS clock is extended for approved personal or parental leaves or other extenuating circumstances (see Rank and Status Policy, section 5.4). Rank advancement from assistant professor to associate professor normally takes place at the same time unless an alternative timeline was agreed upon at hiring.

The deadline by which a faculty member must submit a portfolio to the department is established by the department. Barring unforeseen circumstances, the normal calendar for subsequent levels of review is as follows:

Department reviews to colleges:	No later than November 1	CMS: October 15
College reviews to university:	December 1	
Decisions to faculty:	May 1	

2.2 Rank Advancement to Professor

A faculty member first becomes eligible to apply for advancement to the rank of professor during the fifth year of service as associate professor. If the review is successful, the rank advancement takes effect fall semester of the following year. The annual calendar for reviewing applications for advancement to professor is the same as for final CFS reviews.

2.3 Allegations of Faculty Misconduct or Violations of University Policy

If reviewers believe that a faculty member may have engaged in misconduct or otherwise violated university policy, the reviewers should notify the department chair and the dean. The dean will notify the academic vice president, who will ensure that the allegations are



investigated according to established university procedures. At the request of the faculty member or the academic vice president, the rank and status review process may be stayed while the allegations are investigated and resolved.

3. Assessing a Faculty Member's Contributions

A faculty member's contributions should be evaluated according to established department and college criteria and performance standards defined in the relevant rank and status expectations documents.

In addition to the criteria listed in the remainder of this section, CMS departments should identify other discipline-specific factors to be considered when evaluating mentoring, teaching, scholarship, and research. Demonstrating the quality of a faculty member's contributions may be accomplished in a variety of ways, and *it is the responsibility of the candidate to include appropriate evidence accordingly*. Departments may also establish internal processes for gathering appropriate evidence to be considered. Reviewers in the rank-and-status process should focus on evaluating whether the faculty member's contributions meet the expected standards in each area of performance as well as in overall performance.

Because the relevant groups of eligible voters may be different (e.g., an individual might be eligible to vote on rank advancement but not CFS), all reviewing bodies must hold separate votes on rank advancement and CFS.

In CMS, these separate votes are not meant for an individual voter to provide different votes (e.g., positive vote for CFS and negative vote for promotion), but only to accommodate faculty holding appropriate rank who do not yet have CFS.

3.1 Assessing Mentoring

A faculty member's efforts to mentor students should be reviewed under the broader headings of teaching, scholarship, or citizenship rather than as a separate (fourth) area in the rank and status review portfolio. Mentoring that might fall under more than one category should NOT be described redundantly in multiple sections of the review portfolio. Rather, the faculty member should describe a given mentoring activity in one section and, if necessary, mention it briefly by reference in other relevant sections. Because approaches to student mentoring vary across disciplines, faculty members should describe their mentoring efforts and articulate their benefit to students in a manner that reviewers from other disciplines can understand and evaluate. Colleges and departments should include discipline-specific definitions of mentoring within their own rank and status expectations documents.

3.2 Assessing Teaching

In assessing a faculty member's overall effectiveness in teaching, evaluators should consider:



- A. Teaching load relative to department expectations, including such factors as the number of new preparations, number of different courses taught, size of sections, and level of courses (general education, lower division, upper division, graduate)
- B. The teaching portfolio, in which the faculty member documents his or her efforts to evaluate and improve student learning and the learning environment, and to engage in ongoing processes of improvement
- C. Mentoring and experiential learning opportunities that the faculty member has provided for students outside the traditional classroom, and any measurable outcomes of that mentoring
- D. The number of graduate and honors students mentored as committee member or chair, including thesis and dissertation titles
- E. Reports from substantive confidential peer reviews of teaching regarding achievement of learning outcomes, alignment of course and program learning outcomes, learning activities, learning assessments, interactions with students, cultivation of an inclusive and respectful learning environment, course design and organization, course materials, and the faculty member's efforts to improve the quality of teaching
- F. Student ratings including comments, with emphasis on trends or recurring themes
- G. Evidence that grade distribution is appropriate and consistent with department and college norms

CMS faculty should use and regularly update the teaching portfolio to document their efforts to improve as teachers and mentors, including their efforts to build students' faith.

3.3 Assessing Scholarship

Consistent with the criteria below, departments and colleges determine the types of publications and creative works that signal scholarly achievement. Department rank and status expectations documents should outline the relative value of different types of scholarly products in the discipline; standards for assessing quantity, quality, originality, and impact of scholarly work; and discipline-specific expectations regarding the reputation, selectivity, and impact of scholarly presses, journals, or performance and exhibition venues. Evidence of scholarship should emphasize work performed at BYU since hire into a CFS-track position or since the last rank advancement.

In CMS, a common measure of the impact of scholarly work is the degree to which it has been cited by others, and departments should establish their own expectations in this regard. To assist with assessing this, all professorial faculty members should establish and maintain a profile with Google Scholar or other discipline-preferred bibliographic tracking system. If access to such a system is not freely available to rank-and-status reviewers, the faculty member or department will include the faculty member's profile in the portfolio. Reviewers in the rank-and-status process should keep in mind that citation rates may differ significantly across disciplines or even across specializations within a single discipline.



3.3.1 Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship

In reviewing a faculty member's scholarship, reviewers should consider whether that scholarship:

- A. Is consistent with disciplinary norms of the department and college and with the university mission
- B. Makes the faculty member a more effective teacher
- C. Involves students where possible
- D. Generates new knowledge, understanding, insight, interpretation, or application
- E. Is endorsed by peer review in accordance with national disciplinary norms and department rank and status expectations documents. (Departments or colleges may regularly use on-campus reviews as the primary method of peer review only with approval from the dean and the academic vice president.)
- F. Has received final acceptance for publication, exhibition, or performance

3.4 Assessing Citizenship

3.4.1 Criteria for Evaluating Citizenship

In evaluating a faculty member's citizenship contributions, reviewers should consider whether the faculty member:

- A. Supports and furthers the [mission](#) of the university and the [Aims of a BYU Education](#).
- B. Adheres to the university's [Church Educational System Honor Code](#) and observes university policies.
- C. Exhibits honor, integrity, collegiality, civility, respect, and concern for others.
- D. Demonstrates a commitment to creating an atmosphere of unity and belonging at the university.
- E. Attends department and college meetings and convocations.
- F. Attends, and encourages students to attend, devotionals and forums.
- G. Participates in the intellectual life of the department, college, and university.
- H. Participates in citizenship, leadership, and governance activities within the university.

3.4.2 Other Citizenship Activities

Departments and colleges will define internal and external citizenship expectations for CFS and rank advancement. Faculty members might meet those expectations by:

- A. Serving the profession, including holding offices and assignments in professional associations, organizing professional conferences and panels, editing journals or newsletters, serving on editorial boards, reviewing grant proposals, or serving as scholarly referees. Especially for mid- and late-career faculty, such service typically extends beyond local and regional organizations and venues.



- B. Collaborating with colleagues in teaching, scholarship, citizenship, or student mentoring.
- C. Mentoring colleagues.
- D. Strengthening the university through administrative service; committee service; assignments in the Jerusalem Center and study abroad; or teaching general education, honors, religious education, and interdisciplinary courses.
- E. Participating in international and other activities that enhance BYU's approved outreach efforts.
- F. Participating with students in experiential learning activities.
- G. Making scholarship accessible and influential beyond the academic community, such as by engaging with the media in areas of faculty expertise (see [Media Contact Policy](#)), shaping public policy related to scholarly work (see [Political Neutrality Policy](#)), and marketing intellectual property that results from scholarly work (see [Intellectual Property Policy](#)).
- H. Employing professional expertise in service to the community or the Church of Jesus Christ (see [Cooperation with The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Policy](#)).

4. Department-Level Review

4.1 Department Review Committee

The department review committee comprises at least three faculty members who have earned CFS and, whenever possible, the rank aspired to by the faculty member under review. The department chair appoints the committee and its chair. The committee conducts a thorough review of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. The department committee and the department chair are in the best position to contextualize the portfolio with respect to disciplinary norms. That context gives critical guidance to subsequent reviewers unfamiliar with the faculty member's academic culture. The department chair neither attends nor participates in meetings of the department review committee.

The review committee also reviews a faculty member's mentoring contributions within the context of one or more of the listed areas as appropriate (see Section 4.7).

Although the department chair neither attends nor participates in review committee meetings, the committee may consult with the chair, other department leadership, or other members of the department as appropriate when conducting their review.

4.2 Waiver

Before the department chair or department review committee solicits reviews from faculty, external peers, or others, the faculty member must indicate in writing whether they waive their access to those reviews. Potential reviewers should receive a copy of the signed waiver statement, and it should be included in the faculty member's portfolio (see [Appendix B](#)).



4.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities

The department review committee may solicit reviews from those who have closely observed the faculty member's citizenship activities.

4.4 Student Ratings of Teaching

In initial and final CFS reviews, the department review committee will include in the portfolio the Student Ratings Summary Report, including all student comments, for every class taught. For rank advancement reviews, the portfolio will include the summary report for every class taught during at least the past five years. The department committee's report to the department chair should consider trends in evaluations, as well as the types of classes taught (e.g., large vs. small, lower vs. upper division, required vs. elective, new preparation vs. repeated).

4.5 Peer Reviews of Teaching

Peer reviews that are thorough and balanced are an essential tool for understanding the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher. The department chair ensures that at least two peers evaluate the faculty member's teaching and includes confidential written reports of those evaluations in the portfolio. The department chair may delegate this responsibility to an associate chair or to the department review committee. These reports assess the achievement of learning outcomes; the effectiveness of practices and activities in and out of the classroom; the appropriateness of course content, materials, and assessments; the faculty member's interactions with students and cultivation of a respectful and inclusive learning environment; and the engagement of the faculty member in processes of continuous improvement. The faculty member will facilitate these evaluations by providing reviewers with relevant materials (e.g., teaching portfolio, syllabi, examples of learning activities, slides, quizzes, exams). Ideally, peer reviewers should conduct multiple classroom visits over several semesters.

4.6 External Reviews of Scholarship

In final CFS reviews and rank advancement reviews, but not initial (third-year) reviews, the department chair secures external reviews of the faculty member's scholarship from at least three well-regarded faculty members at other academic institutions. The department chair may delegate this responsibility to an associate chair or to the department review committee. The faculty member may recommend external reviewers and should describe his or her relationship with each suggested reviewer. Ultimately, however, reviewers are chosen by the department chair, associate chair, or department review committee. Reviewers should hold at least the rank being sought and should not have personal or professional ties to the faculty member that might be expected to bias the reviews (e.g., peers who are co-authors, close collaborators in professional organizations, or doctoral advisors). All review letters, together with a curriculum vitae for each reviewer, must be included in the portfolio.



[Appendix C](#) contains a sample invitation to external reviewers. The following materials are sent with the invitation or in a subsequent communication: the faculty member's curriculum vitae (containing embedded links to scholarly work wherever possible), information about the faculty member's teaching assignment, three samples of scholarship selected by the faculty member for inclusion in the portfolio, a summary of the department, college, and university standards for assessing scholarship, and the signed form indicating whether the faculty member has waived the right to know the identity of reviewers and see their letters. Departments should allow ample time for selecting and contacting potential reviewers, conveying materials, and receiving review letters.

Whoever selects the external reviewers (department chair, associate chair, or department review committee) will describe in writing (1) how the reviewers were selected, (2) their standing in the field, and (3) their relationship (if any) with the faculty member. This statement must be included in the portfolio along with external reviewers' letters and their curricula vitae.

4.7 Department Review Committee's Vote and Report

All members of the department committee should thoroughly review the portfolio. After thoroughly reviewing the portfolio and comprehensively considering its strengths and weaknesses, the department review committee will, by majority vote, recommend granting or denying CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. A tie vote signals lack of majority support and is considered a recommendation for denial. The committee will report its vote to the department chair and describe in writing the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including student mentoring within one or more of these areas. Dissenting members of the committee may choose to include a dissenting report.

[The committee report will assess mentoring within the context of the relevant area\(s\) of teaching, scholarship, or citizenship, or an overall assessment may be presented separately.](#)

[The department committee should report only the majority recommendation and should not report the vote count or enter it into the table in the portfolio template. The committee's vote count should be shared with the department chair and added to the portfolio when the chair adds the report of the department vote. If a dissenting report is included, it should not indicate which committee members it represents.](#)

Because the department is most familiar with the faculty member's performance and with scholarship standards in the department and the discipline, the committee's report should carefully and thoroughly assess the faculty member's scholarship to help guide reviewers at the college and university levels. This evaluation should consider the quantity of publications or creative works, including pace and trajectory; the quality and reputation of publication or performance venues; the work's impact, including, when appropriate, citation counts or other metrics; and the relative weight that different types of scholarly products carry in the discipline.



If the faculty member believes that a member of the department review committee is unable, because of personal or professional conflicts of interests, to assess the portfolio objectively, the faculty member should notify the department chair of the potential conflict and the basis for her or his belief as soon as practicable after the faculty member learns of the composition of the department review committee. If the chair believes there is a basis for concern, he or she will direct the committee member to recuse himself or herself from deliberations and voting. If this reduces the committee to fewer than three members, the department chair will appoint an alternate committee member for that review.

The department committee's report is final and should not be revised as a consequence of the subsequent department discussion. If the department committee believes any updates are necessary as a result of additional information gained in the department discussion, they should be provided as an addendum to the committee's report.

4.8 Availability of Committee Report and Portfolio

Before the department faculty deliberations and voting, the committee report and portfolio will be available to all CFS faculty and all CFS-track faculty in the department except the faculty member under review. Each eligible voter is responsible to review the portfolio carefully. The committee report and portfolio, including the identities of all outside reviewers and the content of any recommendation letters, are confidential. Faculty may not copy any part of the portfolio or letters and should not discuss them except with other department faculty members in appropriate professional settings.

4.9 Department Faculty Deliberations and Voting

The department review committee will report its evaluation and recommendation(s) at a department faculty meeting open to all CFS faculty and all CFS-track faculty in the department, except the faculty member under review. Including all faculty broadens the discussion, helps communicate expectations, and informs faculty who will be evaluated in the future. Sufficient time should be allowed for thorough deliberations on each portfolio, even if this requires multiple department meetings.

Only faculty with CFS are eligible to vote in initial and final CFS decisions; only faculty with at least the rank being sought are eligible to vote in rank advancement decisions. Because the groups of eligible voters may be different (e.g., some are eligible to vote on rank advancement only, others are eligible to vote on CFS and rank advancement for the same candidate), all reviewing bodies must hold separate votes on CFS and rank advancement.

Members of the department review committee vote with that committee, and if eligible, also vote with the department faculty. The department chair and dean, however, do not vote with the department faculty.



Only faculty members physically or virtually present for department deliberations may vote. Exceptions require approval from the chair and dean; those granted exceptions are deemed present for purposes of voting.

Arrangements for virtual participation in department deliberations are at the discretion of the department chair and if permitted must be arranged in advance. Participation should be in person whenever possible, with virtual participation generally only in situations where a faculty member is unable to attend in person due to travel, personal or family illness, or other extenuating circumstances.

Voting is by secret ballot, and the recommendation is determined by a majority vote of eligible faculty members who vote to recommend either granting or denying the application. A tie vote signals lack of majority support and is considered a recommendation for denial. The majority recommendation but not the vote count is shared with the department faculty. Only the department chair may inform the faculty member of the majority recommendation.

The department chair will prepare a summary of deliberations, reporting the vote count and summarizing key elements of department deliberations, including any concerns raised about accuracy of the department review committee's report or issues not included in the report. This summary of deliberations is added to the portfolio, separate from the chair's independent evaluation. The chair may delegate responsibility for drafting the summary of deliberations.

If the faculty member under review believes that any member of the department faculty is unable, because of personal or professional conflicts of interest, to assess the portfolio objectively, the faculty member should notify the department chair of the potential conflict and the basis for his or her belief. If the department chair believes there is a basis for concern, he or she should address this concern in the department chair's report, but no eligible voter who attends the department deliberations may be prevented from voting.

4.10 Department Chair's Report

In addition to reporting the vote count and summarizing department deliberations in the portfolio, the department chair will independently evaluate in writing the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. This report should not merely restate the committee's and external reviewers' findings but should offer the chair's unique perspectives. The chair must recommend granting or denial of CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. Like the department committee, the chair should assess the faculty member's performance in light of scholarship standards in the department and the discipline and should explain the quality of publication or performance venues and the relative weight that different types of scholarly products carry in the discipline. The chair's report should also assess the faculty member's progress in addressing any concerns raised in prior reviews, drawing from annual review letters and prior rank and status review summaries.



In addition to assessing teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, the chair's report will also independently evaluate mentoring as applicable. This may be reported within the context of their evaluation of the area(s) of responsibility in which mentoring occurred, or it may be reported in a separate section of the report.

The most effective chair's reports are those that evaluate the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses within the context of department expectations, explicitly stating how the faculty member meets or does not meet those expectations.

4.11 Informing the Faculty Member of a Positive Recommendation

If the recommendations of the department committee, the department faculty, and the department chair are positive, the chair will inform the faculty member of the department recommendations without disclosing vote counts or details of the deliberations and will advance the portfolio to the college.

4.12 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation

If the department committee, the department faculty, or the department chair recommends denial of CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, the department chair will inform the faculty member and will explain the reasons for the negative recommendation. Vote counts remain confidential. A third person should be present at this meeting, e.g., an associate chair or the chair of the department review committee. This meeting should occur before college-level review begins. The chair should inform the faculty member of the option to withdraw the application. The faculty member should be reminded that department deliberations result in non-binding recommendations, and that only the academic vice president's recommendation is subject to independent review (see Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures).

A faculty member's withdrawal of an application for CFS candidacy or CFS constitutes notice of resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the college review committee.

5. College-Level Review

5.1 Colleges without Departments

In colleges without departments, the college review committee, the college faculty, and the dean will perform the functions of the department review committee, the department faculty, and the department chair as described in Section 4: Department-Level Review.



5.2 College Review Committee

The college review committee is composed of at least three faculty members who have achieved CFS and, where possible, the rank aspired to by the faculty members under review. The dean appoints the committee and the committee chair. An associate dean may be assigned to guide the work of the college committee. The dean neither attends nor participates in meetings of the college review committee. Committee members from the same department as the faculty member under review who have voted with their department faculty may participate in deliberations but do not vote again.

5.3 College Review Committee's Vote and Report

Members of the college review committee should conduct their own independent review of the faculty member's performance, using the department's and college's established criteria and performance standards as defined in their rank and status expectations documents. The college review committee will recommend by majority vote to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. A tie vote signals lack of majority support and is considered a recommendation for denial. The committee will write an independent report evaluating the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including student mentoring within one or more of these areas, and reporting the committee's vote. Dissenting members of the committee may choose to include a dissenting report.

If the faculty member believes that a member of the college review committee is unable, because of personal or professional conflicts of interests, to assess the portfolio objectively, the faculty member should notify the dean of the potential conflict and the basis for his or her belief as soon as practicable after the faculty member learns of the composition of the college review committee. If the dean believes the potential conflict would compromise the integrity of the review process, the dean will instruct the committee member to recuse himself or herself from deliberations and voting. If this reduces the committee to fewer than three members, the dean will appoint an alternate committee member for that review.

The CMS college review committee consists of one faculty member from each department in the college, recommended by the department chair and appointed by the dean. The associate dean for faculty development also attends committee meetings but does not vote. The dean may appoint a chair from within the committee or may have the associate dean function in this role. After each portfolio is discussed and a vote taken, one of the members of the committee drafts the committee report and recommendation, which is then circulated to the rest of the committee for review and revision. The committee chair or associate dean is responsible for arranging meetings of the committee, facilitating discussion where appropriate, conducting and recording committee votes, and adding reports to the respective portfolios.



5.4 Dean's Report

After the college review committee's vote, the dean will independently evaluate in writing the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including student mentoring within one or more of these areas. The dean's report should not merely repeat previous findings but should offer the dean's unique perspectives. The dean must recommend granting or denial of CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement.

5.5 Informing the Faculty Member of a Positive Recommendation

If the college review committee's recommendation and the dean's recommendation are positive, the dean will inform the faculty member of the positive recommendations without disclosing vote counts or details of the deliberations and will advance the portfolio to the associate academic vice president – faculty development (AAVP – FD).

5.6 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation

If the college committee or the dean recommends denial of CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, the dean will inform the faculty member and will explain the reasons for the negative recommendation. Vote counts remain confidential. The department chair should be present at this meeting. The dean should inform the faculty member of the option to withdraw the application. The faculty member should be reminded that department and college deliberations result in non-binding recommendations and that only the academic vice president's recommendation is subject to independent review (see [Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures](#)).

A faculty member's withdrawal of an application for CFS candidacy or CFS constitutes notice of resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the AAVP – FD.

6. University-Level Review

6.1 Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status

The Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status is composed of at least eight and not more than twelve professorial faculty members, all of whom have CFS or hold the rank of professor. At least three-fourths of the appointed council members must be present to constitute a quorum. Council members from the same department as the faculty member under review who have voted with their department faculty may participate in deliberations but do not vote again. The AAVP – FD serves as chair of the council but does not vote. The academic vice president appoints each council member and appoints a vice-chair from among the council members.



If the faculty member believes that any member of the Professorial Council on Rank and Status is unable, because of personal or professional conflicts of interest, to assess the portfolio objectively, the faculty member should notify the AAVP – FD of the potential conflict and the basis for the belief before the deadline to advance the portfolio to the AAVP – FD. If the AAVP – FD believes there is a basis for concern, he or she will ask the council member to recuse himself or herself from deliberations and voting.

The AAVP – FD determines which portfolios will be reviewed by the Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status. University council review is mandatory in cases where the college functions as a single academic unit without departments; a recommendation from any prior level of review is negative; or the number of dissenting votes cast at any prior level is considered significant by the associate academic vice president. Only the AAVP – FD may waive the university council review.

For those portfolios that are reviewed by the Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status, the Council will use the department's and college's established criteria and performance standards as defined in their rank and status expectations documents and will determine whether the department and college reasonably applied their written criteria.

The university council will recommend, by majority vote, to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. A tie vote signals lack of majority support and is considered a recommendation for denial. The council's evaluation and recommendations are forwarded to the academic vice president.

6.2 Recommendations that Differ from College Recommendations

If the Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status is considering making a recommendation that differs from that of the dean or the college review committee, the council may ask the dean for clarification or more information before forwarding its recommendation to the academic vice president.

6.3 Academic Vice President's Recommendation

After considering the recommendations from all prior levels of review, the academic vice president will make an independent recommendation to the university president to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. In extraordinary circumstances, the academic vice president may recommend a delay of the review. The vice president's recommendation will be informed by the recommendations of the department, college, and (if applicable) university-level reviewers, but will provide unique perspectives resulting from the vice president's independent review.



If the academic vice president recommends against granting CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, the faculty member will be informed of the recommendation in a letter delivered by the AAVP – FD. The letter will summarize the recommendation and its underlying reasons.

Upon receiving the letter, the faculty member may (1) withdraw the application, (2) allow the recommendation to go forward for the president’s final decision without comment, or (3) request an independent examination of the academic vice president’s recommendation as detailed in the [Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures](#).

A recommendation by the academic vice president to delay the review is not subject to independent examination. Should the faculty member choose to reject the offer of a delay, the academic vice president’s recommendation becomes denial, and the faculty member may exercise any of the three options listed above. By withdrawing an application for CFS candidacy or CFS, a faculty member resigns from employment at the university, effective at the end of the current contract period. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant the individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

6.4 President’s Decision

After receiving the recommendation of the academic vice president and the results of any independent examination, the president will decide whether to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, or take any other action. The president has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president’s sole discretion, to make the decision. All determinations in the rank and status process other than the president’s decision are only recommendations. The president’s decision is final.

The faculty member will receive written notice of the president’s decision. Copies of the notification letter will be sent to the academic vice president, the AAVP – FD, the dean, and the department chair. If the president’s decision is not to grant CFS candidacy or CFS, the university, at its sole discretion, may grant the individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

APPROVED: 14 Feb 2022

PRIOR VERSION: 14 Jan 2008

CMS (PREVIOUSLY CPMS) VERSION APPROVED: 1 June 2023

LAST REVISED: 16 July 2024

APPLICABILITY: These procedures apply to CFS-track professorial faculty.

POLICY OWNER: Academic Vice President



RESPONSIBLE OFFICE: Associate Academic Vice President – Faculty Development

RELATED POLICIES:

- [Aims of a BYU Education](#)
- [Church Educational System Honor Code](#)
- [Cooperation with The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Policy](#)
- [Faculty Hiring Policy](#)
- [Faculty Performance Annual Reviews Policy](#)
- [Intellectual Property Policy](#)
- [Media Contact Policy](#)
- [Mission Statement](#)
- [Political Neutrality Policy](#)
- [Rank and Status Policy](#)
- [Rank and Status Professional Faculty Review Procedures](#)
- [Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures](#)



APPENDIX A: MATERIALS TO INCLUDE IN PORTFOLIO FOR PROFESSORIAL FACULTY

Nomination Form

Curriculum Vitae (CV)

Use colored text or some other method to distinguish work performed since entering the CFS track at BYU or, if applying for advancement to full professor, since the last rank advancement.

Brief Narratives

Brief narratives may be included at the beginning of the teaching, scholarship, and citizenship sections. A narrative must be included in at least one section to articulate how you have responded to the mentoring expectation within one or more of these areas. The narrative may also draw reviewers' attention to aspects of your record that are particularly noteworthy or that require additional context or may address weaknesses and your efforts to remedy them. *The combined length of all the narratives should be no more than eight pages, and shorter if possible.*

Teaching

1. If you choose to include a teaching narrative, consider topics such as student mentoring through teaching that has extended beyond the confines of the traditional classroom, steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching and any evidence of the success of those efforts, any teaching-related concerns that were raised in the initial (third-year) review and how they have been addressed (if applying for CFS), or any other teaching-related information that is crucial to the review of your case and is not covered elsewhere. Please be concise—a philosophical statement regarding your approach to teaching should not be included.
2. *If not in your CV*, include a list of BYU graduate students and honors students supervised. Indicate whether you were the committee chair or a committee member, the years each student attended, and thesis and dissertation titles. A table generated by Faculty Profile may be used.
3. A link to the teaching portfolio.
4. *Department adds* two confidential reports of peer reviews of teaching.
5. *Department adds* the Student Ratings Summary Report, including both table and student comment portions. For initial and final CFS reviews, include all courses taught since entering the CFS track. For advancement to full professor, include all courses taught in at least the last five years. For initial (third year) portfolios being submitted in winter semester, ensure that the report includes the previous fall semester.



Scholarship

1. If you choose to include a scholarship narrative, consider topics such as mentoring of students through their involvement in your scholarship and how students have benefited from those efforts, awards or other recognitions your work has received, any scholarship-related concerns that were raised in the initial (third-year) review and how they have been addressed (if applying for CFS), or any other scholarship-related information that is crucial to the review of your case and is not covered elsewhere. Please be concise.
2. *If scholarly products cannot be annotated as outlined below in your CV*, include a list of all scholarship or creative works produced since being hired at BYU or, if applying for advancement to full professor, since the last rank advancement. With each entry, provide the following:
 - a. Discipline-appropriate evidence of the quality and impact of the work and the publication or performance venues
 - b. An indication of coauthors who are BYU undergraduate or graduate students
 - c. Electronic links to each work, if available.

Add additional notes as needed to help reviewers understand disciplinary protocols including nomenclature (e.g., whether “forthcoming” means accepted), authorship attributions (e.g., whether first or last author signifies lead authorship), and whether “accepted” for books signifies that a publication is imminent or only under contract.

3. *If not in your CV*, and if grant funding is the norm within your discipline, include a list of funded grants for research or creative works. Include project title; your role on the project (e.g., principal investigator, co-principal investigator, sub-contractor); funding source (external vs. internal, as well as sponsor name); project dates; and total dollar amounts. If unfunded grant applications are valued by your college, include a second list of unfunded grant proposals.
4. Include your three best examples of scholarship. Introduce this section with a brief explanation of why each one was selected. Make available in the department office or (preferably) by electronic link in the CV copies of all other written scholarship and evidence of all other creative work produced since hiring or since the last rank advancement.
5. *Department adds* (except in initial reviews when external letters are not needed)
 - a. At least three external review letters of scholarship
 - b. A statement describing how the external reviewers were selected, their standing in the field, and any relationships they may have with the faculty member
 - c. A CV for each external reviewer (may be abbreviated)
 - d. A copy of the letter of invitation that was sent to reviewers
 - e. A copy of the waiver statement signed by the faculty member



Citizenship

1. If you choose to include a citizenship narrative, consider topics such as mentoring of students that is an extension of your citizenship efforts, important but informal citizenship contributions that are not reflected in your lists of formal BYU and professional citizenship assignments, any citizenship-related concerns that were raised in the initial (third-year) review and how they have been addressed (if applying for CFS), or any other citizenship-related information that is crucial to the review of your case and is not covered elsewhere. Please be concise.
2. *If not in your CV*, include a list of all BYU citizenship assignments at the department, college, and university level since hiring (for initial and final CFS reviews) or since the last rank advancement (for advancement to full professor reviews). A table generated by Faculty Profile may be used.
3. *If not in your CV*, include a list of all external citizenship contributions in the profession since hiring (for initial and final CFS reviews) or since the last rank advancement (for advancement to full professor reviews). A table generated by Faculty Profile may be used.
4. *Department may add* (optional) confidential review letters of citizenship from those who have closely observed citizenship activities. If such letters are to be included, the signed waiver statement must be sent to letter writers and included in the portfolio.

Reviewer Reports (Added by the Department and College)

1. Associate academic vice president's letter from initial (third-year) review, if this is the final CFS review
2. If a prior review resulted in an academic vice president's recommendation to delay the review or deny advancement, include the letter informing the faculty member of the reasons for that decision
3. Department review committee's report
4. Department chair's summary of department faculty deliberations and report of department vote count
5. Department chair's report
6. College review committee's report
7. Dean's report



APPENDIX B: WAIVER STATEMENT

Date

To Prospective Reviewers:

As part of the review process for continuing faculty status or rank advancement, I recognize that letters of evaluation may be requested from students, faculty, supervisors, or external peers. For your information, the following represents my choice regarding the waiver of my rights to see those letters.

I waive the right to know the identity of evaluators noted above and to see their letters of evaluation requested in the review process.

Signed by Faculty Member

I do not waive the right to know the identity of evaluators noted above and to see their letters of evaluation requested in the review process.

Signed by Faculty Member



APPENDIX C: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Date

Addressee

Dear Professor _____:

We would be grateful if you would be willing to assist us in the evaluation of Dr. **John/Mary Doe's** application for **continuing faculty status (tenure) and/or** advancement to the rank of **associate professor/professor**.

The formal review process will begin this fall semester and letters from external reviewers need to be available no later than **(date)**.

Our review process benefits greatly from candid evaluations generously provided by knowledgeable peers in the academic community. While we value all dimensions of professorial service—teaching, citizenship, and scholarly/creative work—we are particularly interested in your assessment of the quality, originality, methodological soundness, and pace of the candidate's **scholarship/creative work**. Review letters are especially helpful when they allow us to compare the candidate's record against that of other scholars at a similar stage of their careers and when they consider the candidate's record in the context of BYU's institutional expectations.

If you are able to accept this invitation, we ask that your letter include a description of your relationship with the candidate (if any).

Enclosed for your consideration are the following:

OR If you accept this invitation, the following materials will be sent to you:

- The candidate's curriculum vitae
- A summary of the teaching assignment
- Three samples of scholarly/creative work selected by the candidate
- Department standards for assessing scholarly achievement
- A form that indicates the candidate's decision to waive/not to waive the right to see your letter. When candidates appeal a negative decision, the entire portfolio is made available to them, though letters from external reviewers are redacted as possible to deidentify authors and institutions.



(If applicable) We are pleased to offer an honorarium of \$_____ as an expression of appreciation for your service.

We would be grateful if you could indicate by phone or email and at your earliest convenience if you are able to help us with this review. We know that you must manage many professional demands and hope that you will be able to accept this invitation.

Sincerely,