MEMORANDUM

April 18, 2012

To: Professor Andrea Eis, Chair
   Department of Art and Art History
From: Faculty Re-employment and Promotion Committee
Re: Review Statement for the Department of Art and Art History

The Faculty Re-employment and Promotion Committee (FRPC) has carefully reviewed the revised Review Statement forwarded to it by the Department of Art and Art History (AAH) and the accompanying memo outlining changes that were made. After due deliberation, the FRPC offers the following assessment.

Your revisions have addressed all of the concerns that the FRPC identified in the previous version. We also gratefully acknowledge the careful work that went into your revision effort and the clarity of both the revised document and the revision memo which was very helpful in seeing precisely how you implemented changes to address our concerns.

In short, the FRPC approves the Review Statement for the Department of Art and Art History and thanks you for your diligence and prompt response.

[Signature]
John E. McEnaney, Chair, FRPC
On behalf of the Committee

C: Virinder K. Moudgil, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost
   Andrei Slavin, Chair, CAS Committee on Appointment and Promotion
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ART AND ART HISTORY

REVIEW STATEMENT:
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

(per current Faculty Agreement)

Approved November 13, 2010; amended December 1, 2010; revised February 4, 2012.
A. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

I. GENERAL

1. In accordance with the current Faculty Agreement, the following "criteria and procedures" for reappointment and promotion have been formulated and agreed to by the full-time, tenured, and tenure-track faculty of this Department.

2. This document includes the departmental "procedures" for conducting reviews for reappointment and/or promotion.

3. The Department of Art and Art History offers the following academic programs as a part of the B.A. degree program of the college: Liberal Arts Major in Art History, Liberal Arts Major in Studio Art, Liberal Arts Major in Studio Art with K-12 Art Education Certification, Liberal Arts Minor in Art History, Liberal Arts Minor in Studio Art and Liberal Arts Minor in Graphic Design. All departmental programs are at the undergraduate level.

4. It is the responsibility of the CAP of the College of Arts and Sciences, the FRPC, and Oakland University, as appropriate, to review the Department's recommendations. The Department requests that these various review bodies recognize the traditions of this Department, which include a strong commitment to teaching, service and intellectual activity. All three areas are important, with the specific expectations for review detailed below.

II. GENERAL CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

Criterion I: Instruction

5. The primary role of the Department of Art and Art History in the College is instruction for majors in Art History and Studio Art, and general education courses in the Arts Knowledge Exploration and Arts Knowledge Application areas.

6. The University Standards for Re-Employment, Promotion and Tenure (hereafter, "University Standards") as presented in the current Faculty Agreement, states: "The term 'teaching' refers to all instruction and advising activities that affect or support the academic progress of students. These activities include classroom, laboratory, studio, field, and clinical teaching and evaluation, the supervision of research, writing, independent study, practica, and performance; individual and group advising and mentoring; preparation of courses; development of curricular and instructional materials; instructional innovations; and application of new educational technologies." This department considers the following as ways to demonstrate excellence in teaching and effective transmission of knowledge as described in the university criteria:

- Successful cultivation of students' critical thinking, creative skills, and/or applied skills
- Positive evaluations of teaching by students and peers
- Successful preparation of new courses or substantive modification to existing courses
- Innovative teaching methods
- Successful use of new instructional technologies
- Supervision of independent research papers or creative projects by students
- Participation in interdepartmental and interdisciplinary courses and programs
- Supervision of field experience projects
- Supervision of graduate thesis papers or projects
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Criterion II: Intellectual Activity – Scholarship, Research and Creative Activity

7. The University Standards state that
   “Scholarship and research include:
   • Basic, theoretical or applied research.
   • Scholarship that applies the research to the betterment of society, institutions, groups, and individuals.
   • Peer recognition of the above as reflected in publications in refereed journals, other peer-reviewed publications, and critical reviews as appropriate to the discipline;
   • Successful efforts in securing competitive or professionally significant external funding in disciplines where research is traditionally supported by grants;
   • Scholarship that interprets, draws together, and brings new insights to bear on original research, gives meaning to isolated facts and puts them in perspective, or creates connections across disciplinary lines;
   • Scholarship that involves not only transmitting knowledge but transforming and extending it as well through carefully planned and continuously examined pedagogical procedures that stimulate active learning and encourage students to be critical and creative thinkers with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over.

‘Creative activities’ refers to works of artistic expression, production, or performance, and includes such activities as composing, writing directing, performing, and conducting.”

Members of the faculty of this Department are expected, in addition to their instructional responsibilities, to be actively and demonstrably engaged in creative intellectual investigation and discovery in their areas of expertise. The intellectual activities of this department include scholarly research and creative activity. Although the university criteria do not specifically mention works of visual arts as “creative activities” we assume that they too constitute “works of artistic expression.” The “research equals publication” formula cannot be applicable in an exclusive sense to all faculty of this Department. Activities such as individual and collaborative publications are taken as proof of scholarly progress. Oral presentations at professional meetings and symposia are considered appropriate scholarly activities for both art historians and studio artists. Individual, group and online exhibitions of creative work constitute demonstration of productivity. Other activities which may not lead to a published document, but which nevertheless indicate both scholarly activity and professional standing include researching works for a museum’s archives; acting as a curator for an exhibition; serving as a reader for journals and art publishers; and expert consultation. Seeking funding for research, creative endeavors or curated exhibitions constitutes another important activity that the department will consider when evaluating a candidate. Successful grant applications are the ideal, but candidates should also receive credit for writing grant proposals whether they are funded or not.

a. Art history faculty publish books, as well as articles and book reviews in international, national, local, and online journals; in museum and gallery exhibition catalogs and bulletins; and entries in dictionaries and in encyclopedias. Although a refereed publication is preferred, an invitation to publish in one’s field is considered important professional recognition. Citations of scholarship in the publications of others are also highly valued as marks of national and/or international recognition.

b. Studio art faculty must be practicing artists. They are expected to exhibit, present or perform their work broadly, thereby facilitating its critical evaluation. These exhibitions can be in a wide range of museums, galleries, other public, community and commercial space, and online. The department will consider both the prestige and quality of the venue and the method of selection.
The most prestigious such exhibition is by invitation; the invitation from a gallery director to an artist to exhibit his or her work reflects an important level of professional recognition. Second most prestigious is selection through peer review. The selection of work for display through a juried process is also valued by the department. Inclusion or citation of artwork in reviews or scholarly publications is also valued and should also be considered evidence of professional standing.

c. Nothing in the criteria should be taken to imply that art history faculty may not submit evidence of creative activity or that studio art faculty may not submit evidence of scholarly or research activity for consideration as part of their intellectual activity for a review.

**Criterion III: Service and Citizenship**

8. The University Standards state that
   “The term ‘service’ refers to the following activities:
   • public, institutional, and professional service through work that grows out of the university’s programs and mission and has the potential for substantial and positive effects on a community, profession, or external perceptions of the university, and that draws upon the candidate’s professional competence. Such service includes not only contributions to the organizational work of academic professional associations and societies at all levels but also activities that extend Oakland’s scholarly and instructional capabilities into various external agencies and communities.
   • university service through committee work or governance activities in the area, department, school, institute, college, or the university; for faculty, university service includes service as a role model and mentor for colleagues and students.”

9. Service to the Department is necessary and required of all faculty members at all levels. Faculty members are expected to cooperate in the planning and executing of policies and projects beneficial to the individual and collective instructional and intellectual activities of the Department.

10. Service within the Department is defined as specific administrative appointments such as serving as department chair, Oakland University Art Gallery director, studio art director, chief academic adviser and art education adviser; serving on standing committees, such as the visiting artist committee, or specific assignments such as field experience coordinator; and serving on ad hoc committees such as review committees and faculty search committees. As a general rule, this Department also expects College and University service, as well as service outside the University. Service within the university may take a variety of forms, such as committee membership, or lectures in one’s field of specialization for other departments and units. Service outside the University can take many forms, including: lectures; assisting or advising private or corporate collectors; serving as a consultant to funding agencies; and other appropriate consulting activities.

11. Some faculty members in the Department of Art and Art History may be invited to teach courses in other areas such as the Honors College, American Studies, Asian Studies, International Studies, Cinema Studies, Women and Gender Studies, and the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies. While this constitutes service to the university and/or college, for review purposes any evaluation of the quality of teaching in courses outside of the department remains within the instructional criteria.

**III. SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION**

12. Expectations of accomplishment increase with level of review. In general, although it is impossible to quantify in detail, the expectations of a candidate change from “promise” to “accomplishment” as the
candidate matures and moves through successive reviews. The criteria for the various levels of review follow.

13. c.1 Review

At this level of review it is understood that the candidate is new in the profession and may experience some difficulty in adjusting to the demands of full-time instruction and other academic responsibilities. More tolerance is allowed for promise at this review than at any other.

a. Instruction:
The candidate is expected to demonstrate him/herself to be an effective teacher as evaluated by peers and by students, and to be willing to take steps to correct deficiencies, if any. At this level the candidate normally would provide instruction only in his/her area of expertise and in the appropriate introductory-level course.

b. Intellectual Activity:
The candidate must be able to prove that some work is in progress and under consideration for publication or exhibition. It is acceptable for this work to be based on his/her Ph.D. dissertation or M.F.A. thesis/exhibition. No external evaluations will be solicited at this level. Full-time bargaining unit faculty members most closely associated with the candidate’s area(s) of expertise will assess the quality of the scholarship and/or creative activity that the candidate presents in the supplemental materials.

c. Service:
The candidate must have demonstrated him/herself to be a good departmental citizen as defined under Priority III above (A.II.8-9). Few service requirements should have been imposed on the candidate at the c.1 level, and those are generally at the department level. Service assignments are highly valued by the department.

14. c.2 and/or c.3 Review

At this level of review, there must be demonstrable evidence of independent professional activity by the candidate, and the expectation of continued professional development, which would eventually merit a successful c.4 review.

a. Instruction:
The candidate must have a sustained level of responsible teaching. The candidate must demonstrate him/herself to be an effective teacher as evaluated by peers and students, and to have corrected any significant deficiencies found to have existed at the time of the c.1 review. At this level a candidate may be expected to have developed or to be able to develop revised or new courses based on departmental instructional requirements and his/her area(s) of investigation. Evidence of a willingness to cooperate in interdepartmental or interdisciplinary studies will be highly valued.

b. Intellectual Activity:
The candidate must have achieved demonstrable productivity of the types listed in paragraph 7. In addition, the candidate must have shown proof of intellectual independence. External evaluations are not required at this level of review. As at the c.1 level, full-time bargaining unit faculty members most closely associated with the candidate’s area(s) of expertise will evaluate the candidate’s work as demonstrated in the supplemental materials, and will give weight to evidence of peer recognition beyond the department, such as a peer reviewed publication in print, in press, or accepted pending revisions; or evidence of a maturing exhibition record.

c. Service:
By the time of this review, the candidate should have a record of service. This includes departmental service, and should begin to extend to the College and to the University as a whole. It may also include service outside the University. For the c.2 review the record of service need not be extensive.

15. c.4, d, or h Review

This review involves the granting or denial of tenure; it is the most important review. At this review there must be clear demonstration of professional accomplishment, in addition to the promise of continued professional development and productivity. According to contract, the c.4 review must take place two years after the c.2 review. Under special circumstances, this department will recommend candidates for tenure prior to the contractually mandated review. Candidates will be recommended for early tenure when the department determines that they meet the criteria specified below.

a. Instruction
The candidate is expected to have progressed towards excellent teaching with a strong command of subject matter; clarity and thoroughness in class lectures; and fair practices in relation to students, in the classroom and grading.

b. Intellectual Activity:
The candidate must have established him/herself as an accomplished scholar or artist at a professionally mature level. At this level of review, a minimum of three independent external evaluations of the candidate's professional work will be solicited and employed, as detailed in the Procedures, to confirm the high quality of the candidate's intellectual activity.

Achievement for art history faculty can be demonstrated by publication of peer-reviewed articles or books, or a combination of publications and presentations at scholarly conferences. Museum or university gallery exhibition and collection catalogs should be considered evidence of intellectual activity. For studio art faculty achievement can be demonstrated by regional solo or two-person exhibitions and/or a combination of national or international group exhibitions, curatorial work or artwork included in major collections.

c. Service:
The candidate should have contributed significantly to service at the Department, College and University level. Professional service outside the university will be considered favorably.

16. i Review

As stated in the Faculty Agreement, "A promotion review for a tenured faculty member may be initiated by the faculty member's academic unit or by Oakland."

In the consideration for promotion to the rank of professor, special emphasis is given to the accomplishments of the candidate since the tenure review. However, evidence of achievement may be drawn from the candidate's entire career. The candidate is expected to have a significant and continuing record of excellence, showing high standards in instruction, extensive achievements in scholarship, research or creative activity, and an active and substantial service and leadership record. The department recognizes individuality in the rate of achievement of these criteria for promotion to professor.

a. Instruction:
The candidate must demonstrate academic maturity and continued commitment towards excellent and creative instruction, as evaluated by peers and students, since the granting of tenure. Evaluations at this level are to be sought from current and former students, and from colleagues who have visited the candidate's classes.
b. Intellectual Activity:
The candidate must be nationally or internationally recognized in his/her field. At this level of review, a minimum of three independent external evaluations of the candidate’s professional work will be solicited and employed, as detailed in the Procedures, to confirm the high quality of the candidate’s intellectual activity.

c. Service:
The candidate should have demonstrated significant Departmental, College and University service, and service outside the University. Leadership at the department, college, or university level and professional service outside the university will be considered favorably.

17. Review of Special Instructors and the Granting of Job Security
A review of a special instructor for reappointment without job security and reappointment with job security shall be based primarily upon instruction and service.

a. First and Second Re-employment:
According to the Faculty Agreement (VII, 42a), a special instructor shall be reviewed during his or her first and second terms as special instructor without job security to determine re-employment without job security. For the purpose of the first review, instruction and service shall be defined as for a c.1 review. For the purpose of the second review, instruction and service shall be defined as for a c.2 review. However, since intellectual activity is highly regarded by the department, evidence of scholarship and/or creative activity is considered favorably at both reviews.

b. Re-employment with the Granting of Job Security:
According to the Faculty Agreement (VII, 42c), a special instructor shall be reviewed during his or her final term as special instructor in order to determine re-employment with job security. For the purposes of this review, instruction and service shall be defined as for a c.4 review. Continued evidence of intellectual activity, as defined for a c.2 review, is considered favorably. Review of intellectual activity will be evaluated internally by members of the full-time faculty most closely associated with the candidate’s area(s) of expertise. External evaluations of intellectual activity are not required.

c. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure:
According to the Faculty Agreement VII, 42.d, “Special instructors with job security may be reviewed for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Faculty Agreement 41.h. . .” Should the candidate, in consultation with the Department of Art and Art History wish to initiate a review under this provision any time after being appointed special instructor with job security, he or she must fulfill all requirements for a c.4 review in the areas of instruction, intellectual activity, and service.

d. Procedures: Procedures for the review of special instructors shall be the same as for all other faculty reviews.

18. Review of Full-Time Adjunct Faculty
A review of full-time adjunct faculty (Adjunct Assistant Professor and Adjunct Associate Professor) for reappointment or promotion shall be based upon instruction and service. The criteria for reappointment, however, are not as extensive as for promotion. Adjunct faculty can continue to be reappointed at the same level, without promotion, based on successful reviews (i.e. subsequent re-employment reviews for Adjunct Assistant Professors as Adjunct Assistant Professors are always at the c.2 level; see 18.a).

According to the Faculty Agreement (Appendix A, 2c) the initial appointment of full-time adjunct faculty "shall be for two years, and such appointment shall be renewable with the length of each subsequent
term not to exceed five years.” The review “shall occur during the fall semester of the final year of the appointment, and Oakland shall notify the . . . full-time adjunct faculty member by January 15 of a re-appointment (Appendix A, 2f).” The department may recommend full-time adjunct faculty for promotion (Appendix A, 2g).

a. First and Subsequent Re-employment of Adjunct Faculty:
The first re-employment review for an Adjunct Assistant Professor shall follow the criteria for a c.1 review in teaching, intellectual activity and service. The second and subsequent re-employment reviews shall follow the criteria for a c.2 review in teaching and service. The first and subsequent re-employment reviews of an Adjunct Associate Professor shall follow the criteria for a c.4 review in teaching and service. Adjunct faculty are expected to remain active in their research, scholarship and creative activity at all review levels.

b. Promotion of Adjunct Faculty:
Upon consultation with the Chair, a full-time adjunct faculty member may request a review for promotion at the time of the second or subsequent re-employment review. A promotion review to Adjunct Associate Professor shall follow the criteria for a c.4 review in teaching and service. Adjunct faculty are expected to remain active in their research, scholarship and creative activity at this review levels.

c. Procedures:
Procedures for the review of an adjunct faculty member shall be the same as for all other faculty review, except that class lists from the candidate’s most recent semester(s) may be used in soliciting student comments, and student evaluations from the fall semester during which the review is conducted will not be included.

B. PROCEDURES

1. In accordance with the current Faculty Agreement, the following “procedures” for appointment and promotion have been formulated and agreed to by the full-time bargaining unit faculty members of this Department. Pursuant to these “procedures,” the departmental chairperson (hereinafter “chairperson”) will appoint a faculty review committee (hereinafter “committee”) for each candidate being considered for reappointment and/or promotion.

The full-time bargaining unit faculty will meet to consider candidates for promotion to full professor before February 15 of each year, and vote by secret ballot on whether or not to review for promotion. The Chair should immediately inform any candidates who receive positive decisions, in order to allow sufficient time for review preparation.

2. For these reviews (c.1, c.2, c.3, c.4, d, h, i, 42c) the committee will be composed of three full-time tenured or tenure-track bargaining-unit faculty members and will normally be headed by the most senior (hereinafter “head”). In the case of the review of a special instructor (42a, 42b) and the granting of job security, the committee will be composed of three bargaining unit faculty members and will normally be headed by the most senior. In both cases the head must be tenured. The chair of the department cannot serve as a committee chair; untenured faculty cannot serve on a c.4 or c.6 committee. If an appropriate committee cannot be formed from available members of the department, the chairperson in consultation with the candidate under review will recommend to the Dean one or more full-time Arts and Sciences bargaining-unit tenured faculty members to be appointed to this committee, even to serve as head if necessary.

3. The chairperson will convene a meeting of the committee and the candidate no less than four months in advance of the college deadline to explain the nature and extent of the documentation required by CAP, FRPC, and Oakland, depending on the level at which the candidate is to be reviewed.
4. The candidate will provide the committee with a thorough up-to-date *curriculum vitae* and with a "personal statement," prepared according to CAP and FRPC guidelines, no less than three weeks after the meeting specified in No. 3 above. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be accurate and informative in the presentation of information.

The candidate must provide the committee with one copy of each document – publications, course syllabi, reading lists (though not actual readings), course handouts, Moodle printouts, etc. – which the candidate wishes to become a part of his/her dossier. All materials originally supplied to the committee by the candidate, together with any materials subsequently solicited by the committee, will become a part of the dossier that the department will forward to the Dean or to CAP. Any material in this dossier, with the exception of letters from students currently enrolled in the candidate’s courses, is available for inspection by the candidate at any stage of the process.

5. The committee will evaluate the following aspects of the candidate’s professional performance: instruction, scholarship, and intra- and extra-university service. In this process the committee may, at its discretion, solicit written evaluations from intra- and extra-university faculty and other individuals concerning the candidate’s teaching and service. Subject to criteria published by CAP, if the candidate has taught courses outside of the department, input must be sought from faculty and students in all of the programs in which the faculty member has offered courses.

At the c.4, d, h, and i levels, but not at the c.1 or c.2 levels, the committee will seek evaluations from at least three extra-university professionals with demonstrated expertise in the candidate’s field concerning the candidate’s scholarship and/or creative endeavor. One external reviewer will be chosen from a list of names submitted by the candidate. The committee chair will research other appropriate external reviewers, and suggest at least three more potential reviewers. A minimum of three letters must ultimately be received and included in the review. If three evaluators from the original lists do not agree to do the evaluations, it is the responsibility of the committee chair to find alternative evaluators.

The committee will solicit written letters or emails from a minimum of ten current or former Oakland students selected by the candidate, and a minimum of 20 students selected at random from the candidate’s current or former students. Students currently enrolled in the candidate’s classes should be informed that their responses will be kept confidential, and will not be shown to the candidate until after recording of final grades. All letters or emails will be solicited by the committee head. All letters and emails received, together with copies of the letters of solicitation, will become a part of the dossier to be prepared by the committee. The candidate will be informed of the sources solicited for evaluation except in the instance of the students selected at random from current class lists, and the candidate will be informed whether or not responses have been received.

One committee member will read, evaluate and report on all end-of-semester course evaluations for the candidate since the time of hire or the end of the previous review. End-of-semester course evaluations for the semester immediately prior to the department vote are part of this process. Comparisons will be made between the candidate’s evaluation scores and those of other full-time faculty in the same discipline (i.e. art history faculty for art history candidates; studio art faculty for studio art candidates) and included in the report.

In addition, each committee member will visit at least one hour of an instructional session for each different course conducted by the candidate and will submit a written report to the committee head. Exceptions in extraordinary circumstance will be determined by departmental vote. The committee will also review the candidate’s syllabus and teaching materials, and will consider factors such as curricular innovation, effective use of new technology, etc.

The faculty will consider only documents presented in the dossier. If any member of the tenure/tenure track bargaining-unit faculty feel that other substantive issues need to be considered in making a reappointment and promotion decision, such information must be presented in a letter addressed to the committee head before the vote. Such unsolicited letters will become part of the dossier. All letters addressed to the committee, solicited and
unsolicited, regarding teaching, intellectual activity and service written at the time of this review will be included in
the dossier.

It is the responsibility of the committee to provide an interpretation of raw data, especially in connection with
professional evaluations of publications and with student numerical evaluations of instruction by the candidate.
However, the report submitted to the department for a vote should not make a recommendation for or against
promotion, but should simply present the evidence in a fair and balanced manner.

6. The committee report summarizing all dossier material will be divided into three sections, corresponding to the
three priorities for reappointment and promotion: instruction, intellectual activity, and service. The committee will
present its report to all tenured and tenure-track departmental bargaining-unit members, and will then meet with
all those members except the candidate to discuss its findings and to obtain a vote on a recommendation for the
candidate. Only tenured or tenure-track bargaining-unit faculty members may vote for the reappointment or
promotion of a tenure-track or tenured member of the faculty. The members of the committee who are not part
of the department do not vote. This vote will be by secret ballot and therefore will be reported by count only. The
committee may, however, report representative discussion during the meeting at which this vote is taken.

Faculty will vote separately on each area: teaching, intellectual activity and service. The categories for each area
are: 1) the candidate meets and exceeds departmental requirements, 2) the candidate meets departmental
requirements, 3) the candidate does not meet departmental requirements, 4) abstain. A numerical vote is not
reported, but if there is a tie vote between two categories, then the recorded vote falls to the lower of the two
categories.

The vote to recommend or not recommend a candidate for reappointment and/or promotion will be reported
numerically as 1) yes, 2) no, and 3) abstain.

7. After the department has voted, the head of the committee will write a memorandum to the Dean or CAP
expressing the department's recommendation. This memorandum will become part of the dossier. The
department chair must certify in writing that all procedures have been followed, and this certification must be
included in the dossier. The department secretary must receive the completed dossier at least two weeks before it
is due at the office of the College of Arts and Sciences.

8. Regardless of the recommendation of the committee, the candidate must be informed by the committee head
of the department's recommendation. The candidate will receive a copy of the department's recommendation. If
the recommendation for reappointment and/or promotion is to be negative, the candidate must be provided an
opportunity to challenge and to submit additional new documentation for consideration by the department. The
candidate must submit such documentation to the department within 10 days from the time of receiving this
information from the committee head.

9. The department chair, acting on behalf of the department, must submit to the Dean the entire dossier, report,
and recommendation received from the committee as well as any additional new documentation received from
the candidate.

10. In the interest of ethics, faculty are asked not to discuss the candidacy of a colleague outside the review
process. In the interest of fairness, all members of the department will be asked to respect the confidentiality of
deliberations within the review process.

11. Any faculty member aggrieved by any recommendation in the course of his or her review or believing a
violation of an approved procedure has occurred, shall have the right to submit a written objection (including
evidence the candidate deems relevant) to the subsequent review entity. Candidates under review should consult
the current agreement between the Oakland University Chapter of the American Association of University
Professors (AAUP) and the Board of Trustees of Oakland University regarding this and other rights in the review
process.

AAH Criteria, Priorities and Procedures, p. 10