

[Last updated: 16 February 2015]

All documents referenced below can be found online on the Faculty Administrative Services website under [Reappointments & Promotions](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/resources/reappointments-promotions).

Notes:

* In the text below, “department chair” should be read broadly to include chairs of programs with appointment rights.
* In cases involving fully joint appointments, one of the departments should take primary administrative responsibility for the case, in keeping with whatever conditions are mandated in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) governing the candidate’s case.
* The tenure and promotion process depends upon a perception and practice of complete confidentiality. Department chairs should, at every stage, remind their colleagues of its importance.
* The dates below do not apply for 2014-15 cases, and they are aspirational for 2015-2016 cases. These dates take full effect for 2016-2017 cases.

FASTAP policies concerning timetable and criteria for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor with Tenure:

“Consideration for promotion to tenure will be detached from resource issues… Individuals appointed to both tenured associate professor and professor will, in the language of the current *Faculty Handbook* ‘stand in competition with the foremost leaders in their fields throughout the world.’ Because a tenure appointment is without term, irrespective of rank, it is a forward-looking judgment, even as it is based on achievements to date. It expresses the University’s commitment to, and faith in, a faculty member’s ongoing career of distinguished research and scholarship, disciplinary and interdisciplinary leadership, committed teaching, and engaged university citizenship. Criteria for appointment or promotion to associate professor with tenure and appointment or promotion to full professor differ in degree, rather than in kind. Tenured associate professors are expected to have shown evidence of exceptional accomplishments and future promise that makes the sponsoring department confident that within five years they will merit promotion at Yale to the rank of professor.” *(Report of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Appointments Policy Committee, 5 February 2007)*

Also, as stated in the *Faculty Handbook*:

“The criteria for appointment or promotion to the rank of *associate professor with tenure* differ from those for *professors* in degree rather than kind. Tenured faculty at Yale are expected to stand among the foremost leaders in their fields throughout the world. Associate professors with tenure are expected to develop the qualities of scholarship that earned them permanent appointments, so that within a reasonable period of time their value to the University and their national or international standing will make them suitable candidates for professor.”

Annually by March 1, the *department chair* (with the assistance of the [Office of Faculty Administrative Services](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu)) should identify departmental candidates who will be considered for promotion with tenure in the next academic year. This list should include:

* all faculty on term entering their 8th year in the coming academic year beginning July 1 (or other negotiated penultimate year)
* suitable Associate Professors on Term who will entering their 7th year in the coming academic year
* others whom the department, in consultation with the candidate and the office of the FAS Dean, have deemed appropriate for review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Actor/*Activity*** | **Description** | **Timeline** |
| **Stage 1:****Preliminary Preparation of File** | **Steps 1-6** | **Typically done during spring and summer** |
| Chair*Inform candidate* | 1. **Inform candidate of process**

The department chair sends the candidate the divisional template letter advising of the review and requesting the necessary materials.* [Humanities Letter of Request](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/letter_request_tenure_humanities_2015.doc)
* [Sciences - Biological and Physical Sciences & Engineering Letter of Request](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/letter_request_tenure_sciences_2015.doc)
* [Social Sciences Letter of Request](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/letter_request_tenure_social_sciences_2015.doc)

*\* For candidates being considered early, the letter may be sent on April 1 of year 6, Sept. 1 of year 7, or Jan. 10 of year 7.* | No later than March 1 of the academic year prior to the candidate’s tenure review\* |
| Candidate/Chair*Submit/receive basic materials* | 1. **Submit/receive preliminary materials**

The candidate provides the department chair with electronic copies of:* A detailed academic CV
* Names of up to three individuals who might serve as “arms-length” referees (persons, to the best of the department’s knowledge, who were or are not teachers/mentors/advisors or others who have a close personal relationship with the candidate) names of up to three individuals whom the candidate believes would not offer a fair assessment of his or her work
* A brief statement of research interests to help guide the department in its selection of additional referees

Note: Additional materials and an updated CV are due on August 18 [(see #6 below)](#Submit/review). | End of March break |
| Chair*Select departmental review committee* | 1. **Select departmental review committee**

The department chair selects a departmental faculty review committee, typically composed of three faculty members drawn from the pool of faculty members eligible to vote on the case (see [link](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/fas_faculty_voting_policy.pdf) for faculty eligibility).The department chair submits the proposed names to the chair of the appropriate Area Committee (Biological Sciences, Humanities, Physical Sciences & Engineering, Social Sciences) and to the FAS Dean (by April 8).After iterative consultation, this list is approved and the committee is appointed (no later than April 22). | Begin by early AprilComplete by mid-April |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Departmental ReviewCommittee*Propose referees and comparison candidates**(cont’d)*Departmental ReviewCommittee*Propose referees and comparison candidates* | **4a. Secure referees: Propose referees and comparison candidates**The departmental faculty review committee and/or departmental faculty as a whole identifies 10-15 outside scholars as possible external referees for the promotion, including, when appropriate, some or all of the reviewers suggested by the candidate. Referees should be leading scholars who hold a rank at or above that for which the candidate is being reviewed. In preparing this list, the committee should be aware that, ultimately, at least seven of the letters for this promotion must come from referees who hold an arms-length relation to the candidate (that is, who have not served as the candidate’s teacher, mentor, or research collaborator, or have a conflict of interest), and at least four of these arms-length letters [(see #4d)](#Secure_referees) must come from referees who have not previously written for the candidate for an appointment or promotion at Yale. Proposed referees should be selected with the aim of providing a fair, informed, and rigorous review reflecting a diversity of viewpoints. *At no point in the process should the candidate be informed which referees have been considered or selected.*The department (supported, where appropriate, by the chair’s assistant) prepares an alphabetized list of proposed referees that includes as much of the following as is feasible to obtain without undue effort (and without revealing the identify of potential reviewers to the candidate):* The name of the referee (in bold)
* Degree information (institution and date [or approximate date if actual date is not readily available])
* Current position
* Relevant honors
* Major service activities (journal editorships, etc.)
* Scholarly accomplishments and evidence of eminence (e.g., bibliography, citation counts, h-index, and/or other disciplinary-appropriate evidence)
* Brief explanation of the appropriateness of the referee for the particular case (expertise, stature, presence in leading department, etc.)
* Indication of whether the referee was proposed by the candidate or by the department
* Information about whether the referee has written an evaluation of the candidate for a previous Yale appointment or promotion review (please specify)
* Indication whether the referee is arms-length or not, with notes about any substantial connection to the candidate such as
* whether the reviewer chaired or served on the candidate’s dissertation committee and/or shared a dissertation director with the candidate and/or was the candidate’s teacher or post-doctoral mentor
* whether the reviewer and candidates are co-authors and/or have collaborated on research

The departmental faculty review committee also submits to Department Chair a list of three comparison candidates, at least one of which will be “aspirational” in the sense of having already achieved what we hope our candidate may achieve in the decade after promotion. These should be the stars—rising or established—of the field broadly conceived. This list should be accompanied by a short summary of the credentials of each comparison candidate, identifying the aspirational comparison candidate. This should normally include:* The name of the comparison candidate (in bold)
* Degree information (institution and date [or approximate date if actual date is not readily available])
* Current position
* Relevant honors
* Major service activities (journal editorships, etc.)
* Scholarly accomplishments and evidence of eminence (e.g., bibliography, citation counts, h-index, or other disciplinary-appropriate evidence)
* Brief explanation of the appropriateness of the comparison candidate for the particular case (expertise, stature, presence in leading department, etc.)

The information about referees and comparison candidates will subsequently be included as part of the file the department prepares for the TAC consideration of the case | As soon as possible after the committee is approved*(cont’d)*As soon as possible after the committee is approved |
| Chair*Submit/discuss list of proposed referees and comparison candidates* | **4b**. **Secure referees: Submit/discuss list of proposed referees and comparison candidates**The department chair submits to the chair of the Area Committee and FAS Dean: (a) the candidate’s CV and other relevant material, (b) the alphabetized and annotated list of proposed referees for review and discussion, and (c) the alphabetized and annotated list of comparison candidates.The chair of the Area Committee and FAS Dean review these documents and may suggest deletions, changes and additions to the suggested list of referees and/or comparison candidates. After iterative consultation, the department chair receives approval of a final referee and comparison candidate lists from the chair of the Area Committee. Every effort will be made to conduct this process with efficiency and responsiveness. | As soon as the previous step has been completed |
| Chair or Chair’s Assistant*Contact referees on the approved list* | **4c. Secure referees: Contact approved referees**The department chair (or chair’s assistant) then sends to each of the approved referees a copy of the candidate’s CV, accompanied by an e-mail, using the standard template:* For initial email to referees for promotion of Associate Professor on Term (without tenure) to Tenure, use [this template](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/fas_email_referees_tenure_2015.docx).
* For referees who agree to write a letter ([see #7 below](#Distribute_materials_to_referees)), use [this template](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/fas_letter_external_tenure_2015.docx).

The e-mail requests the referee’s participation in the review and informs them that, if they agree to review the candidate, they will receive access to the materials for review *no later than September 1* and that the report will be due six weeks later. Departments are encouraged to offer materials (by mail or through a secure website) to review over the summer if such materials are available (published books, for example). | As soon as the list has been approved, but no later than June 1 |
| Chair’s Assistant*Track referee responses* | **4d.** **Secure referees: Track referee responses**The chair’s assistant monitors the progress of referee requests and updates the chair as needed. The chair’s assistant:* Tracks and records all responses to the emails to the referee list
* Sends a reminder message 1 week and then 3 weeks after the initial distribution to those who have not responded so that additional referees may be solicited if needed
* Provides an updated report of the responses to the chair no later than July 15
* Keeps a full set of all correspondence between department (including chair) and all referees (including those who decline), which will become part of the permanent file in the case
* Before a case can move to the next step for promotion with tenure, the chair should ensure that letters have been received from a minimum of seven referees who hold an arms-length relation to the candidate (that is, who have not served as the candidate’s teacher, mentor, or research collaborator, or have a conflict of interest), and at least four of these arms-length letters must come from referees who have not previously written for the candidate for an appointment or promotion at Yale.
 | As soon as the invitations have been sent out |
| Chair and Chair’s Assistant*Schedule TAC date* | 1. **Schedule Tenure Appointments Committee (TAC) review date**

The department chair and chair’s assistant work with the FAS Dean’s assistant to schedule a tentative TAC review date. | No later than mid-June |
| Candidate; Chair; Chair’s Assistant*Submit/receive/review final materials* *(cont’d)*Candidate; Chair; Chair’s Assistant*Submit/receive/review final materials* | 1. **Submit/review case materials**

The candidate provides case materials to the department chair. The department chair receives this material and reviews it for completeness and accuracy. The chair may ask the candidate for revisions or updates to ensure that all materials include required information. The candidate is responsible for ensuring that his or her materials for the review are up-to-date, complete, and accurate.The candidate’s case materials should include:* An updated detailed academic CV
* If applicable, the candidate should list in the CV past and current (most important) grants, including role on each grant (e.g., principal investigator), dates for each grant, amount of funding (for direct and/or indirect costs), and (in the case of collaborative grants) portion of funding allocated to the candidate's salary and research program at Yale.
* A chronological list of all the courses they have taught at Yale and the enrollments. Administrative staff members in departments and programs have access in FIS (which will be replaced by Workday) to obtain summary reports with this information. For candidates in Biological Sciences and in Physical Sciences & Engineering, also include contribution to the course (e.g., course director or co-director, number of lectures given, contact hours).
* A comprehensive list of their additional teaching, advising and other contributions at Yale (e.g., advising/evaluation of dissertations, qualifying exams, senior essays; direction of student productions; formal and informal mentoring; organizing of academic reading groups; advising of student academic organizations; service on departmental and university committees)
* A list of current and former trainees (e.g., supervised doctoral or post-doctoral students), indicating their current positions
* A list of any awards, prizes, or other special recognition received by the candidate and by any of the candidate’s current or former trainees
* A comprehensive list of the candidate’s other professional service activities (editorial boards, conference organizing, leadership in professional organizations, etc.)
* A list of colloquia or seminars presented
* A statement of 500-750 words describing the candidate’s approach to teaching, advising, and mentoring
* A statement of 750-1000 words describing the candidate’s research program and future plans
* Copies of (or links to) those pieces of published research that will be included in the review file as specified in the guidelines for the appropriate Area Committee ([Biological Sciences](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/biological-sciences-scholarship-guidelines-promotion-tenure), [Humanities](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/humanities-scholarship-guidelines-promotion-tenure), [Physical Sciences & Engineering](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/physical-sciences-and-engineering-scholarship-guidelines-tenure), and [Social Sciences](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/social-sciences-scholarship-guidelines-tenure)).
* Copies of all major materials (e.g., books, book manuscripts, and chapters) that are not directly available electronically through Yale’s libraries as specified in the guidelines for the appropriate Area Committee (Biological Sciences, Humanities, Physical Sciences & Engineering, and Social Sciences). These materials should be made available to referees and members of the Area Committee on a secure website and, for materials not available electronically, in the FAS Dean’s Office
* Any additional materials the candidate would like the department to consider as it proceeds with the review

The chair reviews the materials for completeness and accuracy, then submits the material to the chair’s assistant for the next phases. | By August 18*(cont’d)*By August 18 |

**STAGE 1 COMPLETE**

**PROCEED TO STAGE 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage 2:****Referee and Departmental Review** | **Steps 7-12** | **Typically done early fall** |
| Chair’s Assistant*Distribute materialsto referees* | 1. **Distribute materials to referees**

The chair’s assistant sends emails to those referees who have agreed to review the candidate. The emails include:* The approved formal letter inviting the referee to evaluate the candidate and describing the information desired (using the standard template). For follow-up letter to external referees concerning promotion of Associate Professor on Term to Tenure use [this template](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/fas_letter_external_tenure_2015.docx)
* The candidate’s CV, teaching and research statements, and (depending on disciplinary custom) links to or copies of relevant publications

Letters of evaluation are due by the agreed date, typically no later than *October 15*. | Preferably by August 25, but no later than September 1 |
| Chair’s Assistant*Track referee responses* | 1. **Track referee responses**

The chair’s assistant collects and tracks receipt of all letters and reminds referees of the deadline. If there is a risk of an insufficient number of letters accumulating, the chair and committee should be informed immediately, so that additional reviewers can be secured as needed, in consultation with the office of the FAS Dean.* The chair (or, where suitable, chair’s assistant) thanks each external reviewer after the referee’s letter arrives.
* The assistant sends reminder messages two weeks and one week before the final deadline to those who have not yet submitted an evaluation.
* If the evaluation is not yet returned, the assistant sends additional reminders one, two and three weeks after the deadline.
* Receipt of at least seven arms-length letters (with at least four of these arms-length letters coming from referees who have not previously written for the candidate for an appointment or promotion at Yale) is required to move to the next step in the process of promotion to Associate Professor or Full Professor with Tenure.
 | Beginning September 1 |
| Chair’s Assistant*Manage documents and document access* | 1. **Manage documents and document access**

Beginning when the candidate submits their materials, and continuing as the referee letters come in, the chair’s assistant ensures that all documents are uploaded in Interfolio. (The chair’s assistant should consult with the [Office of Faculty Administrative Services](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/) if assistance is needed with this task.)Materials should be organized in such a way that:* relevant groups (departmental review committee; eligible department faculty; members of the Area Committee) have access through the secure website to materials at suitable times
* confidential documents are available only to the appropriate individuals

Please ensure that all [confidentiality policies](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/confidentialty_policies_2015.docx) are followed.When all materials are received, the case is assigned to the departmental faculty review committee. | Beginning September 1 and continuing as the letters arrive |
| Departmental Review Committee*Deliberate and recommend* | 1. **Deliberate and recommend**

The departmental faculty review committee, after consulting the [criteria for promotion](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/criteria-promotion-tenure-0) and the [departmental confidentiality policy](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/confidentiality_policy.pdf) reviews the candidate’s materials, with the goal of making a recommendation as soon as possible after the required set of letters has been received and the stated deadline for receipt of any outstanding letters has passed. | Beginning in early fall when the candidate submits materials and continuing as letters become available.Target date for recommendation: no later than November 1 |
| Eligible Departmental Faculty and Chair’s Assistant*Deliberate, vote and submit vote**(cont’d)*Eligible Departmental Faculty and Chair’s Assistant*Deliberate, vote and submit vote* | 1. **Deliberate and vote**

As soon as possible after the required set of letters has been received and one week after the stated deadline for receipt of any outstanding letters (but no later than mid-November), a faculty meeting is held at which all eligible departmental faculty are invited to participate in discussion of the candidate’s materials and to vote formally on the candidate’s case.If more than one department is voting on the case (joint appointment), no aspect of the deliberations or outcome of the first department’s discussion or vote may be revealed to the second department prior to the conclusion of the second department’s formal vote.Formal department deliberations should involve only faculty members who are eligible [to vote according to the *Faculty Handbook*](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/voting_policies.docx). If, by standing department practice or policy, faculty with secondary appointments vote in such cases, a copy of this department policy should be submitted to the FAS Dean to be kept on file. To ensure fairness in deliberations, these *Handbook* policies must be followed meticulously.The department chair should begin formal department deliberations by reminding faculty of the [criteria for promotion](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/criteria-promotion-tenure-0) and the [university and department](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/confidentiality-policies) confidentiality policies.Depending on departmental practice, deliberations may continue across more than one meeting before a formal vote is taken.According to the *Faculty Handbook*, “All voting on multi-year appointments and promotions must be done with secret ballots.”According to the *Faculty Handbook*, “For an appointment to be carried to the appropriate appointment and promotions committee, the candidate must receive affirmative votes from a majority of those present and eligible to vote.” Abstentions are therefore included in the total number of votes cast for purposes of determining whether the candidate receives a majority. A tie vote is *not* majority support.At the conclusion of the meeting:The vote should be recorded by the department chair on the [Departmental Faculty Vote Form](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/dept_faculty_vote_form_2015.docx) available in Interfolio, including a list of those eligible to vote, those present for the vote, and the outcome of the vote (yea-nay-abstain). The form should be uploaded into Interfolio by the chair’s assistant and the case assigned to the FAS Dean.The department chair should remind those present that *no member of the department* should communicate with the candidate about the outcome of the vote until the chair has had the chance to speak formally with the candidate, and that *no information* about the details of the vote (unanimous/divided), the faculty discussion, or the confidential content of the external review letters should be conveyed to the candidate under any circumstances. | Target date: early to mid November*(cont’d)*Target date: early to mid November |
| Chair*Convey result of departmental vote* | **Convey result of departmental vote to candidate**As soon as possible after the departmental meeting, the department chair notifies the candidate of the result of the vote, remembering that the candidate should be informed only whether the vote was favorable or unfavorable. *No information about the details of the vote (unanimous/divided) should be conveyed to the candidate under any circumstances.*Once the chair has spoken to the candidate, s/he should inform the faculty that s/he has done so, and again remind the faculty *no information* about the details of the vote (unanimous/divided), the faculty discussion, or the confidential content of the external review letters should be conveyed to the candidate under any circumstances. | As soon as possible after department meeting |
| Chair*(As needed) follow procedures for unfavorable departmental vote* | **(As needed): Follow procedures for unfavorable departmental vote**If the departmental vote is *not favorable*, the department chair must:* Notify the FAS Dean and the Area Committee chair of the outcome.
* Draft a letter (from the department chair) informing the candidate about the outcome. The letter to the candidate must be approved by the FAS Dean before delivery.
* Schedule a meeting with the candidate to discuss the outcome.

This completes the process. | As soon as possible after department meeting (if vote is unfavorable) |

**STAGE 2 COMPLETE**

**PROCEED TO STAGE 3**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage 3:****Post-Departmental Review** | **Steps 13-18** | **Typically done in November, December or January** |
| Chair/Chair’s Assistant*Prepare materials for TAC* | **13. Prepare materials for TAC**If the departmental vote is *favorable* (in which the majority of those voting, including abstentions, have voted in favor of the case), the chair’s assistant confirms the date for the TAC review with the chair of the Area Committee and prepares the [Department Case Summary](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/fas-dept_case_summary_2015.docx) and submits all materials in Interfolio. Materials for the TAC should conform to the guidelines outlined in the area checklists for promotion with tenure:* [Biological Sciences](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/bio_sciences_tenure_checklist_interfolio_2015.docx)
* [Humanities](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/humanities_tenure_checklist_interfolio_2015.docx)
* [Physical Sciences & Engineering](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/fas-checklist-chair-promotion-associate-professor-tenure-or-professor-physical-sciences-and)
* [Social Sciences](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/social_sciences_tenure_checklist_interfolio_2015.docx)

Note: These materials should be submitted for review as soon as possible, *and no later than 3 weeks prior to the TAC scheduled review*. | As soon as possible after department meeting (if vote is favorable) |
| Chair (and Chair of the Departmental Review Committee)*Present case to TAC* | 1. **Present case to TAC**

The department chair (and, if agreed by the Area Committee chair/FAS Dean, the chair of the departmental review committee or another faculty member with expertise on the scholarship) presents the case to the TAC.The TAC votes on the case, and the FAS Dean conveys the result of the vote to the department chair. | On scheduled TAC date (late November, December or January) |
| Chair*Convey result of TAC vote* | 1. **Convey result of TAC vote**

As soon as possible after the TAC meeting, the department chair notifies the candidate of the result of the vote, remembering that the candidate should be informed only whether the vote was favorable or unfavorable. *No information about the details of the vote (unanimous/divided) should be conveyed to the candidate under any circumstances*. | As soon as possible after TAC meeting |
| Chair*(As needed) follow procedures for unfavorable TAC vote* | **(As needed): Follow procedures for unfavorable TAC vote**If the TAC vote is *not favorable*, the department chair must* Draft a letter (from the department chair) informing the candidate about the outcome. The letter to the candidate must be approved by the FAS Dean before delivery.
* Schedule a meeting with the candidate to discuss the outcome.

This completes the process. | As soon as possible after TAC meeting (if vote is unfavorable) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair*Prepare materials for JBPO meeting; attend and present case at JBPO* | 1. **Prepare materials for Joint Boards of Permanent Officers (JBPO) meeting**

If the TAC vote is *favorable*, the chair prepares a **brief** presentation of the case for the next JBPO meeting.The JBPO will vote on the case at its next meeting. | As soon as possible after TAC meeting (if vote is favorable) |
| Chair*Convey result of JBPO vote* | 1. **Convey result of JBPO vote**

As soon as possible after the JBPO meeting, the department chair notifies the candidate of the result of the vote, remembering that the candidate should be informed only whether the vote was favorable or unfavorable. *No information about the details of the vote (unanimous/divided) should be conveyed to the candidate under any circumstances.* | As soon as possible after JBPO meeting |
| Chair*(As needed) follow procedures for unfavorable JBPO vote* | **(As needed): Follow procedures for unfavorable JBPO vote**If the JBPO vote is *not favorable*, the department chair must* Draft a letter (from the department chair) informing the candidate about the outcome. The letter to the candidate must be approved by the FAS Dean before delivery.
* Schedule a meeting with the candidate to discuss the outcome.

This completes the process. | As soon as possible after JBPO meeting (if vote is unfavorable) |
| Chair’s Assistant*Complete faculty appointment form* | 1. **Complete Faculty Appointment Form**

If the JBPO vote is *favorable*, the chair’s assistant completes the [Faculty Appointment Form](http://facultyadmin.yale.edu/sites/default/files/faculty_appointment_form_0.pdf) and submits it to faculty.admin@yale.edu. | May (if JBPO vote is favorable) |