Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 21 April 2009

In a continuation of the April 7 meeting, the Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 21 April 2009, at 5:00 P.M. in Wachovia Auditorium to complete the unfinished business from April 7th.

After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order he asked the Senate for unanimous consent to add to the agenda a report from the Faculty Compensation Committee. Unanimous consent was granted.

Reports

Hugh Wilder, member of the Faculty Compensation Committee

Mr. Wilder said that the main reason for his report stemmed from the recent publication of faculty salary data by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Given the College’s merit evaluation plans, he thought it was important to summarize some of the committee’s findings in studying the AAUP data. He cautioned, however, that the analysis is preliminary. He added that the AAUP reports average salaries by rank, but not by discipline, and that not all institutions report data to AAUP, though many do.

He began by saying that average salaries at the College are as follows: $80,500 (professors), $65,400 (assoc. professors), $59,400 (asst. professors), and $47,800 (instructors), with an overall average of $64,700. With respect to our peer institutions, we are eighteenth on the list. Western Washington University is the only one that moved ahead of us. This news, Mr. Wilder said, was frustrating, especially in light of the fact that President Benson increased salaries 3.9% last year at the College, for which he deserves credit. In terms of the percentage of salary increases, we rank number one in the state and number 6 among 20 peer institutions. The increase is particularly significant among assistant professors, who as a group enjoyed a 6.3% average increase. Mr. Wilder said that Associate Provost Bev Diamond deserves credit for these salary boosts. In the South Atlantic region, the C of C’s average salary of $64,700 equals 97.6% of the current overall average, up from 96.3%. For assistant professors the average equals 101.5%. Mr. Wilder thanked President Benson and Associate Provost Bev Diamond and said that the committee will work on recommendations that will be forwarded to the administration.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) said that it should be noted that Western Washington, whose faculty earned the largest salary increase, is unionized. Jason Coy (History) thanked the committee members for their work and said that the news about last year’s salary increases is encouraging, but asked about this year’s news on the salary front. What can we do this year to keep the momentum going? Mr. Wilder replied that Laura Turner, chair of the committee, has met with President Benson, and that the committee’s recommendations will offer the President guidance. The AAUP, however, predicts tough times ahead for colleges and universities, but the President has said that increasing faculty salaries is a high priority.

Old Business
Committee on By-Laws and Fac./Admin. Manual

Deanna Caveny, chair of the committee, explained that the Senate would vote on five motions that had originally been presented to the Senate in the March meeting for feedback. Those motions have now been brought back to the Senate for a vote. Ms. Caveny also explained that Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) consists of two parts: (1) the by-laws, which the faculty controls; and (2) the sections that affect faculty and consist mainly of academic policy. The By-Laws and FAM Committee, Ms. Caveny continued, has the responsibility of maintaining the FAM and reporting to the Senate on proposed changes to the non-faculty controlled sections, which the Senate has traditionally voted on with the understanding that votes on those sections are only advisory. The first four motions pertained to the faculty-controlled section of the FAM, the fifth to the non-faculty controlled section.

Before introducing the five motions, Ms. Caveny announced that her committee will have a Web site that lays out the different parts of the FAM and explains who owns what part of it. She also announced that during the summer the committee would work with Tom Trimboli, Sr. VP of Legal Affairs, on details of the hearing and grievance policy (a delicate matter). The committee will also look at the College’s sabbatical policy, consult with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review on issues pertaining to Sr. Instructors and Instructors, and work on policy changes that are voted on today.

First motion: Ms. Caveny introduced the first of the five motions, which seeks to define more clearly the term “regular faculty.” She noted that the motion is the same as the one brought to the Senate in March, except for some small changes in the footnote and a change (highlighted in red under the heading of “Intent”) that combines Instructors and Senior Instructors with tenured and tenure-track faculty members. She added that at the March meeting Bill Olejniczak (chair of the History Department) brought up a question about whether visiting faculty fit into the definition “regular faculty,” and said that there may be a motion next year to include visiting faculty in the definition. The full text of the motion is as follows:

Action: Change to By-laws Article I, Section 1: Membership in the College Faculty, Regular Faculty.

Status: Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

Intent:

- To more clearly define “regular faculty”
- To include among regular faculty those full-time tenured and tenure-track employees who normally teach only three contact hours, including chairs of large departments and assistant and associate deans
- To replace “instructor” with “Instructor”
- To combine Instructors and Senior Instructors with tenured and tenure-track faculty members in application of the three-credit-hour rule
- To clarify which administrators are members of the regular faculty
Motion:

Article I. Membership in the College Faculty

Section 1. Regular Faculty

The faculty members of the College of Charleston are those individuals whose obligation in the institution is both the dissemination and expansion of academic knowledge of an accepted academic nature. At the College of Charleston the following individuals are considered regular faculty members: (1) those full-time¹ tenured, and tenure-track, Instructor, and Senior Instructor employees of the institution who normally teach at least six three contact hours² of college credit courses or the equivalent in assigned academic research in their academic fields each semester; (2) full-time Instructor and Senior Instructor employees; (3) (2) full-time professional librarians; and (4) (3) ex officio, the President of the College, the Provost, the Vice-President for Research and Professional Development and Dean of Graduate Studies, the Deans of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Deans, the Dean of the Honors College, and all administrative officers of the College with academic rank.³ These members of the faculty have voting rights at meetings of the College faculty.

The Senate voted, passing the motion.

Second Motion: Ms. Caveny introduced the second motion, which mainly seeks to more clearly define who is eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate. Ms. Caveny explained that this draft of the motion is almost the same as the one introduced in the March meeting, except for the fact that it combines Instructors and Senior Instructors with tenured and tenure-track faculty in applying the three-hour contact rule for Senate eligibility (this revision is highlighted in red under the heading of “Intent”). The full text of the motion is as follows:

Action: Change to By-laws Article IV, Section 2: Faculty Senate, Composition and Election.

¹ For the purpose only of interpreting Art I., Sect. 1, a “full-time” employee of the College of Charleston shall be defined as an employee receiving a salary and fringe benefits from the College in return for 40 hours or more of labor per regular work week. Any employee holding a title customarily associated with regular faculty membership is presumed to be a full-time employee unless the Provost stipulates in writing that the employee in question has part-time status. The determination of full-time status is not linked to the type or nature of the work assignment for each individual faculty member.
² When they are full-time tenured and tenure-track employees of the institution, full-time Instructor and Senior Instructor employees, or full-time professional librarians, Department Chairs, Assistant Department Chairs, Associate Department Chairs, Assistant Deans, and Associate Deans are defined as employees normally teaching at least three contact hours of college credit courses in each semester.
³ An “administrative officer” shall be defined as any College of Charleston employee with a position title using the words “President” or “Provost.” In addition, the Provost may stipulate in writing that any College employee with academic rank is an administrative officer if that employee (a) has a position title using the word “Director” and (b) normally teaches fewer than three contact hours of college credit courses or the equivalent in assigned academic research in her or his academic field each semester.
Status: Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

Intent:
- To more clearly define which regular faculty members are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, vote in senatorial elections, and be counted in apportionment of Faculty Senate seats
- To replace “instructor” with “Instructor”
- To combine Instructors and Senior Instructors with tenured and tenure-track faculty members in application of the three-contact-hour rule
- To resolve an ambiguity in whether department chairs are allowed to serve as Faculty Senators. Our by-laws have specifically stated that chairs are eligible to serve as faculty senators. However, chairs were not clearly included in the regular faculty, which produced a contradiction.
- To specify that Assistant Deans and Associate Deans (who are otherwise members of the regular faculty) are also eligible to serve as Faculty Senators
- To clearly state which administrators are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators
- To clearly state which administrators are not eligible to vote in senatorial elections and should not count in Faculty Senate seat apportionment.

Motion:

Article IV, Faculty Senate

Section 2. Composition and Election

A. Eligibility.

A Faculty Senator must be a full-time tenured, or tenure-track, Instructor, or Senior Instructor employee of the College who has completed at least three years of service at the College, and who normally teaches at least six contact hours per semester or the equivalent in assigned research or who is a full-time Instructor, Senior Instructor, or professional librarian. Without regard to teaching load, Department Chairs, Assistant Department Chairs, Associate Department Chairs, Assistant Deans, and Associate Deans who otherwise would be members of the regular faculty, regardless of their teaching loads, are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. (Approved App. April 2005) Administrators, Administrative officers, including Deans of Schools and the Dean of Libraries, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Academic Deans, and the Dean of the Honors College are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators. Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

C. Election
1. **Without regard to teaching load, all** All and only regular faculty members as defined under provisions (1), (2), and (3) of Article I Section 1 in Art. I, Sect. 1, excluding all those qualifying as *ex officio* regular faculty members under provision (3), are eligible to vote in Senate elections.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that he was glad to see that these things are being clarified, and noted that the Committee on Nominations and Elections, of which he is a member, has also wrestled with eligibility issues. However, he was unsure about the proposed amendment, particularly the part that makes Assistant and Associate Deans eligible for the Faculty Senate. In the past, they have not been included, so this aspect of the amendment would represent a major change and not a good one in his view. In contrast to Deans, who tend to look outward, Assistant and Associate Deans attend to internal problems, and so by including them in the Senate they would have a kind of double vote—as faculty and as deans. Moreover, since they answer to Deans, it is hard for Assistant and Associate Deans to be independent and to speak against the views of the Deans. Having persons in the Senate who truly represent the faculty and have independent views becomes especially important if the Senate becomes a smaller body, as the *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Governance has suggested it will recommend. **Mr. Phillips therefore moved to put Assistant and Associate Deans in the category of those who are ineligible to serve in the Faculty Senate.** The motion was seconded.

Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) voiced his support for Mr. Phillips’ motion. The argument, he observed, to make Assistant and Associate Deans eligible for the Senate is that they come from the faculty and presumably will return to the faculty ranks. But he pointed out that this practice may change, and that there is no provision in the motion to account for the change. He stressed, too, that Assistant and Associate Deans have little independence and serve at the pleasure of the Deans. Further, the number of Assistant and Associate Deans may grow in the future. He agreed that it was best to exclude them from Senate eligibility.

Brian McGee (guest and a member of the By-Laws and FAM Committee) remarked that the committee discussed the issue and thought this aspect of the their motion might spark some controversy. He said that the amendment to the committee’s motion was fine with him, but he pointed out that the same argument used to exclude Deans and Associate Deans could be used to exclude department chairs, who have more power over faculty. Yet we wouldn’t want, he concluded, to exclude chairs. Ms. Caveny agreed that excluding chairs would be a bad idea. Mr. Krasnoff responded that the issue isn’t mainly about power, but about independence, which is what Assistant and Associate Deans lack.

Mr. Phillips added that we already include the dean ranks as faculty in terms of service on committees. But whereas the Committee on Nominations and Elections can make a judgment as to whether faculty serving as deans should be on certain committees, there is no such committee to mediate such matters when it comes to Assistant and Associate Deans serving in the Senate. He thus urged the passage of his amendment.

**The Senate voted, passing Mr. Phillips’ amendment to the By-Laws and FAM Committee’s second motion.**
The Senate then voted on the By-Laws and FAM Committee’s second motion, which passed.

**Third Motion:** This motion would (among other things) eliminate regularly scheduled fall and spring faculty meetings, which in recent years have been sparsely attended. (Items listed below in red under the heading of “Intent” refer to changes in the amendment that have been made since the March Faculty Senate meeting, when the amendment was first introduced.)

The full text of the amendment is as follows:

**Action:** Change to By-laws Article II, College Faculty Meetings. Associated Change to Article VI, Amending Procedures.

**Status:** Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

**Intent:**

- To eliminate requirement of fall and spring full faculty meetings
- To continue to allow meetings of the faculty to be called by the President of the College, Speaker of the Faculty, or petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by fifty faculty members
- To allow everything (except election of faculty committees and approval of degree candidates) that took place in the required fall and spring faculty meetings to take place at “ordinary” faculty meetings called at Speaker’s discretion
- **To specify how election of faculty committees will take place**
- To reclassify meetings of the faculty from “regular” and “special” to “ordinary” and “extraordinary”, since “regular” seemed to imply “with some regularity or regular schedule”
- To more clearly state that ordinary faculty meetings are not deliberative
- To specify who (the Speaker or Speaker’s designee) can waive the one-week advance notification requirement when calling extraordinary faculty meetings
- To clearly specify that Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern the conduct at extraordinary faculty meetings
- To fix section numbering in Article VI, Amending Procedures

**Motion:**

**Article II. College Faculty Meetings**

**Section 1. Regular Ordinary Faculty Meetings**

The College faculty shall meet twice annually, once early in the first semester and again late in the second semester, to hear reports from and to question the President of the College, the Provost, and the Speaker of the Faculty. At its spring meeting, the College faculty shall recommend recipients of degrees and certificates at spring commencement. Any written reports to the College faculty from the President, the Provost, or the Speaker of the Faculty shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members. Ordinary meetings of the College faculty may be called by the Speaker of the Faculty.
Ordinary faculty meetings may be called for such purposes as the distribution of information, discussion of a topic or topics relevant to the College faculty, hearing a presentation, and asking questions of the President of the College or other administrative officers of the College. An ordinary meeting of the College faculty is not a deliberative assembly, and faculty at such meetings have no legislative or review authority.

Section 2. Special Extraordinary Faculty Meetings

A. Special Extraordinary meetings of the College faculty may be called by the President of the College, or the Speaker of the Faculty, or a petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by fifty faculty members. At such special extraordinary meetings the College faculty may review any Faculty Senate action.

B. Senate actions may be amended or vetoed by a simple majority vote of those members of the regular College faculty (as defined in Article Art. I) present at such special extraordinary meetings of the College faculty, provided there is a quorum present.

C. The College faculty has legislative authority (i.e., may legislate and recommend to the President on matters normally under the purview of the Faculty Senate) only in case it acts in a special extraordinary meeting of the College faculty called by a petition to the Speaker of the Faculty by 50 regular College faculty members (as defined in Art. I) on a specific issue included in the agenda for that meeting and distributed at least one week prior to the date of the meeting.

D. A quorum at special extraordinary College faculty meetings shall be a simple majority of regular College faculty members.

E. Special Extraordinary meetings of the College faculty must be called in writing at least one week prior to the date of the meeting. A written agenda for each meeting will be distributed to all faculty at least one week prior to the meeting. The requirement of one week advance notice may be waived by the Speaker of the Faculty (or the Speaker’s designee) in case of emergency.

F. The current edition of Robert’s Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of special extraordinary meetings of the College faculty.

G. The Faculty Secretary shall perform as secretary for all meetings of the College faculty.

Section 3. Presiding Officer

The Speaker of the Faculty shall preside at all regular and special ordinary and extraordinary meetings of the faculty. If the Speaker cannot be present, she or he shall designate an alternate Speaker for that meeting from among the members of the regular faculty of the College.
Article VI. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Senate Option for Amendment Introduction

A. Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion and any amendments at the next Senate meeting. Motions to amend or repeal these by-laws require a two-thirds vote in the Senate for approval. Approved motions must then be ratified by a simple majority of regular faculty members voting by electronic ballot on the motion. (Rev. Jan. 2007)

Section 2. Extraordinary Meeting Option for Amendment Introduction

B. Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any special extraordinary meeting of the College faculty. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the faculty its recommendation on the motion and any amendments at a second special extraordinary faculty meeting called by the Speaker of the Faculty to consider the motion. The faculty will then vote on the motion to amend or repeal the by-laws. It shall be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the membership voting, provided a quorum is present.

The Senate voted, passing on the amendment.

Motion four: This proposed amendment specifies that the President and Provost must report to the faculty in an early meeting of the Faculty Senate in the fall semester and in a late meeting of the Faculty Senate in the spring semester. The intent of the motion is to retain the function of having the President and Provost report to the faculty, which the previous amendment eliminated. The full text of the amendment is as follows:

Action: Change to By-laws Article IV, Section 1: Faculty Senate, Functions.

Status: Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

Intent:
- To take the requirement that the President and Provost report to the faculty, which was part of the required full faculty meetings, and place it under Faculty Senate meetings instead
Article IV. Faculty Senate

Section 1. Functions

A. The Faculty Senate is the primary legislative body of the College of Charleston faculty. The Senate may make recommendations on any matter under its purview to the President of the College. Except where otherwise specified in the By-Laws of the College Board of Trustees, the President shall have the power of veto over any action by the Senate. The veto shall be communicated in writing to the Senate, with reasons, within thirty days after receipt by the President. By a two-thirds vote, the Senate may appeal any action thus vetoed, through the Speaker of the Faculty, to the College Board of Trustees.

B. The Faculty Senate shall be concerned with all matters relating to academic programs, the curriculum, admissions and continuation standards, the grading system, degree and certificate requirements, and the utilization of the intellectual resources of the College. The Faculty Senate shall have the right and obligation to initiate needed institutional and academic studies, either directly or through appropriate committees.

C. The Faculty Senate may request meetings with the College Board of Trustees to discuss matters of mutual concern. Senators shall receive minutes of all meetings of the College Board of Trustees.

D. The Faculty Senate may establish and instruct such committees, standing and ad hoc, as may be necessary for the performance of its functions and elect or provide for the members of the committees in accordance with these by-laws.

E. At one Faculty Senate meeting early in the first semester and at one meeting late in the second semester, the Faculty Senate shall hear reports from and have the opportunity to question the President of the College and the Provost. Any written reports provided to the Faculty Senate by the President or the Provost shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members.

F. The Faculty Senate is authorized by the College faculty to approve all degree candidates for graduation.

G. The specific duties of the Faculty Senate shall also include, but not be limited to, recommendations to the President concerning any of the following:

The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

Fifth Motion: Ms. Caveny reminded the Senate that the next amendment—which concerned procedural matters in tenure, promotion, and review processes—dealt with the part of the FAM that was not controlled by the faculty. The full text of the proposed amendment is as follows:
Action: Change to Faculty/Administration Manual, VI.D.7, Reporting Procedures of Departmental Evaluation Panel.

Status: Presented to Faculty Senate on March 10, 2009. To be considered by Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009.

Intent:
- To implement previously endorsed change requiring: (a) tenure, promotion, and review candidates to sign their evaluation panel’s letter, and (b) panel chairs to provide candidates with a copy of that panel letter
- To specify that panel members should all sign their evaluation panel’s letter
- To specify what the panel members’ and candidates’ signatures mean

Motion:

VI, Sect. D, Evaluation of Faculty, Procedures for Third-year Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty

7. Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

After due deliberation, the panel will shall take its vote by written ballot. The chair will shall draft a statement for the members of the panel to sign that reports the recommendation and vote of the panel. This statement should include justification for the panel’s recommendation. While maintaining the confidentiality of any meetings, the statement will summarize the discussion that took place among panel members, including positive and negative deliberations.

The chair of the departmental panel will shall meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her provide the faculty member with a copy of the panel’s written recommendation written statement, which will shall include actual vote splits and the signatures of all the panel members. The signatures of the panel members acknowledge only that the panel members participated in panel deliberation and had the opportunity to contribute to the development of the written statement. Third-year candidates will sign the panel’s evaluation. The faculty member shall sign a copy of the statement, with the signed copy to be retained by the chair of the panel for submission to the appropriate Academic Dean. The signature of the faculty member acknowledges only that a copy of the statement has been received by the faculty member.

The evaluation panel chair will shall forward the panel’s recommendation(s) statement to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendations, this must be done by November 1. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this must be done by January 15. (Editorial Note: This last sentence will subsequently be revised by another motion addressing deadlines in the tenure and promotion process.)
The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

New Business

Committee on By-Laws and *Fac./Admin. Manual*

The committee had four proposed amendments to the FAM to present to the Senate—all involving changes to the part of the FAM that is not controlled by the faculty—as well as an announcement concerning the language on annual and merit evaluation to be inserted into the FAM.

**Language on annual/merit evaluation to go in the FAM, VI.E and VI.F:** Ms. Caveny explained that this language on annual/merit evaluations has been looked at by numerous faculty committees and that Associate Provost Bev Diamond has incorporated, when she could, a number of their recommendations. She reported that Assoc. Provost Diamond has asked that the Senate not amend the document containing the language on annual/merit evaluation given that various faculty committees have already reviewed it. The text of the document appears in Appendix 1 at the end of the minutes.

Associate Provost Diamond said that she would be happy to hear all comments on the document. Mr. Krasnoff asked if Ms. Diamond could speak to the provision that faculty, or a chair, dean, or the Provost may request a more detailed report. Ms. Diamond replied that the merit/annual evaluation model follows the model used at the University of Miami in Ohio. The main purpose is to allow faculty to get more detailed assessment, especially when going up for promotion. Some committees have voiced some objections over this part of the document, but the administration has kept a general provision in for the generation of more detailed reports. The intent behind it, she said, is to benefit faculty. On a different topic, Ms. Diamond said that she does not yet know if the post-tenure review will be rolled into the annual/merit review, but that it could happen. Following up on his question, Mr. Krasnoff said that he could see the intent of the provision allowing for more detailed assessments, but wished to know more specifically what “more detailed” means. Ms. Diamond replied that the administration didn’t want to spell out rigid guidelines and thought it was more appropriate to leave room for different practices for different occasions and contexts. Ms. Caveny added that the old practice was that every third year a tenured faculty would get a detailed evaluation, but it could be now happen anytime.

At the conclusion of the discussion of the language on annual/merit evaluation, Ms. Caveny announced the first of four amendments to the FAM.

**First proposed amendment to the FAM:** motion to insert a section on the religious accommodation for students. The full text of the amendment is as follows:

*Action:* Change to *Faculty/Administration Manual, VIII.A, Faculty Responsibilities to Students*, to add a statement on religious accommodation for students.
Status: To be presented to Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009. Committee will request that Faculty Senate consider this motion at one of the April meetings.

Intent:
- To add a statement of religious accommodation for students

Motion:

In VIII, Sect. A, Faculty Responsibilities to Students, insert new #11 and renumber current #11-16 as #12-17.

Insertion:

11. Religious Accommodation for Students

The College of Charleston community is enriched by students of many faiths that have various religious observances, practices, and beliefs. We value student rights and freedoms, including the right of each student to adhere to individual systems of religion. The College prohibits discrimination against any student because of such student’s religious belief or any absence thereof.

The College acknowledges that religious practices differ from tradition to tradition and that the demands of religious observance in some traditions may cause conflicts with student schedules. In affirming this diversity, like many other colleges and universities, the College supports the concept of “reasonable accommodation for religious observance” in regard to class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and other academic work requirements, unless the accommodation would create an undue hardship on the College. Faculty are required, as part of their responsibility to students and the College, to ascribe to this policy and to ensure its fair and full implementation.

The accommodation request imposes responsibilities and obligations on both the individual requesting the accommodation and the College. Faculty members are expected to reasonably accommodate individual religious practices. Examples of reasonable accommodations for student absences might include: rescheduling of an exam or giving a make-up exam for the student in question; altering the time of a student’s presentation; allowing extra-credit assignments to substitute for missed class work or arranging for an increased flexibility in assignment dates. Regardless of any accommodation that may be granted, students are responsible for satisfying all academic objectives, requirements and prerequisites as defined by the instructor and by the College.

The Senate voted, passing the amendment.
Second proposed amendment: motion to change FAM, VI.A. VI.B, VI.D, and VI.H. This motion, as Ms. Caveny explained, seeks to change deadlines and address details related to reporting requirements in the tenure, promotion, third-year, and post-tenure review processes. The full text of the proposed amendment follows below:

**Action:** Change to Faculty/Administration Manual, VI.A, VI.B, VI.D, and VI.H, addressing reporting requirements and deadlines in tenure, promotion, review, and post-tenure review processes.

**Status:** To be presented to Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009. Committee will be requesting that Faculty Senate consider this motion at one of the April meetings.

**Intent:**
- To clarify deadline for President’s decisions and notifications in tenure, promotion, review, and post-tenure review processes.
- To keep August 15 and March 15 deadlines in the Faculty/Administration Manual but remove all other explicit deadlines, replacing explicit dates with more general references and referring readers to the annual calendars distributed for these two review processes.
- To replace many instances of “will” with “should” or “shall”.

**Motion:**

DEADLINES IN TENURE, PROMOTION, AND THIRD-YEAR REVIEWS

Changes are in color and are denoted with strikethrough (for deletion) and underline (for addition). Boldface headers were added for clarification. Remainder of the language was cut and pasted from the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM).

**FAM, pg 104, applicable to promotion reviews of all instructional faculty:** Normally, a petition nominating a faculty member to a higher rank should be made not later than August 15 of the academic year in which a decision on promotion is to be made. The faculty member will then be evaluated under the provisions outlined in Art. VI.D. entitled “Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty.”

**FAM, pg 109, applicable to instructors’ third-year evaluation and review for promotion:** By August 15, each Department Chair will should provide the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost with a list of faculty members to be considered.

**FAM, pg 118, applicable to promotion reviews of library faculty:** Deadline for Nomination. Normally, a petition nominating a library faculty member for promotion to a higher rank should be made not later than August 15 of the academic year in which a decision on promotion is to be made.
FAM, pg 120, applicable to all reviews of instructional and library faculty: By August 15, each Department Chair will should provide the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost with a list of faculty members to be considered. The Dean of Libraries will should provide a list of eligible library faculty members to the Provost.

FAM, pg 110, applicable to instructors’ third-year evaluation and review for promotion: A faculty member will shall submit to the chair of the departmental evaluation panel by the announced deadline a packet containing a current curriculum vitae and evidence assembled to demonstrate that the standards and criteria have been met.

FAM, pg 120, applicable to all reviews of instructional and library faculty: A faculty member will shall submit to the Chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel by the announced deadline a packet containing a current curriculum vitae and evidence assembled to demonstrate that the standards and criteria have been met. The review process begins once the faculty member’s contribution to the packet has been formally submitted for departmental evaluation.

FAM, pg 123, applicable to all reviews of instructional and library faculty: The evaluation panel chair will shall forward the panel’s recommendation(s) to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries by the announced deadline. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendation, this must be done by November 1 deadline is typically at the end of October. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this must be done by January 15 deadline is typically near mid-January.

FAM, pg 124, applicable to third-year evaluations of instructional and library faculty: The appropriate Dean will shall review the faculty member’s packet and the departmental evaluation panel’s recommendation, interview each candidate, and notify the candidate in writing of his/her recommendations. The recommendation of the Dean will be submitted in writing to the Provost by February 1. The Dean shall forward all packets, including those prepared for third-year review, to the Provost’s Office. The Dean shall submit his/her recommendations in writing to the Provost and forward all materials to the Provost’s Office by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of January.

FAM, pg 124, applicable to tenure and promotion reviews of instructional and library faculty: The appropriate Dean will review the evaluation panel recommendations and the candidate’s packet and may choose to interview candidates. The Dean will notify the candidate in writing of his/her recommendations. The Dean will forward these materials to a designated room for review by the Provost and the Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion review by December 1. The Dean will provide his/her recommendation to the Provost by December 1. The Dean shall provide his/her recommendations in writing to the Provost and forward all materials to a designated room for review by the Provost and the Advisory Committee on Tenure.
Promotion, and Review by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of November.

FAM, pg 124, applicable to tenure and promotion reviews of instructional and library faculty: The Provost will shall make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Reappointment. The Faculty Advisory Committee will shall notify each candidate in writing of its recommendation by the announced deadlines.

FAM, pg 124, applicable to third-year reviews of instructional and library faculty: The Committee will shall also review third-year candidates on all negative departmental recommendations or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost. In cases where the Dean’s decision is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, he/she will shall refer the case to the Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee for their recommendations. The Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee will shall interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when the departmental panel or the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries recommendation is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative. The Provost’s and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s recommendation will be submitted in writing to the President.

NEW PARAGRAPHS to be added just after the preceding paragraph: The Provost’s recommendations for all reviews and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s recommendations in cases where they act shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines.

FAM, pg 125, applicable to tenure and promotion reviews of instructional and library faculty: After the Faculty Advisory Committee has made its written recommendation to the President, the Provost may interview the candidate as part of his/her independent evaluation of the candidate. The Provost’s recommendation will shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines.

FAM, pg 125, applicable to all reviews: Upon receipt of the recommendations of the departmental evaluation panel, appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost, the President shall make a final determination and inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair in writing of his/her decision by March 15 or within two weeks of receipt of the recommendations, whichever comes later. In the course of deliberation, the President shall have access to all materials used in the evaluation. The President shall make a final determination within 2 weeks after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the departmental evaluation panel, the appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year. In addition to these recommendations, 4 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by her/him, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair, in writing, of her/his decision.

DEADLINES IN POST-TENURE REVIEW

Changes are in color and are denoted with strikethrough (for deletion) and underline (for addition). Boldface headers were added for clarification. Remainder of the language was cut and pasted from the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM).

FAM, pg 128: A Faculty Member Will Submit to Her/His Department Chair a Packet of Material that Must Include A faculty member shall submit to his/her Department Chair by the announced deadline a packet of material that must include:

FAM, pg 130: The department chair (or the departmental panel) will shall forward to the candidate’s dean by December the announced deadline, typically mid-December, the candidate’s packet with either a brief letter of acknowledgement of the chair’s (or panel’s) concurrence with the candidate’s self-evaluation or a detailed negative letter to the candidate’s dean. At this time a copy of the letter will shall be forwarded to the candidate.

FAM, pg 130: The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review and forward its recommendations to the Provost by the end of February announced deadline, typically at the end of February. Normally, the committee will not review a "satisfactory" recommendation unless the candidate requests the committee to do so. The Provost may make a recommendation and will shall forward all recommendations to the President by the announced deadline.

FAM, pg 130: Upon receipt of the recommendations of the department chair (or the departmental panel), and any or all of the following: the appropriate dean, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the Provost, the President shall make a final determination and inform the candidate, the Provost, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, the dean, and the department chair in writing of his/her decision by March 15 or within two weeks of receipt of the recommendations. In the course of deliberation, the President shall have access to all materials used in the evaluation. The President shall make a final determination within 2 weeks after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the department chair (or the departmental panel chair), the appropriate Dean, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year. In addition to these recommendations, the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing

5 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by her/him, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the department chair (or departmental panel chair), in writing, of her/his decision.

The Senate vote, passing the amendment.

**Third proposed amendment to the FAM:** motion to change VI.H.2, Post-tenure Review, Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet. This motion seeks to change the number of letters required for those seeking a satisfactory rating in their post-tenure review. The full text of the proposed amendment follows below:

**Action:** Change to *Faculty/Administration Manual*, VI.H.2, *Post-tenure Review*, Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet.

**Status:** To be presented to Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009. Committee will request that Faculty Senate consider this motion at one of their two April meetings.

**Intent:**
- To remove the requirement of two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers for candidates seeking a “satisfactory” rating
- To still require two letters from candidates seeking a “superior” rating

**Motion:**

VI, Sect. H, *Post-tenure Review*

2. Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member’s Packet

a. A Faculty Member Will Submit to Her/His Department Chair a Packet of Material that Must Include:

1. A letter from the candidate indicating the rating for which he/she wishes to be considered.
2. Curriculum vitae.
3. Statement from the candidate on teaching, research and service addressing accomplishments since the last review and future plans and goals.
4. Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate during the period under review.
5. Annual performance evaluations by the department chair during the period under review. In the event that a department chair is being evaluated, the dean's annual evaluations of the chair will be included instead.
6. Two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of the candidate's teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency).
7. Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must also furnish clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness (exemplary professional competency in the case
of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship. This evidence must include two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of the candidate’s teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency). Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must also include at least two scholarly articles and/or books (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Candidates must provide evidence that the scholarly material submitted is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated. Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews.

(8) (7) A late packet will not be considered for a superior rating except in extraordinary circumstances. A letter must accompany the packet to explain these circumstances.

The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

Fourth proposed amendment: motion to change FAM, X.A.2, the section concerning benefits when on unpaid leave. Ms. Caveny said that this motion constitutes a human resources issue and probably should be handled by the Human Resources Office. It is an example of how for some changes in the FAM we only need to be informed about them and shouldn’t have to vote on them. The full text of the motion follows below:

Action: Change to Faculty/Administration Manual, X.A.2, Leave of Absence.

Status: To be presented to Faculty Senate on April 7, 2009. Committee will be requesting that Faculty Senate consider this motion at one of the April meetings.

Intent:
- To remove a false suggestion that a faculty member can avoid paying for benefits while on leave without pay

Motion:

FAM X.A.2. Leave of Absence:

Any member of the tenured or untenured faculty may apply to the Provost for a leave of absence without pay for a period of up to two years. Such leaves commonly are granted to complete the doctoral dissertation, to enable a professor to return to graduate school, to accept a post-doctorate fellowship, to pursue research or to participate in a faculty exchange or internship program. When granted to an untenured faculty member, a scholarly leave of absence of one year or less will count as part of the probationary period as though it were prior service at another institution, unless the individual and the institution agree in writing to an exception to this provision at the time the leave is granted.
Normally a leave without pay will not be for longer than two years. Any agreement to the contrary will be fully outlined in the leave of absence document given to the faculty member.

A faculty member on leave may petition the Provost for an extension of his or her leave period. Such a request should be made at least three months before the date of termination of the authorized leave. The Provost will consult with the Dean and Department Chair, and after consideration, rule on the extension.

In the case of a leave of absence without pay, faculty members must pick up funded portions of any health and/or life insurance plans plus the payroll deduction amount if they desire to continue this coverage. However, participants do have the option to terminate all coverage until such time as they return to an active pay status. Faculty members considering a request for leave without pay should consult with Human Resources regarding benefits.

The President of the College has the sole discretion to accept or reject the Provost’s recommendation concerning the faculty member’s request for a leave of absence.

The Senate voted, passing the amendment.

Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

The Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review (T & P Committee) had three motions to bring before the Senate: the first two involved changes to the FAM, and the third was a recommendation to relieve the workload of the T & P Committee.

First T & P Motion: change FAM, VI.A by amending language governing “Exemplary area.” As Richard Nunan, chair of the committee, noted, this motion concerns the use of the word “exemplary” when judging faculty in the tenure, promotion, and third-year review processes. He explained that now the FAM requires “exemplary” levels of performance in at least one area—teaching, research, or service—and “high professional competence” in all. Such a standard is not realistic, he said; and faculty have never seen it as realistic. We pretend that someone who is strong or good in an area is “exemplary.” A more realistic approach that merits institutional support is to reward with tenure and promotion those faculty who present a solid, well-balanced record and do good work in all areas. Mr. Nunan also noted that junior faculty are not generally expected to develop strong service records and their chairs, while encouraging them to engage in service activities, advise them not to become heavily burdened with service work. The motion, he said, would modify the FAM to better reflect this reality. The full text of the motion is as follows:

Page numbers refer to pagination in the current on-line pdf copy of the FAM.

Motion 1: Recommendation to Amend Language Governing ‘Exemplary area’
Modify VI.A (p. 93), second paragraph of Preamble to section on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-year Review, to read as follows:

"Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service. In addition, evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required."

[The last sentence of above paragraph currently reads: “In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas.”]

Similarly, VI.A.4.a (p. 102), last sentence in first paragraph of section enumerating specific criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should read:

“Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required.”

[That sentence currently reads: “Evidence of exemplary performance is required in at least one of the specified professional competency areas.”]

VI.A.4.b (p. 103), second sentence of paragraph enumerating specific criteria for tenuring candidates who were hired at the rank of Associate Professor should read:

Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required.”

[That sentence is currently identical to the language just quoted for section 4.a]

VI.A.4.c (p. 103), last sentence of first paragraph enumerating specific criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor should read:

“Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas is required.”

[That sentence is currently identical to the language just quoted for section 4.a]

Meg Cormack (at-large), speaking in support of the motion, said the changes were excellent and thanked the T & P Committee for proposing them. Bob Perkins (Teacher Education) asked if service could count as area of “exemplary” work. Mr. Nunan replied that it could. In response, Norris Preyer (Physics) noted that Mr. Nunan’s remarks indicated that service was being excluded as a category that one could count as “exemplary.” Mr. Nunan responded that
service was not being excluded, but that it was unlikely that junior faculty would count service as their “exemplary” area. Debra Socha McGee (Communication) observed that a faculty member who came here from another institution without tenure might be heavily involved in service and chose service as an area of “exemplary” work.

At this point, Steve Jaumé called for a quorum. A count of the remaining Senators was conducted by the Speaker, who found that there were just enough for a quorum. Mr. Nunan urged the Senate to deal with the T & P issues now, pointing out that to stop now might mean it would be another year before these proposed changes to the FAM could be made. Ms. Caveny noted that any Senate votes on the section of the FAM dealing with T & P are advisory only.

Debate on the motion resumed. Jason Coy (at-large) spoke against it. He thought the tenor was somewhat disturbing, as it seemed to lower standards, which he thought was unwise, particularly at a time when (as Mr. Wilder indicated in his report) we are paying new faculty at the assistant professor level more than ever. Ms. Cormack supported the motion, saying that on the issue of service she had always viewed it as something faculty focused on post-tenure, after proving that they belonged by doing quality work in teaching and research. Julia Eichelberger (at-large) said that she supported the motion, though she found the language or key terms of the motion—“exemplary,” significant achievement,” and “high professional competence”—a little unclear. To help clarify things, she noted that the term “high professional competence” seemed to mark an important threshold of good work and translated into a grade of “B.” The term “significant achievement” seemed to indicate a slightly higher notch in quality, something like a “B+”; and “exemplary” suggested an “A,” an extraordinary level of achievement that really distinguishes one. So the proposal, Ms. Eichelberger continued, says that for tenure and promotion faculty need to meet a standard in teaching and research that is actually quite high.

Sarah Owen (at-large) said that she also found the terms a little confusing, but was especially concerned about the idea that service could be counted as “exemplary” for tenure. “Is that true,” she asked? That is true, replied Mr. Nunan, so long as the threshold of “high professional competence” is met in all three areas. Mr. Krasnoff was worried about the phrase “significant achievement,” pointing out that this constituted a new category—one that is supposed to have real meaning as opposed to the category of “exemplary,” which, according to Mr. Nunan, has become a kind of phony category. He wondered if Mr. Nunan was concerned about the meaning of this new category. Tim Carens (English) also asked for more comment on the distinction between “high professional competence” and “significant achievement.” Mr. Nunan replied that a new category was needed because the phrase “exemplary” did not accurately apply to quality work done by faculty, which should be validated and supported by the institution. He acknowledged that it is not really possible to quantify these categories. We simply do the best we can to interpret them and draw distinctions among them. John Huddlestun (Religious Studies), speaking in support of the motion, echoed Mr. Nunan’s comment, saying that we design the categories and do our best to figure what they mean and how they work. He emphasized that the key idea behind the motion—that if you are strong in the three areas (teaching, research, and service) you deserve tenure and promotion—is sound.
Mr. Jaumé asked at what level the evaluation applies—departmental, the level of the T & P Committee, the level of the deans? Mr. Nunan responded that the evaluation and the new language apply at every level, starting with the department. At each level, one reads the language in the FAM and tries to exercise one’s best judgment as to how to apply it.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) spoke in support of the motion, saying the proposed changes were great. We waste time, he continued, debating what is “exemplary.” He liked the idea of talking about significant achievements of tenure and promotion candidates, especially at the departmental level and in the formal evaluation letter.

The Senate voted, passing the motion.

Second T & P Motion: Change FAM VI.A.4.c(1) by eliminating “Exemplary Teaching Effectiveness” Standard for Promotion to Professor. The full text of the motion follows below:

Motion 2: Recommendation to Eliminate ‘Exemplary Teaching Effectiveness’ Standard for Promotion to Professor

VI.A.4.c(1) on p. 103, characterizing criterion for promotion to the rank of Professor in the area of teaching should read:

(1) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires sustained high quality and effective teaching.

[That sentence currently reads: (1) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires exemplary teaching effectiveness.]

[The proposed change would replace the exemplary teaching effectiveness standard with language signaling an expectation of continuing development as a teacher since meeting the standard for tenure (sustained effectiveness in teaching) VI.A.4.a(1), p. 102.]

Mr. Nunan explained that the motion does two things. First, it clears up a confusion in the language of the FAM: on the one hand, the FAM currently says that promotion to professor requires “exemplary performance” in one of three areas (teaching, research, or service); on the other, it requires “exemplary teaching effectiveness,” which inadvertently implies that the “exemplary performance” must be in the area of teaching. The motion removes this confusion. Second, the motion also states in plainer language what the standard for teaching is. Now, Mr. Nunan explained, no one knows what “exemplary teaching effectiveness” means. The proposed language makes plain that the for promotion to professor, a faculty member must be a strong teacher.

The Senate voted, passing the motion.
Third T & P motion: workload relief for those serving on the T & P Committee. Mr. Nunan explained that the T & P Committee would like the Senate to endorse this recommendation, which would grant those serving on the T & P Committee a one-course workload reduction for spring semester. The work-relief proposal is justified given how onerous, stressful, and time-consuming the task of serving on the committee is. The proposal, Mr. Nunan added, has been brought up with the Academic Affairs Office in the past. The full text of the motion is as follows:

**Motion 3: Recommendation for workload relief for all regular members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review**

Whenever the total number of tenure, promotion, and renewal cases before the President’s Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review exceeds 25 in a single academic year, the five regular members of the Committee should be granted extra workload relief in the form of a teaching reduction of one course section for the spring semester of that year.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked how often the twenty-five-case threshold is reached. Mr. Nunan answered that it had been reached each time in the last three years when he has been on the committee. Mr. Perkins said that he endorsed the proposal, as would anyone who has served on the committee. There is “an amazing amount of work” required of this committee.

Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) took a different view, saying that the T & P Committee brings such work burdens upon itself because it does very comprehensive reviews, which are not required by the FAM. “What would you have us do,” asked Mr. Nunan? The FAM, Mr. Preyer observed, does not require that the T & P Committee do an independent evaluation. Mr. Nunan disagreed with that interpretation of the FAM, adding that the T & P Committee has conducted independent evaluations for years.

Mr. Krasnoff spoke in support of the proposal, but added that the Senate should think about whether it might be a better idea to have such detailed, independent reviews done at the school level. A shorter, procedural review could then be done at the college level. Rob Dillon (Biology) emphasized Mr. Preyer’s point, which he thought was excellent. The T & P Committee’s job, he continued, is to ensure that the proper procedure for reviews has been followed at the departmental level. That task can be done quickly, in about half a day. He thought there was no need for the proposal.

David Gentry (at-large) asked about how alternates on the T & P Committee are currently used. Mr. Nunan said that in recent years, typically only a single alternate has been used when regular members have to be replaced. There is a big advantage both with respect to familiarity with the process and consistency of judgment to having an alternate review several cases rather than just one. The alternate is chosen by lottery from among those actually available, given their teaching schedules.

The Senate passed the proposal on a voice vote.
Mr. Dillon asked for a division of the house. Speaker Kelly asked those who voted for the proposal to raise their hands, counted their hands, and repeated the process for those who voted against the proposal. The vote was 24 (in favor) to 11 (opposed). A Senator then asked if the sum of the votes constitutes a quorum. Speaker Kelly said no, and George Pothering (Parliamentarian) explained that they don’t because some voters may abstain in the vote.

Reports

Richard Nunan, chair of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

Mr. Nunan said that he wished to summarize his committee’s report, but encouraged Senators to read the whole thing, which deals with issues that need to be addressed next year. (The report is available on the Faculty Senate Web site.)

The first item of the report concerned a slight difference in the FAM about research expectations between those seeking tenure and those seeking promotion to Professor. The difference centers on the use of the word “typically” when referencing the need for scholarly publications for tenure, a qualifier that, as Mr. Nunan pointed out, is absent from the corresponding standard for promotion to Professor. If publications are required at both levels, Mr. Nunan contended that this word should be excised from the tenure standard.

The second item concerned standards in the area of service that are slightly different for those seeking tenure from those seeking promotion to Professor. One difference is in the phrase “in a leadership capacity,” which is found in the standards for promotion to Professor, but not in the standards for tenure. There is a question as to how seriously the standard of “leadership capacity” is taken, what precisely the phrase means, and whether it is (or can be) uniformly applied across the College. Another issue centers on the phrase “service . . . where appropriate, to the community.” Mr. Nunan said that there is ambiguity in how to interpret this aspect of the service standard and how it applies to various disciplines across the College.

The third item concerned the standards for tenure and promotion of librarians, the one group for whom no scholarly publishing is required for tenure. However, for promotion to Librarian III and then to Librarian IV, the FAM does seem to indicate some publication requirement (although even that is not entirely clear). But the phrase “clear evidence of continued professional development and growth” becomes difficult to assess at the level of the tenure evaluation, if no substantive publication record is required. Mr. Nunan said that he was not at the meeting to criticize librarians, but to point out that it is somewhat illogical to require no publications for librarians to receive tenure, only to later suggest such a requirement for promotion at higher levels (Librarian III and IV).

Also related to item three is the fact that the language governing the professional growth and development standards for librarians is slightly different than that governing the professional growth and development standards for other faculty. For example, the word “high” is absent from the phrase “promise for continued professional growth and development” in the standard
for tenure for librarians, as is the phrase “All evidence should be evaluated rigorously.” Another related issue is that the Dean of the Libraries is given a special status, which other deans don’t have, in the process of evaluating faculty. These are two issues, Mr. Nunan concluded, that need to be discussed.

Mr. Preyer asked if the phrase “focused research,” used in his own department, is in the document. Mr. Nunan replied that the FAM contained no specific constraints on the precise nature of the academic research required for a successful evaluation, and that, so far as he knew, use of the phrase was unique to Mr. Preyer's department.

Laquita Blockson (Management and Entrepreneurship) asked if the committee’s recommendations would go into effect in the fall 2010 semester, were they to be adopted next term. Mr. Nunan thought that fall 2010 would probably be when they would go into effect. Following up, Ms. Blockson asked how the changes (should they be approved) would affect those faculty going up for tenure and promotion. Would they be grandfathered in? Mr. Nunan answered that the grandfathering approach was unlikely, since the revised standards would actually broaden, rather than narrow the range of thresholds available for justifying tenure and promotions.

With the report concluded and the Senate’s business completed, there was a motion to adjourn, which was instantly seconded and approved. The Senate adjourned at around 6:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary
Appendix 1

Language on Annual/Merit Evaluation to Go in the FAM

E. Procedures for Annual and Merit Evaluation of Regular Instructional and Library Faculty

1. Introduction

In keeping with S.C. state law, all faculty members at the College of Charleston will be evaluated annually in accordance with the College’s established standards and criteria and with established procedures.

Department Chairs and the Dean of Libraries are responsible for the annual performance evaluation of each faculty member within their departments. In the exceptional case that a faculty member is housed in a program and not in a department, the Program Director will assume the role of Department Chair in the evaluation process.

Annual evaluations shall serve two functions: (1) to guide the professional development of the faculty member, and (2) to record part of the evidence upon which personnel decisions and salary recommendations shall be based. Accordingly,

- each regular faculty member of the College of Charleston will be evaluated annually on the basis of performance over the last calendar year at the College.

In addition,

- each faculty member with at least one full calendar year of service at the College will be assigned a merit category on the basis of performance over the last three calendar years (or the time since hire if this is less than three years) as one factor to be considered in the determination of any salary increase.

Newly hired faculty members will not be assigned a merit category. Instead, normally each will receive an “average” raise determined by the relevant dean and based on the percentage of the salary pool allocated to the faculty member’s school for raises.

Each annual performance evaluation should include strengths, weaknesses, and specific recommendations for improvement. Probationary faculty should be rigorously evaluated each year in preparation for third-year and tenure reviews. In the case of a tenured faculty member or a Senior Instructor, the assessment may be less
detailed. A faculty member, Chair, Dean or Provost can request that a more extensive evaluation be conducted in any given year. A faculty member may make a request for a more detailed evaluation at any time. A Chair, Dean or Provost should make a request by October 1 of the calendar year for which performance is to be evaluated in order to provide time for a faculty member to assemble required materials.

The form of the performance evaluation may vary by school and department, as well as by the rank of the faculty member being evaluated. At a minimum, the Chair or Dean of Libraries will provide an appraisal letter addressing teaching effectiveness, research and professional development, and professional service (for teaching faculty) and professional competency, professional growth and development, and professional service (for library faculty). Notification to the faculty member of the merit category assigned, which may take place separately from the discussion of the annual evaluation, should include a brief justification of the category assigned. Departments and schools may develop additional rating instruments.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to ensure that he/she is making progress toward meeting the criteria published in the Faculty/Administration Manual for other evaluations (tenure and promotion) as well as any additional criteria approved by the school and/or department, and to seek the advice of the Chair or Dean of Libraries and other department faculty toward that end.

A tenure and/or promotion review requires additional evidence beyond that required for an annual review of performance or assignment of merit category, as well as assessment over a different time frame. For instance, a department may conduct a peer review of teaching or an external review of research, and graduate surveys are solicited, at the time of tenure and promotion decisions.

Annual performance and merit reviews constitute only one of many factors that are considered during the tenure and/or promotion decision-making process and in no way conclusively determine that outcome. Because tenure and promotion decisions often involve an assessment of career achievement and potential, as well as a demonstrated ongoing commitment to scholarship and to the mission of the institution, annual performance reviews and the assignment of merit categories to a faculty member for purposes of salary administration for one or several years are insufficient, by themselves, to determine the outcome of such important decisions.

2. Standards, Criteria and Evidence for Annual Evaluation
Schools and departments will develop specific policies, criteria and standards for annual evaluation and the assignment of merit categories in their units. Criteria should be clearly stated and available to all members of the department. They may vary in detail but they must be consistent with general College policies. (See Faculty/Administration Manual, Sections A, B and C.) In particular, teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston.

The Faculty Welfare Committee and an ad Hoc committee of past members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review will provide comments on departmental and school evaluation instruments upon their initial development. Approval of these plans by the appropriate Academic Dean and by the Provost is required before implementation. After initial adoption, any significant changes must be sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee for review/recommendations and to the Provost for approval before implementation. All approved school and department annual evaluation and merit review policies will be available to all College faculty members.

3. Annual Evaluation and Merit Review Process

Annual evaluations will normally be completed early in each calendar year. A calendar for the evaluation process will be posted on the website of the Office of Academic Affairs.

While specific policies may differ by school and department, all annual evaluations should provide sufficient information to allow for full, fair and constructive evaluation without being unnecessarily burdensome to faculty or Department Chairs. At a minimum, faculty members will provide

- a current *curriculum vitae*, and
- a 1-2 page personal statement presenting accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research and professional development, and service (or, in the case of librarians, professional competence, professional growth and development, and service) over the last calendar year.

Schools and/or departments may require faculty to submit additional material, and required documentation may vary by tenure status and rank. Evidence of the sort typically provided for major evaluations should be requested of probationary faculty; schools may require less extensive documentation for tenured faculty and Senior Instructors. Schools and departments may require that the personal statement
include goals for the next one-to-three years. The Department Chair or
Dean of Libraries will conduct the annual evaluation and will have
access to additional information, including the faculty member’s

• previous annual evaluations and personal statements,
• course evaluations, and
• information included in the Faculty Activity System.

To facilitate Chairs’ work in assigning merit categories, concurrent
with the submission of materials for the annual evaluation of
performance, any faculty member with at least one full calendar year of
service at the College of Charleston will submit

• a 1-2 page personal statement presenting accomplishments in
  the areas of teaching, research and professional development,
  and service (or, in the case of librarians, professional
  competence, professional growth and development, and service)
  over the last three calendar years, if employed by the College
during that period of time, or, for a faculty member with fewer
than three years of service at the College of Charleston, over the
period since hire.

The Department Chair or Dean of Libraries will assign a merit category
on the basis of this three-year summary and the annual evaluations over
the same three calendar years. In the case of the Department Chair, this
assignment will normally be tentative until discussed with the Dean.
Newly hired faculty members need not submit any additional materials.

In the case of a faculty member undergoing a major evaluation (Third-
Year Review, tenure and/or promotion, post-tenure review, or renewal
as Senior Instructor), an evaluation of performance over the last
calendar year will not be conducted. A merit category for the purposes
of salary administration will be assigned. Normally, the documentation
provided by the faculty member in the major evaluation will be
sufficient to allow the Chair to assign a merit category. (Since major
evaluation packets are completed early in the fall semester,
documentation of activities through the end of the calendar year could
reasonably be added for this assignment.) This assignment of a merit
category will consider the faculty member’s performance during the
same three-year window used for other faculty.

The Department Chair may consult with a faculty committee in
conducting the annual evaluation or assigning a merit category.

The faculty member must present the requested documents in
accordance with the established format for his/her department or school
and the published schedule. Any faculty member who fails to submit the required documentation for his/her annual evaluation and assignment of merit category will receive a merit rating of “does not meet the merit threshold” and will be ineligible for a salary increase that year.

In the case of library faculty who are supervised by department heads and/or assistant Deans, these supervisors will provide written comments on the performance of the librarians. These comments are forwarded to the Dean of Libraries who uses them as he/she writes the final evaluation narrative. The librarian receives the comments from all supervisors in addition to the Dean’s final evaluation.

After reviewing materials submitted by the faculty member, the Department Chair or the Dean of Libraries shall provide the faculty member with a signed and dated evaluation.

4. Chair’s Interview with the Faculty Member

By the date designated on the evaluation calendar, the Chair or Dean of Libraries shall conduct an interview with each member of his/her department. At least one week prior to the interview, the faculty member will receive the Chair’s or Dean of Libraries’ narrative assessment of strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for improvement. Records of the evaluation will be on file in the office of the Department Chair.

At the evaluation interview, the faculty member and the Chair or Dean of Libraries will discuss the evaluation narrative. The faculty member will sign the form to indicate that he or she has met with the Chair or Dean of Libraries. If there is disagreement about any part of the evaluation, the Chair or Dean of Libraries and the faculty member shall seek to resolve those differences. If a resolution is reached, the Chair shall change the evaluation document accordingly if appropriate.

5. Appeal of Annual Evaluation

A faculty member may appeal his/her annual evaluation to the appropriate Academic Dean by submitting a written request for an appeal hearing to the Dean within 10 working days of the evaluation interview. The Dean will arrange and chair a meeting with the faculty member and the Department Chair to discuss the appeal. At the appeal hearing, the faculty member should state specifically the basis for the appeal and provide appropriate information in support of the appeal. The Dean will attempt to mediate an agreement between the faculty member and the Chair. If unsuccessful, the Dean will reach a decision
and inform all parties in writing. The faculty member may appeal the Dean’s decision to the Provost who will receive all written material pertaining to the case. After consultation with the faculty member, the Department Chair and the Dean, the Provost will render the final decision in writing to all parties concerned.

Library faculty should follow the steps outlined above. Their appeals should, however, go directly to the Provost, who will render the final decision.

6. Dean’s and Provost’s Role in the Assignment of Merit Categories

The Dean plays an active role in the development of departmental and school criteria and standards for annual evaluation and the assignment of merit categories. The Dean is responsible for ensuring that these standards and criteria are applied by chairs equitably across departments in his or her school. The Provost is responsible for ensuring that these standards and criteria are applied by Deans across schools. Normally a Dean and Chair will discuss the assignment of merit categories before a faculty member is notified of such. Notification to the faculty member of the assignment of a merit category may occur separately from the annual evaluation.

7. Appeal of Merit Category Assigned

A faculty member may appeal the assignment of a merit category to his or her performance by following the procedure outlined in Section 5, Appeal of Annual Evaluation, above. Chair, Dean and provost will proceed as in Section 5. However, the Provost’s role in this appeal is limited to ensuring, through discussion with the Dean and/or Chair, that the assignment of the merit category is consistent with criteria and standards at the Department, School and College level and with the assignment of merit categories to others in the Department or School, as appropriate.

F. Merit categories and Salary Increases

Eligibility for any salary increase will be based on merit. The assignment of a merit category will indicate whether the faculty member is eligible for any salary increase. Eligibility for any salary increase requires satisfying the merit threshold. The merit threshold is defined as demonstrating professional competence in all three evaluation areas (teaching, research and professional development, service) according to criteria and standards articulated by schools and departments. Criteria and standards may vary by school, department, tenure status and rank.
The description of additional merit categories will be available on the Academic Affairs website during 2008-09 and included in the Faculty/Administration Manual thereafter.

In addition to merit ratings, market factors may contribute to a salary increase. Market factors will contribute to any salary increase only when the faculty member has met the merit threshold. Market factors may include:

- Data collected in comparative salary studies;
- Internal (College, school, departmental) equity, including gender equity, salary compression and/or inversion.

The respective roles of merit and market factors in salary reviews may vary each year and by school and department and should be communicated annually to faculty as appropriate.