

**COLLEGE of  
CHARLESTON**  
*Faculty/Administration Manual Changes*

**Log of Changes from August 2013 – August 2014**  
For the Committee on By-laws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual*

**Changes to faculty By-laws:** The following two changes were developed by the appropriate faculty committees, reviewed and forwarded to the Faculty Senate by the Committee on By-laws and the FAM, approved by the Faculty Senate, and ratified by the full faculty, as required.

**Article V.1.K. Clarifying the reference of “faculty” in the *FAM***

- To clarify that only “regular” faculty (and not including visiting roster faculty, adjunct faculty, or academic administrators with faculty standing), are eligible to serve in faculty positions on faculty and Faculty Senate committees; change has no impact on the largely ex officio service of administrators on standing faculty and Faculty Senate committees
- Introduced Motion to More Clearly Define Faculty Eligibility for Committee Work, Change to By-laws Article V, Section 1, K in October 2013 meeting
- Discussed and passed Motion in December 2013 meeting (minutes: <http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2013-2014/nov-2013/Minutes%2011-5-13.pdf>)
- Ratified by the full faculty.
- Change FAM Article V.1.K. (*see attached*)

**Article V.3.B.15a.5. and V.3.B.7a.5. To amend the membership of the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review**

- To specify that faculty undergoing post-tenure review should not serve on the faculty Post-Tenure Review Committee, and faculty undergoing promotion review should not serve on the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review
- Introduced Motion to Exclude Faculty Members Currently under Post-Tenure Review from the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 15 a 5 and Motion to Exclude Faculty Members Currently under Promotion Review from the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review. Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 7 a 5 in October 2013 meeting
- Discussed and passed Motions in December 2013 meeting (minutes: <http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2013-2014/december-2013/Motion%20to%20exclude%20faculty%20under%20review%20from%20PTR.pdf>)
- Ratified by the full faculty.
- Change FAM Article Article V.3.B.15a.3. and V.3.b.7a.3. (*see attached*)

**Changes to the administration sections of the FAM:** The following changes were proposed, presented, and endorsed by the appropriate faculty committees and offices, as required.

**Sections VI.E, III.A, VI.B, and VI.H. On amending the annual and merit evaluation processes, post-tenure review process, and Senior Instructor renewal calendars** (*the overall process is outlined here and the description of each section change is given below*)

- Developed from two Provost's workshops with deans, department chairs, and heads of relevant faculty committees (Faculty Welfare, the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, Faculty Compensation and the Post-Tenure Review Committee). The outcome of those workshops was then conceptualized into a formal proposal by the Senior Vice Provost, with support from the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, endorsed by the Provost, reviewed within departments and Academic Council, reviewed and endorsed by the appropriate faculty committees, and presented to the Faculty Senate. There were no substantive changes recommended by members of the Faculty Senate.
- Senior Vice Provost presented conceptual proposal and solicited feedback in Faculty Senate April 2014 meeting (minutes: <http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2013-2014/april-2014/minutes%202014-4-1.pdf>)
- The actual FAM language changes were then developed by the Senior Vice Provost, consistent with the formal proposal, endorsed by the Provost, and reviewed and endorsed by the faculty Committee on the By-laws and FAM.
- Change FAM Sections VI.E, III.A, VI.B, and VI.H. (*see below*)

**Section VI.E. On amending the “Procedures for the Annual and Merit Evaluation of Regular Instructional and Library Faculty”**

- To streamline the annual and merit evaluation processes and to streamline annual evaluation processes by: (1) clarifying the roll-over of full performance evaluations for up to three years for Senior Instructors and tenured faculty members with no performance issues, and (2) making explicit that subsequent evaluations in those cases should cover the period since the last full performance evaluation, rather than just a year. Faculty would still update their department chair on their performance annually for the purposes of merit (raise) evaluations.
- Change FAM Section VI.E. (*see attached*)

**Section III.A. and Section VI.B. On amending the review for renewal as Senior Instructor from the fifth to seventh year.**

- To amend Senior Instructor renewal reviews from every fifth year to every seventh year to better align with changes in the annual evaluation process.
- Change FAM Section III.A. and Section VI.B. (*see attached*)

**Section VI.H. On amending the Post-Tenure Review process.**

- To streamline post-tenure review for tenured faculty who have received satisfactory annual evaluations since their last post-tenure review, to precipitate to an “unsatisfactory” post-tenure review rating (and existing remediation plan) in the event of two unsatisfactory

annual evaluations in the six-year period since the last post-tenure review, and to provide for additional documentation of the evaluation of teaching for faculty seeking a “superior” post-tenure review rating.

- Change FAM Section VI. (*see attached*)

#### **Section X.G. On amending the Faculty and Administrator’s Authority to Enter into Contractual Agreements on Behalf of the College**

- To amend the language to be consistent with an existing institutional policy (see Policy 2.3.1.1. <http://policy.cofc.edu/documents/2.3.1.1.pdf> )
- Proposed by the Office of Legal Affairs
- Discussed FAM changes with the Office of the Provost
- Change FAM Section X.G. (*see attached*)

#### **Section IX.B. On amending the Faculty Awards to include the “College of Charleston Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award”**

- To add the new award introduced by the Board of Trustees in Spring 2014
- Change FAM Section IX.B. (*see attached*)

#### **Other administrative sections**

- Update edition date
- Update College of Charleston logo
- Update Section I.A. “Approved College History” to correct and update the last four paragraphs, including corrections to the dates of the Theodore Stern’s presidency and updates to remaining text by the Interim Provost.
- Update Section I.C. “Statement of Institutional Purpose (Mission Statement)” to include the dates the FAM was approved or revised by the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston and CHE
- Non-substantive corrections of titles, punctuation, and capitalization. Other non-substantive corrections and clarifications.

## Log of Pending Changes

For future consideration for the 2014-2015 *Faculty/Administration Manual*

### Section VIII.C On amending the “Class Attendance” to provide guidance when students are absent for college-related activities.

- Proposal brought to Senate for informational purposes and discussion only. Speaker noted the proposed revision is for a section of the *FAM* over which the faculty does not have direct control.
- Introduced by Andrea DeMaria, Chair, Faculty Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics)
- Discussed by the committee in January 2014 meeting (minutes: <http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2013-2014/jan-2014/2014-01-14%20minutes.pdf>)
- *Pending* changes to *FAM* Section VIII.C (*changes have not been made to this edition*)

### Section VIII.C. On amending the Students with Disabilities section

- To clarify the roles of students, faculty members, and the Office of Disability Services regarding academic accommodations for students with disabilities
- Prepared by: Deborah Mihal, Director, Center for Disability Services in consultation with: Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, Sarina Russotto, Director of Policy and Compliance
- *Pending* changes to *FAM* Section VIII.C (*changes have not been made to this edition*)

## **Attachments**

Changes to the 2014-2015 *Faculty/Administration Manual*

**Article V.1.K. Clarifying the reference of “faculty” in the FAM**

**Article V. Committees**

Section 1. General Regulations

K. For the remainder of Article V, references to the terms “faculty” or “faculty member” specifically mean all and only regular faculty members, as defined in Article I, Section 1, excluding all those qualifying as ex-officio regular faculty members under provision (3). (Rev. July 2014)

Article V.3.B.15a.5. and V.3.b.7a.5. To amend the membership of the Post-Tenure Review Committee and Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

**Article V. Committees**

Section 3. Standing College Committees

B. The following standing College committees are established:

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

a. Composition:

(3) No faculty member undergoing any level of administrative review (i.e., promotion or post tenure review) may serve on this committee during the academic year of that review. (Rev. July 2014)

15. Post-Tenure Review Committee

a. Composition:

(3) No faculty member undergoing any level of administrative review (i.e., promotion or post tenure review) may serve on this committee during the academic year of that review. (Rev. July 2014)

**Section VI.E. On amending the “Procedures for the Annual and Merit Evaluation of Regular Instructional and Library Faculty”**

**E. Procedures for the 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.

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.

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.

A full performance evaluation is conducted for each Instructor and untenured faculty member for each calendar year, with the exception of the years in which the Third-Year Review and the review for tenure or promotion to Senior Instructor are conducted.

~~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. Tenured faculty and Senior Instructors may request the same performance evaluation ratings that were given the previous year for up to two years. A full performance evaluation must be conducted at least once every three years, covering the calendar years since the last full performance evaluation or major evaluation (i.e., review for tenure and/or promotion or renewal as Senior Instructor, application for “superior” post-tenure review reviewed by the PTR or Post-Tenure Review Committee level). A faculty member hired with tenure will undergo full performance evaluations in his or her first and second years and at least every three years following.~~



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 recent 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 than for a probationary faculty member. 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~~ may 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 or school. They may vary in detail but they must be consistent with general College policies. (See Faculty/Administration Manual, Sections VI.A, VI.B, and VI.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 performance evaluations will normally be completed early in each calendar year. A calendar for the evaluation process ~~will be~~ is posted on the website of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Each tenured faculty member or Senior Instructor requests early in January, in writing to the chair, either that the rating received under the most recent full performance evaluation stand or that a full evaluation be conducted. In the case of a request that a previous evaluation stand, the chair will provide in writing by January 25 either approval of this request or a denial of the request and brief explanation of why a full evaluation will be conducted. A chair or dean may require that a faculty member undergo a full evaluation in any given year. The chair will provide the dean with a list of faculty for whom he or she expects to allow previous performance evaluations to stand and receive acknowledgement of this list before providing written approval of such requests to faculty. A department or school may require, as a component of a written policy, that all faculty undergo full performance evaluations every year.

Chairs are responsible for ensuring that a full evaluation of a Senior Instructor or tenured faculty member is conducted at least every three years. Deans are responsible for reviewing chairs' records and completed evaluations.

While specific policies may differ by school and department, all full annual performance 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 period since the last full performance evaluation.

~~Schools and/or departments may require faculty to submit additional material, and~~ Additional required documentation required for a full performance evaluation may vary by tenure status and rank or by department and school. 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-instructor evaluations, and

- information included in the Faculty Activity System.

If a previous performance evaluation is to stand, the faculty member enters recent accomplishments into the Faculty Activity System and provides his or her chair with an updated curriculum vita (with activities since the last performance evaluation highlighted) and any further information appropriate, in accordance with deadlines for the submission of updates listed on the calendar for performance evaluations. Such information will assist the chair and dean in the assignment of a merit category and recommendations for any merit raises available before the next full evaluation takes place.

~~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 at the time that performance evaluations are completed, based on a faculty member's recent performance evaluations, typically over the last three years. If a previous performance evaluation rating is remaining in place at the request of the faculty member, the assignment of a merit category will incorporate any additional information on recent accomplishments provided by the faculty member following approval of the request that the performance rating stand. 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 will not be assigned a merit category.

The assignment of a merit category will be provided to the faculty member with the written documentation of a full performance evaluation (as a separate document which should not be included with performance evaluations in packets prepared for major evaluations). For a faculty member who has received approval of a request that a full performance evaluation conducted previously remain standing, separate notice of the assignment of a merit category will be provided in writing following the

calendar for performance evaluations established by the Provost's Office.  
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, typically three years.

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 and separate assignment of a merit category.

#### 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~~ **this assignment is considered final. 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 VI.E.5, above. Chair, Dean and Provost will proceed as in Section VI.E.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.

(Rev. April 2009, [July 2014](#))

Section III.A. and Section VI.B. On amending the review for renewal as Senior Instructor from the fifth to seventh year.

### III. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

#### A. The Instructional Faculty

##### 2. Instructional Faculty Holding Non-tenure-track Lines or Positions

##### b. Special Faculty Ranks

- (2) Senior Instructor is a non-tenure-track rank for faculty who may not hold the terminal degree and who normally teach only lower division courses. Senior instructors are appointed to this rank after successful completion of a probationary employment period of six years at the rank of Instructor at which time they will be reviewed for continuation of employment at the rank of Senior Instructor. Appointment at this rank and reappointment for continuation take place after the Department Chair, the Departmental Evaluation Panel, the Dean, the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review, and the Provost have made their recommendations to the President. All recommendations are forwarded to the President who makes the final decision. In the case of a negative recommendation, the President will inform the candidate at least twelve months before the expiration of any appointment, thereby allowing an Instructor to serve one additional year beyond the sixth year. Senior Instructors will be reviewed every ~~fifth-seventh~~ year<sup>8</sup> for the continuation of employment according to the process outlined above. (Rev. July 2014)

<sup>8</sup> In 2014-15, Senior Instructors eligible for renewal in the fifth year under previous rules and procedures may decide, in consultation with their chair, whether to proceed for renewal in the fifth or to defer renewal till the seventh year. A Senior Instructor formerly eligible for renewal in 2015-16 may request through their chair and dean an evaluation in that year.

...

### VI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

#### B. Third-Year Review and Promotion of Instructors and Renewal of Senior Instructors

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, promotions, and renewals. The Provost, acting in accordance with the provisions stated in this Faculty/Administration Manual, is responsible for making the final recommendation to the President in respect to all such matters



A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward promotion to Senior Instructor has been made.

Promotion to Senior Instructor is awarded to eligible instructors at the College of Charleston for meritorious achievement in the three areas: teaching, professional development and service. A promotion decision is made only once normally in the sixth year. A review for renewal as Senior Instructor normally takes place every ~~fifth~~ seventh year<sup>30</sup>.

(Inst. April 2011; Rev July 2014)

<sup>30</sup>In 2014-15, Senior Instructors eligible for renewal in the fifth year under previous rules and procedures may decide, in consultation with their chair, whether to proceed for renewal in the fifth or to defer renewal till the seventh year. A Senior Instructor formerly eligible for renewal in 2015-16 may request through their chair and dean an evaluation in that year.

~~level of review, a different rating must be assigned at each that level of review.~~

bf. Appealing a Satisfactory Rating

A candidate who receives a satisfactory rating when having sought a superior rating and who alleges that the rating was based upon discrimination, violation of academic freedom or violation of due process may follow the appeals procedure outlined in Art. VII.B.

If the candidate feels that the satisfactory rating received is incorrect due to reasons other than those outlined in Art. VII.B, a formal appeal is not allowed. However, the faculty member remains eligible to apply for a superior rating in subsequent years.~~upon the candidate's request, the candidate will be allowed to undergo one "successive" post-tenure review the following year and to modify the packet so as to better document the case for a superior rating. The candidate is allowed to modify statements on teaching, research and service, to include additional or different peer letters, and, generally to strengthen the packet with the kinds of evidence outlined in Art. VII.B. However, other than the fact that the vita included in the packet shall be current, the evidence in the packet shall cover the same six-year period that was covered in the prior year's review. A candidate's post-tenure review cycle does not change as the result of undergoing a successive post-tenure review, and no further reviews covering the same six-year period are allowed.~~

Section VI. On amending the Post-Tenure Review process.

**H. Post-Tenure Review**

1. Introduction

A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review (tenure and/or promotion or post-tenure review).

6. Rating of Candidates

a. Ratings of a candidate will take one of three forms:

(1) Superior Rating

The superior rating is awarded to candidates who continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty/Administration Manual.

(2) Unsatisfactory Rating

Candidate has exhibited evidence of habitual neglect of duty, which means consistently and regularly failing to fulfill the terms and conditions of appointment, as laid out in the Faculty/Administration Manual's section on "Termination of Tenured Faculty Members 'for Cause' and Termination Procedure."

(3) Satisfactory Rating

All other candidates.

d. Presumption of Satisfactory Performance

The Post-Tenure Review Committee operates on a presumption of satisfactory performance. That is, the burden of proof (clear and convincing evidence) for a superior performance lies with the candidate, and the burden of proof for an unsatisfactory performance, including with completion of a remediation plan, lies with the department chair (or department post-tenure review panel). The Post-Tenure Review Committee can request additional information at any time during their deliberations.

2. Forms of Post-tenure Review

Consideration for “Satisfactory Rating

For a tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor or at the rank of Professor who wishes to be considered for a “satisfactory rating, in the spring semester of the sixth year following the previous extra-departmental review, the chair will review with the faculty member his or her performance evaluations over the last six years, including any evaluation completed in the sixth year. Following the discussion with the faculty member, the chair will discuss his or her overall summary of those performance evaluations with the dean.

A faculty member who has received two or more “unsatisfactory”unsatisfactory ratings in teaching (or, for a librarian, two or more “unsatisfactory”unsatisfactory ratings in professional competence) over that six-year period will be deemed to have received an “unsatisfactory”unsatisfactory rating for Post-Tenure Review. Otherwise, the faculty member will receive a rating of “satisfactory.” Formal written notice from the chair to the faculty member, dean and Post-tenure Review Committee of an unsatisfactory rating and need to develop a remediation plan will take place by March 15 of each academic year.

Application for Superior Rating

A faculty member at the rank of Professor or Librarian IV is eligible to apply for a superior rating in the fall of the sixth year following a successful extra-departmental review (promotion to professor, or a superior rating on a post-tenure review), provided the faculty member has not received two or more ratings of “unsatisfactory”unsatisfactory in teaching (or professional competence) since the last extra-departmental review. The “superior rating” is awarded to candidates who continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty/Administration Manual.

In the event that a candidate who is eligible for and has applied for a superior rating fails to receive that rating at a level of review, a rating of satisfactory will be assigned at that level of review.

## 5. Deferments

- a. Faculty members may petition the Post-Tenure Review Committee for the postponement of their post-tenure reviews based on extenuating personal circumstances, exceptional professional commitments, or valid medical reasons which must be documented in the petition. Petitions must be endorsed by the faculty member's chair and dean. Postponements will be approved only under extraordinary circumstances and will not normally extend more than one academic year. Decisions by the Post-Tenure Review Committee regarding deferments may be appealed to the Provost within one week of the candidate's notification. The Provost's decision shall be final.
- b. A faculty member who announces his/her decision to retire within three years of their scheduled time for post-tenure review (by submission of a letter to the dean of his/her school and the Provost) may choose not to undergo that review. However, if a faculty member postpones the announced time of retirement for more than one year, he/she will be evaluated in the year of that postponement.
- c. A faculty member scheduled for post-tenure review in a given year will not have to undergo that review if he/she petitions for promotion that same year.
- d. Administrators, such as Deans, rejoining the ranks of the faculty will undergo post-tenure review within three years of their return to faculty status.
- e. If a faculty member takes a sabbatical leave or a leave of absence in the same academic year he/she is scheduled for post-tenure review, the post-tenure review will take place during the following academic year, unless the faculty member decides to undergo the review at the originally scheduled time.
- f. All petitions for a deferment or a waiver of post-tenure review due to an announced retirement must be addressed to the Post-Tenure Review Committee. All official communications regarding postponement or waivers of review will be issued by said committee.

## 3. Superior Rating

A faculty member at the rank of Professor is eligible to apply for a superior rating in the fall of the sixth year following a successful extra-departmental

~~review (promotion to professor, or a superior rating on a post-tenure review). The faculty member will submit a packet of materials as described below in support of that application.~~

Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member's Packet in Application for Superior Rating

a. A faculty member who wishes to be considered for a superior rating shall submit to his/her Department Chair by the announced deadline a packet of material that must include:

~~(1) — A letter from the candidate indicating the rating for which he/she wishes to be considered.~~

~~(1) (2) — Curriculum vitae.~~

~~(2)~~

~~(3) — Statement from the candidate on teaching, research and service addressing accomplishments since the last review and future plans and goals.~~

~~(34) 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.~~

(5) Candidates seeking a "~~superior~~"superior rating must furnish two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers concerning aspects of the candidate's teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency). The evaluation of teaching performance will include the peer review of class materials and/or peer observation of classroom performance by two senior faculty colleagues.

(6) Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate during the period under review.

(7) Candidates seeking a "~~superior~~"superior rating must also furnish clear evidence that they continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the criteria of the Faculty/Administration Manual, as indicated in Sect VI.A.4.c. for instructional faculty and VI.C.4.d for library

faculty. Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews.

- b. 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.

(Rev. April 2009, Rev. Dec. 2011)

3. Recommendations by the Department Chair or Panel and the Dean

Post-tenure review is normally conducted by the department chair. The packet in application for a “superior” rating will be reviewed by the department chair during the fall semester of the sixth year. The chair will recommend a rating for the candidate’s performance. In the event that the chair recommends an “unsatisfactory” rating, he/she will add a substantive evaluation letter to the packet, explaining his/her reasons for the rating.

A departmental post-tenure review panel will be convened only in the case of post-tenure review of the department chair. When the department chair herself/himself is up for post-tenure review, the most senior tenured member of the department (other than the chair) will convene, and chair, a departmental post-tenure review panel consisting of three tenured faculty members (including the panel chair). Panel members will normally be drawn from the home department according to seniority. When necessary to complete the panel, additions will be drawn, following the same criteria, from departments with related areas of study. The panel may not include chairs from external departments. No tenured faculty member concurrently subject to post-tenure review may serve on this panel. The panel will exercise the same responsibility with respect to the department chair’s candidacy that the chair exercises in all other cases. This departmental panel will also review all other cases coming up for post-tenure review at the same time as the department chair.

The chair or departmental panel will recommend a rating for the candidate’s performance.

In the case of a candidate requesting a superior rating, tThe department chair (or the departmental panel) shall forward to the candidate’s dean by the announced deadline, typically mid-December, the candidate’s packet with either a brief letter of acknowledgement of justifying the chair’s (or panel’s) concurrence or failure to concur with the candidate’s self-evaluation or a detailed negative letter to the candidate’s dean. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate. Should the rating of the chair (or departmental panel) be lower than the candidate’s self-

~~ratings~~satisfactory rather than superior, the candidate may forward a letter of rebuttal to his/her dean and his/her department chair no later than five days before the first day of the beginning of the Spring Semester. The Deans will review packets and forward written recommendations to the Office of the Provost, ~~but will not normally review satisfactory recommendations, but will do so at the request of the candidate.~~

In the case of a candidate being considered for a satisfactory rating, the department chair (or the departmental panel) shall meet with the dean to discuss a summary of the candidate's annual performance evaluations. In addition, the chair or panel will forward to the candidate's dean a written statement that the candidate meets the criteria for a satisfactory rating or a brief summary of the ratings received on annual performance evaluations in the area of teaching and a statement that the candidate receives an unsatisfactory rating. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate, the Provost, and the Post-Tenure Review Committee.  
(Rev. April 2009)

~~Should the department chair (or the departmental post-tenure review panel) and/or the dean of the candidate's school recommend a superior rating when the candidate seeks only a satisfactory rating, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will consider a superior rating only with the permission of the candidate.~~

4. Recommendations to the President on Superior Ratings

a. The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review and forward its recommendations on applications for "superior" superior ratings to the Provost by the 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 shall forward all recommendations to the President by the announced deadline.  
(Rev. April 2009)

b. The President shall make a final determination on superior ratings 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a

---

<sup>1</sup> Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.



final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by him/her, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the department chair (or departmental panel chair), in writing, of his/her decision.

(Rev. April 2009)

## 5. — Deferments

~~a. — Faculty members may petition the Post-Tenure Review Committee for the postponement of their post-tenure reviews based on extenuating personal circumstances, exceptional professional commitments, or valid medical reasons which must be documented in the petition. Petitions must be endorsed by the faculty member's chair and dean. Postponements will be approved only under extraordinary circumstances and will not normally extend more than one academic year. Decisions by the Post-Tenure Review Committee regarding deferments may be appealed to the Provost within one week of the candidate's notification. The Provost's decision shall be final.~~

~~b. — A faculty member who announces his/her decision to retire within three years of their scheduled time for post-tenure review (by submission of a letter to the dean of his/her school and the Provost) may choose not to undergo that review. However, if a faculty member postpones the announced time of retirement for more than one year, he/she will be evaluated in the year of that announcement.~~

~~c. — A faculty member scheduled for post-tenure review in a given year will not have to undergo that review if he/she petitions for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor that same year or announces (in writing) his/her intention to do so during the following academic year. However, if the promotion process is postponed, a post-tenure review will take place no later than one year after the originally scheduled time for post-tenure review.~~

~~d. — Administrators, such as Deans, rejoining the ranks of the faculty will undergo post-tenure review within three years of their return to faculty status.~~

~~e. — If a faculty member takes a sabbatical leave or a leave of absence in the same academic year he/she is scheduled for post-tenure review, the post-tenure review will take place during the following academic year, unless the faculty member decides to undergo the review at the originally scheduled time.~~

~~f. — All petitions for a deferment or a waiver of post-tenure review due to an announced retirement must be addressed to the Post-Tenure Review Committee. All official communications regarding postponement or waivers of review will be issued by said committee.~~

~~6. — Rating of Candidates~~

~~a. — Ratings of a candidate will take one of three forms:~~

~~(1) — Superior Rating~~

~~The superior rating is awarded to candidates who continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty/Administration Manual. Only faculty members holding the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible for a superior rating, except that tenured Assistant and Associate Professors who lack a terminal degree but who otherwise meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor are also eligible for superior ratings.~~

~~(2) — Unsatisfactory Rating~~

~~Candidate has exhibited evidence of habitual neglect of duty, which means consistently and regularly failing to fulfill the terms and conditions of appointment, as laid out in the Faculty/Administration Manual's section on "Termination of Tenured Faculty Members 'for Cause' and Termination Procedure."~~

~~(3) — Satisfactory Rating~~

~~All other candidates.~~

~~cb. Merit Increase for Superior Rating~~

~~Whenever the President assigns a rating of superior, such a rating must be accompanied by a permanent merit increase in pay effective the academic year following the year of evaluation.~~

~~5e. Remediation Plan for “Unsatisfactory”Unsatisfactory Rating~~

~~Whenever a candidate receives a rating of “unsatisfactory”unsatisfactory from the Presidentunder post-tenure review, the case will be remanded to the existing departmental~~

post-tenure review panel, or a new one convened for the purpose (in the latter case, including the department chair and two other tenured departmental faculty members), to devise a remediation plan in consultation with the candidate. This plan must be approved by the dean and be submitted to the college-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee for approval within twenty working-~~one~~ days of the President's final determination of an "unsatisfactory"~~unsatisfactory~~ rating. The Post-Tenure Review Committee must approve or, in consultation with the departmental panel, modify the plan within fifteen working days.

A component of this plan must involve full annual performance evaluations of the faculty member that addresses the remediation plan directly. As part of the annual performance evaluation, both the chair and the dean must describe in writing the faculty member's progress in meeting the goals of the remediation plan.

~~(1) Appeals~~

~~A candidate wishing to appeal an unsatisfactory rating must submit a written appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee within ten days of notification of an unsatisfactory rating. The rating may only be appealed when the faculty member alleges the rating was based upon:~~

- ~~(a) Discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon the race, religion, sex, national origin, color, age, or handicap; or~~
- ~~(b) Violation of academic freedom as it relates to freedom of expression; or~~
- ~~(c) Violation of due process as provided in the College's published rules, regulations, policies and procedures.~~

(12) Ratification of remediation plan

Ultimate ratification of satisfactory completion of a remediation plan rests with the college-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee, as constituted at the time of the deadline originally assigned for completion of remediation, to the extent possible. In the event that the Committee concludes that the candidate has failed to complete the

remediation plan to its satisfaction, the Committee will notify the candidate, the department chair or panel, the Provost, and the dean of the candidate's school that the Committee has concluded that proceeding for revocation of the candidate's tenure ought to be instituted, in accordance with the guidelines of the Faculty/Administration Manual.

6.(21) Appeals

.a. Appeal of decision on completion or remediation plan

A candidate wishing to appeal a decision of the Post-Tenure Review Committee that the candidate has failed to complete the remediation plan to its satisfaction must submit a written appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee within ten days of notification of this decision. The rating decision may only be appealed when the faculty member alleges the Committee's decision was based upon:

- (a) Discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon the race, religion, sex, national origin, color, age, or handicap; or
- (b) Violation of academic freedom as it relates to freedom of expression; or
- (c) Violation of due process as provided in the College's published rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

d. Presumption of Satisfactory Performance

The Post-Tenure Review Committee operates on a presumption of satisfactory performance. That is, the burden of proof (clear and convincing evidence) for a superior performance lies with the candidate, and the burden of proof for an unsatisfactory performance lies with the department chair (or department post-tenure review panel). The Post-Tenure Review Committee can request additional information at any time during their deliberations.

e. In the event that a candidate who has applied for a "superior" rating fails to receive that rating at a

~~level of review, a different rating must be assigned at each that level of review.~~

bf. Appealing a Satisfactory Rating

A candidate who receives a satisfactory rating when having sought a superior rating and who alleges that the rating was based upon discrimination, violation of academic freedom or violation of due process may follow the appeals procedure outlined in Art. VII.B.

If the candidate feels that the satisfactory rating received is incorrect due to reasons other than those outlined in Art. VII.B, a formal appeal is not allowed. However, the faculty member remains eligible to apply for a superior rating in subsequent years.~~upon the candidate's request, the candidate will be allowed to undergo one "successive" post-tenure review the following year and to modify the packet so as to better document the case for a superior rating. The candidate is allowed to modify statements on teaching, research and service, to include additional or different peer letters, and, generally to strengthen the packet with the kinds of evidence outlined in Art. VII.B. However, other than the fact that the vita included in the packet shall be current, the evidence in the packet shall cover the same six-year period that was covered in the prior year's review. A candidate's post-tenure review cycle does not change as the result of undergoing a successive post-tenure review, and no further reviews covering the same six-year period are allowed.~~

Section X.G. On amending the Faculty and Administrator's Authority to Enter into Contractual Agreements on Behalf of the College

**G. Faculty and Administrator's Authority to Enter into Contractual Agreements on Behalf of the College of Charleston**

The operation and administration of the College has been delegated to the President by the Board of Trustees. Therefore, the President is, in fact, the only person at the College who has the legal authority to enter into any contractual agreements on behalf of the College. The President has been specifically given the power to delegate some of his authority to members of the administration to maintain and ensure a smooth administrative process in the overall operation of the institution.

~~Only academic Department Chairs, program directors and administrators at the level of Dean or director, and the Provost or Vice President to whom each reports has authority to bind the College, in writing or verbally, in a contractual agreement. Other o~~Officials of the College, unless specifically delegated such authority in writing by the President, do not have this authority. Where uncertainties exist, please confer with the Provost ~~Vice President or Dean who heads the appropriate division~~ or consult the College Counsel. (Rev. Aug. 2014)

Section IX.B. On amending the Faculty Awards to include the “College of Charleston Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award”

**IX. FACULTY AWARDS**

**B. Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award**

The College of Charleston Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award is made to one individual during the spring semester. This award honors those adjunct faculty members who have been designated by faculty colleagues as typifying high standards and commitment to teaching excellence throughout their careers. The recipient is recommended to the Provost by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Provost and consisting of five recent recipients of either the Distinguished Teaching Award or the Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award, including at least one adjunct faculty member, and the Student Government Association President. The award is a framed certificate and a cash award. (Rev. Aug. 2014)

Comment [ABE10]: Rev. Aug 2014