

COLLEGE of
CHARLESTON
Faculty/Administration Manual Changes

Log of Changes from August 2014 – August 2015
For the Committee on By-laws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual*

Changes to faculty By-laws: The following changes were approved by the Faculty Senate and ratified by the full faculty, as required.

Article III, Sections 1.A, 2.A, and Article IV, Sections 2.A, 2.B.2, d.D.2-7, 2.E, 2.F, 2.G, 3.A, 4.F, 4.G, 4.I, and 4.M: Addition of adjunct representation to the Faculty Senate.

- Addition of three Adjunct Faculty Senators to the existing Faculty Senate with full voting privileges.
- Original conceptual proposal developed by sub-committee of Faculty Welfare Committee, subsequently modified in consultation with other faculty committees, and drafted into proposed *Faculty/Administration Manual* (hereafter “FAM”) language by a joint sub-committee of Faculty Welfare Committee and Committee on By-laws and the *Faculty/Administration Manual* in summer 2014.
- Formal proposal approved by Faculty Senate at regular meeting on October 7, 2015.
- Text of motion is available in Faculty Senate archives at:
[http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2014-2015/oct-2014/by-laws and FAM-oct-2014/Motion for Adjunct Faculty Senators Sept 24 2014.pdf](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2014-2015/oct-2014/by-laws%20and%20FAM-oct-2014/Motion%20for%20Adjunct%20Faculty%20Senators%20Sept%2024%202014.pdf).

Article V, Sections 1.B, 1.D, 3.A, 3.B.3, 3.B.9, and 3.B.17: Addition of adjunct faculty representation to three standing faculty committees.

- Addition of adjunct faculty representation in the form of voting membership to Faculty Welfare Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, and Faculty Compensation Committee.
- Original conceptual proposal developed by sub-committee of Faculty Welfare Committee, subsequently modified in consultation with other faculty committees, and drafted into proposed FAM language by a joint sub-committee of Faculty Welfare Committee and Committee on By-laws and the FAM in summer 2014.
- Formal proposal approved by Faculty Senate at regular meeting on October 7, 2015.
- Text of motion is available in Faculty Senate archives at
[http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2014-2015/oct-2014/by-laws and FAM-oct-2014/Motion for adjunct faculty committee members Sept 24 2014.pdf](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2014-2015/oct-2014/by-laws%20and%20FAM-oct-2014/Motion%20for%20adjunct%20faculty%20committee%20members%20Sept%2024%202014.pdf)

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

Sections II.E.5: Change to more clearly define graduate faculty.

- Change in graduate faculty definition, as recommended by Graduate Dean Amy McCandless, after deliberative review and consideration by the College's graduate program directors and the Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education at the request of Interim Provost Brian McGee.
- Change reviewed, modified, approved, and carried to the Faculty Senate by the Committee on the By-laws and *FAM*.
- Approved by Faculty Senate at April 7, 2015 meeting
- Text of proposed change is available in Senate archives at:
http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2014-2015/apr-2015/Notice_of_Intent_for_graduate_faculty_description.pdf.

Introduction of honorific of University Professor and concurrent changes to Section III.A, Faculty Appointments: The Instructional Faculty, and Sections VI.A and VI.C: Evaluation of Faculty.

- Addition of University Professor as an honorary rank, along with guidelines for nomination, benefits, and obligations.
- Proposal developed by Interim Provost McGee.
- Presented to the Faculty Senate by the Committee on the By-laws and *FAM* on behalf of Interim Provost McGee after review and approval by Academic Council, Academic Planning Committee, Faculty Welfare Committee, and Committee on By-Laws and the *FAM*.
- Approved by Faculty Senate at April 7, 2015 meeting
- Text of proposed change is available in Senate archives at:
<http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2014-2015/apr-2015/Notice%20of%20Intent%20University%20Professor.pdf>

Section V.F.5-6, Terms of Faculty Employment and Workload

- Changes to footnote to bring the *FAM* into alignment with our Summer School compensation practices and to correct an outdated reference to state HR regulations.
- Change announced in Provost report at April 7, 2015 meeting of Faculty Senate, with no objections.
- Text of proposed change is available in Senate archives at:
<http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2014-2015/apr-2015/Proposed%20Changes%20to%20FAM%20Sections%20on%20Dual%20Employment%20March%202015.pdf>.

Section VI.A, Evaluation of Faculty: Third-year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty.

- Three changes, recommended by faculty committees in consultation with Interim Provost McGee, and brought forward to Faculty Senate in Provost's Report at April 7, 2015 meeting
 - Addition of language that Departmental Evaluation Panel chair should endeavor to collect at least twenty responses from recent graduates, as recommended by McGee and Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review.
 - Addition of language that Departmental Evaluation Panel chair should specify in writing, for inclusion in the packet, how external reviewers of a candidate's research were selected, as recommended by McGee and Advisory Committee.
 - Addition of language making it explicit that service as department chair, program director, or associate dean counts as service, as recommended by Council of Chairs.
- No objections from Faculty Senate.
- Text of proposed change is available in Senate archives at:
<http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2014-2015/apr-2015/Proposed%20Changes%20to%20Tenure%20and%20Promotion%20Section%20of%20the%20FAM%20March%202015.pdf>.

Section VI.A.2.b.2ii, Instructions for External Reviews of Research:

- Proposal by Interim Provost McGee to emphasize that external reviewers should be appropriately qualified and to explicitly note that candidates shall not contact potential or actual reviewers about any aspect of a such a review.
- Developed by Provost and communicated to Academic Council, Faculty Welfare Committee, and Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. Discussed and affirmed at June 3, 2015 meeting of Academic Council.
- Text of change is attached to this log.

Other administrative updates

- **School of Professional Studies:** Change in Section II.C to introduce Dean of the School of Professional Studies.
- **Sabbatical Leave:** Modification to Section X.A.6 to clarify the requirement to return to the College of Charleston for one full year after a sabbatical. Specifically, the requirement is to return for the full academic year following the academic year in which the sabbatical is taken.
- **Post-tenure Review:** Clarification of Section VI.H.4.d regarding post-tenure review for former twelve-month academic administrators returning to full faculty status. Specifically, the change clarifies that this requirement applies to twelve-month academic administrators, since department chairs undergo post-tenure review on a regular faculty schedule.
- **Distinguished Faculty Awards:** Changed eligibility from "regular" faculty to "roster" faculty in Section IX.A and Section IX.D-F to align with January 2014 Board of Trustees approval of our distinguished faculty awards program.
- Miscellaneous corrections in administrative language on faculty librarians.

- Removal of references to Senior Vice Provost in Section VII.F, Procedures for Misconduct in Research and Scholarship.
- Revised outdated titles; corrected miscellaneous typographical, capitalization, and formatting errors; and deleted obsolete references.
- Updated edition date

Attachments

Changes to the 2015-2016 *Faculty/Administration Manual*

Changes to *FAM Section VI.A.2.b.2ii, Instructions for External Reviews of Research*
Prepared by Academic Affairs

INTENT:

- Move language regarding qualifications of reviewers in order to provide more emphasis.
- Insert language prohibiting candidates from contacting any potential or actual reviewer about any aspect of such a review in their tenure or promotion case.
- Insert language requiring Panel Chair to indicate, in writing, for the candidate's packet, how each external reviewer was selected.

The first two changes listed here were prepared for discussion at the June 3, 2015 meeting of the Academic Council. The third change was presented by the Provost at the April 2015 meeting of the Faculty Senate. They are combined here for convenience.

For each proposed change, ~~single strike through text~~ is a deletion and underlined text is new.

FAM Text with Revisions:

...

a. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

(1) Evaluatee's narrative of research and professional development activities.

(2) i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating research and professional development are required.

ii. Optional evaluation of research and professional development includes:

- letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston evaluating research and professional development and (Rev. April 2012)
- independent external reviews of research. Departments that choose to conduct such external reviews must follow the process outlined here.

Instructions for External Reviews of Research: The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. Candidates should submit the names of at least three professionals from outside the College by late August. Evaluation panel chairs, in consultation with departmental panel members, should present additional names of external reviewers in order to obtain no fewer than two independent reviews of the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. The Departmental Evaluation Panel chair may solicit names of potential additional reviews from people named on the candidate's list. No more than half of the reviews should be secured from

the candidate's own list. The candidate is allowed to strike one name from the panel chair's list. ~~The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements.~~ Under no circumstances and at no point in time shall a candidate contact a potential or actual reviewer about any aspect of such a review. Panel Chair should specify in writing, for inclusion in the packet, how each reviewer was selected. (Rev. April 2012)

After the external reviewers have been determined, a cover letter from the panel chair should accompany the review materials sent to them, stating that the College seeks a review of the quality of a candidate's research and professional development and not merely a testimonial to the candidate's accomplishments. A copy of the candidate's academic curriculum vitae and copies of the relevant scholarly and/or creative works agreed upon by the candidate and evaluation panel chair should be sent to each of the outside reviewers. Copies of the relevant portions of the Faculty/Administration Manual about research and professional development as well as any additional departmental criteria on file in the Office of the Provost should be included. Additional supporting review materials may also be submitted by the panel chair or the candidate, provided that these materials are included in the packet.

Reviewers should be asked to identify what relationship, if any, they have with the candidate and to return their review in a timely manner for the deliberations of the departmental panel. To make it possible that reviews are available prior to those deliberations, external reviews must be solicited sufficiently in advance of panel deliberations.

The panel chair must include in the candidate's packet: (1) a description of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (2) each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, and rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer, which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field, (3) a copy of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, and (4) the confidential outside reviews. (Ins. April 2007)