

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty colleagues, including department chairs and deans

FROM: Deanna M. Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

DATE: June 2, 2021

RE: changes to language on major faculty reviews, effective with the 2021-2022 edition of the *Faculty/Administration Manual*

This memo summarizes changes to tenure, promotion, and third-year review expectations and processes as articulated in the *Faculty/Administration Manual* (hereafter, “*Manual*”). These changes are effective with 2021-2022 faculty reviews and will appear in the 2021-2022 edition of the *Manual*. This document provides a summary list, followed by a replica of Sections VI.A through VI.D of the *Manual*, with tracking to show the exact revisions from the 2020-2021 edition to the 2021-2022 edition. This document will be replaced by the full *Faculty/Administration Manual* and the 2021-2022 change log once those documents are finalized and posted.

The changes are as follows:

- External reviews of research: The new language provides more explicit guidance to Departmental Evaluation Panel chairs for soliciting external reviews of research, in cases where such reviews are used. The focus is on soliciting a review of the quality of a candidate’s research and professional development, rather than an overall assessment of whether the candidate would meet research expectations at the reviewer’s own institution. Additionally, the solicitation letter may reflect any quantitative or qualitative research expectations set by college-wide or approved school or departmental guidelines. See exact revisions in the *Faculty/Administration Manual*, Section VI.A.2.b.(2).ii.(b), a copy of which is attached.
- Presentation of certain professional activities: The new language clarifies an ambiguity in past editions of the *Manual* and clearly communicates that certain professional activities can be presented by the candidate as either professional development or service. See *Manual*, Section VI.A.2.b.(5) and Section VI.A.3.a, a copy of which is attached.

VI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

A. Third-year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty

(Rev. April 2012)

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure, and promotions. 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.

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. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the College; it is not merely a reward for work accomplished, but it is an award given with the expectation that consistently high professional competence will continue.

(Rev. April 2009)

A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. There should be evidence of effective teaching, a continuing research program, and active participation in service. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required tenure decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year. Up to two years credit toward tenure and promotion may be awarded at the time of initial appointment for teaching and research on a full-time basis at other four-year and graduate colleges and universities or for full-time employment at faculty positions of special status at the College of Charleston. A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College. A person receiving one year of credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fifth year at the College.

(Rev. April 2007)

Six years in rank is normally required for an Assistant Professor to be eligible for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Seven years in rank is normally required for an Associate Professor to be eligible for promotion to Professor.

In exceptional cases a faculty member may wish to petition for early tenure or promotion provided the action has the prior written approval of the Provost, the Dean and the Departmental Chair.

Faculty are evaluated in the three categories of Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development, and Professional Service to the Community. Because teaching is the primary responsibility of any faculty member, evidence of effective teaching is expected for tenure and for promotion. Because research and professional development are essential to the mission of the College, evidence of a sustained research program and a continuing scholarly commitment must be provided for tenure and for promotion. Because faculty should be contributing members of the College community and, where appropriate, the community at large, evidence of service to the community is expected.

While quantifiable data (numerical items from student evaluations, numbers of papers published, number of committees, etc.) are important, decisions about tenure and promotion must ultimately rely on sound professional judgment.

What follow are the general standards and evidence that remain constant throughout the four levels of institutional evaluation, namely third-year review, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. A separate evaluation process, with its own standards and evidence, is used for the honorary rank of University Professor (see Art. VI, Sect. I). (Rev. Aug. 2015)

1. Teaching Effectiveness

a. Standard

Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston. Teaching involves communicating knowledge to students and fostering in them the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge. The effective teacher exhibits a sustained concern for teaching, which is reflected in teaching materials, classroom performance, academic advising, critical evaluation of students, and adequate preparation of students for later undergraduate and/or graduate work. Course materials should be well-conceived, well-organized and well-written. Students should be exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. A teacher should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

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

- (1) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion/tenure.

(2) (i) Departmental colleague letters evaluating teaching are required.

(ii) Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating teaching are optional.

(Ins. April 2007)

(3) Evaluatee's narrative of teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments in teaching, advising and other similar activities.

(4) Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least 40 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught; additional students whom the candidate has taught, who need not be majors in the department, may be added by the candidate in consultation with the Chair. Students must list all courses taken from the evaluatee and the grade(s) received in these courses. In addition, the student must sign the form or letter used for evaluation. The Chair must designate which students are recommended by the evaluatee. In cases where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 graduates, the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred. In these cases it may be appropriate to substitute evaluations from non-majors. The Chair should endeavor to collect at least twenty responses from recent graduates, keeping in mind that it is appropriate to send reminders or solicit feedback from more than forty students if response rates are low. (Rev. Aug. 2015)

Without exception, each Department's graduate evaluation form shall include a standardized section designed only to provide and solicit demographic information about each individual graduate completing the form. This standardized section of the form shall be designed and distributed each year by the Office of the Provost and must be used without alteration by each department.

(Ins. April 2007)

Recent Graduate Evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate.

(Rev. Apr. 2007)

(5) Student ratings and summaries:

(i) Student ratings from all courses evaluated. Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. If it is a department's policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the student ratings, the department must develop procedures for collecting and reviewing this portion of the student ratings form. A copy of the procedures should be on file in the Provost's Office. In the absence of these procedures, a faculty member undergoing review may choose to include these comments as part of the packet, having explained in the written narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

(ii) The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester. (Rev. Apr. 2007)

(6) Evidence of teaching effectiveness may also include but is not limited to:

(i) Syllabi, reading lists or bibliographies, policy statements, grading procedures, course goals and objectives.

(ii) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or supplementary course materials.

(iii) Samples of tests, exams, essays or other assignments.

(iv) Participation in curriculum development.

(v) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.

- (vi) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues.
- (vii) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

2. Research and Professional Development

a. Standard

Research and professional development are essential to a professor's ability to carry out the College's educational mission. Research and professional development involve the various activities that increase the faculty member's knowledge and that exemplify scholarly or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, original contributions to the discipline, creative activities in practice and performance in the fine arts, research in pedagogy, and appropriate studies within and outside one's specialties. The professional educator undertakes research for scholarly or creative production, to maintain currency in the content of courses taught, and to improve pedagogical techniques. The professional educator sustains professional contact with colleagues and engages in continuing professional activities to upgrade and augment existing skills or develop new ones.

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

- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of research and professional development activities.
- (2) Colleague letters (departmental and optional external)
 - (i) Departmental colleague letters evaluating research and professional development are required.
 - (ii) Optional evaluation of research and professional development includes:
 - (a) letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston evaluating research and professional development and
(Rev. Apr. 2012)

- (b) 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. 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. Apr. 2012; Rev. Aug. 2015)

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, rather than an overall assessment of whether the candidate would meet research expectations at the reviewer's own institution.~~ 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.~~ Letters to external reviewers may also reflect any quantitative or qualitative research expectations set by college-wide or approved school or departmental guidelines. For instance, the following excerpts from the *Faculty/Administration Manual* could be included in such letters, “Because research and professional development are essential to the mission of the College, evidence of a sustained research program and a continuing scholarly commitment much be provided for tenure and promotion,” and for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must present “... clear evidence of high promise for continued quality scholarship and professional activity. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). All evidence must be evaluated rigorously.” 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. Apr. 2007)

- (3) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion/tenure.
- (4) Evidence of scholarship may include but is not limited to:
 - (i) professionally published scholarly books
 - (ii) academic journal articles
 - (iii) chapters in scholarly books
 - (iv) edited volumes
 - (v) review essays
 - (vi) creative literary and artistic works and other creative works
 - (vii) research grants
 - (viii) conference papers
 - (ix) reviews of candidate's books, performances, etc.
 - (x) scholarly reviews by candidate of books, performances, etc.
 - (xi) invited or juried exhibits, concerts, performances, etc.
 - (xii) technical reports
 - (xiii) textbooks, workbooks, study guides and other published pedagogical materials
 - (xix) draft manuscripts
 - (xx) professional bibliographies
- (5) ~~Evidence of professional activities may include but is not limited to:~~ The professional activities listed below can be included as evidence either in the category of Research and Professional Development, or in the category of Service.

Evidence of professional activities may include but is not limited to:

- (i) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of an international, national, regional or state professional organization
- (ii) serving on an editorial board of a scholarly journal
- (iii) reviewing manuscripts for journals and publishers; evaluating proposals for granting agencies
- (iv) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting
- (v) preparing grant proposals and reports
- (vi) conducting professional workshops, seminars, and field trips
- (vii) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, field trips, etc.
- (viii) undertaking post-doctoral studies
- (ix) receiving fellowships and awards
- (x) serving as a professional consultant
- (xi) serving as Department Chair, Program Director, or Associate Dean (Ins. Aug. 2015)

3. Professional Service to the Community

a. Standard

Service to the College and/or community falls within the responsibilities of a faculty member and is essential to the fulfillment of the College's responsibilities to the academic community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each faculty member is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the department and the College. Service includes involvement in standing or *ad hoc* committees of the College faculty, in departmental committees or offices, and in special committees or task forces.

Service includes working with student organizations and non-academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects. Service can also include those professional activities listed in Section VI.A.2.b.(5), which addresses evidence of professional development.

- b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:
- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of service activities.
 - (2) Departmental and extra-departmental colleague letters:
 - (i) Departmental colleague letters evaluating service are required.
 - (ii) Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating service are required.
- (Ins. Apr. 2007)
- (3) Chair's evaluations since the faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion/tenure.

4. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

What follow are minimum criteria for tenure and promotion. Departments and schools may develop additional criteria. Any such proposed criteria will require review and approval by the appropriate academic dean and Provost's Office to ensure consistency with college-wide guidelines and procedures. Additionally, they shall be reviewed by the originating body every five years and will require review and approval by the dean and the Provost's Office when modified.

(Rev. Apr. 2012)

a. Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is normally awarded simultaneously with tenure. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The Associate Professor will normally hold the highest appropriate terminal degree. Evidence of 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.

(Ins. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009)

- (1) Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor require sustained effectiveness in teaching.
- (2) There must be clear evidence of high promise for continued quality scholarship and professional activity. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). All evidence should be evaluated rigorously.
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

b. Tenure for Associate Professors

A faculty member hired as an untenured Associate Professor must meet the same criteria for tenure as in section a (immediately above). Evidence of 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.

(Ins. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009)

c. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of continuing quality teaching, research and service. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Professor. The Professor must hold the highest appropriate terminal degree. Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas is required.

(Ins. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009)

- (1) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires sustained high quality and effective teaching.
(Rev. Apr. 2009)

- (2) Because Professor is the highest rank, there must be clear evidence of continuing quality scholarship. Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). In addition to scholarship, sustained professional activity is expected. All evidence should be rigorously evaluated.
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College. Leadership should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

d. Tenure for Professors

A faculty member hired as an untenured Professor must meet the same criteria for tenure as in section a (above).

(Rev. Apr. 2012)

5. Nomination of Instructional Faculty to a Higher Rank

When a faculty member becomes eligible for nomination to a higher rank, a nomination may be submitted in the form of a petition from one or more of the following:

- a. the Department Chair, after consultation with the tenured members of the department, to the Provost;
- b. a majority of the tenured members of the department to the Provost;
- c. the individual faculty member to the Provost;
- d. the Provost to the Department Chair;
- e. the Dean to the Department Chair.

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."

(Rev. Apr. 2007)

It should be clearly understood by all faculty members that promotion does not come automatically after the passage of a fixed period of time, but it is recognition of outstanding performance and service at the College.

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. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative promotion decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required promotion decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

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 seventh year¹.

(Inst. Apr. 2011; Rev Aug. 2014)

1. Specific Criteria for Promotion to and Renewal as Senior Instructor (Rev. Apr. 2011)

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to and renewal as Senior Instructor:

- a. Promotion to and renewal in the rank of Senior Instructor requires sustained exemplary performance in teaching.
- b. Continued vitality as a teacher is intimately related to professional development. There must be clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.
- c. There should be active and sustained participation in service to the College, and, where appropriate, to the community.

¹In 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.

2. Teaching Effectiveness

a. Standard

Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston. Teaching involves communicating knowledge to students and fostering in them the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge. The effective teacher exhibits a sustained concern for teaching, which is reflected in teaching materials, classroom performance, academic advising, critical evaluation of students, and adequate preparation of students for later undergraduate work. Course materials should be well conceived, well organized and well written. Instructors should be accessible to students both inside and outside of class, provide frequent constructive feedback to students, and involve them actively in the learning process. Instructors should attempt to use a variety of teaching techniques including innovations involving modern technology, where appropriate, and maintain currency in the pedagogy of their disciplines. Students should be exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. An instructor should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

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

- (1) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been at the College.
- (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements on teaching.
- (3) Evaluatee's narrative of teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments in teaching, advising, and other similar activities.
- (4) Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least 40 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught; departments may choose to use a sample of at least 40 graduates selected randomly from among students in service courses taught by the evaluatee. Additional students whom the candidate has taught may be added by the candidate in consultation with the Chair. Students must

list all courses taken from the evaluatee and the grade(s) received in these courses. In addition, the students must sign the form or letter used for evaluation. The Chair must designate which students are recommended by the evaluatee. In cases where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 graduates, the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred. In these cases it may be appropriate to substitute evaluations from non-majors.

- (5) Student ratings and summaries:
 - (a) Student ratings from all courses evaluated. Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. If it is a department's policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the student ratings, the department must develop procedures for collecting and reviewing this portion of the student ratings form. A copy of the procedures should be on file in the Provost's Office. In the absence of these procedures, a faculty member undergoing review may choose to include these comments as part of the packet, having explained in their narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included. (Rev. Aug. 2018)
 - (b) The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester. (Inst. Apr. 2011)
- (6) Evidence of teaching effectiveness may also include but is not limited to:
 - (a) Syllabi, reading lists or bibliographies, policy statements, grading procedures, course goals and objectives.
 - (b) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or other supplementary course material.

- (c) Samples of tests, exams, essays or other assignments, including some graded work.
- (d) Participation in curriculum development.
- (e) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.
- (f) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues. Each department will develop a procedure for peer observations of candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor.
- (g) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.
- (h) Participation in departmental advising as directed by the Department Chair.

3. Professional Development

a. Standard

Professional development is essential to an instructor's ability to carry out the College's educational mission. Professional development involves the various activities that increase the faculty member's knowledge and exemplify pedagogical or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, research in pedagogy, appropriate studies within and outside one's specialties, and creative activities in practice and performance in the fine arts. Instructors maintain currency in the content of courses taught and in pedagogical techniques. They sustain professional contact with colleagues and engage in continuing professional activities to maintain, upgrade, and augment existing skills or develop new ones.

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

- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of professional development activities.
- (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements on professional activities.

- (3) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been at the College.
- (4) Evidence of professional development may include but is not limited to:
 - (a) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of a local, state, regional, national or international professional organization;
 - (b) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting;
 - (c) preparing grant proposals and reports;
 - (d) conducting professional workshops and seminars;
 - (e) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, et cetera;
 - (f) completing graduate studies or course work relevant to professional competency;
 - (g) receiving fellowships and awards;
 - (h) serving as a professional consultant;
 - (i) attending workshops, symposia, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera;
 - (j) producing scholarly and creative works that are pedagogical in nature, such as media productions, and compiling significant bibliographies, guidebooks, catalogs, study guides, textbooks or workbooks;
 - (k) all activities appropriate at the professorial ranks.

4. Professional Service to the Community

a. Standard

Service to the College and/or the community falls within the responsibilities of a faculty member and is essential to the fulfillment of the College's responsibilities to the academic

community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each faculty member is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the department and the College. Service includes holding departmental offices, serving on departmental committees, and participating in campus and community activities related to the College and to one's professional role. It also includes involvement with standing or *ad hoc* committees of the College, and special committees or task forces. Service includes working with student organizations and non-academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects.

- b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:
- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of accomplishments in service while in the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor.
 - (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements and letters of testimony. The letters shall be solicited by the panel chair. Authors of letters shall be agreed upon by both the panel chair and the evaluatee.
 - (3) Chair's evaluations since the faculty member has been at the College.

C. **Third-Year Review, Tenure and Promotion of the Library Faculty**
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure and promotions. 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.

Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high performance in professional competency, professional growth and development, and service. In addition, evidence of exemplary performance is required in the professional competency area. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the College; it is not merely a reward for work accomplished, but it is an award given with the expectation that consistently high performance will continue.

Promotion to the rank of Librarian II (if necessary) is awarded simultaneously with the third-year review. A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. There should be evidence of effective professional competency, a continuing research and development

program, and active participation in service. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required tenure decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year. Up to two years credit toward tenure and promotion may be awarded at the time of initial appointment for previous professional library experience elsewhere, or for full-time employment at professional library positions of special status at the College of Charleston. A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College. (Rev. Apr. 2007)

Three years in rank is normally required for a Librarian I to be promoted to a Librarian II (which is done simultaneously with the Third-year Review). Six years in rank is normally required for a Librarian II to be promoted to a Librarian III. Seven years in rank is normally required for a Librarian III to be promoted to a Librarian IV. In exceptional cases a librarian may wish to petition for early tenure or promotion provided that action has the prior written approval of the Provost and the Dean.

Librarians are evaluated in the three categories of professional competency, professional growth and development, and professional service to the community. Because professional competency is the primary responsibility of any librarian, evidence of exemplary professional competency is expected for tenure and promotion. Because professional growth and development are essential to the mission of the College, evidence of a sustained quality research program and a continuing scholarly commitment must be provided for tenure and promotion. Because librarians should be contributing members of the College community and, where appropriate, the community at large, evidence of service to the community is expected.

While quantifiable data are important, decisions about tenure and promotion must ultimately rely on sound professional judgment.

What follow are the general standards and evidence that remain constant throughout the five levels of institutional evaluation, namely third-year review, tenure and promotion to Librarian II, III and IV. A separate evaluation process, with its own standards and evidence, is used for the honorary rank of University Librarian IV (see Art. VI, Sect. I). (Rev. Aug. 2015)

1. Professional Competency

a. Standard

The successful librarian contributes to the educational mission and priorities of the College and the Library by providing and promoting quality services and operations to the academic community. Professional competency includes a mastery of requisite professional skills and knowledge within each librarian's specific job description. Professional competency for librarians is the achievement of and commitment to intellectual freedom, accessibility of information (which includes the selection, acquisition, organization, preservation, instruction in the use of, and promotion of appropriate collections to support teaching and other educational activities), and supporting the curricular and research efforts of the academic community.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include, but is not limited to:

- (1) Evaluatee's statement of accomplishments based on annual goals and objectives;
- (2) Annual evaluations;
- (3) Letters addressing the criteria from departmental colleagues, from non-library faculty, from person(s) supervised (directly or indirectly) by evaluatee, from extra-College librarians, and, in the case of the Marine Resources Librarian, additionally from administrators and research associates of the South Carolina Marine Resources Center; (Rev. Aug. 2015)
- (4) Support materials, such as reports, working documents, statistical measures, policy statements, procedure manuals, annual reports, Library 105 and other instructional materials (to include syllabi, policy statements, grading procedures, tests, sample assignments, study or research guides), student evaluations, in-house publications, brochures, media, et cetera.

2. Professional Growth and Development

a. Standard

The professional growth and development of librarians is essential to the College's ability to carry out its educational mission. A librarian's continued vitality is intimately related to professional growth and development. Therefore, librarians are expected to conduct research or engage in other creative forms of professional growth and development. Professional growth and development involves the various professional activities that increase the librarian's knowledge and that exemplify scholarly or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, original contributions to the discipline, creative activities in librarianship, research in pedagogy, and appropriate studies within and outside one's specialties.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:

- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of professional growth and development activities;
- (2) Both internal and external colleague statements on professional growth and development activities;
- (3) Dean's evaluations since librarian has been in rank. Dean must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion or tenure.
- (4) Evidence of scholarship includes:
 - (i) professionally published scholarly books;
 - (ii) academic journal articles
 - (iii) chapters in scholarly books;
 - (iv) edited volumes;
 - (v) review essays;
 - (vi) creative works, including media production, compilation of significant bibliographies, guidebooks, catalogs, study guides, textbooks or workbooks;

- (vii) research grants;
 - (viii) conference papers;
 - (ix) reviews of candidate's books, et cetera;
 - (x) reviews by candidate of books, et cetera;
 - (xi) exhibits exemplifying scholarly endeavors;
 - (xii) technical reports;
 - (xiii) draft manuscripts.
- (5) Evidence of professional activities include:
- (i) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of an international, national, regional, state or local professional organization;
 - (ii) serving on an editorial board of a scholarly journal;
 - (iii) reviewing manuscripts for journal and publishers;
 - (iv) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting;
 - (v) preparing grant proposals and reports;
 - (vi) conducting professional workshops and seminars;
 - (vii) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, et cetera;
 - (viii) completing graduate studies or course work relevant to professional competency;
 - (ix) receiving fellowships and awards;
 - (x) serving as a professional consultant.

3. Professional Service to the Community

a. Standard

Service to the College and/or the community falls within the responsibilities of a librarian and is essential to the fulfillment of the College's responsibilities to the academic community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each librarian is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the Library and the College. Service includes involvement in standing or *ad hoc* committees of the College faculty, in departmental committees or offices, and in special committees or task forces. Service includes working with student organizations and academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects.

b. Evidence should include but is not limited to:

- (1) Evaluatee's narrative of service activities.
- (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements on service activities.
- (3) Chair's evaluations since the faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate's being considered for promotion or tenure.

4. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

a. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian II/Third-year Review

Promotion to the rank of Librarian II is awarded simultaneously with the third-year review. A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. A third-year review may be conducted for untenured librarians at other ranks. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian II and/or third-year review.

- (1) Promotion to the rank of Librarian II requires evidence of progress toward meeting the tenure requirement of exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

- (2) Continued vitality as librarians is intimately associated with scholarship and related professional activities. There must be clear evidence of progress toward meeting the tenure requirement for professional growth and development.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

b. Tenure for Librarians

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for tenure for library faculty.

- (1) Tenure for library faculty requires exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)
- (2) Continued vitality as librarians is intimately associated with scholarship and related professional activities. Traditional publication is not the only medium through which the library profession exchanges information and research findings, although librarianship possesses a growing body of scholarly literature. Workshops, symposia, seminars, meetings of regional and national organizations, et cetera, are also major means of communication within the discipline. Therefore, a candidate's contributions in these areas should be considered the equivalent of traditional scholarship. In addition, there must be clear evidence of promise for continued professional growth and development.
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

c. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian III

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian III. Evidence of exemplary professional

competency and significant achievement in the area of professional growth and development, or service is required.

(Rev. Apr. 2011)

- (1) Promotion to the rank of Librarian III requires sustained and exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)
- (2) There must be clear evidence of high promise for continued quality of scholarship and professional activities. Since peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality, typically the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications). All evidence should be evaluated rigorously.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)
- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College or there should be active and sustained service in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

d. Promotion to the Rank of Librarian IV

Promotion to the rank of Librarian IV requires evidence of continuing quality professional competency, professional growth and development, and service. The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to Librarian IV. Evidence of exemplary performance in the area of professional competence and significant achievement in the areas of professional growth and development, and service is required.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

- (1) Promotion to the rank of Librarian IV requires exemplary professional competency.
- (2) Because Librarian IV is the highest rank, there must be clear evidence of continuing quality scholarship. Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications). In addition to scholarship, sustained professional activity is expected. All evidence should be rigorously evaluated.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

- (3) There should be active and sustained service to the College. Leadership should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate's professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.
(Rev. Apr. 2011)

e. Nomination of Library Faculty to a Higher Rank

It should be clearly understood by all library faculty members that promotion does not come automatically after the passage of a fixed period of time, but is a recognition of outstanding performance and service at the College.

- (1) Source of Nomination. When a library faculty member becomes eligible for nomination to a higher rank, a nomination may be submitted in the form of a petition from:
 - (i) the Dean of Libraries, after consultation with the tenured members of the library faculty, to the Provost;
 - (ii) a majority of the tenured members of the library faculty to the Provost;
 - (iii) a majority of the members of the library faculty to the Provost;
 - (iv) the individual library faculty member to the Provost;
 - (v) the Provost to the Dean of the library.
- (2) 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.

D. Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion of Instructional and Library Faculty

1. Introduction

The third-year evaluation is a significant decision point in a faculty member's career at the College of Charleston. The result of the third-year evaluation is a decision whether to reappoint a faculty member. For a

faculty member with two years of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fourth year. For a faculty member with one year of credit toward tenure, a third-year evaluation will take place in the fall semester of the third year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place in the fall of the fifth year.
(Rev. Apr. 2007)

Candidates hired at mid-year will undergo the third-year review during the fall semester of the third academic year, and the evaluation for tenure will take place during the fall semester of the sixth academic year. The evaluations for third-year review and for tenure will be adjusted accordingly for candidates hired at mid-year and granted credit for prior experience.
(Ins. Apr. 2007)

Tenure and promotion are awarded to eligible faculty at the College of Charleston for meritorious achievement in the three areas of teaching (for library faculty, “professional competence”), research and professional development, and service. Tenure is awarded to faculty to assure that they have freedom in teaching, research and extramural activities and a sufficient degree of economic security to make teaching at the College of Charleston attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and society.²

After the expiration of a probationary period, which is stated in the initial employment and is normally six years (some faculty are hired with up to two years credit for teaching in other institutions of higher education), faculty should become eligible for consideration for tenure and, upon its reward, should be terminated only for adequate cause.
(Rev. Apr. 2007)

Eligibility requirements and nomination procedures are described in Section VI.A. Candidates are reminded that these time-in-rank requirements are minimal. The established criteria for promotion to the various ranks are also minimal requirements. In particular, faculty are encouraged to seek promotion to professor when they feel confident about their eligibility and performance, not merely because minimal requirements are met.

By August 15, each Department Chair should provide the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost with a list of faculty members to be considered. The Dean of Libraries should provide a list of eligible library faculty members to the Provost.

² “On Academic Freedom and Tenure,” (AAUP 1940 Statement of Principle, readopted 1982)

(Rev. Apr. 2007)

The faculty member undergoing third-year evaluation must prepare and submit a packet of evidence to demonstrate that the faculty member has met the standards and criteria for this level of evaluation during that individual's first two years at the College. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

2. Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member's Contribution to the Packet

A faculty member 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.

3. Standards, Criteria and Evidence. See *Faculty/Administration Manual*, Art. VI, Sect. A (for Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty), Sect. B (for Instructors and Senior Instructors) and Sect. C (for Library Faculty). (Rev. Apr. 2011)

4. Composition of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

For each faculty member to be evaluated, an appropriate departmental evaluation panel will be formed to make a summary presentation to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries concerning the candidate. The Chair of the department will provide the appropriate Academic Dean with the names of the panel members and Chair as soon as possible. Any member of the department who is being considered for promotion is disqualified from serving on that member's own review panel or that of a colleague who is being considered for promotion to the same or higher rank within the department. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

The Departmental Evaluation Panel will be composed of at least five tenured faculty members. All tenured departmental faculty will serve on the evaluation panel. Exceptions for faculty on sabbatical or leave are described in Art. X.A. The appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries may sit with the Departmental Evaluation Panel throughout the review process; however, the Dean not required to sit with the Departmental Evaluation Panel. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

Where the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion or third-year evaluation, the same individual from

outside the department sits with the departmental panel members for all cases, unless the department has six or more candidates due for panel evaluation. In such cases, departmental members of the panel may appoint no more than two extra-departmental panel members to sit with the panel in different cases, with the cases divided such that a single extra-departmental panel member shall serve in all cases under review for the same rank. If a department's membership is such that the panel has fewer than five members, additional tenured members of the faculty, from related fields if possible, will be selected to give the panel a total membership of five. In all cases, each year vacancies in the evaluation panel will be filled by having the departmental members of the panel provide a slate of potential evaluation panel members to each of the candidates for third-year reappointment, tenure and promotion who will rank order the slate first to last. The slate will consist of at least five names or twice the number of positions on the panel to be filled (whichever is larger). The rankings of all candidates will be averaged and the panel will be completed by offering the positions to the highest ranked candidates until the panel is completed. (Rev. Aug. 2011; Mar. 2012)

Where there are no members of the department eligible to serve on the panel, all members of the department will meet and select by majority vote a slate of 10 tenured faculty (from related fields if possible) and present it to the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries. The appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries will appoint the five members of the panel from the slate and will designate one of the five to serve as the panel chair.

When unusual circumstances justify and where requested by the Department Chair, the evaluatee, the evaluation panel, the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries or the Provost, the Provost may appoint an outside advisor to assist the evaluation panel in its task. Ideally, said advisor will be a tenured faculty member in the evaluatee's discipline from another institution of higher education.

After consultation with the evaluatee, Department Chair, all members of the panel, and the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries, the Provost will define in writing the role and extent of participation in the process of their outside advisor and furnish copies to all parties.

5. Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair

If the Department Chair is a member of the panel, then the Department Chair is the panel chair. If the Department Chair is not a panel member, the panel chair will be the senior departmental member serving on the panel. The senior departmental member is the one of highest rank who has held that rank longest while at the College. Because the Library does

not have a Department Chair, the tenured Library faculty will elect a Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

6. Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

The departmental evaluation panel will base its recommendation on the following information:

- a. Faculty member's contribution to the packet, as assembled by the candidate, to provide evidence that the faculty member meets the criteria for teaching, research and development, and service. (Rev. Aug. 2018)
- b. Letters by the departmental colleagues addressing whether the evaluatee has met the stated criteria. Normally, all tenured faculty members in a department, excluding the department chair, must provide colleague evaluation letters; however, any member of the department may submit a colleague letter, except that candidates do not write letters of evaluation on their departmental colleagues who are being evaluated for the same purpose. Colleagues should study thoroughly the candidate's contributions to the packet before writing their colleague letters. Colleague letters should be explicit and detailed and should address the criteria. To say "the candidate meets the criteria" is inadequate. College of Charleston personnel are to treat these colleague letters as confidential. They shall be available only to those authorized to use them as part of the evaluation process. (Rev. Apr. 2007; Apr. 2012)
- c. Student Rating Averages from all courses evaluated and Summary Ratings for all courses in the Department or Program. (Normally, course evaluation ratings are included by the candidate in the packet; however, some or all of these documents may be provided by the department chair in the event the candidate is unable to do so.) (Rev. Apr. 2007)
- d. Letters of evaluation from extra-departmental College of Charleston colleagues and, where appropriate, from colleagues at other institutions familiar with the candidate's teaching, and/or research and professional development, and/or service; these letters are solicited by the department chair at the request of the candidate.

An independent external review of the candidate's scholarly work by experts in the candidate's field of work is optional, and the required protocol for this review is included in Section VI.A.2.b.(2).

Extra-departmental colleague letters are optional for third-year review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate.
(Rev. Apr. 2007)

- e. All annual evaluation narratives and rating letters, as well as any letters that the evaluatee has written in response to the annual evaluations.
- f. Recent graduate evaluations addressing the criteria shall be solicited by the panel Chair. Each department shall have established procedures to be used by evaluation panels for the solicitation of recent graduate evaluations. A written statement of this procedure shall be on file in the appropriate Academic Dean and the Provost's office. Recent graduate evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate.
(Rev. Apr. 2007)
- g. A personal interview of the candidate by the department evaluation panel.
- h. Such other data and interviews as the panel feels would be valuable.

7. Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel

After due deliberation, the panel shall take its vote by written ballot. The chair 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 panel shall meet with the faculty member being evaluated to provide the faculty member with a copy of the panel's written statement, which 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. 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.

(Rev. Apr. 2009)

If the panel's written statement provided to the candidate contains an error of fact, the panel chair may correct this error through an addendum to the original panel statement (with notice to the candidate) or the candidate may provide a written correction for the inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Dean with a copy to the chair of the departmental panel. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.³

(Ins. Apr. 2012)

The panel chair shall forward the panel's statement to the appropriate Academic Dean by the announced deadline. In the case of tenure and promotion recommendations, this deadline is typically at the end of October. In the case of third-year reappointment recommendations, this deadline is typically near mid-January.

(Rev. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009)

8. Dean's Role for Third-year Candidates

The appropriate Dean shall review the faculty member's packet and the departmental evaluation panel's recommendation. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Dean from the Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issues, and shall become part of the packet. The Dean shall interview each candidate.

(Rev. Apr. 2009; Rev. Apr. 2012)

The Dean shall provide the candidate and the chair of the departmental panel a copy of the Dean's assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost. The Dean shall submit all 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. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Apr. 2012; Aug. 2018)

³ This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact, in place since AY2012-13, will be reviewed every three years by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee to assess the extent and appropriateness of their use. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate.

9. Dean's Role for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

The appropriate Dean will review the evaluation panel recommendations and the candidate's packet. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Dean from the Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issue, and shall become part of the packet. The Dean may choose to interview candidates.

(Rev. Apr. 2007; Rev. Apr. 2009; Rev. Apr. 2012)

The Dean will provide the candidate and the chair of the departmental panel a copy of the Dean's own assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost. The Dean shall provide these 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 Third-year Review by the announced deadlines, which are typically at the end of November. (Rev. Apr. 2007; Apr. 2009; Apr. 2012; Aug. 2018)

10. Correction of Errors in Dean's Recommendation

If a recommendation provided to the candidate by a Dean contains an error of fact, the Dean may correct this error through an addendum to the Dean's original letter of recommendation (with notice to the candidate and chair of the departmental panel) or the candidate may provide a written correction for the inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs with a copy to the Dean and chair of the departmental panel. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.⁴ (Ins. Apr. 2012; Rev. Aug. 2018)

11. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

The Provost shall make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. The Faculty Advisory Committee shall provide the candidate, chair of the departmental panel, Dean, and

⁴ This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact, in place since AY2012-13, will be reviewed every three years by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee to assess the extent and appropriateness of their use. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate.

Provost a copy of their assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the President by the announced deadlines. (Rev. Apr. 2012)

The Committee 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 either the Dean's recommendation or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, the Dean shall refer the case to the Faculty Advisory Committee for their recommendations. The Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee shall interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when 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 Faculty Advisory Committee's recommendations in cases where they act shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Apr. 2011)

Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the Chair of the Advisory Committee from the Dean, Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair, or through that chair to the candidate. Requests should be written and responses should be brief and also in writing, addressing only the requested issue, and shall become part of the packet. Both the request for information and the response should also be sent, for information, to levels of review between the Advisory Committee and the responding body. (Ins. Apr. 2012)

If a recommendation provided to the candidate by the Advisory Committee contains an error of fact, the candidate may provide a written correction for inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation. The written correction should be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs with a copy to the chair of the Advisory Committee, the Dean and the chair of the departmental panel. The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.⁵ (Ins. Apr. 2012)

⁵ This and other changes in procedure to allow for the correction of errors of fact, in place since AY2012-13, will be reviewed every three years by Academic Affairs in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and the Faculty Welfare Committee to assess the extent and appropriateness of their use. These groups will jointly report this analysis to the Faculty Senate.

12. Provost's Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

After the Advisory Committee has made its written recommendation to the President, the Provost may interview the candidate as part of the Provost's independent evaluation of the candidate. The Provost's recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines. In all cases in which the Provost's recommendation is negative or reverses an earlier decision, the Provost will provide a copy of the Provost's recommendation to the candidate, chair, Dean, and chair of the Advisory Committee simultaneously with notice to the candidate of the President's decision. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Apr. 2012; Aug. 2018)

13. President's Decision

The President shall make a final determination within twelve working days after the President receives recommendations from all of the following: the department 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.⁶ 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 final decision is made by the President, and within the twelve working days after the last recommendation is received (listed above), the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair in writing, of the President's decision. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Aug. 2018)

13. Appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee

- a. A denial may only be appealed to the Faculty Hearing Committee when the faculty member alleges that the denial was based upon any of the following three grounds:
 - (1). Discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, race, color, religion, national origin, veterans' status, genetic information, or disability⁷; or,
 - (2). Violation of academic freedom, as it relates to freedom of expression; or,

⁶ Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.

⁷ This list was revised in August 2017 to reflect the College's policy on *Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse*.

- (3). Violation of due process, as provided in the College's published rules, regulations, policies and procedures.
 - b. The appeal shall be heard as a grievance before a panel of the Faculty Hearing Committee, and the faculty member should follow the procedures of the Hearing Committee in requesting a hearing. The notice requesting a hearing must be filed with the Hearing Committee within 20 working days of receipt of the President's written decision.
(Rev. Aug. 2018)
 - c. The President's decision will be made within ten working days after receipt of the recommendation of the panel of the Faculty Hearing Committee, and receipt of any objections about the conduct of the hearing or correction of errors of fact from the grievant, or notice of waiver of that right by the grievant.
(Rev. Aug. 2018)
14. Discretionary Appeal to College of Charleston Board of Trustees⁸
 - a. The President's decision in cases heard by the Faculty Hearing Committee may be appealed to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees. The decision as to whether or not to accept the appeal is within the sole discretion of the Board.
 - b. When an appeal to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees is sought, the faculty member must file a Notice of Appeal within 10 working days of receipt of the President's decision. This Notice must be in writing and sent to the Chair of the Board, with a copy to the President. The Notice of Appeal must identify the issues to be raised in the appeal and the grounds for the appeal.
 - c. If the Board decides to hear the appeal, the Chair of the Board will establish a reasonable timetable for disposition of the appeal, which will be communicated to all parties.
 - d. At the Chair's discretion, appeals will be heard by the entire Board or by a committee of not less than three Board members appointed by the Chair for that purpose.
 - e. Appeals will be heard on the record established in the Faculty Hearing Committee. The Board shall have available for its review all recordings, statements, documents and evidence accumulated

⁸ The College of Charleston Board of Trustees passed this policy concerning appeals by faculty members in January 1985. This list was revised in August 2017 to reflect the College's policy *Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse*.

during the appeal process. Briefs and oral arguments will be permitted but are not required. Oral arguments may be made by the parties or by their attorneys. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

- f. The Board shall submit its decision in writing to the President and the faculty member. The decision of the Board is final.

15. Disposition of Packet Material

When the evaluation process has resulted in a positive decision, within three months of that decision the packet materials submitted by the faculty member shall be returned to the faculty member; colleague letters will be returned to the authors; and recent graduate evaluation forms will be returned to the Department Chair.

When the decision is negative, the Provost will retain the originals of all packet materials for five years. A faculty member may request and receive from the Provost a copy of the faculty member's contribution to the packet. (Rev. Aug. 2018)