

2-3-2011

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 3, 2011

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 3, 2011" (2011). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 42.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/42

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

**Approved Minutes
Executive Committee
February 3, 2011**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Sue Easton, Barry Levis, Claire Strom, Nick Horsmon, Joan Davison, Laurie Joyner, Lewis Duncan

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:37 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approved the minutes of January 13, 2011.
- III. Committee Reports
 - A. AAC – Levis identifies the committee’s remaining business for the academic year. He hopes EC will forward the resolution regarding Maymester to the faculty at its next meeting. AAC still intends to send a proposal on pre-matriculation/first year field studies to EC and the faculty. Levis also notes AAC is considering changes in the INB major, but at this point it is unknown whether AAC will consider the changes sufficiently extensive to send to the faculty. Duncan suggests inviting a Crummer representative to the AAC meeting which addresses changes in INB due to the accreditation.
 - B. PSC – Strom reports PSC is undertaking substantive bylaw changes. PSC also is working on two other issues – evaluation of teaching and pay structures for adjuncts, Holt teaching, master programs and overloads. Strom explains PSC hopes to suggest a structure which creates salary consistency, but notes she is uncertain whether a recommendation goes to the faculty or the dean.
 - C. SLC – Boles reminds EC that the faculty meeting lost a quorum with the question unresolved as to how to handle the report on the Office of Dean of Student Affairs. Boles reports SLC still plans to bring an attendance policy to EC, but currently is working on concerns which AAC raised. Levis suggests a joint committee to move forward the issue, and Boles acknowledges the value of this approach. Duncan suggests FAR involvement in the discussion given the focus on student athletes. Boles notes SLC previously involved both students and representatives of the athletics department and intends to continue to invite relevant individuals to participate.
 - D. F&S – Easton states F&S plans to hold a colloquium, perhaps with Scott Bitikofer, to discuss the consultants’ report on space allocation. She also announces that F&S is beginning to address the issue of how to prioritize benefits and hopes to obtain reactions and opinions from faculty members on benefits. Joyner suggests targeting department chairs to obtain this information.

IV. New Business

- A. Editorial correction of policies adopted by the Faculty – Foglesong explains the issue is whether EC has the authority to adopt grammatical changes to policies and documents, and in this specific case to the Honor Code. Duncan states he is concerned the Honor Code only holds students responsible for their own behavior, but does not hold them responsible to report other students who violate the code. Boles notes that witnessing an honor code violation is different than knowing about a violation. Duncan concurs, and emphasizes the importance of holding witnesses responsible such as the military academies do. Foglesong states that point is a substantive change and different than the editorial changes under consideration. (See Attachment 1). Boles suggests acceptance of the first set of editorial revisions because the first set fits easily upon cards for students' signatures. Levis agrees. Boles moves and Levis seconds, *EC accepts the first set of proposed editorial changes in the adopted Honor Statement and forwards to SGA for expedited approval.* The motion unanimously passes.
- B. Faculty Governance's role in evaluating provost candidates - Foglesong notes it seems prescient the next faculty meeting occurs two days after the last provost candidate visits and suggests the February meeting could be designated for discussion of the candidates. Duncan questions whether the A&S faculty can act independently from the all college faculty, whether the A&S should publicly rank the candidates, and whether it is preferable to rely upon the Search Committee than EC to gather faculty opinion. Duncan asserts the bylaws are quite explicit. He reads the All Faculty Bylaws, section 3: "Certain College business, such as faculty approval of candidates for the positions of President of the College or Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the College, are issues of concern to the entire faculty of Rollins College. Such business shall be completed at a meeting of the Faculty of Rollins College." Foglesong responds there is not a disagreement that the bylaws call for the All Faculty to meet and send forth an opinion, but the point is the A&S Faculty bylaws also provide for an opportunity to meet to vote on administrative appointments including the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Davison explains the All Faculty bylaws were drafted after the A&S bylaws, and the intent was that both faculties would meet, otherwise the A&S bylaws subsequently would have been amended. She further states this process has been the practice. Levis concurs. Duncan suggests the goal is to collectively seek and attract the best candidate, and a separate A&S ranking of candidates either might keep a person from coming to Rollins or begin the relationship poorly. Boles responds that last year the faculty did not rank candidates but rather identified candidates as acceptable or unacceptable. Strom agrees but notes that if more than one candidate is acceptable then it is desirable to rank the candidates. Duncan mentions last year's meeting was difficult because the search overlapped the end of the year, and Crummer faculty were prepared to leave campus. Duncan also explains that the A&S faculty only evaluates some qualities of the provost and

it is necessary for the senior administration to consider candidates for other attributes. Foglesong responds he is 90% persuaded about the danger of ranking candidates and will make an argument to the faculty regarding these dangers, but he cannot promise A&S will decide not to rank. Strom adds it is a problem faculty can put forward no less than two because the possibility exists one candidate will be qualified, but not two candidates. Levis suggests vote totals are an implicit ranking. Foglesong again asks whether to devote the meeting of the 24th to the issue of provost candidates. Davison moves “The faculty will discuss the provost candidates at the previously scheduled meeting on February 24.” Boles seconds. Levis mentions it also is essential to discuss the Maymester resolution at the meeting on the 24th. The motion unanimously passes.

- C. Student Life’s role in advising the Athletics Department regarding “institutional policies and practices” – Davison explains the Athletics Department currently is involved in its NCAA Institutional Self-Study which contains a new provision making the absence of formal contact between the athletics department and the faculty a significant deficiency. (See Attachment 2.) She elaborates that a significant deficiency suggests lack of institutional control and academic integrity, and therefore advises SLC begin to hold one formal meeting a year with the Athletics Director. Boles wonders whether SLC or AAC is the appropriate committee, and Davison notes the bylaws identify SLC’s jurisdiction related to intercollegiate athletics. Duncan wonders about Crummer representation in a formal meeting given the participation of Crummer students as intercollegiate athletes. Davison moves *Student Life shall devote one meeting each academic year to a meeting with the Athletics Director in which the Athletics Director provides a report regarding institutional policies and practices and engages in questions and answers. The FAR, chair of AAC and a Crummer faculty member representative shall be present at the meeting.* Levis seconds, and the motion unanimously passes.
- D. Maymester policy -- (See Attachment 3.) Levis first explains why AAC left out its third issue, the issue of completion of general education requirements at Rollins following matriculation. He mentions he spoke with Erdmann who does not believe such a policy would hurt admissions. Levis notes the issue is very complex, and AAC still is uncertain, but AAC believes it is unethical not to offer sufficient courses to complete general education requirements. Levis states many students expect to take the O, P and N elsewhere because of the limited course offerings. Joyner and Levis agree that sufficient capacity theoretically exists for all students to complete their science courses at Rollins, but the science courses have only a small percentage of access capacity compared to other general education courses. Joyner comments that students’ options are decreased due to conflicts with other required courses in their majors. Levis responds the addition of science courses in Maymester and Holt will offer increased opportunities to complete these requirements. Joyner asks about the extension of Maymester to four weeks and states the vast majority of students and faculty members responding to a survey think three

weeks is sufficiently long to cover the course material. Levis answers this might be true, but the sciences, where much of the problem of availability exists, argued for four week courses. Boles asks about campus housing during Maymester, and Levis responds that most students live off campus. Duncan suggests there will be a growing on-campus population in coming years, and Joyner asks to contact Hayner to ensure these students can be accommodated. Levis moves the first resolution: “*Resolved: students receiving a Rollins degree, except in the Hamilton Holt school, shall earn one-half of the credits required for graduation in the College of Arts and Sciences or affiliated Rollins programs.*” The motion unanimously passes. Levis then moves a second resolution: “*That the College of Arts and Sciences establish a four-week semester to be called Maymester. The four-week session will normally offer only courses fulfilling general education requirements. Faculty members may petition the AAC to include courses other than those fulfilling general education requirements based on institutional needs. The six-week sessions through the Hamilton Holt School will offer courses not appropriate for the four-week semester such as language and laboratory science courses. Students may take only one course in the four-week semester, although students may petition the Academic Appeals Committee for a waiver to take a second course.*” Joyner inquires about establishing a GPA floor above which students do not need to apply for a waiver. Levis explains AAC did not want to appear to discourage students with lower GPAs who need a second course from applying. Wellman asks about the potential for an overwhelming number of appeals. Levis responds the appeals committee believes it can handle the number. Levis further states that if courses are sufficiently rigorous it appears impossible to attend two classes all day and then complete the studying and homework. Joyner reminds EC that Maymester allows for an extended period for the completion of assignments and papers. Duncan concurs with Levis that it seems impossible in general for all the work of two courses to be completed in four weeks. Joyner responds not only is it possible, but it seems student performance is fine. Joyner inquires whether only general education courses can be taught during the Maymester, and what the possibility is for departments to add courses to relieve major pressures. Levis says this is an option, but AAC does not want general education courses pushed out of the schedule due to major courses. Duncan stresses the importance of pedagogy and emphasizes there exists sound reason to offer different courses at different points in time and in different time segments. Levis agrees and notes that at one point AAC considered including on the course approval form a question of pedagogical justification but decided the answers would be too time-consuming. Strom calls the question, and the motion unanimously passes.

- E. PSC Bylaw Changes – Strom explains the current set of PSC bylaw changes basically changes dates, restructures the discussion of FEC activity, and specifies the electronic process. She notes PSC will bring another set of bylaw changes with substantive content. Strom elaborates PSC tried to create a rational timetable for review of faculty as well as to change the structure of the text. The bylaw would be amended so that any review that does not go to

FEC – the annual and PTR – are specified at the beginning. Subsequently the bylaw deals with all cases that do go through FEC. This change means the reader need not flip back to the initial tenure and promotion discussions, but rather now moves forward. Strom notes both FEC and PSC approved the changes. Strom elaborates that the date for the annual review and PTR is moved from 12/15 to 1/1 to allow new faculty members an opportunity to look at course evaluations. Additionally CEC now notifies others of its make up. Duncan refers to 4H, notification of candidates, and expresses concern that the date of the Board of Trustees meeting floats by several weeks and perhaps does not allow sufficient time for notification. Duncan suggests changing the language to specify notification within 5 business days of the February and May meetings of the Board of Trustees. Strom accepts this change. Boles inquires about the formation of the CEC on May 1 even though the committee does not meet until January. He suggests a December 1 date and Strom accepts. Levis asks whether PSC will bring these changes to the faculty as individual amendments or a consent package. Foglesong suggests this can be decided prior to the meeting. Strom moves to “*adopt the proposed changes in the timetable for tenure evaluations.*” The motion is unanimously approved.

- F. Pre-matriculation/first year field experience programs – Levis reminds EC this issue still exists.

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:56pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

Appendix A

Submitted by Jay Yellen

Original

The development of the virtues of Honor and Integrity is integral to a Rollins College education and to membership in the Rollins College community. Therefore, I, a student of Rollins College, pledge to show my commitment to these virtues by abstaining from any lying, cheating, or plagiarism in my academic endeavor, by behaving responsibly, respectfully and honorably in my social life and in my relationships with others, and by respecting the campus environment and the property of all members of the college community.

Jay's Proposed Revision

The development of the virtues of honor and integrity is integral to a Rollins College education and to membership in the Rollins College community. Therefore, I, a student at Rollins College, pledge to show my commitment to those virtues by abstaining from any lying, cheating, or plagiarism in my academic endeavor; by behaving responsibly, respectfully, and honorably in my social life and in my relationships with others; and by respecting the campus environment and the property of all members of the college community.

OR

The development of the virtues of honor and integrity is integral to a Rollins College education and to membership in the Rollins College community. Therefore, I, a student at Rollins College, pledge to show my commitment to those virtues by:

- abstaining from any lying, cheating, or plagiarism in my academic endeavor;
- behaving responsibly, respectfully, and honorably in my social life and in my relationships with others; and
- respecting the campus environment and the property of all members of the college community.

Attachment 2

From Joan Davison

Here is the specific issue. The Athletics Department must complete an NCAA Institutional Self Study every five years. The NCAA now treats as a "significant deficiency" failure to have a procedure through which "...the faculty as a whole, or through some representative body, [is] periodically consulted regarding institutional policies and practices affecting the operation of intercollegiate athletics."

I suggest SLC formally meet at least once a year with the Athletics Director and at this meeting obtain a report and engage in questions and answers.

I do not know believe we need a bylaw change to introduce this practice, but EC certainly could consider an amendment. Currently the bylaw states:

"Section 3. The Student Life Committee

Responsibilities. The Student Life Committee recommends policies and priorities with regard to student life to the Faculty and advises the administration concerning the implementation of such policies.

Student life concerns include, but are not restricted to, issues related to student housing, student services, student activities and organizations, student conduct and standards, recreation, and intercollegiate athletics."

Attachment 3

From Academic Affairs

General Education Courses, Transfer Credit, and Maymester

Rationale

In the last several years the number of credits students have earned outside of Rollins College has increased exponentially. New students bring in many credits through dual-enrolled high school courses, IB, AP and others. Once students matriculate, many will take courses from other institutions during the summer, especially to fulfill general education requirements. While students give a variety of reasons for taking these external courses, many will admit that they take them elsewhere because they believe the courses will be easier. The Academic Affairs Committee has studied this problem over the past several years and has concluded that this trend is damaging in several ways. In the first place, students likely take courses to fulfill their general education requirements that do not come up to our standards of quality and rigor. Moreover, the college loses revenue when these students graduate early. Another trend is the increasing number of students who graduate in 3½ years. The following proposals are designed to address these issues. The first modification would require graduating students to complete half of their total credits at Rollins College. The establishment of Maymester will facilitate this process by offering general education courses in the summer at Rollins. Since not all general education courses such language and laboratory science are suitable for a very short semester, this proposal would also open up the Holt six-week semester for these courses.

Motions

1. Resolved: The residency requirement for students receiving a Rollins degree shall be one-half of the credits required for graduation. These credits must be earned in the College of Arts and Sciences or affiliated Rollins programs.
2. Resolved: That the College of Arts and Sciences establish a four-week semester to be called Maymester. The four-week session will normally offer only courses fulfilling general education requirements. Faculty members may petition the AAC to include courses other than those fulfilling general education requirements based on institutional needs. The six-week sessions through the Hamilton Holt School will offer courses not appropriate for the four-week semester such as language and laboratory science courses. Students may take only one course in the four-week semester, although students may petition the Academic Appeals Committee for a waiver to take a second course.

Attachment 4a – Proposed version with highlighted changes

From PSC

Most of what is in the below document is exactly what is in the current bylaws. What has been altered is the structure. The two evaluations that do not involve FEC are placed first. Then the CEC and FEC are explained; then each evaluation that goes to FEC is outlined, with each step in each section. Before, someone going up for mid-course had to refer often to the tenure part of the document. Although this makes the document longer, we believe it makes it clearer. Any information that is actually deleted or added, rather than moved, is highlighted and explained.

C. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY

The CEC will conduct annual evaluations of all tenure-track faculty. The candidate will submit materials for review, including a professional assessment statement, to the CEC by December 15. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate's permanent file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure, based on the criteria set forth in the bylaws and in individual departmental criteria.

These annual evaluations are to be conducted for every year in which neither a tenure evaluation nor a comprehensive mid-course evaluation takes place.

Departmental evaluations are to be conducted every year for Visiting Professors of any rank. The evaluation will be documented in a report and placed in the faculty member's departmental file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments in meeting department and College expectations.

D. POST-TENURE EVALUATIONS

The CEC, with the support of the appropriate Dean, is charged with the responsibility of encouraging improved teaching and professional development for all members of the faculty. Tenured faculty will normally be evaluated every seven years, two years before their eligibility for a sabbatical. Exceptions may be recommended by the appropriate Dean, with the approval of the Professional Standards Committee.

While the primary purpose of continued assessment is to promote improved teaching and professional development, it also assists tenured faculty in the identification of strengths and correction of any deficiencies. Should the CEC or the appropriate Dean detect deficiencies which are particularly significant, the evaluation proceedings may be initiated at any time.

The faculty member's professional assessment statement plays a primary role in these seven-year evaluations. The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan. This plan, with supporting documents, goes to the members of the Cede to review. The CEC then meets with the faculty member to discuss the professional assessment statement and writes a brief letter of evaluation in response to it, noting their developmental assessment of the faculty member and how the plans fit into the department's goals. This letter is sent to the appropriate Dean by April 15 of the penultimate year before the faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical.

Deans play a central role in providing ongoing encouragement and support for faculty efforts at professional development. The Dean meets with the faculty member separately to discuss the professional assessment statement, and supporting documents, and the letter of the CEC. The Dean then writes a brief letter of evaluation, stating points of concurrence or disagreement. The faculty member receives a copy of this letter by August 15 of the evaluation year.

Both letters, along with the Faculty Development Plan, and other supporting materials, are placed in a file for the faculty member that is kept in the office of the Dean. While a faculty member has a reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, this file is then used in decisions about release time, requests for funding, and merit awards.

Timeline for Annual and Post-tenure Review

	Annual	Post-tenure
Notification by Dean's office of eligibility	N/A	April 15
CEC formed by:	May 1	May 1
Candidate materials submitted to Dean and CEC	December 15	December 15
CEC's letter to Dean and candidate by:	February 15	April 15
Dean's letter to candidate and CEC by:	N/A	August 15

E. PROCEDURES FOR MID-COURSE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION FACULTY REVIEW

Section 1. Candidate Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

The chair of the department to which the candidate has been appointed, in consultation with members of that department, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee by May 15 prior to the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The CEC normally consists of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a minimum of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding tenured members who wish to serve. In addition, a member of the FEC serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member when the candidate is being evaluated for tenure or promotion. If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, non-tenured members may be appointed. If non-tenured members are unavailable, the department Chair, with the advice of the candidate and the approval of the CEC, will select tenured members from outside the department to serve on the CEC. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair.

For candidates with an appointment in more than one department or program, the CEC, with the advice of the candidate, will add to the CEC one more tenured faculty member, or non-tenured faculty member if a tenured faculty member is unavailable. This faculty member should have greater familiarity with the work of the candidate outside the

department to which the candidate was appointed. If such a faculty member is unavailable, the Chair of the Professional Standards Committee will select a tenured faculty member to serve on the CEC.

b. Collection of Materials Required for Review

The Chair of the CEC has the responsibility for collecting additional materials required for the evaluation including letters from tenured members of the department and/or department letters signed by the tenured members of the department, and student evaluations, and making them available electronically for members of the CEC, FEC, and the appropriate Dean to review by the time the candidate submits her/his materials. **[inserted language replaces current language about assembling paper files]**

At the candidate's request, for the assessment of the candidate's scholarship, two peer evaluators for institutions other than Rollins will be selected by the Chair of the CEC and the appropriate Dean from a list submitted by the candidate. The Chair then contacts the peer evaluators and requests their evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. This request must be made in writing to both the Dean and the Chair of the CEC by May 15. **[fits in with changed time guidelines]**

c. Review by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

After each member of the CEC has reviewed the candidate's file, the CEC meets with the candidate to discuss the activities addressed in the file. Issues that the CEC considered relevant to the evaluation that might not have been addressed by the candidate are also raised here. The CEC then approves a report and recommendation written by the Chair. The report and recommendation records the vote of the CEC. **The report and recommendation are sent electronically to the candidate, the Dean, and the FEC. [inserted phrase replaces current language about circulating manual files]**

If the CEC makes a positive recommendation, it gives reasons for its recommendation in the report. In the cases of a recommendation against awarding tenure or promotion, the CEC gives reasons for its conclusion. No candidate is tenured or promoted without the approval of a majority of the CEC. The candidate is given a copy of the report and recommendation, and has the opportunity to respond in writing, **within one week, sending his/her response to all of the appropriate entities in the process. [altered language to match that later in document—added time constraint of one week]**

Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

The FEC consists of six tenured faculty members each with the rank of Professor serving staggered terms of three years. These faculty members are appointed by the Executive

Committee, with some consideration given to academic diversity, and ratified by the faculty. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the committee. **[change made and approved by faculty several years ago and is current practice. Bylaws not updated]**

b. Access to Information

The FEC has access to the candidate's file and all other materials considered at other stages of the evaluation process, and can request additional information from the Dean. It is always appropriate for the FEC to introduce additional information that might not have been included by the CEC or the appropriate Dean. The FEC also has the authority to call in anyone it needs for consultation, especially where there is disagreement between parties at different stages of the evaluation process.

c. Review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

The FEC conducts its own evaluation of each candidate for tenure or promotion. The evaluation will be based on the following sources: the written report and recommendation by the CEC, the department's approved criteria for tenure or promotion or, **in the absence of approved criteria, specifications of how College criteria for tenure and promotion are defined, measured, and applied,**~~[deleted as all departments now have criteria]~~ the assessment of external evaluators (when requested by the candidate), the report and recommendation of the appropriate Dean, the candidate's professional assessment statement, an interview with the candidate, and any other material or information that the FEC has obtained in the exercise of its duties. The FEC may also consult with the CEC, the appropriate Dean, or any other member of the community.

Meetings of the FEC must be confidential, regardless of subject matter under consideration and may be attended only by the duly appointed members of the FEC. Candidates for tenure, promotion, and mid-course reviews will attend their scheduled FEC interviews as well as additional meetings at the request of FEC. At the invitation of the FEC, other persons, who the bylaws state may be consulted, may attend meetings of the FEC to which they are invited. This bylaw supersedes all other by laws or faculty handbook rules, which may be contrary.**[added last fall by faculty]**

The FEC cannot challenge substantive requirements of a department for tenure or promotion that has approved criteria. The FEC will require the evaluation from the CEC to adhere to its approved criteria, both procedural and substantive.

Upon completion of its review of its candidate, the FEC writes a report and recommendation. The recommendation of the FEC may agree or disagree with that of the CEC or of the Dean. In the event of a negative evaluation by the FEC, the FEC will consult with the CEC on points of disagreement. If the FEC is still not satisfied with the arguments of the CEC, it submits its negative recommendation, **along with the candidate's file, the Candidate Evaluation Committee's report and recommendation, the Dean's report and recommendation, and the candidate's response(s) to any of the reports**

and recommendations [deleted according to current practice] to the Provost for his/her report and recommendation.

Section 3. Comprehensive Mid-Course Evaluation

Prior to the tenure review, each candidate for tenure and promotion will receive one comprehensive mid-course evaluation.. The CEC, the appropriate Dean, and the FEC will each prepare a written report detailing the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, including specific comments regarding directions the candidate might pursue to strengthen his or her case for tenure or promotion.

A candidate for promotion to Professor has the right to make a written request to the relevant department head and Dean for a comprehensive mid-course evaluation. The subsequent evaluation for promotion can take place no earlier than two years after the mid-course evaluation.

a. Notification

Normally, the comprehensive mid-course evaluation will take place in the spring of the candidate's third year, but no later than two years before the evaluation for tenure is to take place.

The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and/or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides him/her with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials s/he must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

b. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his/her activities since her/his last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of his or her successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of

development, and

- how the candidate's research interests are connected to his or her academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from his or her particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, appropriate Dean, and FEC by December 15. **[language altered to fit adjusted timetable]**

c. Evaluation by Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file, interviewed the candidate, and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it electronically, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by February 15. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week. **[language added to make chronological process clear within document]**

d. Evaluation by Appropriate Dean

Based on the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate, the appropriate Dean conducts a separate evaluation. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For mid-course evaluations, the Dean submits a report and recommendation to the candidate, the CEC, and FEC no less than one week before its meeting with the candidate. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week. **[language added to address current practice and new timeline]**

e. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the appropriate Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by May 15.

Section 4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

a. Eligibility

Normally, a candidate is eligible for the awarding of tenure in her/his seventh year of a tenure-track appointment at Rollins, with the possibility for earlier consideration if the candidate has had prior experience. Individuals with three years full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their sixth year at Rollins. Individuals with four or more years full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their fifth year at Rollins. Individuals who have had full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at Rollins in a visiting position may use their Rollins' visiting experience as tenure-track, or may utilize up to the full seven-year tenure-track probationary period.

b. Notification

The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and/or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must **inform his/her department chair [change for current practice and new timetable]** and the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides her/him with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials each candidate must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation). **The candidate must submit these materials to the department chair by June 15. The Dean also notifies the department chair of the candidate's intention to undergo review.** ~~[deleted--no longer relevant—at other places in document]~~

c. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his/her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College

service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development, and
- how the candidate's research interests are connected to his/her academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from her/his particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean, and FEC by July 1. [See new timetable]

As the evaluation process proceeds, the candidate receives copies of all reports and recommendations submitted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee, the Faculty Evaluation committee, the Dean of the Faculty, and the Provost. Any responses will become part of the material which the Provost will use for his or her recommendation and report. Should the candidate wish to respond to any of these reports and recommendations, he or she may do so in writing to all of the appropriate entities in the process. [deleted—incorporated elsewhere]

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by October 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal .

e. Evaluation by Dean

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the appropriate Dean will conduct a separate evaluation. This will be based on the Dean's

review of the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For tenure decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent electronically to the FEC, the candidate, and the CEC at least one week before the candidate's meeting with FEC. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week.

f. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the appropriate Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by December 15. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the FEC, s/he may send an electronic response addressed to the Provost, but also sent to the FEC, the Dean, the CEC within one week.

It is the responsibility of the FEC to make the following materials available to the Provost by December 15: the candidate's file; the report and recommendation, together with the letters from outside evaluators, of the CEC; the report and recommendation of the Dean; the report and recommendation of the FEC and additional materials it used in its evaluation; and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

g. Evaluation by Provost

Assessing the recommendations from the CEC, FEC, and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate's file and makes a recommendation to the President. For tenure decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by January 15. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the CEC and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the FEC, s/he submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the FEC and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the FEC and the CEC, or when the FEC receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date for the Provost's recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the FEC report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost's recommendation to the President.

h. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost's letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For tenure decision, this recommendation is made at the February Board meeting. For all other promotion decisions, the recommendation is made at the May Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing by

the last day of February for tenure decisions or by May 31 for decisions on promotion to Professor. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to tenure and promotion to Professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

Section 5. Promotion to Professor

a. Eligibility

Faculty members with the terminal degree in the appropriate field holding the rank of Associate Professor may be awarded promotion to Professor, after a minimum of five years full time experience in a senior institution at the rank of Associate Professor, of which at least three years have been at this institution. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation by the President, may waive this minimum duration, but only in exceptional circumstances. The delineation of these circumstances will be determined by each CEC of the College in consultation with the FEC and the Dean.

b. Notification of the Candidate

The review for promotion to Professor is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform his/her chair and the Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides her/him with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials that s/he must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

c. The Candidate

At the time of the promotion to Professor evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his or her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of

development, and

- how the candidate's research interests are connected to her/his academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from his/her particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean, and FEC by July 1.

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by November 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal .

e. Evaluation by Dean

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the appropriate Dean will conduct a separate evaluation. This will be based on the Dean's review of the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For promotion to Professor decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent electronically to the FEC, the candidate, and the CEC no less than one week before FEC's meeting with the candidate. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week.

f. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by April 1. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the FEC, s/he may

send a response addressed to the Provost, but sent also to the FEC, the Dean and the CEC within one week.

It is the responsibility of the FEC to make the following materials available to the Provost by April 1: the candidate's file; the report and recommendation, together with the letters from outside evaluators, of the CEC; the report and recommendation of the Dean; the report and recommendation of the FEC and additional materials it used in its evaluation; and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

g. Evaluation by Provost

Assessing the recommendations from the CEC, FEC, and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate's file and makes a recommendation to the President. For promotion to Professor decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by April 15. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the CEC and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the FEC, s/he submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the FEC and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the FEC and the CEC, or when the FEC receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date for the Provost's recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the FEC report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost's recommendation to the President.

h. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost's letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For promotion to Professor decision, this recommendation is made at the May Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing by May 31 for promotion to professor decisions. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

Section 6. Timeline

	Mid-Course Evaluation	Tenure & Promotion	Promotion to Professor
Dean notifies Candidate re: eligibility	April 15	April 15	April 15
Candidate notifies Dean re: intention	May 15	May 15	May 15
Candidate notifies Dean and FEC Chair re: CEC Chair and CEC make-up	June 1	June 1	June 1
Candidate electronically submits materials to CEC, Dean, and individual members of the FEC	December 15	July 1	July 1
CEC submits letter to candidate, Dean, and FEC Chair	February 15	October 1	November 1
Dean submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and FEC Chair	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting
FEC submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and Dean	May 15	December 15	April 1
FEC submits letter to Provost	N/A	December 15	April 1

Attachment 4b – Current version

From PSC

C. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY PRIOR TO THE TENURE REVIEW

Section 1. Annual Evaluations

The Candidate Evaluation Committee will conduct annual evaluations. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate's permanent file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure, based on the criteria set forth in the bylaws and in individual departmental criteria.

These annual evaluations are to be conducted for every year in which neither a tenure evaluation nor a comprehensive mid-course evaluation takes place.

Departmental evaluations are to be conducted every year for Visiting Professors of any rank. The evaluation will be documented in a report and placed in the faculty member's departmental file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments in meeting department and College expectations.

Section 2. Comprehensive Mid-Course Evaluation

Prior to the tenure review, each candidate for tenure and promotion will receive one comprehensive mid-course evaluation. This evaluation procedure follows the description given in Part D., sections 1-6 for a tenure/promotion evaluation except for the timing and the absence of a recommendation for tenure or promotion. Normally, the comprehensive mid-course evaluation will take place in the spring of the candidate's third year, but no later than two years before the evaluation for tenure is to take place. The Candidate Evaluation Committee, the appropriate Dean, and the Faculty Evaluation Committee will each prepare a written report detailing the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, including specific comments regarding directions the candidate might pursue to strengthen his or her case for tenure or promotion.

A candidate for promotion to Professor has the right to make a written request to the relevant department head and Dean for a comprehensive mid-course evaluation. The subsequent evaluation for promotion can take place no earlier than two years after the

mid-course evaluation. In this case, the procedures for the comprehensive mid-course evaluation for tenure will be followed.

D. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDACY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Section 1. Eligibility for Tenure

Normally, a candidate is eligible for the awarding of tenure in his or her seventh year of a tenure-track appointment at Rollins, with the possibility for earlier consideration if the candidate has had prior experience. Individuals with three years full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their sixth year at Rollins. Individuals with four or more years full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their fifth year at Rollins. Individuals who have had full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at Rollins in a visiting position may use their Rollins' visiting experience as tenure-track, or may utilize up to the full seven-year tenure-track probationary period.

Section 2. Notification of the Candidate

The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and/or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides them with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials each candidate must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation). The candidate must submit these materials to the department chair by June 15. The Dean also notifies the department chair of the candidate's intention to undergo review.

Section 3. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his or her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of his or her successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation

- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development, and
- how the candidate's research interests are connected to his or her academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from his or her particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

As the evaluation process proceeds, the candidate receives copies of all reports and recommendations submitted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee, the Faculty Evaluation committee, the Dean of the Faculty, and the Provost. Any responses will become part of the material which the Provost will use for his or her recommendation and report. Should the candidate wish to respond to any of these reports and recommendations, he or she may do so in writing to all of the appropriate entities in the process.

Section 4. Candidate Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

Reappointment evaluations are normally conducted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee. The chair of the department to which the candidate has been appointed, in consultation with members of that department, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee by June 15 prior to the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The Candidate Evaluation Committee normally consists of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a minimum of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding tenured members who wish to serve. In addition, a member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member when the candidate is being evaluated for tenure or promotion. If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, non-tenured members may be appointed. If non-tenured members are unavailable, the department Chair, with the advice of the candidate and the approval of the Candidate Evaluation Committee, will select tenured members from outside the department to serve on the Committee. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as Candidate Evaluation Committee chair.

For candidates with an appointment in more than one department or program, the Candidate Evaluation Committee, with the advice of the candidate, will add to the Committee one more tenured faculty member, or non-tenured faculty member if a tenured faculty member is unavailable. This faculty member should have greater familiarity with the work of the candidate outside the department to which the candidate

was appointed. If such a faculty member is unavailable, the Chair of the Professional Standards Committee will select a tenured faculty member to serve on the Candidate Evaluation Committee.

Collection of Material Required for Review. The Chair of the Candidate Evaluation Committee has the responsibility for collecting additional materials required for the evaluation including letters from tenured members of the department and/or department letters signed by the tenured members of the department, and student evaluations, and for placing them, along with materials submitted by the candidate, in the candidate's file for members of the Candidate Evaluation Committee to review.

At the candidate's request, for the assessment of the candidate's scholarship, two peer evaluators for institutions other than Rollins will be selected by the Chair of the Candidate Evaluation Committee and the appropriate Dean from a list submitted by the candidate. The Chair then contacts the peer evaluators and requests their evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. This request must be made in writing to both the Dean and the Chair of the Candidate Evaluation Committee by June 15.

Review by the Candidate Evaluation Committee. After each member of the Committee has reviewed the candidate's file, the Committee meets with the candidate to discuss the activities addressed in the file. Issues that the Committee considered relevant to the evaluation that might not have been addressed by the candidate are also raised here. The Committee then approves a report and recommendation written by the Chair. The report and recommendation records the vote of the Committee.

If the Committee makes a positive recommendation, it gives reasons for its recommendation in the report. In the cases of a recommendation against awarding tenure or promotion, the Committee gives reasons for its conclusion. No candidate is tenured or promoted without the approval of a majority of the Candidate Evaluation Committee. The candidate is given a copy of the report and recommendation, and has the opportunity to respond in writing. For tenure decisions, the Committee Chair sends the report and recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the candidate by September 30. For all other promotion decisions, the Chair sends the report and recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the candidate by October 15. A copy of the report and recommendation, along with the candidate's file, is sent to the appropriate Dean at the same time.

Section 5. Evaluation by Deans or Directors

Based on the candidate's file as well as his or her knowledge of the candidate, the appropriate Dean conducts a separate evaluation. The Dean may also consult with the Candidate Evaluation Committee, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

The Dean writes a separate report and recommendation on the candidate addressed to the Provost. For tenure decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, the candidate, and the

Candidate Evaluation Committee by October 31. For all other promotion decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent to the candidate, the Candidate Evaluation Committee, and Faculty Evaluation Committee by October 31.

Section 6. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

The Faculty Evaluation Committee consists of five tenured faculty members each with the rank of Professor serving staggered terms of three years, and one alternate (serving a term of one year), to serve when a regular member is excused from an evaluation. These faculty members are appointed by the Executive Committee, with some consideration given to academic diversity, and ratified by the faculty. Members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee receive one course-released time every year they serve on the committee.

Access to Information. The Faculty Evaluation Committee has access to the candidate's file and all other materials considered at other stages of the evaluation process, and can request additional information from the Dean. It is always appropriate for the Faculty Evaluation Committee to introduce additional information that might not have been included by the Candidate Evaluation Committee or the appropriate Dean. The Faculty Evaluation Committee also has the authority to call in anyone it needs for consultation, especially where there is disagreement between parties at different stages of the evaluation process.

Review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts its own evaluation of each candidate for tenure or promotion. The evaluation will be based on the following sources: the written report and recommendation by the Department Evaluation Committee, the department's approved criteria for tenure or promotion or, in the absence of approved criteria, specifications of how College criteria for tenure and promotion are defined, measured, and applied, the assessment of external evaluators (when requested by the candidate), the report and recommendation of the appropriate Dean, the candidate's professional assessment statement, an interview with the candidate, and any other material or information that the Committee has obtained in the exercise of its duties. The Committee may also consult with the Candidate Evaluation Committee, the appropriate Dean, or any other member of the community.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee cannot challenge substantive requirements of a department for tenure or promotion that has approved criteria. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will require the evaluation from the Candidate Evaluation Committee to adhere to its approved criteria, both procedural and substantive.

Upon completion of its review of its candidate, the Faculty Evaluation Committee writes a report and recommendation. For tenure decisions, the Committee submits its final report and recommendation, positive or negative, to the candidate by December 8 and to the Provost by December 15. For all other promotion decisions, the Committee submits the candidate's file, report and recommendation, positive or negative, to the Provost by

March 1. In either case, the recommendation of the Committee may agree or disagree with that of the Candidate Evaluation Committee or of the Dean.

In the event of a negative evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will consult with the Candidate Evaluation Committee on points of disagreement. If the Faculty Evaluation Committee is still not satisfied with the arguments of the Candidate Evaluation Committee, it submits its negative recommendation, along with the candidate's file, the Candidate Evaluation Committee's report and recommendation, the Dean's report and recommendation, and the candidate's response(s) to any of the reports and recommendations to the Provost for his or her report and recommendation.

Section 7. Evaluation by Provost

Assessing the recommendations from the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate's file and makes a recommendation to the President. For tenure decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by January 15. For all other promotion decisions, the letter is submitted to the President by April 1. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the Candidate Evaluation Committee and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, he or she submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Candidate Evaluation Committee, or when the Faculty Evaluation Committee receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date for the Provost's recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the Faculty Evaluation Committee report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost's recommendation to the President.

Section 8. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost's letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For tenure decision, this recommendation is made at the February Board meeting. For all other promotion decisions, the recommendation is made at the May Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing by the last day of February for tenure decisions or by May 31 for decisions on promotion to Professor. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to tenure and promotion to Professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

Section 9. Structure and Timing for Tenure Evaluation

A faculty member becomes a candidate for tenure by notifying the Dean by May 15 of the calendar year in which the evaluation takes place. The structure and process occurs as summarized in this section.

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the Candidate Evaluation Committee writes a report and recommendation which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by September 30. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Dean, and the Candidate Evaluation Committee by October 15. Should the Candidate Evaluation Committee make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal (Part E).

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the Candidate Evaluation Committee, the Dean will review the candidate's file, deliberate, and write a Dean's report and recommendation, which is addressed to the Provost, and will send it to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, with copies to the candidate and the Candidate Evaluation Committee, by October 31. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the Dean, he or she may send a response to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, with copies to the Dean and the Candidate Evaluation Committee, by November 7. Having received a positive recommendation, a candidate will normally not respond to the Dean's report. However, if there are significant issues, such as matters of fact, that the candidate chooses to challenge in the report, he or she may choose to write a response, directed at those issues, and will send it to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, with copies to the Dean and the Candidate Evaluation Committee, by November 7.

Having received the recommendations of the Department Evaluation Committee and the Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file and deliberating, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate by December 8. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, he or she may send a response addressed to the Provost and send it to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, with copies to the Dean and the Candidate Evaluation Committee, by December 15. Having received a positive recommendation, a candidate will normally not respond to the Faculty Evaluation Committee's report. However, if there are significant issues, such as matters of fact, that the candidate wishes to challenge in the report, he or she may choose to write a response, directed at those issues and addressed to the Provost, and will send it to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, with copies to the Dean and the Candidate Evaluation Committee, by December 14.

It is the responsibility of the Faculty Evaluation Committee to make the following materials available to the Provost by December 15: the candidate's file, the report and recommendation of the Dean, the report and recommendation of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and additional materials it used in its evaluation, the report and recommendation of the Candidate Evaluation Committee, and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

The Provost will write a report and recommendation to the President, with copies sent to the candidate, the Dean, the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the Candidate Evaluation Committee, by January 15.

E. APPEALS ON DECISIONS OF TENURE AND PROMOTION

Section 1. Grounds

Decisions on tenure and promotion may be appealed in the event of the following charges: discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age or physical handicap; procedural improprieties; or violations of academic freedom.

Section 2. Appointment of the Appeals Committee

The Appeals Committee consists of three tenured faculty with the rank of Professor, serving staggered terms of three years. The Professional Standards Committee, upon the approval of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the President appoints these three members. The Appeals Committee will include no members of the Candidate Evaluation Committee or the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Section 3. Review of the Appeals Committee

A candidate who appeals a tenure or promotion decision has until August 1 following the evaluation to file an appeal. The candidate appeals to the Appeals Committee who reviews the case and decides whether there is sufficient cause for an appeal. If the Appeals Committee finds that sufficient cause does exist, a meeting for a full-scale review is convened.

The Appeals Committee has the authority to review the procedure of a tenure or promotion decision. It does not rule on the substance of a case. To win an appeal, the candidate must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Committee that the evaluation process has been flawed. In the absence of convincing evidence that the procedure has been flawed, the Appeals Committee affirms the original decision to deny tenure or promotion.

Section 4. Recommendations of the Appeals Committee

After reviewing the case, the Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the President. It may recommend upholding the decision to deny tenure or promotion, or it may recommend a new evaluation, either by the original committee(s) or by newly constituted committee(s) as appropriate.

F. EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

The Candidate Evaluation Committee, with the support of the appropriate Dean, is charged with the responsibility of encouraging improved teaching and professional development for all members of the faculty. Tenured faculty will normally be evaluated every seven years, two years before their eligibility for a sabbatical. Exceptions may be recommended by the appropriate Dean, with the approval of the Professional Standards Committee.

While the primary purpose of continued assessment is to promote improved teaching and professional development, it also assists tenured faculty in the identification of strengths and correction of any deficiencies. Should the Candidate Evaluation Committee or the appropriate Dean detect deficiencies which are particularly significant, the evaluation proceedings may be initiated at any time.

Section 1. Candidate Evaluation Committee

The faculty member's professional assessment statement plays a primary role in these seven-year evaluations. The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan. This plan, with supporting documents, goes to the members of the Candidate Evaluation Committee to review. The Committee then meets with the faculty member to discuss the professional assessment statement and writes a brief letter of evaluation in response to it, noting their developmental assessment of the faculty member and how the plans fit into the department's goals. This letter is sent to the appropriate Dean by April 15 of the penultimate year before the faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical.

Section 2. Evaluations by Deans

Deans play a central role in providing on-going encouragement and support for faculty efforts at professional development.

The Dean meets with the faculty member separately to discuss the professional assessment statement and the letter of the Candidate Evaluation Committee. The Dean then writes a brief letter of evaluation, stating points of concurrence or disagreement. The faculty member receives a copy of this letter by August 15 of the evaluation year.

Both letters, along with the Faculty Development Plan, are placed in a file for the faculty member that is kept in the office of the Dean. While a faculty member has a reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, this file is then used in decisions about release time, requests for funding, and merit awards.