

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
AGENDA
March 27, 2015**

2:00 p.m.

Kinard Auditorium

- I. Approval of minutes** of January 30, 2015
Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly Kelly Richardson,
Chair
 - i. [See appendix 1](#)

- II. Report from CAS Committees**
 - a. **Curriculum committee** Dave Pretty
 - i. [See appendix 2](#)

- III. Old Business**

- IV. New Business**
 - a. **Committee elections** Leslie Bickford
 - i. *Voting will be done electronically via a Qualtrics survey. The survey link will be sent to your Winthrop email account by 5pm on March 27th, and the survey will close at 5pm on March 30th.*

- V. Announcements**
 - a. **Qualtrics conference report** Cheryl Fortner-Wood
 - i. [Support and training website](#)

- VI. Dean's Remarks** Karen M. Kedrowski
 - a. **Evaluation of administrators**
 - b. **Course evaluation committee update**
 - c. **Tenure and promotion procedures**
 - i. [Draft of tenure document](#)
 - ii. [Draft of promotion document](#)

- VII. Adjournment**

Note: Quorum (35% of full-time faculty) is 51 faculty members. The minimum attendance to do business (20% of full-time faculty) is 29 faculty members.

Appendix 1

**MINUTES
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
January 30, 2015**

2:00 p.m.

Kinard Auditorium

I. Approval of Minutes:

After determining that there were enough faculty members present to constitute a quorum, the meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m. by Dr. Kelly Richardson, Associate Professor of English and Chair of Faculty Assembly. The minutes of the November 14^h, 2014 Faculty Assembly meeting were approved with no corrections.

II. Curriculum Committee Report:

Dr. Dave Pretty, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented a list of course and program change proposals.

a. The following course change proposals were reviewed and approved:

- i. Modify course: BIOL 461, Academic Internship. Change in GPA requirements, prerequisites, and number of times the course may be repeated.
- ii. Modify course: BIOL 463, Academic Internship. Change in GPA requirements, prerequisites, and number of times the course may be repeated.
- iii. Add course: MCOM 575, Organizational and Crisis Communication.
- iv. Modify course: NUTR 607, Research Methods. Change prerequisites and limit course to graduate students.
- v. Modify course: NUTR 611, Global Nutrition. Remove NUTR 221 as prerequisite.
- vi. Add course: WRIT 675, Writing for Digital Communities. Will provide a theoretical and hands-on seminar in writing for electronic publication.

b. The following program change proposals were approved:

- i. Modify program: BSW-SCWK. General education updates.
- ii. Modify program: Minor-SWEL. Reduction of total credit hours from 18

c. The following blanket petitions were approved:

- i. *Department of Interdisciplinary Studies:* For the WMST minor, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, add WMST 405 (“Special Topics in Women’s Studies”) to the list of WMST core courses.
- ii. *Department of Political Science:* For the PLSC major, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, allow PLSC 510 (“Evolution and Political Theory”) to count as a Theory course in the major.

- iii. *Department of Sociology & Anthropology*: For the WMST minor, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, allow SOCL 350, when taught as “Masculinities” and cross-listed with WMST 450, to count as a WMST core course.
 - iv. *Department of Sociology & Anthropology*: For the ANTH concentration, allow ANTH 503a or 503b to count towards the fieldwork requirement.
- d. **Twenty-four student petitions were approved.**

III. Report from CAS Committees:

a. Nominating and Rules Committee:

- i. Dr. Leslie Bickford, Assistant Professor of English, reported that the following CAS and University committee positions will be vacated at the end of the academic year:
 - 1. University Committee Positions:
 - a. Academic Council (Laura Glasscock)
 - b. Academic Council (Virginia Williams)
 - c. Academic Freedom and Tenure (Wendy Campbell)
 - d. Faculty Committee on University Life (Jennifer Disney)
 - e. Financial Exigency (Laura Glasscock)
 - f. Gen Ed Curriculum (Andy Doyle)
 - g. Gen Ed Curriculum (Frank Pullano)
 - h. Undergraduate Petitions (Kristen Kiblinger)
 - i. University Curriculum (Tom Polaski)
 - 2. CAS Committee Positions:
 - a. Curriculum (Clara Paulino)
 - b. Curriculum (Kelly Richardson)
 - c. Curriculum (Wendy Campbell)
 - d. Curriculum (Joe Rusinko)
 - e. Nominating and Rules (Leslie Bickford)
 - f. Personnel Advisory (Leigh Armistead)
 - g. Personnel Advisory (Joe Rusinko)
 - h. Personnel Advisory (Will Kiblinger)
 - i. Chair of CFA (Kelly Richardson)
 - j. Chair of GFC (Jo Koster)
- ii. Dr. Bickford noted that faculty members will vote on these open positions in March. An email with a list of open committee positions will be sent to faculty members; faculty members should contact Dr. Bickford or their department chairs if they are interested in being nominated for open positions.

IV. Old Business:

a. Discussion of Activity Insight and Faculty Annual Reports:

- i. Dr. Beth Costner, Associate Dean of CAS, led a discussion of Activity Insight, Digital Measures, and the required faculty Annual Reports. She announced that Mr. Brian Hipp's transfer to the College of Business would result in some shifting of responsibilities in the College of Arts and Sciences. She also noted that the implementation of Activity Insight would be a three year process involving significant changes, revisions, and modifications as the program becomes fully implemented. She solicited ongoing input from faculty members and thanked them for their patience as this new database is implemented.
- ii. Dr. Costner demonstrated how to "Run Custom Reports" in Activity Insight and noted that the two most important custom reports are the CAS Annual Report and the Class and Office Schedule. Faculty members should select the "Build Report" option between January and May of 2015 to upload data and create their annual reports. Faculty members may see how their final annual reports will appear by selecting "Run Report" and should upload any missing or incomplete information.
- iii. Dr. Costner noted that the annual reports should include all faculty activity from June 2014 to May 2015. The "Overall Summary" category is optional, but faculty members should upload syllabi, scholarly activity, and committee activities.
- iv. Dr. Costner led a discussion in which she responded to several faculty questions and comments, including Dr. Gregory Oakes' comment about how the "Reflections on Teaching" category differs from the "Assessment" category. Dr. Costner noted that reflection on teaching and assessment of courses can be entered under "Scheduled Teaching," while reflections on course design can be entered in the "Reflect on Course Design" cell. Course levels, course student learning outcomes, and course assessment measures ("Assessment" cells) must be filled out by faculty members. Dr. Costner clarified that faculty members only have to identify one to three outcomes per course.
- v. Dr. Gregory Oakes, Coordinator of Special Projects for the College of Arts and Sciences, noted that Activity Insight is not necessarily a new or supplemental type of assessment process. Rather, it is a new platform for data previously submitted in various annual reports. Dr. Oakes emphasized that this is a university-wide collaboration meant to meet assessment needs across the campus. In response to a faculty member's concern that there was no explicit CAS faculty input on this platform, Dr. Oakes replied that specific departments have had the opportunity to provide input on the platform. The concern was raised that this may be a "back-door" way to change current assessment procedures. Dr. Michael Lipscomb, Associate Professor of Political Science, noted that this new process had not been submitted to the CAS Assessment Committee. Dr. Oakes stated that CAS was already engaged in this type of assessment in annual reports and that the new process is "congruent with the general notion of reflection on teaching throughout the year." Dr. Oakes emphasized that there was no intent to add or change assessment procedures, and that the next step would be to meet with Assessment Coordinators throughout the college.

- vi. Dr. Karen Kedrowski, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, noted that the vast majority of faculty members already reflect on student thinking and on their own teaching strategies. A small minority of faculty members does not reflect on their teaching in a substantive way; this new system responds to that minority by intentionally prompting them to reflect on their teaching strategies and outcomes.
- vii. Dean Kedrowski noted that these reports are focused on individual self-assessment and are not intended to be tied to larger program assessments. She noted that self-assessment and evaluation of faculty members are two distinct categories that should not be blurred. The faculty “assessment” categories in Activity Insight should be considered “Self-Reflection.” Dean Kedrowski further noted that we will modify and test this for several years while seeking further faculty feedback.
- viii. Dr. Jeffrey Sinn, Associate Professor of Psychology, asked whether we ever agreed as a college to change the annual reporting process, and noted that these associated changes may be eroding our ability to control how we are assessed and evaluated. Dr. Oakes noted that the faculty evaluation procedure will stay exactly the same and that faculty members have a wide range of freedom on how much information they put in the data cells in Activity Insight.
- ix. Dr. Beth Costner assured faculty members that her personal responses in the “reflection” sections are very different from those of Dr. Oakes, and noted that information from other documents can be cut and pasted into the boxes in Activity Insight.

b. Discussion of Course Evaluations:

- i. Dr. Gregory Oakes addressed the issue of the new online student CAS course evaluations, and noted that last semester’s system for student course evaluation presented a number of problems, including the following limitations:
 - 1. The open-ended comment boxes limit student feedback
 - 2. The system has weak user tools
 - 3. There is no way to control when students take the evaluation
- ii. Going forward, online student course evaluations will include larger comment boxes, better user tools, and better faculty control of when evaluations are administered.
- iii. Dr. Oakes noted that CAS will be using the Qualtrics Platform for student evaluations rather than the platform provided in Blackboard. He noted that this transition will be simple. Faculty members will be able to decide when to give a specific code to students to take the evaluations. Students will log in to the course evaluations using their WU ID numbers and a course code. The College will provide departments and faculty members with the text to instruct students on how to complete the evaluations.
- iv. Professor Jeannie Haubert, Associate Professor of Sociology, noted that it’s important that faculty have control over when evaluations are administered to students. Dr. Oakes replied that this new system will provide faculty members with more control over timing.

- v. Dr. Kristin Kiblinger noted that it would be helpful to know which students had completed the evaluation, as she likes to provide extra credit to students for completing course evaluations. (Another faculty member noted that we had previously voted and adopted a resolution stating that we could not give students extra credit for completing course evaluations.) Dean Kedrowski stated that we can include completion of course evaluations as part of class participation. Dr. Oakes noted that at present the evaluation includes the standard five questions currently used in CAS evaluations. Various faculty members asked questions about how we could assure that students complete all questions, and Dean Kedrowski replied that we have never been able to assure that, even with the paper evaluations.
- vi. Dr. Oakes noted that the College of Arts and Sciences had a very good participation rate (70%) for the 2014 fall semester course evaluations and stated that more information concerning online course evaluations would be sent to faculty members via email.

V. New Business:

a. Digital Commons:

- i. Ms. DeAnn Brame, Digital Services and Systems Librarian at Dacus Library, gave a presentation on the new web platform called Digital Commons at Winthrop University. Ms. Brame noted that this is an open-access platform that provides an online forum for faculty members to upload their scholarship, research interests, and published articles. Digital Commons was launched in January of 2015 and is designed to showcase the depth and breadth of research being done by faculty members at Winthrop University. Faculty members can manage, personalize, and organize their own pages.
- ii. Benefits of Digital Commons for Faculty Members:
 - 1. An opportunity to showcase scholarly research and publications.
 - 2. An easy, accessible platform.
 - 3. A way to have scholarly work indexed to Google.
 - 4. A way to allow users to follow authors and receive publication updates.
 - 5. A way to gather statistical data and reports on scholarly work.
- iii. Ms. Brame demonstrated how to access the site, upload scholarship, and organize entries on the site. She noted that each department on campus will have a page on the site, and encouraged departments to upload faculty publications and department newsletters. She also noted that the site will include a Faculty Book Gallery with links to allow users to purchase books.
- iv. Ms. Brame stated that the site will also feature undergraduate research, honors theses, advisory board reports, links to the Louise Pettus Archives, and old Winthrop yearbooks.
- v. Ms. Brame encouraged faculty members to begin to upload documents and articles to the site and responded to a number of faculty questions, including questions about copyright laws. Ms. Brame stated that faculty members can

check with individual publishers to confirm whether they can upload links or documents to the site. Other faculty members asked if Winthrop can do batch uploads or uploads from BibTeX files. Ms. Brame stated that we can check on those options and that Winthrop conference presentations will automatically be uploaded if they are available online. Another faculty member noted that many faculty members already do this in ResearchGate and asked if there is a way to link these two online platforms. Ms. Brame stated that she will look into linking the two online platforms. Ms. Brame encouraged faculty members to contact her with questions or comments (bramed@winthrop.edu).

VI. Announcements:

- a. Dr. Richardson noted that the next College Faculty Assembly meeting would be held on Friday, March 27th at 2:00 p.m. The Graduate Faculty Assembly meeting will immediately follow this meeting.
- b. Dr. Robin Lammi, Professor of Chemistry and Director of Undergraduate Research, noted that the deadline for travel funds is Thursday, February 5, 2015. She stated that the Big SURS deadline is Sunday, February 15, 2015, and that the university Abstract Book deadline is March 6, 2015. She stated that faculty members should encourage students to submit abstracts online before the deadline.
- c. Dr. Beth Costner noted that the deadline for submitting nominations for the University Tutoring Award is March 27, 2015. She stated that Dean Gloria Jones has noted that there has been an over-representation of nominations from the Academic Success Center, and she encouraged faculty members to promote nominations from other tutoring groups on campus, such as the Writing Center, Math Tutoring Center, etc.

VII. Dean's Remarks:

a. Administrative Support Project:

- i. Dean Karen Kedrowski reminded faculty members that, earlier this year, she had solicited feedback from faculty members regarding how best to handle the administrative support needs within the college. Dean Kedrowski reported that faculty feedback indicated that there was no interest in movement from the current model of having administrative support staff members assigned to specific departments, though she stated that faculty members were accepting of having staff members share some tasks. Dean Kedrowski noted that there are now three openings rather than one, including the open position created by Mr. Brian Hipp's transition to the College of Business Administration.
 1. The new person functioning as the administrative specialist for the third floor of Bancroft would support two departments, with some tasks and projects omitted from the position.
 2. The third floor of Kinard would be assigned a three-quarter FTE staff person (30 hours/week) and would provide assistance over the summer.

3. A third position, Technology Coordinator for CAS, will require a Master's degree and will include some teaching responsibilities. This twelve-month position would include some responsibilities currently held by some faculty and administrators.
- ii. The Dean's Office will assume the responsibility of editing all department web pages on the university website. A designated faculty member will still need to monitor the web pages for content within each department.
- iii. The Technology Coordinator will be able to provide assistance with Internal Self-Studies and Program Reviews, can help generate data from Blackboard Analytics, and can help departments with data collection and calculations.
- iv. After the new department support staff positions are filled, the college will administer "mini-searches" for tasks that have been carved away from the current support staff members. These tasks might include support for on-site conferences, the West Forum, summer camps and summer AP Institutes, special projects, etc.
- v. Dean Kedrowski stated that the Dean's Office will provide technical support and logistical help for on-campus conferences, institutes, or camps. These venues can be revenue generators for the college and will have a high priority within the Dean's Office.
- vi. Finally, the Dean's Office will create an Administrative Handbook and will provide electronic training and support for administrative specialists.

b. Promotion and Tenure Review:

- i. Dean Kedrowski informed faculty members that tenure and promotion documents need to be current and that all language in tenure and promotion documents should be consistent with current language in the CAS Faculty Roles and Alignment document; she also noted that the Dean's office was working to update the current documents. Dean Kedrowski reminded faculty members that language and practices associated with tenure and promotion procedures should be consistent with current practices. For instance, she explained that most portfolios are submitted in electronic form, even though the language in some documents clearly refers to paper portfolios.
- ii. She also solicited feedback for a "Tip Sheet" to be prepared for faculty members currently undergoing tenure or promotion review.
- iii. Dean Kedrowski reminded the faculty that a new Committee on Personnel Action, consisting of Acting President Debra Boyd, Vice President for Finance and Business J. P. McKee, and Associate Vice President for Human Resources Lisa Cowart, now exists. This committee assesses all requests for to hire, create new positions, merit or retention raises outside of the normal faculty t/p processes etc.
- iv. Dean Kedrowski stated that tenure and promotion policies will go through Academic Affairs before the March CAS Faculty Assembly meeting.
- v. Dr. Bill Naufftus, Professor of English, asked whether the term "With Distinction" will be added, in addition to the term "Satisfactory," to the post-tenure review process. Dean Kedrowski stated that this issue has not been

addressed yet because the college still needs to figure out the financial awards that would be attached to the “With Distinction” category.

- vi. She noted that questions about compensation are being routed to the Compensation Committee.
- vii. Dr. Matt Hayes, Assistant Professor of Psychology, asked why the tenure and promotion documents now state “Roles” rather than “Roles and Rewards.” Dean Kedrowski stated that in 2011, the president at the time accepted the “Roles” portion of the document but rejected the “Rewards” portion. At that time, the Post-Tenure review category “With Distinction” remained, but the financial compensation attached to that category was expunged. Dr. Hayes then asked if the Compensation Committee is currently working on the “Rewards” part of the review process. Dr. Richardson noted that several people who currently have tenure went through this process without these options in place.
- c. Dr. John Bird, Professor of English, noted that Dean Kedrowski’s birthday was January 29th and wished her a happy birthday.

VIII. Adjournment:

Dr. Kelly Richardson moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:47 p.m. The motion to adjourn was seconded and unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda L. Hiner, Ph.D.

Appendix 2

Curriculum Committee
Report for Faculty Assembly
From March 10, 2015 and March 20, 2015 meetings

1. The following course change proposals were approved:

- a. Drop course: BIOL 450, Honors: Selected Topics in Biology. No longer used or needed, so should be dropped to avoid confusion with the 450H course that is used instead.
- b. New course: BIOL 529, Stem Cell Biology. Currently being offered at BIOL523X, and there is extensive student interest to continue offering the course.
- c. New course: ENGL 550, Topics in Critical Reading. Needed to allow more topics offerings.
- d. New course: WRIT 511, Topics in Writing and Critical Communication. Need another topics course for piloting courses.
- e. New course: HIST 624, Special Topics in History for Social Studies Educators. Has been offered as an experimental course before.
- f. Modify course: INGS 201, Introduction to Study Abroad. Part of a wider effort to change all INAS courses to the INGS designator.
- g. Modify course: SCWK 330, Research Methods for Social Work. Remove prerequisites.
- h. New course: FREN 624 Special Topics in Language Teaching. Has been offered as an experimental course before.
- i. New course: SPAN 624 Special Topics in Language Teaching. Has been offered as an experimental course before.

2. The following program change proposals were approved:

3. The following blanket petitions were approved:

- a. *Department of Interdisciplinary Studies*: For the Medieval Studies minor, allow MDST 350, ARTH 453, and ARTS 482 (when cross listed with ARTH 453) to count in category 3 of the minor requirements. This change has been approved by Academic Council starting in 2015, so this petition is to cover students in current and previous catalogs.

4. Four student petitions were approved.

Appendix 3

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES PROCEDURES AND POLICIES FOR TENURE CONSIDERATION

Our policies relating to tenure consideration follow the general regulations for tenure provided in the [Winthrop University Faculty Manual](#) and the [Faculty Roles document passed in April 2011](#). The following is an effort to summarize and systematize University procedures and policies and to specify certain other aspects of such procedures and policies which are appropriate for the College of Arts & Sciences.

Any policy or procedure in this document which is in conflict with the policies and procedures of Winthrop University as stated in the current [Winthrop University Faculty Manual](#), the [Faculty Roles](#) document, or subsequent interpretive documents is superseded by the institution-wide policies.

Necessity for separate action

Consideration of a faculty member for tenure shall always be an action separate from consideration for promotion, even if the two occur in the same year. While separate dossiers need not be prepared, a separate letter of application by the candidate and separate letters of evaluation by the departmental and college committees, department chair, and Dean are required.

Initiation of consideration

Consideration of a faculty member for tenure normally occurs during the sixth year of probationary service, including years of previous service credited toward the probationary period. The Dean will notify candidates for tenure by May 1 each year, or by the deadline stipulated by the Division of Academic Affairs in its [timeline](#).

Materials to be submitted for tenure consideration

The candidate to be considered for tenure shall prepare a dossier containing the materials listed below. These materials should cover the entire probationary period, including materials from other institutions, in cases where candidates received credit toward tenure. Candidates may include additional materials predating the probationary period.

- A. A cover sheet containing the following information:
 - Date employed at Winthrop;
 - Rank at original appointment;
 - Date(s) promoted and years in each rank; and
 - Prior service credit granted at employment.

- B. An application letter in the candidate's own words requesting consideration for tenure, including an analysis/statement by the candidate explaining how he/she meets the qualifications for tenure.

- C. A table of contents:
- Appropriate indexing tabs should be employed.
 - The location of materials outside the original binder/notebook must be indicated.
- D. Current *curriculum vitae*.
- E. Annual reports and evaluations, arranged in chronological order, to include:
- All Chair's and Dean's comments;
 - Annual evaluations from secondary supervisors. This is relevant to faculty with secondary appointments in the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, University College, or other campus units.
- F. The [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statements](#) regarding Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship, and Academic Responsibility. The candidate may include, at his/her discretion, the "[Types of Undergraduate Research with Respect to Faculty Credit](#)" grid appended to the Scholarly Activity Statement. These statements should be accompanied by additional departmental explanations where applicable.
- G. A statement or report of activities associated with *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship* as defined by the College. (This statement may be integrated into B above.)
- The candidate should discuss his/her activities related to *Student Intellectual Development* and clearly articulate how they meet or exceed the requirements for tenure as defined in the [College of Arts and Sciences Roles Alignment Statement on Student Intellectual Development](#).
 - The candidate should classify each artifact under *Scholarly Activity* according to the Priority levels defined in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statement on Scholarly Activity](#). The candidate may refer to the "[Types of Undergraduate Research with Respect to Faculty Credit](#)" grid appended to the Scholarly Activity statement.
 - The candidate should describe her/his Professional Stewardship activities and relate how these activities meet or exceed the expectations in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statement on Academic Responsibility](#) and meet the criteria outlined in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statement on Professional Stewardship](#) set forth for tenure.
 - The candidate should include additional departmental explanation where applicable.
 - The candidate should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities.
 - The candidate is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.
- H. A statement of the candidate's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years. This may be appended to the statement described in G above.
- I. Evidence to support the activities specified in the candidate's statement.
- Evidence in the area of *Student Intellectual Development* includes, but is not limited to, student course evaluations and syllabi. In addition, candidates may include sample exams or assignments, peer evaluations of teaching, and other information documenting the candidate's achievements in this area of faculty review.

- Evidence in the area of *Scholarly Activity* includes, but is not limited to, copies of publications, conference presentations, videos, etc. which have been developed during the probationary period. In the case of scholarly activity that is not developed in written form, the candidate should submit materials in the appropriate and accessible the form.
- Evidence in the area of *Professional Stewardship* may include, but is not limited to, letters of appointment or thanks; publications, reports, or other documents generated; letters of support from colleagues; committee rosters; and the like, as they are readily available.
- Candidates may request reference letters from former students, colleagues, research collaborators, and others with whom they have worked, at their discretion. The College recommends that such letters be sent directly to the department chair, or in the case of a department chair, directly to the dean. The chair or dean (as appropriate) should add them to the portfolio immediately upon receipt.
- Other supporting documents pertinent to the review.

Organizing the portfolio

It is the responsibility of the candidate to have the portfolio well organized so it can effectively be reviewed at each stage of the evaluation process. Candidates may submit paper or electronic portfolios, or a combination of the two, pursuant the University's policy on electronic portfolio submissions. When using electronic platforms (in part or entirely) the faculty member should make three identical copies available. One will remain in the CAS Dean's office and the other two will be used during the review process at all levels. At such time that web-based options are made available, the faculty must create a copy of all materials on a CD or flash drive to remain in the CAS Office of the Dean throughout the review process.

In the case of paper portfolios, the portfolio should be organized in the following manner:

1. All letters, statements, annual reports, vita, etc. should be collected in hard-cover notebooks with the candidate's name on the front and on the side.
2. A table of contents with appropriate indexing tabs should be employed.
3. A listing of any materials that are part of the portfolio but which are not in the notebook(s) should be included, preferably on the table of contents page. (This will ensure that no materials get separated from the candidate's portfolio.)
4. Annual evaluations and other materials should be arranged in chronological order, with the most recent materials presented last. The semester/year should be clearly indicated on teaching evaluations.

Materials included in electronic or hybrid portfolios should use descriptive file names, and be organized so that reviewers can easily identify and locate the materials. Whenever possible, documents should be saved in .pdf formats rather than in editable formats to deter changes being made after submission. Materials must be stored in a secure environment, such as a shared drive on the Winthrop University server, the Blackboard course management system, or on CD or flash drives. They should not be stored in any unsecured medium.

Candidates submitting electronic or hybrid portfolios must provide a copy of their portfolios to the Dean's office on a CD, flash drive, or similar medium. This copy will serve as a backup in case the files are corrupted or there is any suspicion of tampering during the review process.

Adding materials to the portfolio after submission

Candidates may add relevant materials to their portfolios after submission, with the permission of the dean. All individuals engaged in the review at the department or college level must be afforded the opportunity to review these materials and to revise their letters as they see fit. Once the portfolio leaves the dean's office, the candidate may no longer add materials.

Departmental committees

In each year when there are persons to be considered for tenure, the department chair, in consultation with the candidate and dean, shall appoint a departmental personnel committee consisting of no fewer than five tenured faculty members. The department chair shall name one member of the committee as chair. This person shall receive from the chair all materials submitted by candidates for tenure.

The department chair, in consultation with the candidate and the dean, may appoint an interdepartmental committee if there are insufficient qualified faculty members within a department to constitute a committee of the required size, or if for other reasons it is desirable to the candidate to have extra-departmental representation. A majority of the members of this committee should, whenever possible, be members of the candidate's home department. The department chair shall name one member of the committee as chair, preferably a member from the candidate's home department.

If a department chair is to be considered for tenure in his or her capacity as a faculty member, the dean, in consultation with the candidate and the chair of the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee, shall appoint a special committee to consider the case. This committee shall meet the number and eligibility requirements stated above and shall ordinarily include at least one member (if eligible) from within the department. At least one member will be another department chair from the College of Arts & Sciences. Additional members shall be from outside the department. One member of the committee shall be named chair by the dean when the appointments are made. This committee shall make its recommendation directly to the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee and the dean. The dean fulfills the role of the department chair as described in the procedures below.

Committee procedures

1. The committee shall consider all materials submitted by the candidate and any reference letters solicited by the candidate. However, neither the candidate nor any other individual may appear in person before the committee.
2. Individual members of the committee should not seek or receive information beyond what is contained in the portfolio. Committee members with relevant disciplinary knowledge (i.e. disciplinary norms, selectivity of a journal, prestige of a conference presentation, competitive nature of an award) may use and share this knowledge in the evaluation of a candidate. Requests for clarification or additional information shall be made by the chair of the departmental committee to the department chair. The department chair, in turn, will forward the request to the candidate. The candidate shall respond to the department chair, who will then add the materials to the candidate's portfolio.

3. No minutes of transactions or deliberations of the committee shall be kept.
4. The committee in its formal deliberations shall sit alone without the department chair present. The committee may meet with the department chair to present the results of its deliberations.
5. All deliberations of the committee shall be confidential and shall not be revealed to the candidate under consideration or to other outside agents except those persons who later participate in the evaluation process.
6. The committee shall evaluate the candidate in accordance with the criteria in this document, in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment](#) documents, the [Faculty Roles](#) document, and in the [Faculty Manual](#).
7. The committee shall review all materials and after deliberation, make a recommendation for or against tenure for the candidate under consideration. A positive recommendation shall require a majority vote.
8. After making its decision, the committee shall make a written recommendation explaining in detail the reasons for recommending for or against tenure. The written report must contain an analysis of the extent to which the candidate's scholarly activity complies with the College's alignment statement on *Scholarly Activity*, including a count by Priority Level. In addition, the report must contain a description of how the candidate meets the other criteria for tenure as described in the College's other alignment statements.
 - The committee's response must include a clear statement indicating the recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies.
 - When the decision of the committee is not unanimous, the report should indicate the areas of disagreement. If a single report cannot adequately represent the evaluation of all committee members, a minority report must be submitted along with the primary report.
 - All committee members must sign either the primary report or minority report.

Actions of the department chair

When the department chair receives a report from a departmental committee, he or she shall add to the dossier his or her independent judgment for or against tenure of the candidate. The chair shall prepare a memo to the dean indicating in detail the reasons for agreeing or disagreeing with the committee recommendation and shall forward it, along with the complete dossier and the committee report, to the dean.

Actions of the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee

After the department chair has added her or his statement to the dossier, the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee shall meet to consider all candidates submitted by chairs as well as those coming from special committees. This committee shall then follow the general procedures specified above for departmental committees with the exception of making reports to the dean instead of the department

chair. The committee recommendation can refer to previous recommendations and documents from the department committee and chair.

In cases where a personal or professional relationship precludes a fair evaluation of a candidate, an Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee member may recuse him/herself from the deliberation of a candidate. This decision should be made in consultation with the dean.

Actions of the dean

After receiving recommendations from the departmental committee, the chair (if applicable), and the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee, the dean shall formulate an independent judgment for or against promotion of the candidate. The dean shall add a memo to the dossier indicating the reasons for the recommendation for or against tenure.

As stipulated in the [Faculty Manual](#), all materials are then submitted by the dean's office to Division of Academic Affairs by the deadlines established in the timeline, regardless of level of support.

Confidentiality of the review process

During the period of consideration of a faculty member for tenure, all actions and recommendations of the various committees, the department chair, and the dean will be held in complete confidence.

Notification of final decision

Once the process of review has been completed at the institutional level, the Dean will share the final decision as well as the dean's own recommendation with the faculty member and with the department chair. The recommendations of the departmental committee, the department chair, and the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee will also be shared with the candidate at this time.

Timeline for tenure reviews

Candidates, departmental committees, department chairs, the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee, and the dean will submit materials as specified by the deadlines on the Division of Academic Affairs [timeline](#).

Updated January 2015

Appendix 4

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES PROCEDURES AND POLICIES FOR PROMOTION CONSIDERATION

Our policies relating to promotion consideration follow the general regulations for promotion provided in the [Winthrop University Faculty Manual](#) and the [Faculty Roles](#) document passed in April 2011. The following is an effort to summarize and systematize those procedures and policies as they apply to the College of Arts & Sciences and to specify certain other aspects of such procedures and policies which are appropriate for the College of Arts & Sciences.

Any policy or procedure in this document which is in conflict with the policies and procedures of Winthrop University as stated in the current [Winthrop University Faculty Manual](#), the [Faculty Roles](#) document, or subsequent interpretive documents is superseded by the institution-wide policies.

Initiation of consideration

As stipulated by the Division of Academic Affairs, the dean shall send to each eligible faculty member by May 1, or by the deadline stipulated by the Division of Academic Affairs in its [timeline](#), a promotion review form. Any faculty member requesting promotion review shall return the form to the department chair by June 1. In the absence of exceptional circumstances, failure to meet that deadline shall constitute waiver of promotion review. Any faculty member who believes that he or she is ready to be considered for promotion is encouraged to discuss this intent with the department chair. The purpose of this discussion is to provide the faculty member with formative feedback about her/his readiness for promotion. This meeting is suggested for informational purposes only. The decision to apply for promotion remains with the faculty member. Regardless of the advice of the chair, the faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion may prepare and submit materials for review.

Materials to be submitted for promotion consideration

The candidate to be considered for promotion shall prepare a dossier containing the materials listed below. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should include annual reports and comments since the date of their last promotion. Candidates applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should include annual reports and comments beginning with their year of appointment. Candidates whose time in rank exceeds six years must include annual reports, chair's comments, and dean's comments covering the last six years; they may include additional years at their discretion. Materials should be clearly organized in chronological order.

A. A cover sheet containing the following information:

- Date employed at Winthrop;
- Rank at original appointment;
- Date(s) promoted and years in each rank; and
- Prior service credit granted at employment.

- B. An application letter in the candidate's own words requesting consideration for promotion, including an analysis/statement by the candidate explaining how he/she meets the qualifications for the requested promotion.
- C. A table of contents:
- Appropriate indexing tabs should be employed.
 - The location of materials outside the original binder/notebook must be indicated.
- D. Current *curriculum vitae*.
- E. Annual reports and evaluations, arranged in chronological order, to include:
- All chair's and dean's comments;
 - Annual evaluations from secondary supervisors. This is relevant to faculty with secondary appointments in the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, University College, or other campus units.
- F. The [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statements](#) regarding Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship, and Academic Responsibility. The candidate may include, at his/her discretion, the "[Types of Undergraduate Research with Respect to Faculty Credit](#)" grid appended to the Scholarly Activity Statement. These statements should be accompanied by additional departmental explanations where applicable.
- G. A statement or report of activities associated with *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship* as defined by the College. (This statement may be integrated into B above.)
- The candidate should discuss his/her activities related to *Student Intellectual Development* and clearly articulate how they meet or exceed the requirements for the faculty rank sought as defined in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statement on Student Intellectual Development](#).
 - The candidate should classify each artifact under *Scholarly Activity* according to the Priority levels defined in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statement on Scholarly Activity](#). The candidate may refer to the "[Types of Undergraduate Research with Respect to Faculty Credit](#)" grid appended to the Scholarly Activity statement.
 - The candidate should describe her/his Professional Stewardship activities and relate how these activities meet or exceed the expectations in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statement on Academic Responsibility](#) and meet the criteria outlined in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statement on Professional Stewardship](#) set forth for each rank.
 - The candidate should include additional departmental explanation where applicable.
 - The candidate should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities.
 - The candidate is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.
- H. A statement of the candidate's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years. This may be appended to the statement described in G above.
- I. Evidence to support the activities specified in the candidate's statement.

- Evidence in the area of *Student Intellectual Development* includes, but is not limited to, student course evaluations and syllabi. In addition, candidates may include sample exams or assignments, peer evaluations of teaching, and other information documenting the candidate's achievements in this area of faculty review. Candidates whose time in rank exceeds six years should include materials from at least the last six years. Candidates whose time in rank is six years or less should include all materials since the last promotion or the date of initial appointment, as appropriate.
- Evidence in the area of *Scholarly Activity* includes, but is not limited to, copies of publications, conference presentations, videos, etc. which have been developed since the last promotion, with particular emphasis on the last six years. In the case of scholarly activity that is not developed in written form, the candidate should submit materials in the appropriate and accessible form.
- Evidence in the area of *Professional Stewardship* may include, but is not limited to, letters of appointment or thanks; publications, reports, or other documents generated; letters of support from colleagues; committee rosters; and the like, as they are readily available. Candidates whose time in rank exceeds six years should include materials from at least the last six years. Candidates whose time in rank is six years or less should include all materials since the last promotion or date of initial appointment, as appropriate.
- Candidates may request reference letters from former students, colleagues, research collaborators, and others with whom they have worked, at their discretion. The College recommends that such letters be sent directly to the department chair, or in the case that a department chair is a candidate for promotion, directly to the dean. The chair or dean (as appropriate) should add them to the portfolio immediately upon receipt.
- Other supporting documents pertinent to the review.

Organizing the portfolio

It is the responsibility of the candidate to have the portfolio well organized so it can be effectively reviewed at each stage of the evaluation process. Candidates may submit paper or electronic portfolios, or a hybrid of the two, consistent with the University's promotion policy. When using electronic platforms (in part or entirely) the faculty member should make three identical copies available. One will remain in the CAS Dean's office and the other two will be used during the review process at all levels. At such time that web-based options are made available, the faculty must create a copy of all materials on a CD or flash drive to remain in the CAS Office of the Dean throughout the review process.

In the case of paper portfolios, the portfolio should be organized in the following manner:

1. All letters, statements, annual reports, vita, etc. should be collected in hard-cover notebooks with the candidate's name on the front and on the side.
2. A table of contents with appropriate indexing tabs should be employed.
3. A listing of any materials that are part of the portfolio but which are not in the notebook(s) should be included, preferably on the table of contents page. (This will ensure that no materials get separated from the candidate's portfolio.)
4. Annual evaluations and other materials should be arranged in chronological order, with the most recent materials presented last. The semester/year should be clearly indicated on teaching evaluations.

Materials included in electronic or hybrid portfolios should use descriptive file names, and be organized so that reviewers can easily identify and locate the materials. Whenever possible, documents should be saved in .pdf formats rather than in editable formats to deter changes being made after submission. Materials must be stored in a secure environment, such as a shared drive on the Winthrop University server, the Blackboard course management system, or on CD or flash drives. They should not be stored in any unsecured medium.

Candidates submitting electronic or hybrid portfolios must provide a copy of their portfolios to the Dean's office on a CD, flash drive, or similar medium. This copy will serve as a backup in case the files are corrupted or there is any suspicion of tampering during the review process.

Adding materials to the portfolio after submission

Candidates may add relevant materials to their portfolios after submission, with the permission of the dean. All individuals engaged in the review at the department or college level must be afforded the opportunity to review these materials and to revise their letters as they see fit. Once the portfolio leaves the dean's office, the candidate may no longer add materials.

Departmental committees

In each year when persons request consideration for promotion, the department chair, in consultation with the candidate and dean, shall appoint a departmental personnel committee to evaluate faculty members wishing to be considered for promotion. The committee shall consist of no fewer than five tenured faculty members, all of whom hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and none of whom may be a person whose own promotion is a matter of consideration in that year. The department chair shall name one member of the committee as chair. This person shall receive from the chair all materials submitted by the candidate for promotion.

The department chair, in consultation with the candidate and dean, may appoint an interdepartmental committee if there are insufficient qualified faculty members within a department to constitute a committee of the required size, or if for other reasons it is desirable to the candidate to have extra-departmental representation. A majority of the members of this committee should, whenever possible, be members of the candidate's home department. The department chair shall name one member of the committee as chair, preferably a member from the candidate's home department.

If a department chair is to be considered for promotion in his or her capacity as a faculty member, the dean, in consultation with the candidate and the chair of the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee, shall appoint a special committee to consider the case. This committee shall meet the number and eligibility requirements stated above and shall ordinarily include at least one member (if eligible) from within the department. At least one member will be another department chair in the College of Arts & Sciences. Additional members shall be from outside the department. One member of the committee shall be named chair by the dean when the appointments are made. This committee shall make its recommendation directly to the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee and the dean. The dean fulfills the role of the department chair as described in the procedures below.

Committee procedures

1. The committee shall consider all materials submitted by the candidate and any reference letters solicited by the candidate. However, neither the candidate nor any other individual may appear in person before the committee.
2. Individual members of the committee should not seek or receive information beyond what is contained in the portfolio. Committee members with relevant disciplinary knowledge (i.e. disciplinary norms, selectivity of a journal, prestige of a conference presentation, competitive nature of an award) may use and share this knowledge in the evaluation of a candidate. Requests for clarification or additional information shall be made by the chair of the departmental committee to the department chair. The department chair, in turn, will forward the request to the candidate. The candidate shall respond to the department chair, who will then add the materials to the candidate's portfolio.
3. The committee shall consider the materials in the portfolio without regard to time in rank, other than to focus on the record compiled in the last six years for candidates with more than six years in rank.
4. No minutes of transactions or deliberations of the committee shall be kept.
5. The committee in its formal deliberations shall sit alone without the department chair present. The committee may meet with the department chair to present the results of its deliberations.
6. All deliberations of the committee shall be confidential and shall not be revealed to the candidate under consideration or to other outside agents except those persons who later participate in the evaluation process.
7. The committee shall evaluate the candidate in accordance with the criteria in this document, in the [College of Arts & Sciences Roles Alignment Statements](#), the [Faculty Roles](#) document, and in the [Faculty Manual](#).
8. The committee shall review all materials and after deliberation, make a recommendation for or against promotion of the candidate under consideration. A positive recommendation shall require a majority vote.
9. After making its decision, the committee shall make a written recommendation explaining in detail the reasons for recommending for or against promotion. The written report must contain an analysis of the extent to which the candidate's scholarly activity complies with the College's alignment statement on *Scholarly Activity*, including a count by Priority Level. In addition, the report must contain a description of how the candidate meets the other criteria for promotion as described in the College's other alignment statements.
 - The committee's response must include a clear statement indicating the recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies.

- When the decision of the committee is not unanimous, the report should indicate the areas of disagreement. If a single report cannot adequately represent the evaluation of all committee members, a minority report must be submitted along with the primary report.
- All committee members must sign either the primary report or minority report.

Actions of the department chair

When the department chair receives a report from a departmental committee, he or she shall add to the dossier his or her independent judgment for or against promotion of the candidate. The chair shall prepare a memo to the dean indicating in detail the reasons for agreeing or disagreeing with the committee recommendation and shall forward it, along with the complete dossier and the committee report, to the dean.

Actions of the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee

After the department chair has added her or his statement to the dossier, the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee shall meet to consider all candidates submitted by chairs as well as those coming from special committees. This committee shall then follow the general procedures specified above, with the exception of making reports to the dean instead of the department chair. The committee recommendation can refer to previous recommendations and documents from the department committee and chair.

In cases where a personal or professional relationship precludes a fair evaluation of a candidate, an Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee member may recuse himself/herself from the deliberation of a candidate. This decision should be made in consultation with the dean.

Actions of the dean

After receiving recommendations from the departmental committee, the chair (if applicable), and the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee, the dean shall formulate an independent judgment for or against promotion of the candidate. When the recommendation is positive, the dean shall add a memo indicating the reasons for the recommendation for promotion.

In accordance with the procedures specified in the [Faculty Manual](#), the dean shall privately notify the candidate of the dean's, chair's, and committees' recommendations.

As stipulated in the [Faculty Manual](#), when the dean's recommendation is positive, all materials are submitted to Division of Academic Affairs. When the dean's recommendation is negative, no materials are submitted to the Division of Academic Affairs. The dean will discuss with the faculty member the strengths and weaknesses identified in the review process. If the dean disagrees with a positive department committee (or special committee) recommendation in two consecutive years, the promotion portfolio will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs in the second year unless the faculty member requests otherwise according to the established [timeline](#).

Confidentiality of the review process

During the period of consideration of a faculty member for promotion, all actions and recommendations of the various committees, the department chair, and the dean will be held in complete confidence, except as noted above.

Notification of final decision

Once the process of review has been completed at the institutional level, the dean will share the final decision with the candidate and the department chair.

Timeline for promotion reviews

Candidates, departmental committees, department chairs, the Arts & Sciences Personnel Advisory Committee, and the dean will submit materials as specified by the deadlines on the Division of Academic Affairs [timeline](#).

Instructor and Senior Instructor Ranks

The ranks of instructor and senior instructor are appointed ranks for faculty who hold at least a Master's degree and who are not eligible for appointment to a professorial rank. The movement from instructor to assistant professor, while appearing to be a promotion, is technically an appointment to a new position and does not require the same procedure as promotion to other ranks.

Updated January 2015