

**COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
AGENDA
March 31, 2017**

2:00 p.m.

Kinard Auditorium

- I. Approval of minutes** from March 03, 2017 Wendy Sellers
 - i. See [appendix 1](#)

 - II. Report from CAS Committees**
 - a. **Nominating & Rules committee** Dustin Hoffman
 - i. Updates to CAS Alignment Statement (*vote to include on next agenda*)
 - 1. See [appendix 2](#)
 - ii. 2017-18 committee elections – follow up vote for Academic Council position (*Voting will be done electronically via a Qualtrics survey. The survey link will be sent to your Winthrop email account by 5pm on Friday, March 31, and the survey will close at 5pm on Monday, April 3.*)
-
- III. Old Business**
 - a. Bachelor of Professional Studies M. Gregory Oakes
-
- IV. New Business**
-
- V. Announcements**
 - a. CAS Faculty Scholarship Award instructions update M. Gregory Oakes
 - b. Faculty annual reporting timeline and procedures for 2017 M. Gregory Oakes
 - c. Wiley contract update Karen M. Kedrowski
 - d. Post-tenure review policy clarification Karen M. Kedrowski
 - i. See [appendix 3](#)
-
- VI. Dean’s Remarks** Karen M. Kedrowski
-
- VII. Adjournment**

Note: Quorum (35% of full-time faculty) is 40 faculty members. The minimum attendance to do business (20% of full-time faculty) is 28 faculty members.

Note: There will be no Graduate Faculty Committee meeting following this Faculty Assembly.

Appendix 1

**COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
MINUTES
March 03, 2017**

1:56 p.m.

Kinard Auditorium

VIII. Approval of minutes from January 13, 2017 Wendy Sellers

IX. Report from CAS Committees

a. Curriculum committee Jo Koster

i. The following new courses were approved.

Department of Biology

BIOL 316, Principles of Human Genetics

Department of Chemistry, Physics, and Geology

GEOL 270, Dinosaurs

Department of English

ENGL 470, Undergraduate Research in English

ENGL 670, Graduate Research in English

ENGL 694, Graduate Studio in English

WRIT 503, Creative Writing Theory

Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

WMST 503, Psychology of Gender and Sexuality

Department of Mathematics

MATH 511, Functional Analysis

MATH 570, Industrial Mathematics

Department of Political Science

PLSC 101, Careers in Political Science

PLSC 308, Campaigns and Elections

PLSC 309, Controversies of the American Founding (Constitutional Requirement)

PLSC 500, Academic Research in Political Science

Department of Psychology

PSYC 104, Psychology Department Assessment 1

PSYC 404, Psychology Department Assessment 2

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

SOCL 298, Career Development for Sociology Majors

SOCL 519, Social Research Methods II: Qualitative Methods

ii. The following course modifications were approved.

Department of Biology

BIOL 315, Cell Biology

BIOL 403, 404, 440, 450H, 471, 472, 480, 480H, 491, 492, 505, 508, 510, 511, 513, 515, 518, 519, 522, 524, 529, 530, 540, 551, 552A, 552B, 555,

and 560: All to require a grade of at least C in all the prerequisite courses

Department of English

ENGL 529, Contemporary American Fiction

ENGL 308, 432, 433, WRIT 431, 432, and 433: All to change the number of times the course may be repeated for credit.

ENGL 501, 502, 503, 503H, 504, 505, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 520, 521, 525, 527, 528, 530, and 550: All to ensure that the correct 200-

level survey course is specified as the pre-requisite

Department of Mass Communication

IMCO 105, Introduction to Integrated Marketing Communication

IMCO 475 and MCOM 471: Change in pre-requisites

MCOM 425, 441, 461, 462, and 463: Allow DIFD students to take these courses

Department of Mathematics

Math 111, Everyday Mathematics

Department of Political Science

PLSC 261, 305, 306, 307, 310, 311, 312, 317, 319, and 321: Change pre-requisite to PLSC 201 with a grade of C- or better

Department of Psychology

PSYC 408, Cognitive Psychology (number and title change)

PSYC 615, Legal Ethical, and Professional Issues in School: Title Change

PSYC 670, Continuing Professional Development: Variable number of hours

iii. The following program changes were approved.

Department of Chemistry, Physics, and Geology

Modify program, BS-CHEM-BIOC

Department of Human Nutrition

Modify Program, BS-NUTR-DIET

Department of Mass Communication

Modify Program, BS-IMCO

Department of Political Science

Modify Program, BA-PLSC

Department of Psychology

Modify Program, BA-PSYC

iv. The following blanket petitions were approved.

Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

For the minor in Legal Studies, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, add ACCT 351 to the list of permissible elective courses for the

minor.

For the minor in Women's and Gender Studies, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, allow WMST 450/SOCL 350/AAMS 390, when taught as *Race, Gender, and Crime*, to fulfil a core course requirement

for the minor.

For the minor in Women's and Gender Studies, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, allow WMST 450/RELG 350, when taught as *Women and Gender in Islam*, to fulfil a core course requirement for the

minor.

For the minor in Women's and Gender Studies, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, allow WMST 450/WMST 503/PSYC 503, when taught as *Psychology of Gender and Sexuality*, to fulfil a core course requirement for the minor.

Department of Philosophy and Religion and Department of World Languages

For the BA/BS in all majors in the college, in all catalogs, allow students who completed Latin 101 with a C or better to count RELG 102X Biblical Greek or MLAN 109X Elementary Ancient Greek as the second course

necessary to complete the Foreign Language requirement for the college

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

For the BA in Sociology, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, allow SOCL 519X *Social Research Methods II: Qualitative Methods* to substitute for SOCL 516 *Social Research Methods II*.

- v. There were no student petitions for review.
- vi. The final meeting for the year is April 25, 2017
- vii. All material for review must be uploaded into the Curriculum Application System by noon on April 18, 2017, to make the agenda
- viii. Jo Koster thanked everyone in the curriculum process

b. Nominating & Rules committeeDustin Hoffman

- i. Members of the Faculty Assembly are encouraged to participate in the 2017-18 committee elections (*Voting will be done electronically via a Qualtrics survey. The survey link will be sent to your Winthrop email account by 5pm on Friday, March 3, and the survey will close at 5pm on Monday, March 6.*)
- ii. Greg Bell (HIST) was nominated for the Library Committee

X. Old Business There was no old business.

XI. New Business

- i. The Climate Campus survey will be implemented March 27-April 21st. The purpose of the survey is to collect data about sexual assault on campus. Faculty members will receive an email about the survey in the first week after spring break and are asked to encourage students to take the survey. The survey can be accessed through wingspan. Data will be collected without identifying information.

XII. Announcements

- i. The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) and Prior Learning Assessment Programs (PLA)Greg Oakes

- The purpose of the PLA is to assess experience or knowledge that individuals got in the industry or such things like placement tests or military experience. The portfolio process will demonstrate that the student has earned college credit. The committee proposed several limitations for portfolio submission: (1) How much PLA credit a student may have; (2) How long after being trained that students may submit a portfolio for review. Students must pay a fee to submit their work. If a student does a portfolio at other institutions that student cannot get credit at Winthrop. The committees suggested the establishment of an office to facilitate PLA. The recommendations were sent to the Provost for review.
- The BPS program is intended to develop an adult student body at the University that is 25+ years old or with some significant life experience. If approved, students with an associates degree would be able to apply to our 60-hour program, which will have a 15-hour core and options for concentrations. Six potential

concentrations were identified that might be phased in over a period of several years such as Organizational Operations and General Health Studies (phase 1), Digital Communication & Social Media and General Social Services (phase 2), and Security Studies and Law & Community (phase 3). The Provost has approved consideration of these recommendations. The committee hopes to develop curriculum by fall 2017 and launch the program in fall 2019.

- ii. Activity Insight & faculty annual reporting Greg Oakes

The University's contract with Digital Measures expires at the end of April. A committee considered alternative programs, including the option of doing the reporting system in-house; however, that turned out to be the most expensive alternative. After looking at several options the committee made a recommendation to the Provost's office. The Provost's office has signed an agreement with Faculty180 (the faculty reporting system) to use its service. The new program will allow users to conduct searches and ease the Tenure and Review Process. Users will upload information the same way they do now beginning this spring. Data will be transferred into the new system. Training will be offered in mid-April. Eventually, there will also be online tutorials. The due date for annual faculty reports has been extended to June 1st, 2017. Adjunct faculty will have the option of doing this year's report as a Word document from a template. Faculty raised concerns that the old contract expires before annual reports are due, causing undue stress during a chaotic period. Dr. Oakes said these concerns would be considered.

XIII. Dean's Remarks

- i. A second German minor student has received a \$2,500 scholarship for a study abroad from the German Language and Culture Foundation in Charlotte.
- ii. Thirteen Winthrop students received individual accolades at the UNCC Model UN conference or the Southern Regional Model UN conference last semester.
- iii. Greg Hecimovich is involved in a project with Historic Columbia to tell the story of African American life in the city and slave narratives.
- iv. The Human Nutrition Department is building on its partnership with the South Carolina National Guard in which nutrition students provide counseling to service men and women. Students were thanked with a boxed American flag.
- v. The South Carolina and North Carolina Political Science Associations will have a joint meeting in the Digiorgio Campus Center over the weekend. The Dean thanked John Holder and Claire Weikle for their contributions.
- vi. The English Department is selling books for \$1 per pound in an event called "Books by the Pound."
- vii. The College of the Arts and Sciences alignment statements – the college interpretation of the Faculty Roles document that was passed in 2011 – are under review. While the documents clearly state what the faculty must do to earn tenure, promotion to associate professor, and promotion to professor, they do not say what adjunct faculty, instructors or assistant professors in the probation period must do. Language was drafted to address this limitation. The language includes a

clear one-page description for adjunct faculty, coordinators, etc. that provides a description of what adjuncts can expect from the College, such as office space and library privileges. The draft was reviewed by the Dean's Council and focus groups and then sent to the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee. It has now been submitted to the Rules and Nominations Committee. Discussion will continue at the next faculty meeting, with hopes that the language will be finalized by the beginning of the academic year. A companion document will outline the procedures for putting together a tenure and promotions portfolio. The hope is that the document will be operative for the next academic year.

- viii. Staff are reviewed in March. After someone completes a year of their probationary period then they move to a March 31st review date. Faculty are encouraged to provide feedback to inform the review process.
- ix. An attorney reviewed the Appropriate Use of Technology policy. Faculty are covered by the Student Conduct Code, which prohibits unauthorized recording. Legally speaking, the classroom is not a protected space. Anything brought up in the classroom may be introduced to a judicial legal proceeding if it comes to that. If a student admits to committing a crime in the classroom, for example, faculty (or anyone in the classroom) may be subpoenaed. Faculty may also be obligated to report a crime. The attorney suggested that if a student begins an incriminating dialogue faculty must warn them of the potential legal consequences. Students are encouraged to use the terms "hypothetically" or "I am asking for a friend."

XIV. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:27 p.m.

Appendix 2

College of Arts and Sciences Alignment Statement with Roles & Rewards

The College of Arts and Sciences endorses the Faculty Roles at Winthrop document adopted by the Winthrop University Faculty Conference in April 2011 and included in the Faculty Manual. The College is comprised of fourteen departments that represent disciplines diverse in both subject matter and methodology. Because of this diversity, the College recognizes the variety of ways faculty members engage in Academic Responsibility, Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, and Professional Stewardship. Therefore, the following statements articulate how the College will interpret and implement the Faculty Roles at Winthrop document in terms of evaluating faculty work in all disciplines.

According to the “Roles” document, accomplishments in one area (Student Intellectual Development, Professional Stewardship, and Scholarly Activity) may seem to overlap with another area of faculty work. In such cases, faculty members must identify the most appropriate single category for reporting. The statements included here will apply to all full- and part-time faculty members as appropriate to their respective levels of appointment and rank and their specific work assignments.

In each section below, the original text from the Faculty Roles at Winthrop document is presented (italics), followed by the College’s interpretive and/or clarifying statement.

General Statement Regarding Expectations for Faculty in the College of Arts & Sciences:

Faculty members may be hired into full-time, non-tenure-track positions and granted academic rank based upon their credentials and professional qualifications at the time of appointment. This decision is made by the Provost, in consultation with the Dean and department chair, at the time of hire. These individuals are required to meet the College’s expectations for their rank as defined below.

Individuals hired into administrative positions may be granted faculty rank based upon their credentials and professional qualifications at the time of appointment. This decision is made by the Provost, in consultation with the Dean, at the time of hire. These administrators may engage in faculty work outside of their administrative roles and be subject to supervision of the appropriate department chair and Dean for that work. In such cases, the administrators are required to meet the College’s expectations for their rank as defined below.

A. Academic Responsibility

Academic Responsibility spans all the traditional areas of faculty evaluation, and includes involvement of faculty in ways that support the institutional mission, maintain the functions of the University, and sustain the faculty role in shared governance. All faculty members are expected to be academically responsible to their students and peers as a baseline for service in their academic departments. Faculty members are expected to establish and maintain a consistent record of academic responsibility while at Winthrop.

Academic Responsibility includes but is not limited to activities such as: academic registration support, availability to students through multiple platforms (e.g., office hours, emails, assignment feedback),

engagement in faculty meetings at all levels, participation in department and college events, participation in university commencements and convocations, professional development that supports improvements in practice (e.g., participation in peer observations, attendance at professional conferences to explore current research, engaging in sessions through the Teaching and Learning Center), recruitment and retention efforts, and service on committees. Chairs and deans should ensure equitable distribution of assignments among faculty; and faculty should be supported in ways that allow for free exchange of ideas, broad participation, and balanced work expectations.

In addition to activities related to academic responsibility, other professional responsibilities are expected of faculty who hold full-time appointments, regardless of rank. These professional responsibilities are primarily documented through reviews by supervisors and are considered expectations of employment. These responsibilities include adherence to academic policies (e.g., the privacy and confidentiality of student information, intellectual property and copyright, treatment of human subjects in research, final exam schedule, meeting classes at the appointed times, adhering to deadlines for grade submission, submission of midterm grades as requested) and active participation in the collection of assessment data associated with teaching and/or work assignments. Although faculty may not report on these expectations regularly, chairs and deans will address areas of concern through meetings with individual faculty and annual evaluations.

College of Arts and Sciences' Statement on Academic Responsibility

The College of Arts and Sciences endorses the university definition of Academic Responsibility. In addition, the College perceives other aspects of advising (e.g., scheduling and fulfilling advising appointments, being accessible to advisees) to be important parts of academic responsibility for faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Adjunct Faculty

At the time of appointment, an Adjunct faculty member should demonstrate a commitment to those expectations within Academic Responsibility that are requirements for all faculty (e.g., adherence to academic policies, participating in the collection of assessment data necessary for course and program evaluation), including completing an annual report. The Adjunct faculty member also may be expected to participate in department/program meetings at the discretion of the chair or program director. Throughout the time at this rank, the Adjunct Faculty member should demonstrate a consistent record of academic responsibility.

Note: Adjunct faculty members have voting rights in the College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Assembly. They are welcome, but not required, to attend Faculty Assembly meetings.

Full-time faculty

All full-time faculty (Instructors, Senior Instructors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors) are expected to meet all Academic Responsibilities as defined by the College and University.

A. B. Student Intellectual Development

Because the mission of Winthrop University focuses on the development of students prepared to meet the challenges of future endeavors, Student Intellectual Development is a fundamental responsibility of all

Winthrop faculty. Faculty in all disciplines are responsible for developing student potential as related to the University Level Competencies, supporting the delivery of the Touchstone Program, and providing opportunities for student development of expertise in the chosen discipline. As such, Student Intellectual Development is a critical factor in all evaluations.

Student Intellectual Development is a significant task for all Winthrop faculty. In 1780, Abigail Adams stated, "Learning is not attained by chance; it must be sought for with ardor and attended to with diligence" (as cited in Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Faculty play a key role in developing environments in which students seek such development—academic, personal, social, moral, and more. In these environments faculty provide opportunities for students to engage in thinking at various levels, with the goal being to develop graduates who evaluate, create, synthesize, and analyze—the highest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Forehand, 2005).

A broad range of faculty activities fits within the area of Student Intellectual Development. Activities include helping students to acquire disciplinary knowledge, develop critical thinking and problem solving skills, enhance interpersonal and social skills, cultivate effective communication skills, apply knowledge and skills across contexts, learn through service in the discipline, and pursue further academic exploration.

Effectiveness in Student Intellectual Development can be observed in various instructional environments including classroom, laboratory, studio, field-based, and digital settings, as well as through exhibitions, collections of academic and creative materials, support of independent exploration, and student mentoring. Effectiveness in this area is marked by an impact on student thinking and learning. Faculty members must provide evidence of an ability to engage students in ongoing and significant pursuits of knowledge, critical/reflective thinking, communication, and skill application. This evidence must also include a willingness and propensity to adapt instructional methods to promote student learning.

Evidence of Student Intellectual Development is related to the discipline, experience level, and appointment of the individual faculty member. However, all faculty members must show periodic, reflective self-assessment of the activities in which they engage and provide evidence of improved teaching and student learning. Documentation for Student Intellectual Development may include items such as reflective analyses of activities, student evaluation results, letters from peer observations, course materials, student learning outcome data, and teaching awards.

Examples of Student Intellectual Development may include but are not limited to:

- Connections made between instruction and program goals
 - Course updates to maintain relevance and enhance teaching methods
 - Course, curriculum, or program development
 - Curricular revision efforts
 - Development of instructional materials (e.g., software, original course supplements)
 - Effective use of class time
 - Engagement of students in service learning
 - Evidence of student progress toward meeting course and/or program learning outcomes
- Implementation of a variety of instructional practices and assessment methods
- Implementation of high expectations for students (e.g., course tasks that require thinking at various levels of cognition, course assessments that measure student learning at various levels of cognition, impact on student development associated with University Level Competencies)
 - Leading student groups on field experiences or international experiences

- *Participation in goal assessment for courses and programs*
- *Response to observation data/evaluations of classroom performance, exhibition design, and/or other Student Intellectual Development activity from supervisors, peers, or students Student mentoring activities (e.g., undergraduate and graduate research, career direction, information literacy)*

College of Arts and Sciences' Statement on Student Intellectual Development

The College of Arts and Sciences endorses the university definition of Student Intellectual Development. In addition, the College recognizes the diverse ways faculty members engage in Student Intellectual Development and that these activities often overlap or bridge the divisions between Student Intellectual Development, scholarship, and professional stewardship.

Regardless of the diversity of their efforts, faculty members' work toward Student Intellectual Development should include aspects related directly to (a) developing University Level Competencies, (b) supporting delivery of the ~~Touchstone Program~~ **General Education Program**, and (c) developing student expertise in the respective discipline.

Student Intellectual Development includes a variety of activities, including face-to-face, hybrid, and online delivery modes; mentorship of student research; internship and field placement supervision; and other student evaluation activities. The expectations listed below are applicable to all instructional faculty irrespective of their roles.

The specific examples noted above that convey the range of activities fostering Student Intellectual Development are not exclusive and should not be perceived as prescriptive or proscriptive lists.

The following descriptions by rank provide an illustration of how faculty expectations can change across time and rank at Winthrop.

Adjunct Faculty

At the time of initial appointment, an Adjunct faculty member should demonstrate a potential for, or offer evidence of, effective Student Intellectual Development activities. Throughout the time at this rank, the Adjunct faculty member should develop more advanced skills in the area of Student Intellectual Development and participate in appropriate professional development. Adjunct faculty are expected to reflect appropriately on their courses; be responsive to feedback from students, peers, and superiors; handle routine student issues; and adhere to the grading norms and syllabi standards as defined by the Department, College, and/or University, as appropriate.

Instructor and Senior Instructor

At the time of initial appointment, an Instructor should demonstrate a potential for, or offer evidence of, effective Student Intellectual Development activities. Throughout the time at this rank, the Instructor or Senior Instructor should develop more advanced skills in the area of Student Intellectual Development and participate in appropriate professional development. Instructors and Senior Instructors are expected to reflect appropriately on their courses; be responsive to feedback from students, peers, and superiors; participate in curriculum development as appropriate; handle routine course issues; and adhere to the grading norms and syllabi standards as defined by the Department, College, and/or University, as appropriate.

Assistant Professor

At the time of appointment, an Assistant Professor should demonstrate a potential for effective Student Intellectual Development. As an Assistant Professor, the faculty member is expected to build a balanced record of accomplishment in the area of Student Intellectual Development and Scholarly Activity that is appropriate for a junior member of the faculty. An Assistant Professor is expected to reflect appropriately on their courses; be responsive to feedback from students, peers, and superiors; handle routine course issues; and adhere to the grading norms and syllabi standards as defined by the Department, College, and/or University, as appropriate. Furthermore, an Assistant Professor in a tenure-track appointment should build a portfolio that documents effective Student Intellectual Development and meets or exceeds the expectations for tenure.

Tenure

When considered for tenure, a faculty member should have demonstrated a consistently effective record in the area of Student Intellectual Development. Effectiveness in this area is marked by an impact on student thinking and learning. Faculty members must provide evidence of an ability to engage students in ongoing and significant pursuits of knowledge, critical/reflective thinking, communication, and skill application. Evidence should be provided that illustrates that the faculty member addresses appropriate student learning objectives; handles routine course issues; maintains accessibility to students through a variety of modes of communication; demonstrates best practices in the design and delivery of courses; and reflects appropriately on teaching effectiveness in ways that show s/he is responsive to feedback from students, peers, chair, and dean. Individuals are expected to maintain these expectations throughout a tenured appointment with appropriate growth.

Associate Professor

For promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate engagement with students in meaningful ways beyond what is described for tenure. Candidates must demonstrate excellence in Student Intellectual Development through activities that may include but are not limited to implementing innovative instructional practices; mentoring students; supervising student research; engaging in service learning; or providing supplemental academic support. A successful candidate for promotion or appointment to Associate Professor has demonstrated involvement in curriculum development at the course and/or department levels and has maintained a connection to the discipline through professional development and reflective practice.

Professor

For promotion or appointment to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate engagement with students in significant ways beyond what is described for Associate Professor. This record should be sustained and superior. Further, evidence of creative approaches, instructional renewal, and continuous professional exploration should be provided. A candidate for the rank of Professor is an individual who is respected among peers; maintains positive environments that promote student learning and development; and serves as a mentor to faculty as they develop strategies to engage students. Finally, a candidate for Professor is recognized as a leader in Student Intellectual Development through work on and/or off campus.

C. Scholarly Activity Scholarly Activity is an essential part of University life and development and encompasses the many pursuits that broaden and expand the learning communities in which faculty function and the University is situated. Typically these activities are related to the faculty member's discipline but may include significant work that prompts the intellectual advancement of others in areas related to the faculty member's University appointment.

The evaluation of scholarly endeavors is greatly influenced by the disciplinary focus of the faculty member and regulations for evaluation established by accrediting agencies; however, the evaluation of scholarship must be flexible enough to recognize unique contributions that arise as faculty engage in discovery, integration, and application. Using Boyer's (1990) categories of scholarship presented in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, academic unit 5 priority systems must recognize a variety of avenues for scholarly engagement. The scholarship of discovery encompasses those activities that have been traditionally considered scholarship and focuses on creation of knowledge or products. The scholarship of integration focuses more on activities that help non-specialists make connections to a discipline or on explorations that examine information in a new way. The scholarship of application differs from the focus on research and synthesis crucial to the first two forms of scholarship. Here the scholar uses knowledge to solve specific problems. The scholarship of teaching focuses on the work of scholars as they affect and change the students with whom they engage. This form of scholarship is seen when the faculty and students are pushed to explore and think in new ways, thus expanding what is known about the discipline, its connections, and related problems.

By using a broader lens through which to examine and evaluate scholarly engagement, we are encouraging an environment in which Winthrop faculty can actively affect the communities in which they directly engage. Therefore, unit level systems should recognize the importance of both theoretical study and the application of theory to solve problems in a variety of settings.

When submitting work to be considered in the category of Scholarly Activity, the faculty member should provide validation (internal or external) of the work's merit. Although the University Faculty Roles document does not include priority guidelines for scholarly work, provided examples are intended to show a range of scholarly activities. The academic unit priority guidelines will situate such engagement within the disciplines and will be used to evaluate merit. In this category of evaluation, faculty members should only include scholarly activities associated with their roles as Winthrop faculty members.

Examples of Scholarly Activity may include but are not limited to:

- Academic presentations (e.g., academic conferences, professional conferences, on-campus colloquia)
- Academic publications (e.g., academic journals, conference proceedings, scholarly books, textbooks)
- Application of scholarship that results in documented change (e.g., collaboration with local schools, work with community organizations in problem solving, new professional certifications resulting from significant exploration, design of assessment systems/reports that require synthesis of expertise and exploration of data)
- Creation of scholarly materials or models (e.g., significant study that leads to change in University processes, policies, or widely-used materials)
- Creative endeavors, performances, and literary or artistic works
- Grant development and awards
- Significant study to expand areas of scholarly expertise promoting crossdisciplinary experiences and/or student research
- Invitational or juried exhibitions

- *Patent applications*

College of Arts and Sciences' Statement on Scholarly Activity

The College of Arts and Sciences endorses the university definition of Scholarly Activity. In addition, the College recognizes the diverse ways faculty members engage in scholarly activity (**including creative activities in disciplines where appropriate**) and that these activities often overlap or bridge the divisions between Student Intellectual Development, scholarship, and professional stewardship.

Regardless of its diversity, however, scholarship:

- 1) Is intellectually rigorous,
- 2) Extends the frontiers of knowledge/creative expression,
- 3) Can be documented, and
- 4) Is validated by and shared with other professionals.

Scholarly activities that count toward tenure and promotion involve these four primary qualities.

In terms of the first two qualities, scholarly activity is defined as serious inquiry, examination, or experimentation aimed at the discovery and interpretation of knowledge, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new knowledge, or practical application of theories or laws. Scholarship involving creative activities may be defined as the act of bringing into existence *ex nihilo*, as in composing a poem or play. The final two qualities involve the distribution of knowledge through a variety of modes: scholarly publications, electronic media, patents, developing new clinical techniques, public performance, grant production, and the reporting of findings.

These discovery and interpretive activities extend one's disciplinary expertise, generate new knowledge, have tangible results, and contribute substantively to one's discipline or the larger academic community.

Applied activities, which often overlap with professional service and teaching, are distinguished from civic and institutional citizenship by their scholarly rigor. They represent the best in professional practice and draw on the faculty member's professional knowledge. They may take form in a variety of internal and external activities in which one brings his/her expertise to bear on problems and tasks and, thereby, benefits the campus or professional community and/or the common good. In many disciplines, applied scholarship is an essential if not primary contributor to the field's knowledge base. Examples include conducting clinical intervention studies, program management, developing grant proposals, providing technical assistance, shaping public policy, editing journals, consulting, and writing or performing for the media.

Teaching is especially valued as a scholarly enterprise at Winthrop. Teacher-scholars acquire and generate knowledge by ongoing study of new material in their fields and in reflective practice. They apply or disseminate knowledge by integrating it into their pedagogy; developing new programs and courses; formulating, publishing, or presenting reports of new teaching techniques; and participating in programs with the schools, in assessment programs, and in programs that educate the public.

As a guide for faculty pursuing tenure, promotion and post-tenure review, the following list prioritizes some scholarly activities based on the degree to which they embody the above mentioned four primary qualities: rigor, knowledge contribution, and the degree of review or validation by disciplinary peers or other professionals. Candidates for promotion and tenure bear the burden of proof for demonstrating the scholarly nature of their work and substantiating its priority ranking. When forwarding a candidate's

dossier, departments will include an evaluation of the scholar's work and assign those activities to the appropriate priority area.

Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences are encouraged to collaborate with students in research and other Scholarly Activity. Faculty mentoring of student research and other scholarly activity is Student Intellectual Development. When the mentoring relationship leads to a product, this product can be categorized as Scholarly Activity as defined below. [Addition approved by CAS Faculty Assembly 08/30/13]

The general guidelines on the priority level of a scholarly product should be followed in any case of co-authorship, whether with students or other professional colleagues. In all cases of coauthorship, the faculty member should clearly delineate the role s/he played in generating scholarly products. [Addition approved by CAS Faculty Assembly 08/30/13]

The following list is to aid faculty in communicating their scholarly identity by codifying, according to priority, scholarly and creative activity within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Priority One Scholarship *illustrates novel ideas, demonstrates mastery of skill, or refinement of current knowledge, highest public/private validation or judgment of work. Examples of such scholarship would be:*

- Publications in any mode of original or innovative work, that is refereed or judged by other professionals - including those related to teaching, interdisciplinary work and service: for example, books, book chapters, textbooks or teaching materials from original research and discovery, monographs, articles, poems, or plays.
- Applied forms of scholarship: for example, consultations, translations, and development of patents or new testing methodologies which lead to innovative processes or products or advance scholarly fields.
- Editorship of a major publication.
- Grants funded by extramural agencies or foundations.

Priority Two Scholarship *integrates existing ideas, utilizes discipline-specific skills, often products of the refinement process, less stringent public/private validation or judgment of work. Examples of such scholarship would be:*

- Publications in any mode of scholarly information: for example, book reviews or other materials, bibliographies, abstracts of materials published by others, encyclopedia contributions, technical manuals, and websites and textbooks that integrate existing knowledge in new ways.
- Applied forms of scholarship including in rare cases professional stewardship which contribute to one's discipline or community: for example, serving on an editorial board or as a public policy analyst; producing research reports for agencies, disciplinary groups, businesses and industry.
- Presentations, performances, exhibitions, clinics, workshops or symposia in significant professional contexts that include an opportunity for scholarly exchange. When presentations undergo a stringent, refereed selection process by experts and produce a scholarly product that makes a significant contribution to the field they may qualify as Priority One scholarship. The burden of proof for the latter qualification lies with the faculty member.
- Grants developed and submitted to seek extramural funding.

Priority Three Scholarship uses discipline skills in myriad productive ways without the kinds of professional assessment that characterize higher priority scholarship. Examples of such scholarship would be:

- Publications in popular and non-academic sources, including newsletters and magazines directed to general and specialized audiences.
- Publications or presentations in contexts outside of the classroom where students are the primary audience and that include an opportunity for scholarly exchange.
- Applied forms of scholarship in which one serves other scholars and professionals or contributes to the good of the community: for example, reviewing research proposals, papers and accreditation or certification applications for an external group; constructing and developing web sites that provide a forum for the exchange of scholarly ideas, research problems or pedagogical materials; developing and organizing scholarly conferences; and serving on the boards of professional organizations.
- Presentations, talks, and activities for the general public, which draw upon one's scholarly expertise.
- Direction or supervision of student master's theses, undergraduate honors theses, or substantial research and creative projects.
- Projects or experiences that require an extended time commitment and significantly broaden one's pedagogical or professional expertise such as faculty exchange programs, Fulbright studies, workshops and colloquia.
- Funded intramural grants.

Because faculty are asked to articulate a scholarly identity when applying for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, faculty should demonstrate how their work among the priority categories contributes to an overall professional identity. Building upon the four previously identified qualities of Scholarly Activity: faculty need to display intellectual/creativity curiosity, illustrate mastery of necessary skill sets related to their discipline (qualitative, quantitative, artistic), present outcomes to peers and/or external audiences and demonstrate efforts to make ones work better towards maximizing academic/public utility. Expectations vary by level of appointment.

Adjunct Faculty

An Adjunct faculty member is not required to engage in Scholarly Activity, although the College welcomes such activity if the faculty member chooses to engage in it.

Instructor

An Instructor in non-tenure-track appointments is not required to engage in Scholarly Activity, although the College welcomes such activity if the faculty member chooses to engage in it. A faculty member hired into a tenure-track position at the rank of Instructor, pending the completion of her/his terminal degree, is expected to engage in Scholarly Activity as necessary to complete the degree requirements and to transition to the Assistant Professor rank.

Senior Instructor

A Senior Instructor is expected to engage in and maintain some form of Scholarly Activity or Professional Stewardship beyond that required for an Instructor.

Assistant Professor: At the time of appointment, an Assistant Professor should have a plan for active engagement in Scholarly Activity. As an Assistant Professor, the faculty member is expected to build a balanced record of accomplishment in the areas of Student Intellectual Development and Scholarly Activity that is appropriate for a junior member of the faculty. An Assistant Professor in a tenure-track appointment should build a portfolio of Scholarly Activity that meets or exceeds the expectations for tenure.

Tenure: The candidate must have established an active research identity, while demonstrating the four primary qualities.

Associate Professor: The candidate must have established a successful research identity and earned a measure of professional recognition in the discipline of specialization, while demonstrating the four primary qualities. The candidate's scholarly activity should be recent and sustained.

Professor: The candidate must have achieved a mature record of scholarly excellence and earned a significant professional recognition in the discipline/profession, while demonstrating the four primary qualities of scholarly activity.

€. D. Professional Stewardship

Professional Stewardship—as it counts toward tenure, promotion, annual evaluations, and merit raises—is “service” that requires faculty members to use their knowledge and experience to enhance the University and/or community. Carol Geary Schneider (1998) asserts that “professional stewardship” captures the significance of activities that are vital to the health and well-being of universities and that require significant faculty time and the application of faculty knowledge or expertise. Activities that illustrate *Professional Stewardship* require faculty members to be involved in work that goes beyond regular teaching expectations and academic responsibility. Through such opportunities faculty impact circumstances, create opportunities for new knowledge or services, and/or support and enrich the function of existing structures on and off campus.

Professional Stewardship develops with experience at the University and is a vital component of the faculty's role in the University mission. All faculty, regardless of rank, participate in *Professional Stewardship* activities that are reflective of their roles, ranks, and expertise. When providing evidence, faculty are encouraged to discuss the level of engagement, how expertise was applied, and/or the impact of activities.

Examples of *Professional Stewardship* may include but are not limited to:

- Active engagement with a campus student group (e.g., duties of a faculty advisor, participation in the design and delivery of programming, consultation related to discipline)
- Active membership on community committees, task forces, or similar groups
- Application of faculty knowledge or expertise to support university initiatives (e.g., student research activities, service learning opportunities, international experiences, support opportunities)
- Facilitation of professional development programs or continuing education programs
- Leadership roles in assessment initiatives that require significant time and expertise
- Leadership roles in international, national, or regional professional organizations
- Management of external grant programs

- *Presentations, workshops, or demonstrations to professional, civic, or community organizations not seen as scholarship Program coordination (e.g., degree programs, academic support services)*
- *Service or leadership on a committee (typically at the college or university level) that has been shown to be complex in nature, require significant engagement, or demand considerable time*
- *Special assignments within the department, college, or university (e.g., fund raising, development of new programs, grant program evaluation, creation of a policy manual).*

In a minority of cases, a faculty member whose job has been redefined by circumstances and who is applying for promotion may show exemplary work in the area of Professional Stewardship as the priority area for promotion. This exemplary work must be sustained, complex, and time consuming; have significant impact on the University or learning community; and receive recognition by peers. Individuals presenting accomplishments in this category as the priority area for promotion should have previously discussed the decision to do so with the department chair and the college dean. In addition, these faculty must provide evidence of impact for Professional Stewardship activities and engage in Scholarly Activity.

College of Arts and Sciences' Statement on Professional Stewardship

The College of Arts and Sciences endorses the university definition of Professional Stewardship. In addition, the College recognizes the diverse ways faculty members engage in professional stewardship and that these activities often overlap or bridge the divisions between Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, and Professional Stewardship.

Regardless of the diversity of their efforts, faculty members' work in Professional Stewardship is based on their professional knowledge and/or disciplinary expertise. The College also sees the following as examples of professional stewardship:

- Administrative leadership at the program, department, college, or university level.
- Mentorship, service, or leadership at the program, department, college, university, or professional level that has been shown to be complex in nature, requires significant engagement, or demands considerable time.
- Special assignments at the program, department, college, or university level (e.g., assessment, accreditation, recruitment, curricular modification, development of new programs, program evaluation, policy formulation, fund raising).

Similar to its perspective on Scholarly Activity, the College recognizes a spectrum of contributions in Professional Stewardship. Committee work traditionally associated with a faculty member's basic responsibilities—categorized as Academic Responsibility in the Faculty Roles at Winthrop document—do contribute to Professional Stewardship but not to the same degree as other more intensive and time-consuming activities. For example, a scholarship committee that meets only once or twice a year is not regarded as the same level of service as the College Personnel Advisory Committee.

In a minority of cases, a faculty member whose job has been redefined by circumstances and who is applying for promotion may show exemplary work in the area of Professional Stewardship as the priority area for promotion. Usually, these situations will have been discussed and documented by the candidate and his or her department chair and/or dean in advance. Candidates cannot use Professional Stewardship as a replacement for Scholarly Activity; instead, activities in both areas are judged together to determine the candidate's professional impact. In that minority of cases where Exemplary Professional Stewardship and Scholarship are used together to make a case for promotion in rank, the candidate must have evidence of multiple and/or sustained activities that allow for the use of

professional knowledge and skills to make a significant impact in the community, profession, and/or university. Although work as an administrator can be used to demonstrate Professional Stewardship, when building a case for Exemplary Professional Stewardship, the candidate must demonstrate how the work went well beyond what is normally expected of the administrative role.

The following descriptions by rank provide an illustration of how faculty expectations can change across time and rank at Winthrop.

Adjunct faculty

An Adjunct faculty member is not required to engage in Professional Stewardship, although the College welcomes such activity if the faculty member chooses to engage in it.

Instructor

In the College of Arts & Sciences, an Instructor in a non-tenure-track appointment is expected to engage in Professional Stewardship activities within the department or program appropriate to her/his rank and status. A faculty member hired into a tenure-track position at the rank of Instructor is expected to engage in Professional Stewardship activities as necessary to transition to the Assistant Professor rank.

Senior Instructor

A Senior Instructor is expected to engage and maintain Scholarly Activity or Professional Stewardship responsibilities appropriate to their rank and status. In the latter case, the candidate's Professional Stewardship record should involve activities beyond the department level to include the College, University, discipline, and/or community.

Assistant Professor

A faculty member in this rank should explore ways to engage in Professional Stewardship as appropriate to the Assistant Professor's rank and tenure status. An Assistant Professor in a tenure-track appointment should build a varied and substantial record of Professional Stewardship that meets or exceeds the expectations for tenure.

Tenure

A candidate for a tenured appointment should demonstrate a developing record of professional engagement in the campus community and discipline. This can be established through activities associated with Academic Responsibility, which can include but are not limited to regular attendance at faculty governance meetings, service in the department, involvement in University events that allow for interaction with students and families, and participation in professional events related to the discipline.

Associate Professor

A candidate for the rank of Associate Professor should demonstrate involvement that exceeds the expectations for tenure. For promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must provide evidence for continued, productive involvement on campus beyond the department. This may be demonstrated through activities, which may include but are not limited to participation on

committees and/or taskforces outside the department, leadership in professional organizations, or community involvement related to the individual's discipline.

Professor

A candidate for the rank of Professor should demonstrate involvement that exceeds the expectations for an Associate Professor. The candidate for promotion or appointment to the rank of Professor is an established steward of the University and discipline/profession. S/he has a sustained record of engagement that serves as a model for other faculty, that demonstrates maturity, and that results in recognition by one's peers. Further, the candidate must provide evidence of leadership and engagement at the college and university level and in the discipline/profession. Involvement in the community is encouraged but not required.

Appendix 3

Policy Title

Post Tenure Review--Effective 2014-2015 Academic Year

Policy Description

A post-tenure review process was first established at Winthrop in response to the mandate in Act 359 (1996), South Carolina's performance funding legislation that public institutions of higher education include in their faculty performance review systems periodic peer evaluation of tenured faculty members. In line with the AAUP's definition, the Post-Tenure Review Process at Winthrop is a system focused on sustaining faculty development beyond the point at which tenure is granted.

Therefore the process is focused on sustaining faculty involvement in all aspects of the University and providing support for all faculty members as identified through the review process.

To receive a "Satisfactory" post-tenure evaluation, the tenured faculty member should provide evidence that the level of activity associated with the rank held has been maintained throughout the years since the tenure decision or previous post-tenure review. This involvement should include a record of promoting Student Intellectual Development, continued Scholarly Activity, and ongoing Professional Stewardship. Further, the faculty member should provide evidence of a record of sustained academic responsibility.

Policy Procedures

All tenured faculty will participate in post-tenure review every six years. Faculty members will be reviewed six years after the year in which their tenure was effective, a post-tenure review was conducted, or a promotion was awarded. Outcomes and recommendations from the post-tenure process will be used in merit raise decisions.

In the case of faculty seeking promotion during the year in which a post-tenure review is scheduled, the faculty should submit application materials based on the timeline for promotion established in Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop. If promotion is granted then the post-tenure review is deemed to be satisfactory and the faculty member will stand for post-tenure review again in 6 years. If promotion is denied, the faculty member will stand for post-tenure review in the following academic year.

Exceptions to the six-year cycle of post-tenure review are as follows:

- Faculty who sign statements of an intention to retire (including TERI separation dates) within two years after they are scheduled for post-tenure review will not participate. Faculty exercising this option must complete a post-tenure review during the academic year following rescission of an intention to retire.
- Faculty who take personal leave (e.g., sick leave, maternity leave, etc.) for longer than one semester may request, through the Vice President for Academic Affairs, that their review be deferred for a period appropriate to the duration of leave taken. The Vice President will rule on the deferral in consultation with the faculty member's dean and department chair and inform the faculty member in writing of the year in which post-tenure review will take place. This deferral does not apply to faculty who have received sabbatical leaves or other leaves for development purposes.

· Faculty members who wish to request that their review be rescheduled (for example, because of a sabbatical or other leave for development purposes which will take them away from campus during the year post-tenure review is scheduled) should make their request in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will consult with the dean and department chair and inform the faculty member in writing whether the review will be rescheduled.

· Department chairs, associate deans, and assistant deans who are not full-time administrators will be reviewed according to the schedule and procedures for faculty members. Post-tenure review for full-time administrators holding faculty rank will be deferred. Regular review of full-time administrators is conducted through alternative processes involving faculty and staff from multiple units. Such faculty will stand for post-tenure after three annual review cycles in a position that is not full-time administration.

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs will maintain the post-tenure review schedule, notify the deans who will inform the faculty members when their post-tenure reviews will take place, and update annually the time-line for review. See calendar on Academic Affairs webpage

Required Materials

The Post-Tenure Review Portfolio will include the following items:

1. A statement from the faculty member outlining work and development in the areas of Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship, and academic responsibility since the last tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. Each category should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities. The faculty member is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.
2. A statement of the faculty member's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years.
3. Annual reports from all years since last review (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations).
4. Peer evaluations, if available.
5. Current vita.
6. Information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year, post-tenure review period.
7. Supporting documents pertinent to the review.

If desired by a faculty member, the committee may send evidence of Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship, and academic responsibility to one or more reviewers outside the University. External reviewers will be selected by the committee in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed.

Post-Tenure Review Committee

All members of post-tenure review committees will be tenured Winthrop faculty. No faculty member will serve on a post-tenure review committee in the year in which he or she is scheduled for post-tenure review. For review of faculty members, the committee will consist of one member from the candidate's department if available, one member external to the department, and preferably a second member from the candidate's

department. For review of chairs and other administrators without full-time administrative duties, the committee will consist of one member from the candidate's academic department if available; one additional member from the academic unit in which the candidate serves, and one chair, assistant dean, or associate dean from another academic unit.

The faculty member should submit a list of possible committee members to the department chair consistent with the composition described above. Review committees will be selected by the department chair in such a way that the majority of members come from the faculty member's list of possible candidates. The department chair will submit the list of committee members to the dean, who will approve the committee as complying with post-tenure review policies and procedures. The dean will notify the chair and faculty member of the composition of the committee. The faculty member can appeal to the dean the appointment of any committee members who are not selected from the list provided.

The review committee will write a post-tenure review report evaluating the faculty member's performance and including a rating of "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory." The report will provide evidence for the committee's rating and suggestions for future performance and development. The committee will send copies of the report to the faculty member under review. A copy of the report and the post-tenure portfolio will be forwarded to the department chair or to the direct supervisor in cases of faculty in administrative roles. If the faculty member wishes to provide a written response, the faculty member must submit this response to the department chair/direct supervisor within two weeks of the notification of the decision.

The department chair or direct supervisor will review the committee report and portfolio, write a response, and forward all materials to the dean. The dean will also review all materials and reports, write a response, and forward information/materials as described below to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. All statements will be sent to the faculty member as the portfolio moves to the next level of review.

Satisfactory Reviews

In the case of a "Satisfactory" review, the committee's report will document areas in which the faculty member has excelled and make recommendations for future performance and development. In the case of a "Satisfactory" evaluation, the committee report cannot be overturned nor the rating changed to "Unsatisfactory" by the chair/supervisor or the dean.

A copy of the report and all supporting statements will be kept in the dean's office. A list of faculty members who have received "Satisfactory" post-tenure reviews in a unit will be forwarded annually to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Unsatisfactory Review

In the case of an "Unsatisfactory" review, the committee's report will document ways in which the faculty member's performance of specific duties and roles is unsatisfactory and will include a development plan.

The development plan must include:

- realistic goals and expectations for performance;
- activities to improve performance;
- a timeline for completing the development plan that allows for two annual review cycles by chairs/supervisors and deans that address the development plan;
- suggested resources to support the plan; and
- methods for assessing achievement of the goals and expectations, including peer and student evaluations of performance.

In the case of unsatisfactory reviews each response from the chair/direct supervisor and dean will include an indication of agreement or disagreement with the committee report. Further, copies of the responses will be forwarded to both the faculty member and the chair of the post-tenure review committee. The dean will

forward all materials to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will respond in writing to the dean and the faculty member indicating agreement or disagreement with the committee report.

If the department chair, dean, or Vice President for Academic Affairs disagrees with the “Unsatisfactory” rating or with aspects of the development plan, they will discuss such disagreements. If two of them agree to either change the rating to “Satisfactory” or to modify the development plan, such changes will be made and communicated to the review committee and the faculty member.

If the department chair, dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs agree with the “Unsatisfactory” rating, another review of the faculty member’s performance will be conducted after the completion of the development plan. The department chair will retain a complete copy of the materials submitted for the review, the committee report, and any statements from the faculty member, department chair, dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Appeals Process

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will serve as the appeals committee in all cases involving post-tenure review.

Basis for Appeals. A faculty member may appeal the results of a post-tenure review rating for any of the following reasons:

- An appeal on the basis that the procedures and timetable posted were not followed or that the post-tenure review committee was improperly constituted or improperly directed, which resulted in an incorrect finding or recommendation.
- An appeal of the substance of the committee’s evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as “Unsatisfactory.” Such appeals should reflect a set of unusual or extraordinary circumstances and will require considerable supporting evidence, particularly in cases in which the review committee, department chair, dean, or Vice President for Academic Affairs concurred in the evaluation.
- An appeal of the development plan, requesting an adjustment of the plan recommended by the review committee and approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Possible Courses of Action. Depending on the nature of the appeal, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure may recommend:

- that the evaluation of the post-tenure review committee be allowed to stand;
- that the development plan recommended by the review committee be revised; or
- that a new committee be constituted and the review process repeated in the following year, using the procedures established for all post-tenure reviews.

Procedures for Appeals. Any faculty member who desires to appeal should notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs within five days of notification. Then within two weeks of receiving the Vice President’s evaluation and development plan, the faculty member must forward to the President and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure:

- A letter outlining the basis for the appeal and stating the desired outcome (revision of development plan or review by a new post-tenure review committee).
- The entire post-tenure review package, including the committee’s report, any response from the faculty member, and the reports from the department chair, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Within two weeks of receiving the appeal materials, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will forward its findings to the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean, the department chair,

and the faculty member. The committee's report should reflect the basis and evidence for the appeal and recommend one of the courses of action listed above.

Within two weeks of receiving the report from the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the President will report to the Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean, the department chair, and the faculty member whether the development plan should be revised, whether a new review should be completed in the next academic year, or whether the post-tenure review committee's evaluation should be allowed to stand. Should the President not respond to the Committee's recommendation within two weeks, the Committee's recommendation will be allowed to stand.

If this process results in a "Satisfactory" rating, the dean's office will maintain a copy of all reports and supporting statements.

If the appeals process upholds an "Unsatisfactory" rating, the faculty member begins the development plan and will be reviewed again according to the timeline established in the development plan.

Second Review after an Unsatisfactory Evaluation

The second review will take place within three months of the completion deadline communicated in the development plan. If feasible, the committee that conducted the original review will be reconvened to conduct the second review. If a committee member is unavailable for the second review, a replacement will be chosen by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member.

The following materials will be provided to the committee by the faculty member and department chair:

- a complete copy of the materials from the first review;
- a statement from the faculty member delineating the activities undertaken during the development period with a self-evaluation of the outcomes;
- annual reports from all years since last review (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations);
- information on Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship, and/or academic responsibility needed to indicate progress identified in the development plan;
- copies of the results of any assessments required by the development plan;
- a statement from the chair documenting resources provided to support the development plan;
- an updated vita; and
- any other materials addressing progress within the context of the development plan.

The committee reviews the materials above and decides whether the faculty member has made significant progress toward addressing the problems identified in the initial "Unsatisfactory" review. The committee writes a report clearly indicating the recommendation and reasons for the decision. This report is forwarded to the chair and dean as established in post-tenure reviews to allow for statements to be provided. As in "Satisfactory" evaluations, this information is reported to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by the dean.

If the committee returns an "Unsatisfactory" evaluation on the second review, the faculty member may add a response to the committee report within two weeks of notification. As in the case for regular post-tenure review, the response from the chair/direct supervisor and dean will include an indication of agreement or disagreement with the committee report.

Further, copies of the responses will be forwarded to both the faculty member and the chair of the review committee. The dean will forward all materials to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will respond in writing to the dean, the chair, the faculty member, and the review committee indicating agreement or disagreement with the report.

If the department chair, dean, and/or Vice President for Academic Affairs disagrees with the “Unsatisfactory” rating, they will discuss the rating. If two of them agree, the rating will be changed to “Satisfactory.”

As mandated by the Commission on Higher Education, if a faculty member fails to make substantial progress toward the performance goals outlined in the development plan within the specified time frame of the development plan and does not receive a “Satisfactory” on the subsequent review, the Vice President for Academic Affairs can require that the development plan be continued for a specific time frame to include two complete annual review cycles or can recommend that the institution initiate procedures for dismissal of the faculty member, as outlined in the Winthrop University Faculty Manual.

Internal Control Considerations

Timetable

May 1 Vice President for Academic Affairs updates post-tenure review list and notifies deans of those faculty to be reviewed the following year.

May 15 Deans notify faculty (and their department chairs) who will be reviewed in the following year. The list would exclude faculty who made application for promotion in the previous Fall.

Oct 31 Faculty member provides the department chair a list of faculty members to be considered for the review committee.

Nov 15 Department chair selects the committee and forwards list to the dean for approval; faculty member is notified by the department chair of the committee membership.

Nov 25 By November 25, faculty member may appeal the composition of the committee to the dean.

Jan 10 Faculty member provides committee with materials for the review.

Feb 1 Committee sends its report to the faculty member and department chair.

Feb 15 Faculty member responds to the report if he or she wishes.

Mar 1 Department chair adds a written statement and forwards the report, with the faculty member’s response, to the dean.

Mar 15 In the case of “Satisfactory” ratings, the dean adds a statement and returns the report, with all supporting statements, to the faculty member. A copy of the department chair’s and dean’s response will be shared with the committee. A copy of the report and all supporting statements is kept in the dean’s office.

Mar 30 The list of faculty members receiving “Satisfactory” reviews is forwarded to the vice president.

In the case of “Unsatisfactory” reviews:

Feb 1 Committee sends its report to the faculty member and department chair.

Feb 15 Faculty member responds to the report if he or she wishes.

Mar 1 Department chair adds a written statement and forwards the report, with the faculty member’s response, to the dean.

Mar 15 Dean adds a statement to the report and forwards all supporting materials and statements to the vice president, department chair, committee and faculty member.

Mar 31 After conferring with the department chair and dean, the Vice President responds in writing to the faculty member, dean, department chair and committee. If this response results in a “Satisfactory” rating, the dean’s office will maintain a copy of all reports and supporting statements. If this response results in an “Unsatisfactory” rating, the faculty member begins the development plan and will be reviewed again after two years. Review of satisfactory progress on the development plan at the end of two years will follow the same timetable as the original review.

Apr 6 Appeals due to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Apr 20 Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure forwards its response to the President, Provost and faculty member.

May 5 President’s response due to the faculty member, Provost and dean and to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. A copy of the report on the President’s final decision is kept in the dean’s office.

Policy Author(s)

Board of Trustees, Academic Affairs, Faculty Conference

Effective Date

August 2012

Review Date

June 2012

Policy location

<https://www2.winthrop.edu/public/policy/fullpolicy.aspx?pid=291>