

## **D. Statements on Tenure and Promotion**

### **1. Tenure**

Subject to the provisions and policies adopted within the University and after a suitable probationary period, members of the faculty who are in regular positions shall be eligible for appointment to tenure. The granting of tenure constitutes a mutually advantageous arrangement between the University and the faculty member: the University engages to provide continuing employment to the faculty member, and the faculty member in turn engages to maintain competence in teaching and scholarship. Appointment to tenure is not automatic and is not solely the result of time spent teaching. However, appointment to tenure carries with it automatic promotion to the rank of associate professor. When tenure is not awarded, a terminal appointment must be offered to the faculty member for an additional year, regardless of any special circumstances surrounding the initial appointment or agreements about the probationary period.

Tenure terminates at retirement; however, the services of those awarded tenure may be terminated earlier under circumstances of financial exigency or of discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, or for adequate cause. Adequate cause for the termination of tenure is related directly and substantially to the fitness of a faculty member as a teacher and scholar and is defined as professional incompetence, neglect of duty, mental or physical incapacity, or gross personal or professional misconduct.

#### **Probationary Period**

The probationary period begins at the time of appointment to a regular position at St. Lawrence University and concludes at the end of the academic year in which the candidate is considered for tenure. Normally the probationary period is six years; that is, tenure consideration takes place in the sixth year after appointment to a regular position. However, the probationary period may vary in length, depending upon the candidate's previous experience and changes in the circumstances of employment after being appointed to a regular position. In exceptional circumstances, candidates may be considered for tenure early, but in no case will the probationary period be less than the equivalent of one year of full-time teaching at St. Lawrence University.

At the time of appointment to a regular position or during the probationary period, faculty members may negotiate with the Dean, in consultation with the department chairperson or program coordinator, to adjust the probationary period to accommodate faculty leaves (see III.H.), temporary administrative appointments, or extraordinary medical or family circumstances. It is the responsibility of the faculty member, in consultation with the department chairperson or program coordinator, to declare whether a faculty leave taken during the probationary period will extend its length. Agreements to adjust the probationary period will in no case extend it beyond eight years. All agreements to adjust the probationary period will be expressed in writing to the candidate and department chairperson or program coordinator and will be subject to review by the Professional Standards Committee (PSC).

The normal probationary period for faculty members appointed to shared, regular positions is six years of combined full-time teaching. The normal probationary period for faculty members appointed to two-thirds-time positions, or appointed to a regular position and opting during the probationary period to reduce their teaching loads temporarily, is a prorated equivalent of six years of full-time teaching.

The probationary appointment shall be reviewed annually by the department or program in which the appointment is held. At the midpoint of the probationary period a comprehensive review of the candidate's performance shall be made in writing and a copy of the evaluation given to the candidate [See III. D. 3.]. Written notice that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed shall be given to the faculty member in advance of the expiration of his or her appointment according to the following minimum standards of notice:

- As early as possible, but not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
- Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the second year of service terminates during the academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
- At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years at St. Lawrence.

### **Recommendation for Tenure**

During the summer before a given academic year, the Dean of Academic Affairs shall notify department chairpersons and program coordinators of the names of faculty members eligible for tenure consideration during that year. Recommendations concerning tenure shall be submitted to the PSC through the Dean and must be accompanied by the written consensus recommendation of the tenured members of the department or program. In each case the PSC shall make a recommendation to the President regarding tenure. The final determination on tenure shall be made by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the President. If the President's recommendation differs from that of the Committee, the Board shall be so informed, together with the reasons why. The candidate shall be notified in writing of the Board's action, ordinarily no later than March 1.

The criteria for appointment to tenure shall be those formulated from time to time by the PSC and approved by the faculty, the President, and the Board of Trustees. The procedures to be followed in applying these criteria shall be prescribed by the Committee, but shall be subject to such review by the faculty, the President, and the Board as may be necessary to assure their adequacy, consistency, and fairness.

### **Continuing Evaluation**

It is the obligation of the tenured members of the faculty to continue to maintain their competence in teaching and scholarship. It is the responsibility of the Dean of Academic Affairs,

as the principal academic officer of the University, and of department chairpersons and program coordinators to ensure that competence is maintained. Should the Dean conclude on the basis of annual reviews that reasons for concern exist, he or she shall discuss it with the faculty member and place a memorandum of the discussion in appropriate files. A copy of the memorandum shall also be furnished to the faculty member. If, after an appropriate interval fixed at that discussion, the cause for concern continues to exist, the Dean at his or her discretion may either request the PSC to initiate a peer review as a guide to further action or institute proceedings for termination under the provisions of the following section.

In the event of a peer review by the PSC, the member of the faculty under review will be asked to supply the Committee with a dossier similar to that defined above, and assessments of his or her performance as a teacher will be sought from students and faculty. The Dean and department chairperson or program coordinator will make available to the Committee all evidence pertinent to the case. The Committee may request the person concerned and other faculty, students, or members of the administration to appear. The Committee's judgment of the case will be based competency in teaching and in scholarship as it affects teaching. Its findings will be reported to the Dean in the form of minutes recording the vote and major arguments. Any subsequent action leading to proceedings for termination are governed by the policies on Termination for Cause and Termination Under Other Circumstances, below.

### **Termination for Cause**

Proceedings to terminate a tenure appointment for adequate cause, as defined in the second paragraph of this section (III.D.1.) shall be conducted as expeditiously and justly as possible.

In cases involving alleged mental or physical incapacity, any decision to terminate shall be based on clear and convincing medical evidence submitted to the Dean of Academic Affairs. If there is objection on behalf of the faculty member concerned to such a decision, a grievance proceeding in the usual form may be instituted to secure appropriate review. Faculty members whose appointments are terminated for mental or physical incapacity shall receive the equivalent of one year's salary over the twelve months following the date of termination of their employment.

In cases involving alleged professional incompetence, neglect of duty, or gross personal or professional misconduct, charges may be made by any officer of the University, faculty member, or student. Such charges shall be submitted in writing to the Dean of Academic Affairs, who shall seek the advice of the PSC. If a prima facie case is found to exist, the faculty member shall be notified of the charges in writing.

The first procedural step after such notification shall be discussion between the faculty member and appropriate administrative officers with a view to reaching a mutually satisfactory settlement.

If a faculty member faced with termination of his or her appointment so desires, he or she may contest the charges against him or her. In such event, he or she shall be entitled to a review and hearing of the case by three or more members of the PSC, provided that he or she so requests within ten days after receiving notice of those charges. The faculty member shall have at least

twenty days from the time the review is requested to prepare a defense. The review hearing shall begin no later than thirty days after submission of the request unless postponed by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the appropriate administrative officers.

At the hearing, the faculty member shall have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense, to have with him or her an adviser of his or her own choosing who may act as counsel, to present witnesses and introduce evidence on his or her own behalf, to question witnesses adverse to him or her, and to be informed of the author or source of all adverse statements made elsewhere and presented to the PSC Hearing Committee for its consideration. The proceedings shall be recorded and furnished to the faculty member upon request. In the hearing of charges of professional incompetence or neglect of duty, the testimony may include that of faculty members and others either from St. Lawrence or from other institutions.

Within fourteen days after the close of the hearing, the PSC Hearing Committee shall report its findings to the Dean of Academic Affairs, the President, and the faculty member. After consulting with the Committee and with the faculty member if the latter so requests and after reviewing all the proceedings, the President shall render a decision on the case in writing within thirty days after his or her receipt of the Committee's report.

### **Termination Under Other Circumstances**

The Board of Trustees reserves the right to terminate any faculty position, tenured or nontenured, for reasons of financial exigency involving a grave risk to the continued existence or effective operation of the University. The Board recognizes, however, that any such action is of an extreme character, and it will resort thereto only in cases of demonstrable need and only after consultation with the Faculty Council on the steps to be taken. Termination of tenured positions because of the discontinuance of departments or programs for reasons other than financial exigency shall be based primarily on educational considerations as determined by the President after consultation with appropriate University committees and with the approval of the Board of Trustees.

Faculty members whose appointments are terminated because of such discontinuance shall receive the equivalent of one year's salary over the twelve months following the date of termination of their employment.

## **2. The Professional Standards Committee**

The Professional Standards Committee (PSC), established by the Faculty, receives, evaluates, and transmits to the President all recommendations for faculty promotions and appointments to tenure. In so doing, the Committee assumes a responsibility for encouraging continuous improvement in the quality of the Faculty. The Committee consists of seven voting members of the tenured faculty elected for two-year terms and the Dean of Academic Affairs *ex officio* and non-voting. A faculty member is eligible for election if tenure will be in effect as of the time of proposed service. Once a faculty member has completed a total of four years of service on the PSC within a period of six consecutive years, he or she is not eligible to be elected to the

Committee again for a period of four years. A faculty member may not serve on the Professional Standards Committee if he or she is serving on the Dean's Staff or the President's Senior Staff. The Dean is present at Committee meetings to provide appropriate assistance, including relevant information that the Committee may not have. The Dean normally does not debate the merit of individual cases; his or her assistance to the Committee is usually offered orally as part of its deliberations.

### **3. Policies on Tenure and Promotion**

Changes in this section of the Statement of Principles must be approved by the faculty, the President, and the Board of Trustees.

#### **Criteria for Appointment to Tenure and Promotion in Rank**

Academic rank and tenure are distinctive attributes of the teaching profession. For advancement in rank and appointment to tenure, the University expects full professional preparation (completion of the doctorate or the appropriate terminal degree). Only in demonstrably exceptional circumstances will an individual be considered for appointment to tenure without the doctorate or the terminal degree in his or her field. The appropriate terminal degree, when other than the doctorate, will be determined at the time of appointment by the Dean in consultation with the individual's department or program and the PSC. The University also expects a high quality of performance under each of the following criteria. While uniformity in all areas is not expected, strength throughout the criteria is. The principal criterion for evaluation of faculty performance is the quality of teaching. The standards set forth herein are measures used to evaluate the quality of the total contribution of the faculty member to St. Lawrence University.

Throughout the evaluation of a candidate for tenure or promotion, the burden of proof rests with the candidate to give evidence for why tenure or promotion should be granted.

##### *a) Effectiveness in Teaching*

The primary standard for evaluation of faculty performance is excellence in teaching. In the application of this standard to individual cases, however, the Committee recognizes that within the University, and under the ideal of liberal education, there is great variety: in the goals for particular disciplines or courses, in class size and structure, in pedagogical technique, etc. When the Committee reviews a case, it seeks evidence of both a faculty member's aspirations as a teacher and his or her success in realizing those aspirations.

Specific evidence of effectiveness in teaching might include: thorough class preparation; effective presentation; communication of respect for knowledge; continuing application of new knowledge to teaching; development of the ability to use knowledge creatively; contribution to the design and pedagogy of team-taught courses; a constructively critical attitude toward the work of colleagues in team-teaching; ability to formulate intellectual contexts beyond the limits of a single discipline; skill in articulating fundamental, enduring questions relevant to a liberal education; ability to challenge students to think clearly; encouragement of students to develop open yet disciplined minds; stimulation of students to do independent work; adherence to high

standards for student performance; a constructively critical attitude toward the work of the student; care and thoroughness in the evaluation of student work; interest in students and contribution to their welfare through conference and informal advising; development of improved methods of teaching; and such other evidence as the candidate may wish to present.

Additionally, at St. Lawrence teaching includes formal academic advising.

*b) Achievement in Scholarship and the Arts*

Concrete evidence is sought of a growing, outreaching mind that is not content with merely passing on received knowledge but demonstrates eagerness and ability to develop itself and to make important contributions to scholarship and the arts. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a continuing concern for improving their talents and skills, for increasing their knowledge, and for contributing to the general body of knowledge or the enhancement of the arts. Evidence of achievement in scholarship and the arts includes:

- writing of books, monographs, articles, and reviews; creative work in literature, music, drama, or the fine arts; presenting a paper; organizing or chairing or participating as a member of a panel, discussion, or meeting;
- participation in local, regional, or national professional organizations as an active member, a committee member, or an officer; participation on an academic accreditation team; receipt of a scholarship or fellowship award; acting as a consultant or serving as an editor; research; formal advanced study; recognition of one's work by peers, or any kind of recognition related to one's scholarly work or reputation as an authority within or without one's discipline; serving as a judge of an art exhibit or on a foundation panel to evaluate proposals;
- articulation of a specific position on education, the liberal arts, or academic policies and procedures; innovations in educational materials and methods; writing of grant proposals;
- other evidence as the candidate may wish to present.

*c) Contribution as a Member of the Academic Community*

Faculty are expected to demonstrate acceptance of their responsibilities as members of the academic community at St. Lawrence University. Evidence of contribution to the academic community might include: participation in the scholarly or professional dialogue within the University; service to a department or program; participation in the paracurricular life of the University; enhancing the learning environment of the University; committee and University governance service; a constructively critical attitude toward the work of the University; devotion to intellectual freedom and the ethics of the profession; recognition as a valued member of the University; and other evidence as the candidate may wish to present.

#### *d) Institutional Considerations as a Factor in Tenure Review*

The tenure decision will be based on a candidate's merit as defined by the above criteria. Institutional considerations other than merit should not be a factor in the denial of tenure. Denial of tenure is here distinguished from termination of an appointment for reasons of financial exigency or changing program needs. Changing needs shall not disqualify a tenure-track faculty member for reappointment less than 18 months prior to October 15 of the year of scheduled tenure review or after the midprobationary review has begun.

#### **Midprobationary Review**

At the midpoint of the probationary period, a comprehensive review of the candidate's performance shall be made in writing and a copy of the evaluation given to the candidate. A major purpose of this evaluation shall be to aid the candidate in identifying strengths and weaknesses and in improving his or her performance as a faculty member. The criteria to be applied in this review shall be the same as those described above for evaluating appointments to tenure, and the candidate's progress in addressing weaknesses and building upon strengths cited in the midprobationary review will be a significant consideration in his or her tenure review. The midprobationary review and the optional response of the candidate to it will be made part of the candidate's official file.

The procedure detailed below is based on several assumptions, which are implicit in recent past practice. They are:

- Hiring for, and appointment to, a tenure-track position is done with the expectation that the individual will be considered for tenure by the PSC at the end of the appropriate probationary period, normally in the sixth year.
- All parties to this appointment--the individual, the department or program in which he or she is appointed, any programs in which he or she may be involved, and the University as a whole—are best served by regular, ongoing feedback between the parties. Such evaluation has as its primary goal the preparation of the faculty member to stand for tenure. It also provides the University, through its departments and programs, the opportunity to benefit from the fresh and unique perspectives that junior faculty members bring to the institution.
- Regardless of whatever other reviews in particular departments and programs may occur, all parties are best served by a comprehensive review of tenure-track faculty at the midpoint in the probationary period, normally during the third year at St. Lawrence. The purpose of this review is to assist the tenure-track faculty member in making appropriate mid-course adjustments en route to the tenure decision. It also provides performance information that would, if necessary, result in the faculty member's not being continued in the tenure track.

- In the event that a candidate is not continued in the tenure track as a result of the midprobationary review, the presumption is that the position will be continued in the department or program.

The specific procedure for accomplishing the midprobationary review is as follows:

Evaluation #1. The individual faculty member under review will prepare a self-evaluation of his or her performance to date under the three categories of assessment used by the PSC: teaching, scholarship, and community service. The specific format of the self-evaluation is left open. In all cases, it should show appropriate self-consciousness about professional goals and objectives, particularly with regard to teaching and scholarship. It should seek to identify both strengths and weaknesses in meeting those goals and objectives to date and aspirations for future development.

Evaluation #2. The faculty member's department chairperson or program coordinator will consult with all tenured members of the department or program, and other department or program members as appropriate, and prepare a written evaluation. The primary goal of this evaluation is to advise the faculty member on his or her professional performance based on the evidence accrued thus far in the probationary period. The evaluation should represent the opinions of the tenured members of the department or program on the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The main goal, as noted above, is to prepare the candidate to stand for tenure before the PSC.

Evaluation #3. In the event that the individual under review has been involved with more than one department or program, the Dean of Academic Affairs will consult with the faculty member and all relevant department chairpersons and program coordinators and design a review process appropriate to .

Evaluation #4. A list of the members of the PSC for the current year and for the six previous years will be provided to the individual under review and to the chairperson or coordinator of his or her department or program. A current or recent member of the PSC from outside the faculty member's department or program will be selected who is mutually agreeable to all parties. The faculty member and relevant departments and programs are encouraged to seek the advice of the PSC representative throughout the review process. After reviewing the file and evaluations described above, the PSC representative will write an evaluation assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member as revealed by the file and of his or her presentation of the case for review.

Evaluation #1 is due at the office of the Dean of Academic Affairs by the first Monday in February; evaluations #2 and #3 are due at the office of the Dean of Academic Affairs by the first Monday in March; Evaluation #4 is due at the office of the Dean of Academic Affairs by the first Monday in April. Upon their completion, these evaluations will be shared with all of their authors and with the Dean of Academic Affairs. The Dean will subsequently convene a meeting with the appropriate department chairpersons and/or program coordinators, and the PSC representative, to review the evaluations. The appropriate department chairperson or program coordinator will then prepare a draft report on the substance of that meeting. Once agreement is reached about the substance of this report, it, along with copies of all evaluations described

above, will be signed by the President, the Dean, and appropriate department chairperson(s) and/or program coordinator(s). A copy of the final report and accompanying evaluations will be provided to the faculty member for his or her signature.

Assuming the recommendation is that the faculty member should anticipate standing for tenure at the conclusion of the probationary period, this document will serve as the basis for future mentoring. If the recommendation is that the faculty member should not be continued in the tenure track, he or she will be so informed. In the event that there is no clear recommendation on the continuation of the faculty member in the tenure track, the Dean will make a recommendation to the President for the final decision.

### **Guidelines for Promotion in Rank**

Promotion to the rank of assistant professor is independent of tenure. Tenure carries with it automatic promotion to the associate professor rank for those previously in the assistant or instructor ranks. Promotion to associate professor or professor may not be considered before the tenure consideration. \*Promotion from associate professor to professor will not normally be considered before the fifth year in rank.\*

[\*These rules apply to full-time teaching faculty initially employed with the beginning of the 2005-2006 academic year. For those employed prior to this date the previous policy applies.]

Promotion will become effective in the year following successful consideration. A candidate whose recommendation for promotion has failed should not be recommended again until there is substantial new evidence.

An initial appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor requires that the candidate present an equivalent record of achievement in scholarship or the arts as would be required for promotion to the given rank, with strong evidence for the promise of successful teaching and contributions as a member of the academic community.

#### *a) Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor*

Appointments at the rank of instructor are reserved for those who do not hold the doctorate or the appropriate terminal degree. When an instructor completes the terminal degree, promotion to assistant professor will occur without review by the PSC. Only in the most exceptional cases and after Committee review may promotion to the rank of assistant professor be made without the terminal degree.

#### *b) Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor*

Promotion to the rank of associate professor is automatic with tenure and may not be considered before consideration for tenure. Therefore, the criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor are those set forth for tenure. For assistant professors with exceptional records of professional accomplishment, consideration for promotion to the rank of associate professor earlier than the time previously scheduled may only be achieved through revision of the length of the probationary time for tenure, as described above.

#### *c) Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor*

Promotion to the rank of professor requires evidence of distinguished professional stature. While the primary emphasis on high quality performance as a teacher continues, increased stress is placed upon substantial professional productivity. In addition, as senior members of the faculty, candidates for promotion are expected to have continued to serve the campus community. Achievements should be in addition to those which qualified the candidate for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

### **Disposition of Recommendations**

Unless the PSC informs candidates to the contrary, final tenure files must be submitted to the chairperson of the PSC by the second Monday in October; final promotion files must be submitted to the chairperson by the second Monday in February. Although the candidate's chairperson or program coordinator may inform the PSC by letter of significant developments in the candidate's professional status or accomplishments that have occurred during the semester of the Committee's consideration of tenure or promotion, the Committee otherwise considers the candidate's file closed as of the due date.

At the end of its deliberations on a case, the Committee votes and transmits its recommendation to the President along with the case minutes and notifies the candidate of its decision and of the major arguments for and against the recommendation. After the Committee has considered all cases, the President meets with the Committee to discuss them.

After this meeting, if the President accepts the Committee's recommendation on a specific case, he or she informs the candidate in writing, with copies to the department chairperson or program coordinator and the chairperson of PSC.

If the President is disposed to disagree with the Committee's recommendation, whether positive or negative, he or she must notify the Committee and the candidate in writing of his or her grounds of disagreement. The Committee will conduct a second vote on the case and forward this vote to the President along with additional case minutes. Before taking a second vote, the Committee may reexamine the file and/or seek additional information as it deems necessary. The President then makes his or her decision on the case and informs the candidate in writing, with copies to the department chairperson or program coordinator and the chairperson of the PSC. If the decision of the President differs from the Committee's final vote, or if the Committee changes its decision from positive to negative after a request for a second vote from the President, the President is obligated to report these circumstances and the grounds for his or her decision in the letter to the candidate. Concurrently, the chairperson of the PSC will inform the candidate in writing of the Committee's recommendation and of the major arguments for and against the recommendation.

The candidate has the opportunity to request a reversal of a negative decision. A request for reversal should be directed to the chairperson of the PSC and the President according to the timetable provided below. The President and the Committee will meet jointly in any reconsideration of the case. In reconsidering a decision, the PSC will consider only evidence that addresses alleged violations of procedure and/or evidence that addresses the areas of deficiency identified in the Committee's letter to the candidate. Arguments for reversal should be based

upon evidence that directly pertains to the interpretation of the materials already presented in the candidate's file.

The timetable for any reconsideration will be:

- (1) The candidate receives a letter from the President reporting his or her decision.
- (2) The candidate submits a formal request for a reversal of the decision within one week of receipt of this letter from the President.
- (3) The candidate submits evidence for reversal. If the candidate receives notification of the President's decision in the fall, the deadline for submitting this evidence to the Dean's office is the third Monday in February; if in the spring, the deadline is thirty days from the date of the formal request for reconsideration. The candidate may seek additional evidence to be provided by other individuals and/or his or her department or program.
- (4) Reconsideration of the case in light of evidence presented will occur as soon as possible, given the Committee's case load, but in any case no later than the Monday prior to Commencement. Once the President has transmitted his or her decision to the Board of Trustees, the final determination in all cases of tenure and promotion in rank rests with the Board. When final action is taken, the Dean informs in writing the candidate, the department chairperson or program coordinator, and the chairperson of the PSC of the decision of the President and the Board of Trustees. If the decision is not to tenure or promote, the President personally informs the candidate and department chairperson or program coordinator of the reasons for the negative action, and, should the candidate so desire, those reasons are put in writing by the President and made a part of the candidate's record.

#### **4. Specific Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Consideration**

Based upon past experience, these procedures are determined by the PSC for the expeditious handling of recommendations and reviews. Since they are not matters of policy, proposed changes in this section of the Statement of Principles will be instituted 30 days after they are announced to the Faculty and Faculty Council, if there are no substantive objections.

The responsibilities of the various parties to a tenure and/or promotion case outlined below notwithstanding, it is the candidate who bears the burden of demonstrating why his or her performance merits tenure or promotion. This applies most importantly to the file used by the Committee for tenure and promotion review: the candidate is ultimately responsible for ensuring that it contains all relevant material that he or she believes will support his or her case by the date on which the file is closed. A faculty member may inspect all materials in his or her tenure and promotion file except letters of evaluation, which shall remain confidential.

## **Responsibility of the Dean of Academic Affairs**

It is the responsibility of the Dean of Academic Affairs to remind department chairpersons and program coordinators during the summer preceding a given academic year of the names of faculty eligible or mandated for tenure consideration.

The Dean will send a letter to department chairpersons and program coordinators in September reminding them of the deadline for recommendations for promotion. It is the responsibility of the Dean to inform the department or program concerned when department chairpersons or program coordinators must be considered for tenure. The Dean or a tenured member of the department or program may initiate the preparation of the tenure recommendation. In the case of promotion for a department chairperson or program coordinator, it is the responsibility of the Dean to confer with the chairperson or coordinator to ascertain his or her wishes concerning promotion. If the chairperson or coordinator wishes to be recommended for promotion, the Dean will see that appropriate action is taken and, in consultation with the tenured members of the department or program, will select a person to prepare and submit the recommendation.

The Dean of Academic Affairs will, after consultation with the candidate and the department chairperson and/or program coordinator, select external evaluators of scholarship and solicit their evaluations.

## **Responsibility of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs**

It is the responsibility of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to:

- a) Prepare a list of former students taught by the candidate within the past five years to be solicited for their evaluation of the candidate. The list should include a sample of graduated majors and minors from the candidate's department or program, a representative sample of current students including both majors and non-majors, and all current and former advisees;
- b) Share the list of selected students with the candidate and invite the candidate to add additional names;
- c) Write to the selected students and invite them to submit their evaluation of the candidate;
- d) Forward the student letters to the PSC, along with the lists of students solicited in each category;
- e) Prepare a summary of the grade distribution in each of the candidate's courses during the probationary period (for tenure review), or during the past five years (for tenured faculty). This summary should be shared with the department chairperson or program coordinator, the candidate, and the PSC as part of the case materials.

## **Responsibility of the Department Chairperson**

In most instances the department chairperson will initiate recommendations for tenure and promotion. Other members of the faculty, within or without the department, may propose to the Committee candidates for promotion. In all cases to be considered by the Committee, however, the preparation of the recommendation form, whether positive or negative, and its submission to the PSC, are the sole responsibilities of the tenured or other appropriate members of the department.

In addition, it is the responsibility of the department chairperson to:

- a) Fill out and return the “Soliciting Student Letters” form to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs;
- b) Provide the Associate Dean with the names and mailing labels for other students from whom the candidate specifically requests that letters of evaluation be solicited;
- c) Prepare a consensus recommendation approved by a majority of the tenured members of the department;
- d) Review the completed recommendation form with the tenured department faculty and the candidate;
- e) Transmit this recommendation to the PSC through the Dean of Academic Affairs. When a department does not recommend a person for tenure at the end of the probationary period, the chairperson of that department must notify the Committee as to the reasons why;
- f) Remind all tenured members of the department to send individual letters about the candidate to the PSC. Because in its deliberations the Committee must rely heavily on those peers who are best able to judge the candidate, in both positive and negative cases it is the responsibility of each tenured member of the department to submit an individual assessment in writing of the candidate. Should a tenured member of the department refuse to submit such an assessment, the Committee will expect an explanation in writing of the reason(s) for the refusal. Appropriate non-tenured members of the department may also be consulted and their views incorporated in the recommendation of the tenured members. The PSC invites all non-tenured members of the department and other interested persons to present letters of evaluation;
- g) Send to the PSC through the Dean course evaluations from all St. Lawrence courses taught by the candidate during the probationary period (for tenure review), or during the last five years (for tenured faculty). All parts of the evaluation form should be sent, all the raw data upon which any summaries of open-ended questions are based, and a copy of the appropriate questionnaire;
- h) Forward to the PSC through the Dean a copy of the mandated mid-probationary review;

i) Forward to the PSC a list of the names of any individuals who have been solicited by the candidate or department to send evaluative letters. A copy of any solicitation letters should also be forwarded to the PSC;

j) Forward to the PSC the Peer Review of Courses;

k) Forward to the Dean a list of names and addresses of persons who might be solicited for external review of the candidate's scholarly activity, including a description of the evaluator's work in the candidate's field and that individual's affiliation with the candidate.

### **Responsibility of the Program Coordinator**

In cases when the candidate is being considered for tenure in a program, the responsibilities outlined in above apply. In other cases, it is the responsibility of the program coordinator to:

a) Prepare a recommendation based on the candidate's participation in the program;

b) Review the recommendation with the candidate and transmit the recommendation to the PSC through the Dean of Academic Affairs;

c) Remind all tenured faculty who have taught in the program with the candidate to send individual letters about the candidate to the PSC;

d) Send to the PSC through the Dean any course evaluations for courses taught for the program by the candidate during the probationary period (for tenured review), or during the last five years (for tenured faculty). Duplications of evaluations done for department courses need not be included. All parts of the evaluation form should be sent, all the raw data upon which any summaries of open-ended questions are based, and a copy of the appropriate questionnaire.

### **Responsibility of the Candidate Under Review**

It is the responsibility of the candidate to:

a) Send to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs an abbreviated one-page resumé to be sent out with letters soliciting student evaluation of the candidate;

b) Send to the PSC through the Dean of Academic Affairs three copies of a professional resumé or curriculum vitae, two of which should be submitted as early as possible and will be made available for public review;

c) Send to the PSC through the Dean a history of teaching assignments at St. Lawrence;

d) Forward to the PSC through the Dean evidence of contributions and achievements under the headings of scholarship and university service, including information about whether or not a contribution has been refereed, juried, or invited for publication or presentation;

e) Send to the PSC through the Dean a personal statement of professional goals in scholarship and teaching;

f) Send to the PSC the names of all former and/or current students who the candidate has *personally* requested to submit letters;

g) Send to the PSC through the Dean any other evaluative material that the candidate feels may be helpful to the work of the PSC, such as course syllabi, writing assignments, examinations, and information about independent and honors projects the candidate has directed.

In addition to the required materials described above, other desirable materials might include:

1) letters from non-tenured members of the department; 2) letters from colleagues with whom the candidate has team-taught; 3) letters from faculty at large; 4) letters from professionals in the candidate's field; 5) other evidence of the candidate's work.

Candidates should make copies of all materials that they may wish to consult in the future. Scholarly and professional development materials will be returned to the candidate after all decisions are completed.

Candidates for tenure and promotion may solicit specific individuals or may ask their department chairperson or program coordinator to solicit specific individuals for letters of evaluation (other than students or the mandated external review). The department chairperson or program coordinator must submit to the PSC a list of names of those who have been specifically solicited and a copy of the solicitation letter.

### **Evaluation of Teaching**

The University's tenure policy implies that it is the continuing responsibility of each academic department to appraise the teaching of its members. Teaching is a complex endeavor, capable of an almost infinite variety of successful expressions, and thus, success as a teacher cannot be judged by any one criterion or through one single mechanism. Careful, fair review is especially important at times of review for tenure and promotion.

To assure that the teaching of each faculty member is judged as fairly as possible, the judgment of teaching should be performed in a minimum of four diverse and general ways: 1) student opinion of teaching in courses; 2) peer review of courses; 3) self-evaluation of aims, goals, and accomplishments; 4) solicitation of the views of former students. None of these forms of evaluation should singularly inform a judgment of teaching; they should be used in concert to provide a reasonable and complete representation of the candidate's abilities as a teacher.

Departments and programs should establish procedures and guidelines for the review of candidates in accordance with the policies described. The survey of student opinions would normally be the only procedure implemented for each course each semester.

The evaluation of teaching described here is intended to provide a summative view of a teacher's strengths and possible weaknesses. It is not in itself designed to be formative—that is, to

improve the abilities of the candidate. However, a summative assessment of teaching must of necessity inform formative processes and should form the basis of a dialogue resulting in the improvement of teaching.

#### *a) Survey of Student Opinion of Teaching*

The PSC has developed a list of evaluation questions to which students in all undergraduate classes are asked to respond. To supplement this standard evaluation instrument, departments, programs, and individuals may develop questionnaires of their own in order to address specific course, disciplinary, or departmental concerns. Surveys of teaching effectiveness are normally conducted toward the end of each semester, with student assistants in each class distributing and collecting the evaluation materials while the instructor is absent from the classroom. The evaluation of courses is administered by the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs; certain programs such as the First Year Program may administer their own internally-developed evaluation processes.

The feedback afforded by student evaluations is used for both formative and summative purposes by individuals, programs, and departments.

The department chairperson or program coordinator is responsible for the safekeeping of student comments, a copy of the questionnaire, and a copy of computer-scored responses for each course. A copy of computer-scored responses should also be preserved by the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.

The Dean will have access to student comments and computer-scored responses whenever a significant question arises about reappointment of a faculty member, including at the time of midprobationary and tenure and/or promotion reviews. Tenured colleagues will have access to a faculty member's student evaluations at the time of midprobationary and tenure and/or promotion reviews.

Because success as a teacher cannot be measured through one single mechanism, and because the surveys do not apply an absolute scale (there must be a relative ranking of a selection of even the "best" teachers), the PSC should not use or understand such comparative figures as the primary indicator of a candidate's teaching ability.

The PSC, in conjunction with department chairpersons and program coordinators, will establish a periodic review of the mandated evaluation questions and will consider alternative questions for the purpose of improving the overall process of student evaluation of teaching at St. Lawrence.

Summary data from comparable questions may be generated and publicized by the PSC or as requested by individual departments or programs.

#### *b) Peer Review of Courses*

A group of three or more peers, not necessarily from within the same department or program or even, in the case of small or specialized departments or programs, from St. Lawrence, should

separately review course materials on forms suggested by the PSC. Materials may be submitted in the form of a dossier for selected courses taught, although not necessarily for each course or for each semester. The PSC will offer guidance as to additional materials that might be included in the dossier. In addition, each member of the review group should observe the faculty member in the classroom or other appropriate teaching venue. Classes observed should represent a variety of level, class size, and pedagogy, if applicable.

*c) Instructor's Statement of Aims, Goals, and Accomplishments*

In the context of a summative evaluation, it is particularly useful for the person being evaluated to explain goals, methods, special circumstances and outcomes.

The instructor's commentary on specific course(s) may include: a statement of the objectives of the course; a statement of course assignments and grading policies; new or improved teaching methods or innovations; the instructor's assessment of the level of success of the course; and commentary on student evaluation of the course. This commentary may also be included in the dossier for peer review. The PSC will offer guidance as to additional materials that might be included.

*d) Solicitation of the Views of Former Students*

The views of the instructor's former students and advisees are solicited via the distribution of standardized letters by the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, the solicitation being accompanied by a return envelope.

**External Evaluation of Scholarship**

External evaluation of the scholarly/creative work of candidates for tenure and promotion will be required in the evaluation process. The purpose of these evaluations is to help the PSC to assess the significance and quality of a candidate's scholarly/creative work, both in general and in relation to specific disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary fields. The candidate and the department chairperson or program coordinator should agree on a list of five experts from whom evaluations might be requested. In the candidate's list of five names, he or she must provide information describing the evaluator's work in the candidate's field and that individual's affiliation with the candidate. The solicitation letter sent to evaluators will also request that the evaluator identify any affiliation with the candidate. The candidate is advised, but not required, to include at least one reviewer from a liberal arts college. In cases of disagreement over appropriate evaluators, the candidate and chairperson and/or program coordinator should each submit a list of five names to the Dean of Academic Affairs who, after consultation with the candidate and chairperson/coordinator, will select evaluators to contact. A minimum of three external evaluations will generally be expected by the PSC, to whom the evaluations will be sent. Evaluators will be given guidelines for tenure and promotion at St. Lawrence, the candidate's curriculum vita, and reproductions or descriptions of his or her professional work not readily available. In all cases, the Dean of Academic Affairs will solicit the evaluations and bear their costs.

The external evaluation of scholarship is required of all candidates for tenure whose initial appointment begins on or after the Fall Semester of 2000. A candidate whose initial appointment began prior to the Fall Semester of 2000 who wishes to do so may request an external evaluation of his or her scholarly or creative work according to the procedures outlined above.

### **Deliberations of the Professional Standards Committee**

Normally, in the course of its deliberation on tenure, the PSC will ask the department chairperson and/or relevant program coordinator to appear in support of the department's and/or program's recommendation. In both tenure and promotion cases, the department chairperson or program coordinator may request in writing to appear before the Committee. It is the Committee's prerogative to contact the department chairperson, program coordinator, or candidate for clarification of specific issues in the file about which questions have arisen during PSC deliberations.

Letters of evaluation for tenure and all supportive evidence must be submitted to the PSC by the second Monday in October, and letters of evaluation for promotion by the second Monday in February. A subcommittee examines the papers of all candidates for completeness. The Committee expects to finish its deliberations on tenure cases by December 15 and on promotions by May 1.

The Committee's decision on each recommendation is made by a written ballot on a formal motion to approve. All elected members of the Committee, including the chairperson, vote. No abstentions are allowed.

Members of the Committee may vote on the cases of members of their departments or programs, but a Committee member whose case is under consideration must be absent during the deliberations. A member of the Committee who is a department chairperson or a program coordinator and who presents the case on behalf of members of his or her department or program is not allowed to deliberate or vote in that case. Should a committee member feel obligated to recuse him or herself for personal reasons, he or she should so indicate before consideration of the case and not participate in the Committee's deliberations.

In the event of a tie vote, the recommendation will be automatically reconsidered by the Committee. Should a tie remain after reconsideration, the case will be forwarded to the President as a negative recommendation.

Major arguments in the Committee's decision are recorded in case minutes. Action of the Committee is forwarded to the President of the University by the Dean in the form of the case minutes along with copies of all evidence supplied to the Committee.