

Personnel Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
at
The University of the South
July 1, 2023

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|--|---------|
| I. | Preamble..... | page 2 |
| II. | Statutory Authority Governing Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotions | page 2 |
| III. | Definitions and Duties | page 3 |
| IV. | Timing for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion | page 8 |
| V. | University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion..... | page 9 |
| VI. | Procedures for Evaluation of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty..... | page 12 |
| | A. General Comments About Procedures | |
| | B. Detailed Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty in the Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews | |
| | C. Detailed Procedures for Evaluation for: 1) Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor; and 2) Promotion to Full Professor | |
| | D. Post-Tenure Review | |
| VII. | Procedures upon Notice of Non-Reappointment or Denial of Tenure and/or Promotion for Reasons of Performance..... | page 27 |
| VIII. | Impermissible Grounds for Non-Reappointment or Denial of Tenure and/or Promotion | page 29 |
| IX. | Non-reappointment of Non-tenured Tenure Track Faculty for Reasons of Needs and Resources..... | page 29 |
| X. | Termination of Faculty Employment for Reasons of Financial Exigency or Program Change..... | page 30 |
| XI. | Disciplinary Actions and Dismissal..... | page 31 |
| XII. | Future Amendments..... | page 32 |

I. Preamble

The purpose of this document is to state the procedures governing the employment status of the tenure-track and tenured faculty members of the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Theology, including appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, notification of non-reappointment, disciplinary actions, and dismissal. These procedures constitute the official policy of the University, and the University commits itself to make no permanent changes in these procedures without prior consultation with the faculty.

Because no set of employment procedures can address every issue that may arise in making employment decisions, these procedures may be modified or supplemented in individual cases at the discretion of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences or the Dean of the School of Theology, the Provost, or Vice-Chancellor. Such modifications can be made only with the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee or tenured members of the School of Theology faculty, and only after informing the faculty member in question of any necessary modifications in the procedure before the evaluation occurs. The office of the Dean of the College and the office of the Dean of the School of Theology will track and record any such alterations in the employment procedures.

The University provides equal employment opportunity to all faculty members and applicants for faculty positions. No person shall be discriminated against in employment because of race, color, sex, national origin, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, pregnancy, childbirth, genetic information or religion (except for those positions in the School of Theology and the chaplain's office where religious affiliation is a necessary qualification).

II. Statutory Authority Governing Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotions

The Constitution of the University of the South charges the Board of Regents with the power of election, upon the nomination of the Vice-Chancellor, of all professors and other persons connected with teaching at the University¹. The University Ordinances specify that all non-tenured faculty members will be deemed elected by the Board of Regents upon the Vice-Chancellor's approval of the appointment, and that the granting of tenure requires nomination by the Vice-Chancellor and approval by the Board of Regents². The Ordinances also provide that the Provost shall assist with faculty relations, appointments, and promotions³.

¹ Constitution, Article IV, Section 2

² Ordinance 2, Section 4

³ Ordinance 5, Section 2

III. Definitions and Duties

The following definitions and duties are relevant to this document.

A. Academic Tenure

Academic tenure means assurance of a faculty member's continuing employment after the expiration of a probationary period until the tenured faculty member resigns, retires, becomes permanently disabled, is dismissed for cause, or as a result of financial exigency or program change. A tenured faculty member who is appointed to an administrative position retains their academic tenure, but there is no tenure in an administrative position or its accompanying salary level.

B. Academic Freedom

The University adheres to the 1940 AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom:

Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and the publication of the results, subject to adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

The University adheres as well to the following principles: (1) "classroom" as used in this definition of academic freedom includes any venue in which faculty conduct professional instructional and research activities; (2) the protection of academic freedom and the requirements of academic responsibility regarding accuracy, restraint, respect, and individual voice apply to all who exercise teaching responsibilities; (3) academic freedom extends to the expression of opinion in the context of university governance.

C. Full-time Appointments

Faculty who are employed full-time in the College normally teach five courses per academic year. Faculty who are full-time in the School of Theology normally teach four courses per academic year. Tenure-track appointments are normally full time. Except for term

appointments clearly designated as such at the outset, all full-time faculty are probationary for tenure or are tenured. All those probationary for tenure are considered to be on annual appointment, unless individual appointment letters provide otherwise. The ranks that apply to tenured or tenure-track appointments are Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor.

D. The Department, Program, Department Chair and Program Director, Chair of Review Committee

Departments are academic units that house faculty and academic programs. Interdisciplinary Programs are academic units that draw from faculty and coursework in their own unit and other departments for the delivery of their program. A faculty member, through the assignment of their tenure line, is assigned to a department and/or program. The Department Chair is a faculty member in the unit who directs the work of each department.⁴ The program director is a faculty member in the interdisciplinary program who directs the work of that program. The Chair of the Review Committee is usually the Chair or director of the candidate's unit, but as needed can also be a senior member of the candidate's unit. Throughout this document, only the phrase "Department Chair" will be used, but it should be understood that it may be a Department Chair or an interdisciplinary program director.

E. The Review Committee and others contributing to review

The Chair of the Review Committee shall be the Department Chair of a department or program in which the candidate under review is appointed or another senior faculty in place of the Chair. In the case of review for promotion to Full Professor, and if the faculty member under review is the Chair of the department or program, the Dean will appoint a Full Professor as the Chair of the Review Committee.

The Review Committee shall consist of no fewer than three and no more than five tenured members of the departments or programs in which the candidate is appointed, including the Chair. Should the department or programs have fewer than three tenured faculty members, additional members will be selected to participate through consultation among the Dean, Chair of the Review Committee, and the candidate under review. The Committee will be staffed when the candidate begins teaching duties in the College and its staffing will remain flexible in order to accommodate sabbaticals, leaves, and the developing interests of the candidate. If a Review Committee member must be changed, the Dean will appoint a replacement in consultation with the Chair of the department and the Chair of the Review Committee. If the candidate has evidence or reasonable suspicion that a Review Committee member or possible member is hostile toward the candidate, the candidate should approach the Dean with these concerns and the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the Chair of the Review Committee, will determine if a change needs to be made.

⁴ Ordinances 24, sections 1 and 3.

It is expected that the Review Committee Chair will be familiar with the narrative arc of the faculty member's professional work and will reference the issues and actions undertaken between reviews. The formal Review Committee letter, brought into composite form by the Review Committee Chair and sent to the Promotion and Tenure Committee and Office of the Dean of the College, should be detailed and avoid generalizations. Aside from the faculty member's letter and documentation of professional activity, the Review Committee Chair's letter is another foundation stone of the promotion dossier. A substantial Chair's letter runs a minimum of three full pages and a maximum of five pages in length, single-spaced, and addresses the candidate's development in the areas of teaching, research, and service (See Section V). Chair's letters should not gloss over a candidate's challenges but should address them forthrightly.

Departmental Appointments: In the case of persons who also regularly teach specifically-required courses in an interdisciplinary program, the Review Committee should include the Chairs or tenured representatives of those interdisciplinary programs within the three-to-five Review Committee limit.

Program Appointments: In the case of persons hired into interdisciplinary programs, the Review Committee shall be constituted by the Program Chair and the tenured members of the Program Committee.

Joint Appointments: In the case of persons hired into multiple programs, the Review Committee shall consist of the Chairs and no more than three additional members on the Review Committee.

Tenured members of departments or programs in which the candidate is appointed and who are familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or service, are encouraged to write a letter of assessment to the Chair of the Review Committee. The Chair is responsible for including all such letters in the dossier and information from these letters can be included in the composite letter. The composite letter and all individual letters remain in the dossier.

A faculty member(s) from another department or program may be invited to submit a letter of evaluation if the faculty member is in a position to offer a close assessment of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Such faculty are chosen in consultation among the Dean, Chair of the department, Chair of the Review Committee, and the candidate under review.

In cases in which a department or program is not able to hold functional Review Committee meetings, the Dean may appoint a Chair of the Review Committee from outside the candidate's department or program. Potential or actual Review Committee members shall recuse themselves or accept recusal from committee colleagues or the Dean under the following circumstances:

- (1) the member has or has had a sexual and/or romantic or familial relationship with the person under review;
- (2) the member is aware of any prejudice, pro or con that seems likely to impair their

judgment of the person under review; or

(3) the Dean or other committee member (with credible evidence from a documented source) is aware of any prejudice, pro or con, that seems likely to impair their judgment in any of the cases.

F. Recusal

Recusal is the process of a member of a committee stepping off the committee for a particular review because of a conflict of interest. A Promotion and Tenure Committee or Called Hearings Committee member must recuse themselves, or be recused, under the following circumstances:

- (1) the member has or has had a sexual and/or romantic or familial relationship with the person under review;
- (2) the member is aware of any prejudice, pro or con that seems likely to impair their judgment of the person under review; or
- (3) the Dean or other committee member (with credible evidence from a documented source) is aware of any prejudice, pro or con, that seems likely to impair their judgment in any of the cases.
- (4) the member is from the same department or program as a faculty member undergoing review. (This does not apply to the School of the Theology member, since there are no departments in the School of Theology.)

Number four does not apply to recusal from a Review Committee.

G. Building the Review Dossier

It is incumbent upon the Chair of the department(s) or program(s) to track the professional progress of the candidate over the course of their employment, and to oversee the building of the candidate's dossier over time. The Chair and faculty member are expected to have an annual discussion with the candidate regarding their teaching, scholarship, and service. Ideally, this discussion should include discussion of the faculty member's annual Activity Report. The Chair must document this discussion and both parties are to receive and retain a copy. This documentation does not need to be in the form of a formal letter; notes or bullet points are sufficient. As Chairs change, this written documentation must be passed to the new Chair to retain continuity and attentiveness to the ongoing review process for the candidate. Thus, the Chair of the department(s) or program oversees the building of the dossier and functions as a guide for the process. If someone other than the Chair of the unit is to Chair the Review Committee, that person should be involved in the annual meetings as well.

In the School of Theology, the functions ascribed here and elsewhere to the Chair in the College of Arts and Sciences are performed by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, or another senior member of the faculty designated by the Dean when the Associate Dean is unable to perform them.

H. College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is advisory to the Dean of the College regarding second-year and fourth-year reviews, the awarding of tenure, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, and from Associate to Full Professor. Its charge and rules governing composition are found in the Committee Charge.

I. The Hearings Committee, the Pool, and the Called Hearings Committee

The Hearings Committee is advisory to the Dean of the College, the Dean of the School of Theology, the Provost, the Vice-Chancellor, or the Board of Regents depending on the specific case circumstances and which administrative office has rendered a negative or questioned recommendation on a dossier. It conducts a procedural review of cases of employment termination on the basis of a negative reappointment or promotion review or financial exigency, or if there is an allegation that procedural error has led to an inappropriate positive review. Except in cases of dismissal for cause (see Section XI.B.), the Hearings Committee adjudicates on processual conduct alone and does not adjudicate the substance of a case, as is the case also for the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The Hearings Committee consists of a **Pool** of ten tenured faculty, eight from the College and two from the School of Theology. Two candidates are nominated by the Committee on Committees of the Joint Faculties each year for five-year terms, staggered, and elected by the Joint Faculties. The committee Chair is the member who has served on the committee the longest. No member is eligible to serve consecutive terms on the Hearings Committee Pool. No member may be a member of the College's Promotion and Tenure Committee or have served on the College's Promotion and Tenure Committee in the six years prior to election to the Hearings Committee. All Hearings Committee members receive yearly training in the Personnel Procedures and the requirements of a processual review. They also receive diversity, equity, and inclusion training their first year on the committee and every other year after that.

When the Hearings Committee is convened or **Called**, the Called Committee shall consist of five tenured College faculty members and one tenured School of Theology faculty member. A minimum of two Associate Professors and a minimum of two Professors are required on each Called Committee. The Chair of a Called Hearings Committee is the faculty member who has served the longest on the Hearings Committee in the current term. No two College faculty members on a Called Committee can hold an appointment in the same department or program. Members of a Called Hearings Committee usually rotate down to the bottom of the Pool for the next Called Committee.

In the unlikely event that the Hearings Pool contains too many recusals in a specific case to constitute a Called Hearings Committee, the Provost shall appoint special members to the Committee from the appropriate faculty. Where not otherwise specified in the Personnel Procedures, the Hearings Committee shall normally hear a case within 10 days of a negative

recommendation or allegation that procedural error has occurred. The Hearings Committee examines and makes a recommendation on a given reappointment, tenure, or promotion case only once (there cannot be the establishment of a second Called Hearings Committee).

J. A Day

Unless specified otherwise, a “day” means a calendar day. Where a deadline falls on a weekend or University holiday, the next business day will be the deadline.

IV. Timing for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Appointment of faculty to tenure-track positions is governed by the Faculty Appointment Procedures.

Normally, a faculty member with tenure-track appointment will be considered for tenure and promotion during the sixth year of service as a full-time member of the faculty. Persons upon whom tenure is conferred receive tenure at the beginning of the fiscal year after the review year (normally at the beginning of their seventh year of teaching). Up to two years of full-time teaching elsewhere may be counted towards the date for a decision about tenure, though this is not automatic. In appointments to exceptional positions, the Dean may recommend appointment with tenure after consultation with the appropriate committees – including, for the College, the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Appointments Committee. Any special conditions relating to the tenure clock, including the number of years spent in teaching elsewhere that will be counted, will be stated in the letter of appointment sent to a new faculty member by the Dean. Likewise, any special conditions regarding teaching years counted and the tenure clock will be stated in the letter of appointment for a faculty member not originally on tenure-track who is subsequently appointed to a tenure track position.

- A. A faculty member may request a one-year extension of the probationary period for tenure, with or without taking a full or partial leave of absence, in accordance with University leave policies. Requests must be made in writing to the Dean of the College or the Dean of the School of Theology. Both the interests of the University as well as those of the faculty will be considered, and the Dean may require supporting documentation of need. Within ten days of receipt, the Dean will forward the request to the Provost for final action. The Provost will provide their decision within ten days, and the faculty member will be informed of the Provost’s decision by the Dean within ten additional days. If the tenure clock is extended, all persons contributing to the tenure review will be informed that the probationary period was extended under institutional policy. The faculty member’s record should be reviewed as if they had only the normal probationary period. That is, work undertaken during the extended period of probation will be included in the evaluation for tenure. An agreement for an extended probationary period does not prejudice the outcome of the tenure review nor preclude termination prior to tenure if the faculty member’s performance warrants termination

- or if the University decides to eliminate the position or program.
- B. Promotion to the rank of Professor will normally be considered when their dossier meets the requisite requirements, but no sooner than four years after attaining the rank of Associate Professor; the time may vary depending upon the faculty member's performance and the recommendation of the faculty member's Department Chair or the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs in the School of Theology. In calculating length of service, time spent on sabbatical leave or other leaves for post-doctoral study shall ordinarily be included. The Dean, using the guidelines of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, will assess the case for any disadvantages incurred.
 - C. An administrator with regular faculty rank who is qualified for tenure by education, experience, and professional activities and who teaches regularly though not full time may be recommended by the Dean for tenure. Upon such recommendation, the normal procedures pertaining to evaluation for tenure will apply.
 - D. At the discretion of the Dean of the College or the Dean of the School of Theology, permission may be granted for a tenure-track faculty member to apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor early in their tenure clock.
 - E. All recommendations for tenure and promotion must reach the Board of Regents for consideration at its last meeting within the fiscal year in which the tenure and/or promotion review is made. Accordingly, the necessary papers must reach the appropriate committees and officers in sufficient time for the matters to be submitted to the Regents at this time. The Dean shall be responsible for establishing a timetable to meet this requirement consistent with the schedules described below.

V. University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

The conferral of academic tenure requires a positive assessment of the faculty member's demonstrated professional excellence in the areas of teaching effectiveness and engagement, scholarship, and University and professional service, including service to the academic community and potential for future contributions. Tenure and/or promotion may not be withheld on grounds stated to be impermissible under Section VIII.

In the College, the Ph.D. degree or the appropriate terminal degree is ordinarily required for tenure. It is also ordinarily required for the rank of Assistant Professor. In the School of Theology, the appropriate terminal degree is understood to be an earned doctoral degree of recognized professional reputation.

Since there are no departments in the School of Theology, the functions ascribed to them in Section V below are to be exercised by the Dean or the Dean's designee in consultation with tenured members of the School of the Theology faculty. The tenured members of the School of Theology faculty constitute the Committee on Promotion and Tenure in the School of Theology.

Faculty members under review for tenure should consider the University Criteria for Tenure

here stated as critical general guidelines. Additionally, each academic department or program has a document with specific expectations that are distinctive to that department, program and field of study and clarify how the University's expectations are worked out in its particular discipline. In departments or programs with fewer than three tenured members, the guidelines should be written in conjunction with at least one tenured faculty member from outside the department or program. The departmental or program guidelines and revisions to them will be approved by the Dean in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee to ensure these requirements across disciplines are similar in rigor even if different in expression. Expectations of the department or program must not violate any aspect of the university document. It is the responsibility of the Dean to ensure that these guidelines are reviewed by departments and programs periodically every three to five years to guarantee that they represent current best practices.

The guidelines will be given by the Chair of the department or program to persons holding tenure-track appointments at the start of the first year of teaching. These discipline-specific guidelines are designed to give the candidate a more detailed understanding of what is expected of them, as well as help inform and guide all members of the review process. The set of guidelines, University and discipline-specific, in place at the time a faculty member begins tenure-track employment are relevant at the time a tenure decision is made. If a faculty member came in under a set of guidelines and during the course of their probationary process those guidelines changed, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated under the subsequent set of departmental or programmatic guidelines.

The following criteria are used by the Review Committee, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Dean, the Provost, and the Vice-Chancellor in evaluating faculty members for promotion and tenure. The criteria are listed in the order of their relative importance.

Teaching Effectiveness and Engagement

Excellence in teaching requires, among other things, a thorough knowledge of the subject being taught, a genuine commitment to a continuing investigation of that subject, and an imaginative approach to the presentation of that subject in the classroom. A good teacher fosters a learning environment of mutual respect, inclusivity, and equitable means for all students to achieve learning success. This requires approachability and attention to students' questions and intellectual inquiry, inside and outside of class. Professors are also expected to model effective methods and habits of original inquiry. Engaged teaching requires that faculty members give close attention to students' work produced for grading and that they respond to such work promptly. They must adhere to the standards commonly observed in evaluating students' academic performance, and have regular office hours during which they are available to students for consultation. Faculty members are also expected to observe any written academic regulations and procedures of the University, including punctual observance of classroom obligations.

Excellence in teaching is required in all faculty positions, whether full or part-time. As teaching is always in process and subject to many variables, multiple methods of

assessment and best practices should be employed regularly to perceive overall patterns in pedagogical effectiveness. What occurs in the classroom is a dynamic process and requires ongoing professional development and attention at any stage in one's pedagogical life. The use of student evaluations and peer observation is expected and they are crucial components of any promotion dossier. Engaged teaching requires self-reflection. Such self-reflection and the practical honing of teaching skills can be enhanced through all means of evaluation, experimentation, critical analysis of one's pedagogy, workshops, and collegial discussion on teaching.

Scholarship

Scholarly and other professional achievements strengthen a faculty member's teaching, make the University a vital intellectual community, and contribute to the professional development of the faculty member. Wherever possible, documentation of the reciprocal relationship between teaching and scholarship should be provided in the dossier. Those who possess a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree are equipped by their education and professional training to make significant contributions to an academic discipline. Tenure-track faculty must be active scholars, scientists, critics and/or artists, and they must have completed and made available research, scholarship, critiques, or artistic production of such quality as to gain favorable peer recognition within their disciplines. This normally comes in the form of publication. Past achievement, future promise, and quality of completed work all determine eligibility for tenure and/or promotion. Tenured faculty members at the University are expected to continue to be active in scholarly and professional pursuits appropriate to their investigation of that subject. Therefore, faculty members seeking tenure and promotion should provide a scholarly narrative not only of past scholarly achievements, but also of future research or creative production plans.

In addition to these primary forms of scholarly production, faculty members are encouraged to participate in conferences, professional meetings, performances, and/or exhibitions, or to otherwise demonstrate their expertise, which may also include publication of non-peer-reviewed writing or pursuance of external funding. Faculty scholarship and creative production may include the scholarship of teaching and learning, civically-engaged scholarship on the community outside the institution, digital scholarship, and interdisciplinary work in addition to their disciplinary training. Assessment of scholarship may include all of the above as well as letters from external reviewers, and departmental letters alongside the candidate's narrative of scholarly achievement. As with all three areas of criteria for promotion and tenure, the maintenance of robust yearly Activity Reports aids the development of a narrative arc of a faculty member's development and progress.

Service

The effectiveness of the institution is enhanced by active faculty citizenship in the life of the institution outside the classroom. A faculty member's cooperation and contribution to departmental endeavors, interdisciplinary programs and institutional goals, engender a

healthy academic community; without such service, our intellectual collectivity wanes and falters. Service expectations include, but are not limited to, the constructive participation in discussions and implementation of departmental and institutional goals; respectful and professional engagement with one's colleagues in faculty, staff, and administration, as well as with students; engagement in administrative tasks appropriate to one's rank; University, college, and/or school committee assignments; engagement with and advising student organizations; mentoring junior faculty; participation on faculty Review Committees; Chairing a department or program; participation in pre-major and/or major advising on a regular basis; membership in *ad hoc* committees and task forces; work on behalf of the Admissions, Advancement, or Alumni Offices; and University administrative positions. Service outside the University, including community engagement and active citizenship where appropriate to one's discipline, and organizational or leadership roles in academic societies are important parts of faculty service. All such service should be tracked on yearly Activity Reports.

It is expected that tenure-track faculty start slowly and take on a lighter service load in the early years of employment and that those service expectations increase with seniority and experience. Faculty members should seek to engage in University service in a balanced manner that does not impede their scholarship or teaching for long periods of time; this means that not every service request should be accepted.

In the School of Theology, members of the faculty are additionally expected to be active in the life of the Church and committed to its mission, including teaching and other appropriate ecclesial service.

VI. Procedures for Evaluation of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

A. General Comments about Procedures

The process of review has several levels from the candidate to Review Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean, the Provost and the Vice-Chancellor. It is important that each level be free of influence from the levels above. At the same time, a level of review may have questions during their deliberation that need clarification from a prior review level. Our process allows a level of review to pose questions of clarification to the immediately lower level of review. These questions are provided in writing, as are the answers. As noted below, there may be specific ways these questions are routed. These questions cannot suggest or request that the office or committee below reinterpret the file or reconsider their recommendation. All question-and-answer correspondence becomes part of the dossier.

1. Promotion and Tenure Committee

Every member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will take diversity, equity, and inclusion training upon the start of their term, and every other year after that.

The adjudication of a promotion dossier is on the basis of the substance of that dossier, reflecting the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. These proceedings are absolutely confidential during and after the proceedings and will not be made available to the candidate, or representatives or advocates of the candidate, and may not be divulged by any Committee member or any office that receives the Committee's recommendation. During its deliberations, the Committee may pose questions of clarification to the candidate and/or departmental Review Committee by writing those questions and sending them to the office of the Dean who will act as intermediary in relaying the questions and answers. The committee will make its recommendation to the Dean, either yea or nay, and will provide in writing a summary explanation of their recommendation. The Committee examines and makes a recommendation on a given dossier only once. The Committee may not be reconvened by an Administrative officer with a request to reconsider a recommendation. If necessary, the Dean may pose questions of clarification in writing to the Promotion and Tenure Committee while the dossier is under consideration in their office. These questions will be added to the dossier.

References to the department or program and the Promotion and Tenure Committee in this document apply only to the College. Since there are no departments in the School of Theology, the functions ascribed to them in this document are to be exercised by the Dean or the Dean's designee in consultation with tenured members of the School of Theology faculty.

2. Hearings Committee

This section pertains to the role of the Hearings Committee in review cases. For information on the role of the Hearings Committee in disciplinary or dismissal cases, see Section XI.

If an error in procedure, or a strong suspicion of an error, occurs at any time during a reappointment or promotion review, that review is placed on hold for up to 30 days and the case is sent to the Hearings Committee, and all subsequently dated deadlines are extended. A Called Hearings Committee is established automatically in the review process if there is a negative recommendation by the Dean of the College, the Dean of the School of Theology, the Provost, or the Vice-Chancellor. The Committee's task is to examine and determine whether or not proper procedures were followed in the process heretofore. This includes examining materials and events such as:

- 1) the list of contents of the promotion dossier and dates they were added;
- 2) a list of all meetings, their dates, and who was in attendance;
- 3) the Review Committee members and additions or subtractions and the dates of said changes in membership'
- 4) a list of any persons external to the Review Committee who were asked to participate in the process – when and in what capacity;

- 5) the dates upon which every step was performed and evidence they performed appropriately such as written notes;
- 6) the dates, nature, and source of any changes made to the dossier after it was closed upon being taken up by the Promotion and Tenure Committee;

In addition, as part of its process the committee may ask questions for clarification, in writing, to any participant and if deemed necessary, the committee may interview participants.

The Hearings Committee's methods and findings are not a readjudication of the substance and merit of the review dossier. Rather, its purpose is to determine whether or not proper procedures were followed by all parties in the review process, or if clear and material procedural error occurred. Clear and material procedural error means departure from the procedures described herein that cast reasonable doubt upon the unfavorable recommendation or decision.

The administrative office that issues a negative recommendation and the next highest administrative office will receive a copy of the full report of the Hearings Committee. The review process is placed on hold for up to 30 days when a Called Hearings Committee is established. It resumes the day upon which a decision is reached by the appropriate administrative office to whom the committee reports its findings. All discussions, documents, and decisions of the Hearings Committee require confidentiality, during and after proceedings, by committee members, administrators who receive the findings, and faculty advocates.

If the Called Hearings Committee finds a clear and material procedural error, they may recommend to the appropriate administrative offices corrective action and/or a reconsideration of the negative recommendation by the office(s) that issued the negative recommendation, or a full repetition of the evaluative process. The Called Hearings Committee considers a case and renders its findings only once in the review process. If the committee finds that proper procedure was breached, the candidate will not be informed of the committee's proceedings, but will be informed in writing of where, when, and the nature of the error, as well as any corrective action recommended by the Called Hearings Committee. The appropriate administrative office will inform the Called Hearings Committee in writing of their decision in a case upon which the Called Hearings Committee has submitted recommendations. If the Called Hearings Committee finds no clear and material procedural error, their findings are reported to the appropriate administrative offices and to the candidate as a declarative statement that no procedural breach was found. The review process resumes with intervals between stages correlative to the original schedule in this document.

B) Detailed Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty in the Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews

Tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated in the first semester of the second and fourth years of employment. These reviews are overseen by the appropriate Dean. For candidates on leave in the fall of their review year, classroom visits and assessments should be scheduled in the spring semester of that calendar year. The procedures and schedule for the second- and fourth-year evaluations of tenure-track faculty include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 1) By **April 15th** in the calendar year of review, the Dean will meet with persons undergoing second- and fourth-year review and the designated Chair of the Review Committee to clarify the procedures and answer questions. Additions and changes to the Review Committee should be determined in consultation with the Dean at this time.
- 2) By **September 25th**, all **class observation** visits are completed. These visits should be spread out over the course of two years, with no more than two observers per semester. The Review Committee Chair and two or more members of the Review Committee designated by the Review Committee Chair will each make at least two pre-arranged in-class visits to observe the faculty member's teaching. Ideally, each visitor will attend two sequential classes in the same course, and each visitor will attend a different course. The faculty member and Review Committee visitor should meet afterwards to debrief and discuss the classroom dynamics and pedagogy employed. This conversation and the faculty member's reflection on its content are crucial in the process of identifying and remediating any teaching challenges and in documenting pedagogical growth and successes. The visitor should document this process in writing, provide it to the candidate and also submit it to the review Chair to be included as part of the dossier. This information will contribute to the composite letter. The candidate may use the information in their cover letter as well. This written documentation is crucial in helping the faculty member track their progress as a pedagogue and in securing continuity when there is a change of administrative staffing. The faculty member or the Dean may arrange another visitation by another colleague in addition to the ones arranged by the Chair.
- 3) Because teaching excellence is a primary criterion in all faculty performance reviews, all student course evaluations, both quantitative and narrative, will be considered in combination with the other materials in the faculty member's dossier. Supplementary evaluation forms used by the faculty member may also be included in the dossier. The review dossier will contain all student evaluations from the start of the faculty member's employment.
- 4) By **October 1**, the faculty member being evaluated will submit their evaluation dossier to the Dean and the Review Committee. The second-year review will serve as the beginning of the tenure dossier and materials from all subsequent reviews will add to it cumulatively and remain as a part of the candidate's dossier as it carries forward into subsequent reviews. This dossier will include:

- a) A cover letter that includes self-assessments of teaching, scholarship, and service. The letter should make reference to any issues and challenges brought up in previous reviews, the measures taken to address those challenges and successes attained; the cover letter should also discuss future trajectories or goals in all three areas. The cover letter affords an opportunity to assess the larger course of one's accomplishments and to articulate future plans. This cover letter should run three to five pages, single-spaced.
- b) If necessary, a cover letter addendum that includes charts, data or other materials referred to in the cover letter.
- c) All scholarly or creative work published, accepted for publication, or submitted for publication and under review or in press. Work not yet published but under review should be submitted in its most recent draft form.
- d) All annual reports, prior evaluation letters from the Dean, student evaluations, and peer evaluations, from the time of hire to the present, including from the fall semester of the review year. Review candidates should note in the dossier if there are course evaluations missing and the reason for their absence (e.g., sabbatical or other leave, COVID exception).
- e) Current curriculum vitae.
- f) Materials that demonstrate teaching excellence, such as teaching philosophy, syllabi, assignments, scaffolded research projects, etc. These should be from courses in which the candidate has done significant work to design a new course or significantly redesign an existing course. No more than five items.
- g) Optional materials chosen by the candidate such as a research plan, examples of grant proposals, documentation of labor or contributions not captured in normal assessment methods, such as informal mentoring of colleagues or students.
- h) Additions to the dossier by the candidate that provide substantive updates to the teaching, scholarship, or service record that were not available at the time the dossier was completed (such as a book contract or article acceptance for publication) may be added as they become available by submitting them to the dean/associate dean who will add them to the dossier. These items will be considered by all who review the dossier after their addition; they do not trigger a reconsideration by any previous levels of review.

Additionally, in the case of the fourth-year review the dossier in the Dean's office will already include all materials from the second-year review. As noted in Section VI, Part A, Number 4, all reviews add cumulatively and remain as a part of the candidate's dossier as it carries forward into subsequent reviews. These prior documents are maintained in the electronic dossier system managed by the Dean's office.

- 5) By **October 10**, members of the Review Committee will submit letters of assessment to the Chair of the Review Committee. These letters are used to craft a composite letter and are maintained in the Review Committee Chair's files and are submitted by the Chair to the Dean's office as part of the dossier. These letters are confidential

and their content may not be disclosed to the candidate.

- 6) By **October 20**, the Chair of the Review Committee, in consultation with the Review Committee and their letters submitted on October 10, will write a composite letter signed by all members of the Committee. The identities of individual faculty members raising concerns addressed in this letter will be concealed. Before composing this letter, Chairs should consult with Section III which outlines the Chair's role, and Section V that delineates the criteria for reappointment. This is a crucial document in the process as it is the foundation stone of peer evaluation that will introduce the dossier to the Promotion and Tenure Committee and to subsequent administrative offices. The composite letter should be detailed and avoid generalizations. A substantial composite letter runs a minimum of three full pages and a maximum of five pages, in length, single-spaced, and addresses the candidate's development in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The composite letter should not gloss over a candidate's challenges but should address them forthrightly.

- 7) By **October 27**, the Chair of the Review Committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the performance to date, and wherever appropriate, suggest ways to improve. Both parties sign the Chair's composite letter indicating that the faculty member being evaluated has seen the letter and discussed its contents; such acknowledgement does not necessarily indicate that the faculty member being evaluated agrees with the contents of the letter. The signed letter is submitted by the Chair to the Dean's office as part of the dossier. The faculty member may, in addition, submit a separate letter discussing the results of the meeting and the evaluation no later than **October 31** to be included in the dossier.

In the School of Theology, the Dean should consult the tenured members of the faculty. These evaluations will be based on the criteria for promotion and tenure described herein and will be furnished to the Dean in writing for inclusion in the faculty member's dossier.

- 8) By **November 1**, the Promotion and Tenure Committee begins assessment of the dossier. If there are questions that need clarification during the deliberations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee those questions will be sent in writing to the Dean who will pose them to the candidate and/or Review Committee Chair no later than November 25. The written record of any such exchange will be added to the dossier by the Dean. On the basis of the evidence examined, on the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, the Committee shall vote on its recommendation. Prior to their deliberative work, Committee members should consult with Section III that concerns their duties and with Section V that specifies criteria for reappointment. These proceedings are absolutely confidential during and after the proceedings, and will not be made available to the candidate, or

representatives or advocates of the candidate.

In the School of Theology, the Dean should consult the tenured members of the faculty. These evaluations will be based on the criteria for promotion and tenure described herein and will be furnished to the Dean in writing for inclusion in the faculty member's dossier.

- 9) By **December 7**, the Promotion and Tenure committee will forward their recommendations to the Dean. The deliberations and recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are absolutely confidential during and after the proceedings and may not be divulged by any Committee member or any office that receives the Committee's recommendation. The committee will make its recommendation to the Dean, either yea or nay, and will provide in writing a summary explanation of their recommendation. The written recommendation and summary explanation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is added to the candidate's dossier. The Committee examines and makes a recommendation on a given dossier only once. The Committee may not be reconvened by an Administrative officer with a request to reconsider a recommendation. If necessary, the Dean may pose questions of clarification in writing to the Promotion and Tenure Committee while the dossier is under consideration in their office. These questions will be added to the dossier. The written record of any such exchange will be added to the dossier by the Dean.
- 10) If there are documents and confidential information in the candidate's personnel file in the Dean's office that the Dean deems as substantive to their decision, the Dean must document the information and notify the candidate that the Dean is using that information, which must therefore be added to the dossier. The notification to the candidate is in writing with reasonable particularity without breaching confidentiality, and is also entered into the dossier. The candidate may submit a letter of response to the Dean's office and that letter is also included in the dossier. This information may not be shared with the Review Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee. This information is provided to all reviewers of the dossier subsequent to the Dean including the Called Hearings Committee should the Called Hearings Committee be convened.
- 11) By **January 15**, the faculty member will receive a letter from the Dean informing them of the Dean's decision regarding reappointment. This letter becomes part of the dossier. See Section VII if the Dean makes a negative decision.

C) Detailed Procedures for Evaluation for: 1) Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor; and 2) Promotion to Full Professor

The processes for evaluation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and for evaluation for promotion to Full Professor are identical unless noted below. The expected level of achievement of professional accomplishment distinguishes the two reviews.

Notes on the Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Since the tenured members of the Faculty determine in large measure the quality of teaching and scholarship in the University, tenure cannot be granted without serious deliberation. There is no *de facto* tenure simply due to a tenure-track appointment.

For faculty with tenure-track appointments, the tenure review will take place at the time designated in the appointment letter and, in any event, not later than the sixth year of teaching unless that time has been extended in accordance with Section IV of these procedures. These reviews are overseen by the appropriate Dean. A recommendation regarding tenure implies a matching recommendation regarding promotion to associate professor. Only in very rare circumstances might the university separate these two decisions.

Notes on the Review for Promotion to Full Professor

A faculty member promoted to the rank of Full Professor has achieved the highest stage of professional accomplishment recognized by the University. This promotion therefore presumes that the faculty member has made distinctive contributions to the institution and its students and has sustained for some years a manifest excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. It presumes that the candidate has developed professional reputations both within, and typically beyond, the Sewanee campus. Faculty members of the rank of Associate Professor at this institution are normally eligible to be considered for promotion to Professor. Promotion to the rank of Professor will normally be considered when the candidate's dossier meets the requisite requirements, but no sooner than four years after attaining the rank of Associate Professor.

Any faculty member being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion should be in residence during the fall semester when the review takes place. However, if the candidate is scheduled to be on leave in the fall of their review year, classroom visits and assessments should all be scheduled in the prior spring semester of that calendar year.

Detailed procedures

The procedures for tenure and promotion evaluations of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 1) By **April 15** in the calendar year of review, the Dean will meet with the faculty members under review and their Review Committee Chairs to discuss the procedures to be followed for the review. Additions and changes to the Review Committee should be determined in consultation with the Dean at this time.
- 2) By **June 30**, the faculty member being evaluated will submit to the Dean's office the names of three-to-five persons outside the University qualified to judge their

scholarship. The faculty member should disclose any and all relationships with the proposed external reviewers. The faculty member will provide a list of names of those persons with whom they have an inadmissible relationship such as dissertation advisors, dissertation committee members, and co-authors. The completed dossier should ordinarily contain at least two **external review** assessment letters, one of which may be from an evaluator selected by the Dean. The content of these letters may not be disclosed to the candidate under review. The faculty member may also submit names of persons they do not wish to evaluate their work for reasons that need not be disclosed.

- 3) During the summer, the Office of the Dean will send evaluation forms to all Sewanee alumni/ae who have been taught by the faculty member and whose address is kept on file. These reviews will be included in the candidate's dossier and are not disclosed to the candidate. The dossier will contain all student evaluations from the start of the faculty member's employment. Supplementary evaluation forms used by the faculty member may also be included in the dossier.
- 4) By **October 1**, the faculty member being evaluated will submit their tenure and/or promotion documents to the Dean's office and to the Review Committee. The submitted items to be added to the dossier include:
 - a) A cover letter that includes self-assessments of teaching, scholarship, and service. The letter should make reference to any issues and challenges brought up in previous reviews, and the measures taken to address those challenges and successes attained; the cover letter should also reference to future trajectories or goals in all three areas. The cover letter affords an opportunity to assess the larger course of one's accomplishments and to articulate future plans. This cover letter should run three-to-five pages, single-spaced.
 - b) If necessary, a cover letter addendum that includes charts, data or other materials referred to in the cover letter.
 - c) All scholarly or creative work published, accepted for publication, or submitted for publication and under review or in press. Work not yet published but under review should be submitted in its most recent draft form.
 - d) All annual reports, student evaluations, and peer evaluations since the last review. Review candidates should note in the dossier if there are course evaluations missing and the reason for their absence (e.g., sabbatical or other leave, COVID exception).
 - e) Current curriculum vitae.
 - f) Materials that demonstrate teaching excellence, such as teaching philosophy, syllabi, assignments, scaffolded research projects, etc. These should be from courses in which the candidate has done significant work to design a new course or significantly redesign an existing course. No more than five items.
 - g) Optional materials chosen by the candidate such as a research plan, examples of grant proposals, documentation of labor or contributions not captured in normal assessment methods, such as informal mentoring of colleagues or students.

h) Additions to the dossier by the candidate that provide substantive updates to the teaching, scholarship, or service record that were not available at the time the dossier was completed (such as a book contract or article acceptance for publication) may be added as they become available by submitting them to the dean/associate dean who will add them to the dossier. These items will be considered by all who review the dossier after their addition; they do not trigger a reconsideration by any previous levels of review.

Additionally, the dossier in the Dean's office will already include all materials from previous reviews since the faculty member's employment. As noted in Section VI, Part A, Number 4, all reviews add cumulatively and remain as a part of the candidate's dossier as it carries forward into subsequent reviews. These prior documents are maintained in the electronic dossier system managed by the Dean's office.

5) The Dean may also solicit letters of evaluation from faculty beyond the Review Committee to be included in the dossier.

6) **By Thanksgiving Break**, all **class observation** visits are completed. These visits should be spread out over the course of two years, with no more than two observers per semester. The Review Committee Chair and two or more members of the Review Committee designated by the Review Committee Chair will each make at least two pre-arranged in-class visits to observe the faculty member's teaching. Ideally, each visitor will attend two sequential classes in the same course, and each visitor will attend a different course. The faculty member and Review Committee visitor should meet afterwards to debrief and discuss the classroom dynamics and pedagogy employed. The notes from observation debriefing from previous reviews should be consulted. This conversation and the faculty member's reflection on its content are crucial in the process of identifying and remediating any teaching challenges and in documenting pedagogical growth and successes. The visitor should document this process in writing, provide it to the candidate and also submit it to the review Chair to be included as part of the dossier. This information will contribute to the composite letter. The candidate may use the information in their cover letter as well. This written documentation is crucial in helping the faculty member track their progress as a pedagogue and in securing continuity when there is a change of administrative staffing. The faculty member or the Dean may arrange another visitation by another colleague in addition to the ones arranged by the Chair.

7) Because teaching excellence is a primary criterion in all faculty performance reviews, all student course evaluations, both quantitative and narrative, will be considered in combination with the other materials in the faculty member's dossier. The review dossier will contain all evaluations from second-year review on. Assessment of the narrative arc of pedagogical skill over the course of the candidate's career should be addressed by both the Review Committee Chair and the faculty member in their respective letters to the Dean.

- 8) By **January 10** student course evaluations from the previous semester will be made available to the faculty member and Review Committee and will be added to the promotion dossier. The candidate may choose to send an addendum to their dossier cover letter, highlighting or explaining the evaluations no later than **January 31**.
- 9) By **January 10**, all members of the Review Committee will submit their letters of assessment to the Chair of the Review Committee. These letters are used to craft a composite letter and are maintained in the Review Committee Chair's files and are submitted by the Chair to the Dean's office as part of the dossier. These letters are confidential and their content may not be disclosed to the candidate.
- 10) By **January 10**, the letters from external reviewers, faculty members not on the Review Committee, and any other solicited peer evaluation letters are due to the Office of the Dean. These letters are confidential and their content may not be disclosed to the candidate.
- 11) By **January 20**, the Review Committee Chair, in consultation with the Review Committee and their letters submitted on **January 10**, will write a composite letter signed by all members of the Committee. The identities of individual faculty members raising concerns addressed in this letter will be concealed. Before composing this letter, Chairs should consult with Section III which outlines the Chair's role, and Sections V that delineates the criteria for promotion. This document should make reference to the prior Review Committee Chair's letters from all previous reviews. The Review Committee's letter should be detailed and avoid generalizations. It is expected that the Chair will be familiar with the narrative arc of the faculty member's professional work and will reference the issues and actions undertaken between reviews. Aside from the faculty member's letter and documentation of professional activity, the Chair's letter is another foundation stone of the dossier. A substantial Chair's letter runs at least three-to-five pages in length, single-spaced, and addresses the candidate's development in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Chair's letters should not gloss over a candidate's challenges but should address them forthrightly.
- 12) By **January 28**, the Chair of the Review Committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the performance to date, and wherever appropriate, suggest ways to improve. Both parties sign the Chair's composite letter indicating that the faculty member being evaluated has seen the letter and discussed its contents with the Chair; such acknowledgement does not necessarily indicate that the faculty member being evaluated agrees with the contents of the letter. The signed letter should be submitted by the Chair to the Dean's office as part of the dossier. The faculty member may, in addition, submit a separate letter discussing the results of the meeting and the evaluation by **January 31**. This signed letter is sent to the Dean's office to be included in the dossier.

In the School of Theology, the Dean should consult the tenured members of the faculty.

These evaluations will be based on the criteria for promotion and tenure described herein and will be furnished to the Dean in writing for inclusion in the faculty member's dossier.

- 13) By **February 1**, the Promotion and Tenure Committee begins assessment of the dossier. If there are questions that need clarification during the deliberations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee those questions will be sent in writing to the Dean who will pose them to the candidate and/or Review Committee Chair no later than **February 25**. The written record of any such exchange will be added to the dossier by the Dean. On the basis of the evidence examined, on the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, the Committee shall vote on its recommendation. Prior to their deliberative work, Committee members should consult with Section III that concerns their duties and with Section V that specifies criteria for promotion. These proceedings are absolutely confidential during and after the proceedings, and will not be made available to the candidate, or representatives or advocates of the candidate.

In the School of Theology, the Dean should consult the tenured members of the faculty. These evaluations will be based on the criteria for promotion and tenure described herein and will be furnished to the Dean in writing for inclusion in the faculty member's dossier.

- 14) By **March 1**, the Promotion and Tenure committee will forward their recommendations to the Dean. The deliberations and recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are absolutely confidential during and after the proceedings, and may not be divulged by any Committee member or any office that receives the Committee's recommendation. The committee will make its recommendation to the Dean, either yea or nay, and will provide in writing a summary explanation of their recommendation. The written recommendation and summary explanation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is added to the candidate's dossier. The Committee examines and makes a recommendation on a given dossier only once. The Committee may not be reconvened by an Administrative officer with a request to reconsider a recommendation. If necessary, the Dean may pose questions of clarification in writing to the Committee while the dossier is under consideration in their office.

- 15) If there are documents and confidential information in the candidate's personnel file in the Dean's office that the Dean deems as substantive to their decision, the Dean must document the information and notify the candidate that the Dean is using that information, which must therefore be added to the dossier. The notification to the candidate is in writing with reasonable particularity without breaching confidentiality, and is also entered into the dossier. The candidate may submit a letter of response to the Dean's office and that letter is also included in the dossier. This information may not be shared with the Review Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee. This information is provided to all reviewers of the dossier

subsequent to the Dean including the Called Hearings Committee should the Called Hearings Committee be convened.

- 16) By the **Wednesday after Spring Break**, the Dean will send written notification to the candidate informing them of the Dean's recommendation to the Provost. This letter becomes part of the dossier. On this date, the Dean will forward their recommendation, along with the dossier to the Provost. See Section VII if the Dean makes a negative recommendation.
- 17) By **April 15**, the Provost, after reviewing the promotion dossier in full, will make their recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor. See Section VII if the Provost issues the first negative recommendation.
- 18) By **April 30**, the Vice-Chancellor will nominate or decline to nominate the candidate for promotion to Associate or Full Professor. The Vice-Chancellor's nomination will be forwarded to the Board of Regents for its approval. See Section VII if the Vice-Chancellor issues the first negative recommendation.
- 19) Once approved by the Board of Regents, tenure and/or promotion, if granted, will take effect on **July 1** following the decision of the Board of Regents.

D) Post-Tenure Non-Promotion Review

All tenured faculty members must be evaluated on a regular basis. In the College of Arts and Sciences, this has a formative and summative portion.

- 1) Formative Review: Tenured Faculty Reflection (TFR) Process
 - a. Preface and Philosophical Underpinning

The goal of this process is to allow tenured faculty to pause on a regular basis and reflect on their work in prior years and consider thoughtfully how they wish to develop their career in the coming years. The process's intent is developmental, not judgmental.⁵ The TFR is designed to enhance job satisfaction, encourage new endeavors, and build collegiality. The professional life of a faculty member is a work in progress and follows different arcs at different points of a career. This conversational model seeks to articulate aspirations and facilitate ongoing and self-directed development at all stages of a tenured faculty member's career, so that every faculty member has a clear sense of what they want to accomplish going forward.

The TFR process has three functions and three beneficiaries. The first function is to

⁵ TFR works with the annual report system to create a robust and complete review process for tenured faculty members. Any judgment about underperformance or praise for particularly high performance would be the result of review of annual reports, not of the TFR process.

benefit the faculty member undertaking the appraisal process. TFR encourages the faculty member to reflect with colleagues about their career narrative in an intentional and articulate fashion that helps put into place the practices that will allow that narrative to come alive. This means that the TFR process is going to look different for each faculty member. For example, if a senior faculty member has spent the last five years on a manuscript project that is near completion, they may want to think about other areas of faculty life that may have been shortchanged during that period of intensive scholarship and writing. This faculty member may have, due to personality and/or field, a certain zeal and that could be applied in the area of service. Or a tenured faculty member may have spent the last few years in long-term service endeavors (programs like the First Year Program, Sewanee Scholars, directing IGS, or CfT) that have left them distant from scholarly projects. The TFR could help tenured faculty recognize the fact that they are swamped with service, or to garner the resources they need to build a years-long project, or to learn to “just say no,” carving out time to continue scholarly endeavors. This process should help check professional atrophy and help tenured faculty imagine and map their next step in the growth and health in all three areas of professional life.

The second beneficiary of the TFR process is the larger intellectual community of Sewanee. The more faculty get together to talk about their intellectual lives, the better. This discursive model encourages one to speak with others outside of one’s own discipline or department. The conversational model will also increase both intellectual exchange and help build a bridge over what is sometimes a shockingly wide gap in awareness of the experience of current junior and senior faculty.

The third beneficiary of the TFR is the administration. These individual faculty development appraisals will begin to paint a portrait, not just of the individual faculty member, but also of the institutional context in which they labor. If there are material, personality, or administrative conditions that hinder or enhance their labor, the TFR process will bring those conditions to light. They will serve as a kind of *alltagsgeschichte* check up on both faculty and institutional life. As a whole, these reports will outline how institutional or administrative patterns hinder or promote a healthy faculty work environment. As such, the TFR process could serve as an instrument in the ongoing endeavor of shared governance.

b. The Process

Associate Professors will complete the process in the fourth year of being an Associate Professor at Sewanee and the faculty member then will complete the process through their career in the scheduled year prior to applying for sabbatical. Completing the process once every seven years means that approximately fourteen faculty will go through the process each year.

The professor going through the TFR process will choose two other faculty members to create a team; the Department Chair or academic program director will participate at

least in the final meeting of the trio to gain a sense of that conversation. The team must be approved by the Dean before the process begins.

Documents used in the TFR process include, but are not restricted to:

- i. annual activity reports;⁶
- ii. student evaluations;
- iii. an updated curriculum vitae; and
- iv. a copy of prior TFR letters

The TFR group will meet for at least three hours (more if desired) to discuss the faculty member's past activities and future plans. The faculty member will then reflect and write a report on the process; the faculty member's Chair and the two-member panel will jointly write a report about their observations on the faculty member's reflection and plans. The Dean then meets with the faculty member to discuss the past activities and future plans. To be efficient, faculty might create a trio that can assess each other so that the time invested will yield results for three faculty members, though this is not required.

The two reports should address the faculty member's past activities and future plans in the traditional areas of faculty activity: teaching, service, and creative scholarship. The reports should also include treatment of these areas as well: inclusion, grants seeking, and civic engagement; none of these three are required, but the presence of them is a desideratum for faculty development. While the balance of these might vary in any given arc of a career, all three should be considered at all times. For associate professors, an awareness of the departmental expectations for promotion to full professor, as well as the Dean's expectations, should be addressed. The two reports do not necessarily need to agree. The team may see different things than the faculty member does, or in different ways. The two documents provide insight into the development of the faculty member and the process should allow for difference of opinions. The faculty member will see the team letter. Future plans will coalesce around ideas from the conversation between faculty member and Dean.

In order for the TFR to function as a tool with which to evaluate administrative and institutional conditions, TFR reports for each year should be stored in the DOC office digitally and made available to the Coordinating Committee for its review. A regular scan for patterns will help all involved get a clear sense of where the institution is hindering, promoting, or muddling faculty development conditions.

2) Summative Review: Annual Report Review

The summative assessment of tenured faculty members occurs through regular review of the faculty annual report. Each year, faculty complete an annual report in accordance

⁶ The current process of annual reports will continue. The annual report process will allow Department Chairs and academic program directors to mentor faculty in their unit on a frequent basis and to deal with any issues of underperformance. Such summative evaluations occur through the annual report process, not through the TFR. The annual reports can then serve, however, as one set of documents for reflection by the TFR faculty team.

with college guidelines. The Chair of the department and the Dean's office review annual reports. If a report raises a concern, the Chair of the department and Dean will alert the faculty member of the concern and suggest adjustments to reduce or eliminate the concern. If the faculty member refuses to address the concern, or if the concern continues for three annual reviews, the Dean will meet with the faculty member to discuss implications, which could range from: 1) continued development activities to reduce the concern; 2) disciplinary action; or 3) dismissal for cause.

VII. Procedures upon Notice of Non-Reappointment or Denial of Tenure and/or Promotion for Reasons of Performance

Anytime a negative recommendation or decision on reappointment, tenure and/or promotion is made, the candidate should be informed of the reason(s). Upon the first notice of non-reappointment or non-promotion for reasons of performance from the Dean of the College, the Dean of the School of Theology, the Provost, or Vice-Chancellor, the procedures and schedule of process are as follows:

- 1) Second- and fourth-year tenure-track faculty** members will be notified of non-reappointment in writing no later than **December 20**. This decision resides with the Dean of the appropriate unit.

When the Dean makes a negative decision on reappointment, the reappointment process is paused for up to 30 days and a Called Hearings Committee automatically takes up a review of the reappointment process in the first week of the spring semester. Their findings are sent to the Dean and the Provost no more than 10 days after the first day of the spring semester. If the Called Hearings Committee finds no error in the review process, the Provost undertakes a full reassessment of the candidate's dossier on the basis of merit and substance. In no more than 10 days, Provost writes a letter of evaluation that is added to the dossier. The Dean takes this letter into account when making their final decision in no more than 10 additional days. Dean's decision regarding reappointment is final. No further appeals are allowed.

In the case of a second-year review, if the Dean decides not to reappoint, the faculty member's appointment ends at the close of their second academic year of employment. They are not entitled to an additional year of employment. In the case of a fourth-year review, the terminal year of employment begins on July 1, even in the event that a Called Hearings Committee process carries over into that academic year.

Tenure-track faculty members who fail to receive the Ph.D. or the appropriate degree before the end of the second year (i.e., June 30) of full time teaching at the University will normally not be reappointed.

If the Called Hearings Committee finds clear and material procedural error at any point in the process, the full report is sent to the Dean and the Provost. The Called Hearings

Committee may recommend to the Dean and Provost corrective action and/or a reconsideration of the negative recommendation by the office(s) that issued the negative recommendation, or that the evaluative process be restarted at the point of error. The Hearings Committee hears the case and renders its findings only once in the reappointment process (there cannot be the establishment of a second Called Hearings Committee).

2) Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate or Full Professor will be notified in writing of the Dean's negative recommendation no later than the **Wednesday after Spring Break**. The Assistant Professor who is denied tenure is entitled to an additional year of employment beginning on July 1, which will be the terminal year of employment even in the event that a Called Hearings Committee or Board appeal process carries over into that academic year. A faculty member who has been denied promotion to Full Professor will not be considered for promotion for four additional years.

In the event that the Dean makes a negative recommendation on tenure and/or promotion, the tenure and/or promotion process is paused for up to 30 days and a Called Hearings Committee automatically takes up a review of the tenure and/or promotion process. Their findings are sent to the Dean and the Provost no more than 10 days after notification. If the Called Hearings Committee finds no error in the review process, the Provost undertakes a full reassessment of the candidate's dossier on the basis of merit and substance, and has 10 days to render their recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion to the Vice-Chancellor, whose decision is final. No further appeals are allowed.

In the event that the Provost issues the first negative recommendation on tenure and/or promotion, the tenure and/or promotion process is paused for up to 30 days and a Called Hearings Committee automatically takes up a review of the tenure and/or promotion process. Their findings are sent to the Provost and the Vice-Chancellor no more than 10 days after notification. If the Called Hearings Committee finds no error in the review process, the Vice-Chancellor conducts an assessment of the dossier on the basis of merit and substance and has 10 days to render their decision. The Vice-Chancellor's decision is final and no further appeals are allowed.

In the event that the Vice-Chancellor issues the first negative decision on tenure and/or promotion, the tenure and/or promotion process is paused for up to 30 days and a Called Hearings Committee automatically takes up a review of the tenure and/or promotion process. Their findings are sent to the Vice-Chancellor no more than 10 days after notification of the refusal to nominate. If the Called Hearings Committee finds no procedural error, the faculty member may appeal to the Board of Regents. Such requests for review by the Board of Regents shall be addressed to the Chair of the Board and be filed in the Vice-Chancellor's office within 10 days after the date of the Called Hearings Committee's findings.

In all cases, review by the Board of Regents shall be limited to the question of whether

the Vice-Chancellor or other appropriate participants committed clear and material procedural error under the provisions of this document in reaching the decision under review. **Clear and material procedural error means departure from the procedures described herein that cast reasonable doubt upon the recommendation or decision.** The Board shall make its decision within 45 days of its first regular meeting after receipt of the request for review by the Chair of the Board even if this carries the process past the beginning of the next fiscal year.

If the Called Hearings Committee finds clear and material procedural error at any point in the process, the full report is sent to the Dean of the College, the Dean of the School of Theology, the Provost, or the Vice-Chancellor as indicated above. The Called Hearings Committee may recommend corrective action and/or a reconsideration of the negative recommendation by the office(s) that issued the negative recommendation, or that the evaluative process be restarted at the point of error.

VIII. Impermissible Grounds for Non-Reappointment or Denial of Tenure and/or Promotion

For all faculty, a decision to deny reappointment, tenure and/or promotion may not be based upon (1) exercise by the faculty member of rights of academic freedom; (2) discrimination based upon race, color, sex, national origin, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, pregnancy, childbirth, genetic information or religion; or (3) personal malice. If a faculty member alleges that a decision against reappointment, tenure and/or promotion was primarily based upon an impermissible ground, the faculty member may appeal the decision through the appropriate venue based on the nature of the alleged violation. For #1 and #3 the appeal would be addressed to the provost and the Hearings Committee since it would allege a material error of procedure. An allegation in #2 would be adjudicated through the university's non-discrimination policy.

IX. Non-reappointment of Non-tenured Tenure-Track Faculty for Reasons of Needs and Resources

This document relates only to tenure-track faculty. Non-reappointment of non-tenure-track faculty is described in the Personnel Procedures for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.

In addition to evaluating non-tenured tenure-track faculty member's performance as outlined in this document, Deans, the Provost, and the Vice-Chancellor may take into account and use as the basis of their recommendation in whole or in part, any factors deemed relevant to the academic needs and/or resources of the institution, i.e., the total institutional interests. These factors may include, but are not limited to, considerations of institutional policy or program development. The decision may not be based upon the impermissible reasons stated in Section VIII.

If the appropriate administrative officers determine that budgetary constraints indicate a position or positions of non-tenured faculty should be eliminated, the Provost, before making that determination, shall consult with the Budget Priorities Committee of the University. Following that consultation, if the Provost determines that a certain number of non-tenured faculty must be eliminated, the Provost shall inform the Dean of the College or the Dean of the School of Theology, whichever is appropriate, of the financial situation which requires the elimination of one or more faculty positions. In the case of the elimination of a faculty position or positions at the School of Theology, the Dean of the School of Theology shall consult with the tenured members of the School of Theology faculty. In the case of the elimination of a position or positions in the College, the Dean of the College shall consult with the Appointments Committee. After determining what lines should be eliminated, the Dean will inform the Chair(s) and the faculty member(s) and the faculty member(s) affected shall be given written notice of non-reappointment as soon as possible after the decision is made.

It is assumed that, under normal circumstances, decisions not to reappoint a non-tenured tenure-track faculty member on the basis of the institution's needs and resources will not be made after the tenure-review year has begun. If, however, circumstances require that such a determination be made after the tenure-review year has begun, the faculty member affected will be entitled to an additional year of teaching, which is normally considered the terminal year.

X. Termination of Faculty Employment for Reasons of Financial Exigency or Program Change

A financial exigency is an imminent financial crisis that threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by ordinary means. Program change means discontinuance or major curtailment of a department, program, or school. The following provisions pertaining to financial exigency and program change in this document apply only to tenure-track and tenured members of the faculty. A state of financial exigency and program change as used herein are distinct from the consideration of current needs and resources, about which Deans, the Provost, and the Vice-Chancellor are entitled to make their recommendations at the time of annual reappointment.

Termination of tenured or non-tenured tenure-track appointments because of financial exigency or program change should be demonstrably bona fide. Any decision that the reduction or cessation of academic programs in the College is required on the grounds of financial exigency or program change should be made after consultation with the Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee and the Budget Priorities Committee. Any decision that the reduction or cessation of academic programs in the School of Theology is required on the grounds of financial exigency or program change should be made after consultation with the tenured members of the School of Theology and the Budget Priorities Committee.

If these decisions require that the appointments of faculty members be terminated, a

reasonable effort should be made to notify those faculty members as soon as possible. Moreover, tenured faculty should normally be entitled to a terminal year of employment. The appointment of a tenured professor should be continued wherever possible and should not be terminated in favor of a tenure-track faculty member without tenure who may seem at the moment to be more promising. In those cases where there is no choice except to terminate the services of a tenured faculty member, a year's notice should be given if at all possible. The University's obligation in financial exigencies and program changes is not only to safeguard its own financial integrity, but to guarantee the soundness of its academic programs and to protect, insofar as is possible, the rights of those engaged in teaching and research.

XI. Disciplinary Actions and Dismissal

Disciplinary actions against faculty members include, but are not limited to, a reprimand, a probationary period with specified conditions, suspension with or without pay, and dismissal. In reaching a decision to discipline a faculty member, the Dean shall notify the faculty member in writing of the reason discipline is being considered and the policy where a violation is alleged. The faculty member then has an opportunity to respond. A faculty member may be suspended with or without pay pending disciplinary decision if, in the judgment of the Vice-Chancellor, Provost, or Dean, such action is necessary to prevent harm to the University or others. The University's concerns only extend to a faculty member's personal life when the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher, scholar, or member of the University may be involved.

A) Disciplinary Actions Short of Dismissal

A faculty member against whom a lesser disciplinary action has been taken may make a written appeal to the Hearings Committee within 10 days of the receipt of the notice of the disciplinary action. The Hearings Committee shall serve as an advisory committee to the administrator who imposed the disciplinary action. Its jurisdiction shall be appellate rather than *de novo*, i.e., the Committee shall review the procedures employed in reaching the decision, but not the merits of the case anew.

B) Dismissal

1. Dismissal or the threat of dismissal will not be used to restrain faculty members in their exercise of academic freedom.
2. Any member of the Faculty may be dismissed at any time for adequate cause. Adequate cause includes, but is not limited to, neglect of duty; inadequate performance; reasonable evidence of discrimination against or harassment of students, staff, or faculty members; serious violations of the code of professional ethics (see AAUP Red Book, 2015 Edition, p. 145 ff.); or other just cause.
3. Any dismissal for cause shall be preceded by discussions between the faculty member

and the Dean, Provost and/or Vice-Chancellor to address the situation. The Dean, Provost or Vice-Chancellor may discuss the matter with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair of the faculty member's department or program, or the tenured faculty of the School of Theology. If no acceptable resolution is reached, a written statement of charges, made with reasonable particularity by the Dean, Provost or Vice-Chancellor, should be presented to the faculty member.

4. Faculty members facing dismissal for cause have a right to have the case heard by a Called Hearings Committee and, ultimately, to have a review of the matter by the Board of Regents. The appeal to the Hearings Committee must be filed in writing within 10 days of notice of the decision. The Called Hearings Committee shall notify the faculty member and the Dean, Provost, or Vice-Chancellor in writing of the time and place of the hearing at which both the faculty member and the Dean, Provost, or Vice-Chancellor (or their designee) may appear and present evidence related to the grounds for dismissal. The proceedings of the Called Committee shall be recorded. The faculty member and the Dean, Provost, or Vice-Chancellor will each be permitted to choose, and have present, an adviser. If the faculty member has legal counsel as an adviser, the Dean, Provost, or Vice-Chancellor must be notified a week in advance and is entitled to legal counsel as well, if they so choose. During the hearing, legal counsel shall only serve as an advisor and may not present evidence, question witnesses or otherwise act as an advocate. The faculty member and administrator involved may review all pertinent evidence presented, may present witnesses and other evidence, and both may question all witnesses. The Called Committee may consider any evidence which it determines is pertinent to the issues before it. The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the University. Within 10 days of the conclusion of the Called Committee's proceedings, it shall submit a written report and recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor and communicate its findings to the faculty member. The recommendation of the Called Hearings Committee will be advisory to the Vice-Chancellor.
5. Within 10 days of receiving the report from the Called Committee, the Vice-Chancellor shall accept or reject its finding and state in writing to both the Chair of the Called Hearings Committee and the faculty member their decision and reasons for their decision.
6. Requests for review by the Board of Regents of a decision by the Vice-Chancellor to dismiss a faculty member for cause shall be addressed to the Chair of the Board of Regents. The request must be filed in the Vice-Chancellor's office within 10 days after the date of the communication to the faculty member of notice of the decision sought to be reviewed. Review shall be limited to the question of whether the Vice-Chancellor or other appropriate participants committed clear and material procedural error under the provisions of this document in reaching the decision under review. The Board shall conduct its review on the record of the hearing and the decision of the Vice-Chancellor; it may also, at its discretion, hear such other evidence as it deems necessary. The Board shall make its decision within 45 days after receipt of the request for review by the Chair of the Board.

XII. Future Amendments

The Dean of the College or the Dean of the School of Theology may request the Vice-Chancellor to consider, as appropriate, changes to these Personnel Procedures. Changes approved by the Vice-Chancellor, after appropriate consultations, including the faculty and the Board of Regents, become effective in the next academic year. Once approved, the current document defines review procedures necessarily applicable as follows: as of publication of this document, untenured tenure-track faculty members may opt for one last review (in the 2nd, 4th, or 6th year) under the previous Personnel Procedures document (dated 2018). All subsequent reviews will move to the 2023 Personnel Procedure document. As of May 1, 2023 all reviews for promotion to full professor must take place under the 2023 Personnel Procedures document.