

# Handbook sections covering reviews

## **1.412 Faculty Affairs Committee (faculty)**

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) serves as a confidential advisory committee to the Vice President and Academic Dean and the President in the promotion, termination, reappointment and granting of tenure to members of the faculty, and in other issues related to faculty personnel. This committee develops and implements a system of faculty evaluation. (See "The Review Process" 2.300.)

The FAC also hears concerns about personnel matters from individual faculty members. This committee formulates and recommends, as necessary, policies for implementing its delegated responsibilities.

When 1) oneself, 2) a member's spouse or committed partner, or 3) a person in the same department as a member of FAC has been nominated for tenure or promotion, or is being evaluated for review, the faculty member will excuse herself or himself from the deliberations having to do with these persons' leaves, evaluations, tenure, or promotion, whichever is relevant. Prior to the discussions of the person to be evaluated, a replacement should be arranged. In all of the above cases, the FAC will ask the Nominating Committee to provide a replacement from the same division as the person stepping aside, preferably someone with previous experience on the FAC.

**Membership.** Five tenured faculty members representing the major academic divisions of the College, one of whom chairs the committee; and the Academic Dean.

## **2.300 THE REVIEW PROCESS**

*[Revisions approved by the faculty, April 2, 2014 and the President, April 22, 2014]*

*The review process outlined in this section applies to second-year, fourth-year, tenure, promotion and other reviews undertaken by the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). For all reviews, the Academic Dean will meet with faculty coming up for review prior to their submitting materials. The FAC reviews are undertaken with priority given to those requiring earliest notification. Normally reviews occur in the following order: second-year, tenure, fourth-year, special, and promotion. The College will comply with the 1970 "Interpretive Comments" of the AAUP's 1940 "Statement of Principles" regarding notification of non-renewal deadlines: no later than March 1st of the first academic year of service; no later than December 15th of the second academic year of service; at least twelve months before the expiration of appointment after two or more years in the institution.*

*During the fall semester of the faculty member's second year the FAC conducts a formal evaluation and review of each tenure-track faculty member's performance. This*

*process is known as the second-year review and its purpose is to determine retention or non-retention. If the review is negative, the decision not to extend a third letter of agreement is communicated to the faculty member before December 15th of the second year.*

*In some cases along with a positive second-year review, the FAC, the Academic Dean, or the President may stipulate that a subsequent evaluation and review will be held within the next twelve months. Any such review will follow the same procedures as other reviews. Any negative review other than the second-year review will be communicated on or before May 15th, so as to provide a full twelve months' notice of termination.*

*During the fall semester of the fourth year, the FAC will conduct another review of tenure-track faculty performance. The purpose of the fourth-year review will also be to determine retention or non-retention and to communicate areas in which improvement is needed in the faculty member's performance if tenure is ultimately to be granted. As in the second-year review, the FAC, the Academic Dean, or the President may mandate an additional review the following academic year.*

*During the fall semester of the sixth year of teaching at the College, the FAC will conduct a tenure review of a tenure-track faculty member's performance. Prior to the FAC's beginning the tenure review process, it is required that the faculty member has completed the appropriate terminal degree. Written evidence from the degree granting institution must be received by the Academic Dean before the opening faculty meeting in the fall of the year the person is scheduled to come up for tenure.*

*Any reduction of the probationary period is agreed upon at the time of initial appointment as is stated as part of the first letter of agreement to a tenure-track appointment (See Section 2.400 Tenure Review Process).*

## **2.301 The Tenure Timeline**

The probationary period for a pre-tenure member of the faculty hired into a full time tenure-track position is six years, with tenure review in the sixth year of appointment. This section describes all exceptions to this probationary period and the process for granting those exceptions. The tenure review is conducted only once for each faculty member, during the final year of the probationary period.

Faculty members must have completed the appropriate terminal degree prior to the tenure review. An official transcript or other authorized documentation from the degree granting institution must be received by the Academic Dean no later than August 15 (the first day of the annual period of service for faculty) of the year the person is scheduled to be reviewed for tenure. If the faculty member has not completed the appropriate terminal degree and submitted appropriate documentation for completion by this deadline, the faculty member will not be reviewed for tenure, and will be given a terminal letter of agreement for the following year.

## ***2.302 Reductions In Probationary Period***

Any reduction of the six-year probationary period is agreed upon by the College and the faculty member at the time of initial appointment and is stated as a part of the first letter of agreement to a tenure-track appointment. Occasionally, new faculty may be granted one or two years of credit toward tenure for prior college-level teaching. In rare cases, three years of credit may be given. To earn credit, the faculty member must have completed an appropriate terminal degree, typically will have taught on a full-time basis at a four-year college or university within the past two or three years immediately prior to the date of consideration, and will have shown evidence of excellence in teaching. A reduction of the probationary period will accelerate the review process; the accelerated schedule will be described at the time of appointment. At the time of extending the initial appointment, the Academic Dean, in consultation with the department, recommends to the President that teaching credit be given. The decision as to whether to grant such credit is made by the President.

In rare situations, senior faculty and administrators may be hired with tenure or at rank above assistant level. Such a decision shall be approved by the academic department, the FAC, Academic Dean and President before proceeding to the Board of Trustees for a final decision.

## ***2.303 Extensions of Probationary Period***

Faculty members who wish to request an extension of the probationary period must apply for an extension no later than April 15 (the deadline for faculty to return their signed letters of agreement) in the year preceding that in which the faculty member is scheduled to be reviewed for tenure. Extensions of the probationary period may be granted for personal or medical reasons. No extension may be granted without application by the faculty member to the Academic Dean, and approval by the President upon recommendation of the Academic Dean.

A faculty member who adds a child or children to their family through birth or adoption during the probationary period will be granted an automatic one-year extension of the probationary period following notification about the adoption or birth to the Academic Dean. Faculty members may request a waiver of this extension if they do so in writing to the Academic Dean.

Extensions of the probationary period based on approved leaves described in Section 5.200 ("Leave Policy") will also be granted automatically to faculty during the probationary period. If the faculty member provides reasons other than approved leaves for applying for an extension, the Academic Dean will consult with the department chair (or, if the individual is the department chair, with a senior departmental colleague) before making a recommendation to the President. While multiple extensions of the probationary period are permissible, under no circumstances may the total extension of the initial probationary period be greater than three years.

Unless otherwise explicitly stated, only full-time annual teaching letters of agreement are considered as a part of the period of employment that must pass before tenure can be granted. This specifically excludes part-time, summer school, one-semester or other limited teaching agreements, as well as leaves of absence, unless specific agreements have been reached with the Academic Dean and recorded in the annual teaching letter of agreement.

When a probationary faculty member is appointed to a full-time administrative position, the administrative work is not counted as a teaching letter of agreement. Full-time faculty whose teaching load is reduced by some administrative responsibility may still accrue years toward tenure. Such accrual should be established in the annual letter of agreement.

Time spent on research grants or fellowships that take the faculty member away from the institution normally does not count for time accrued toward tenure. Any exceptions will be determined by the Academic Dean. Faculty who receive grants to work on campus with students during the academic year normally must teach at least half time in order to accrue time toward tenure.

Under extraordinary circumstances, after a successful pre-tenure review, the faculty member may request that the tenure review be conducted at an earlier time than established in the faculty member's initial letter of agreement. This request is sent to the FAC and the Academic Dean. The FAC and Academic Dean will make a recommendation to the President. If the President's decision is to proceed with the review, the College will follow the normal procedure for a tenure review in the following year.

### ***2.304 Preparation of FAC members and others conducting faculty reviews***

Through its policies and decisions, the FAC has a direct effect on both the short- and long-term makeup of the Guilford faculty. Thus, in addition to being conscientious, the members of the FAC and anyone conducting faculty reviews should receive appropriate preparation and training each academic year, before conducting any faculty reviews.

1. As part of the preparation, the Academic Dean and FAC chairperson are responsible for ensuring that all reviewers (1) have a clear shared understanding of current scholarship on topics relevant to the faculty evaluation process and (2) understand how our standards and criteria are applied at Guilford and of how the review process functions. At the beginning of fall term, the Dean and FAC chair will assemble a meeting of all faculty reviewers. At least two members of the Faculty Development Committee will also attend this training.
2. For example, reviewers could explore current research on the psychology and sociology of group decision making; the interactions of biases (especially ones

based on ethnicity or gender); and the interpretation of student and peer evaluations. The FAC's applications of these findings to its own work can occur in any of several ways, including through attendance at workshops or conferences on faculty evaluation; through presentations to the FAC by scholars in the field of faculty evaluation; and through discussions involving the full faculty.

3. If substitute members will be needed for FAC during the year, where possible they should be selected from former FAC members who have participated in these trainings and discussions.

## **2.310 Information-Gathering Responsibilities**

*[Revisions approved by the faculty, April 2, 2014 and the President, April 22, 2014]*

The Academic Dean is responsible for maintaining current personnel files of all faculty members and for distributing and keeping any specific instruments of evaluation adopted by faculty action (e.g., student evaluations of classes and a standardized advisor evaluation). Each file shall include an official transcript and an up-to-date vita of the faculty member. The Academic Dean is also responsible for notifying in writing all faculty members scheduled to be reviewed. Such notification shall take place on or before October 1st and will provide at least a thirty-day notice before which materials must be submitted for review. Through appropriate College media, (e.g., The Beacon), the Dean will announce the names of faculty to be reviewed and issue an invitation to all members of the community to write letters concerning the person to be reviewed. The chairperson of the FAC will work with the Academic Dean to assure timely collection of all additional material relevant to any individual review. Confidential materials collected for reviews can be seen only by the FAC, the Academic Dean, the President, the Appeals Board (if convened), and the Board of Trustees.

The Office of the Academic Dean will collect the following materials and make them available to the FAC:

- A written self-evaluation submitted by the faculty member under review. This self-evaluation shall include the faculty member's response to issues raised in student advising and course evaluations (e.g., special information about course format, population, goals). The self-evaluation will also speak to those strengths, weaknesses, accomplishments, and goals which the faculty member particularly desires the FAC to note and to respond to any suggestions made in previous reviews. Supporting materials may also include course syllabi of special interest, announcements of exhibitions or lectures, and samples of work published or in progress, and similar items may also be included.
- Copies of all standardized course evaluations for all classes taught at Guilford during fall and spring semesters since the previous FAC review or for the last two

academic years at the College, as well as the individual, college, and division averages of numerical summaries for the semesters under review. Faculty members who wish to do so may submit supplementary student evaluations which particularly address their specific subject matter and/or teaching style and which may provide a clearer picture of their efforts to improve their teaching.

- The previous FAC review letter and any written response submitted by the faculty member after the review. Supporting documents and other material considered for prior reviews are not a part of a current review.
- Confidential letters of evaluation from all full-time departmental faculty members. An analysis of the faculty member's qualifications and work, based in part on teaching observations, shall be part of each letter of evaluation, whatever its substance. Non-tenure-track and first-year faculty members may choose to abstain from submitting letters.
- Confidential statements concerning the quality of the faculty member's work from one to three extra-departmental colleagues nominated by the candidate.
- Confidential letters solicited from thirty-five (35) randomly selected students who have worked with the faculty member over the past two academic years, including at least twenty-five students from class lists (majors and non-majors when possible), and up to 10 advisees (new students and major advisees when possible). The prompts from the Dean's office will ask the student to comment on the faculty member's teaching and advising.
- Confidential letters from three students, to be named by the faculty member, who have taken a class from or been advised by the faculty member during the period under review.
- Results of standardized advisor evaluations. A standardized advisor evaluation is one component used by the FAC in assessing "evidence of effective advising" (see section 2.343). The advisor evaluation will be distributed by the Academic Dean's office to students between April 1st and May 15th each year. Faculty will have access to the results of their evaluations, as well as aggregate data from all advisors, by August 1st of each year. Faculty are encouraged to discuss their evaluation results obtained during the time period between reviews in their self-study using section 2.343 as a standard of effectiveness.
- Other appropriate materials such as letters received as a result of invitations posted through the appropriate College media (e.g., The Beacon) or additional items requested by the FAC or the Academic Dean.

Note: The failure of any individual or group to provide any or all of the above material in no way invalidates the deliberative conclusions of the FAC. **Required material submitted by the faculty member under review after the announced deadline will not be considered as part of the review.**

## **2.320 Deliberative Process**

*[Revisions approved by the faculty, April 2, 2014 and the President, April 22, 2014]*

Each member of the FAC and the Academic Dean shall review all the materials described above, prior to Committee discussion. The Academic Dean shall provide any relevant administrative information in such a manner as to protect the confidentiality of those concerned. All discussions of the Committee are confidential. After the FAC has reviewed the written material and initiated its discussion, the chairperson may invite the faculty member under review to meet with the Committee for open discussion of the Committee's and the faculty member's perceptions. If the faculty member desires, a faculty colleague may be invited to appear as an advocate before the Committee. Should the faculty member under review choose not to appear before the Committee, the deliberative process shall continue according to routine. If the FAC deems it necessary, other individuals may be invited to discuss the candidate's performance. The FAC will keep a written, confidential summary of any meetings with the faculty member under review. The faculty member will have the opportunity to review and respond to such a summary. The summary and any response becomes a part of the review record.

*[The inserted paragraph approved by the Teachers, Officers and Curriculum Committees of the Guilford College Board of Trustees, January 28, 2000]*

*The members of the FAC shall work toward a sense of the meeting separately from the Academic Dean. Afterward, the FAC and the Academic Dean will confer and if there is a clear sense of the meeting they will communicate their recommendations to the President of the College. If there is not a clear sense of the meeting, then two or more recommendations reflecting the different positions will be written, recorded, and transmitted to the President. The President makes the final decisions about positive and negative second and fourth year reviews, and about negative tenure and promotion reviews, reporting these decisions to the Board of Trustees. The President takes positive recommendations for tenure and promotion to the Board of Trustees who make the final decision. In tenure or promotion reviews where the President's recommendation is positive, but where there are unresolved differences among the President, the Dean, and/or the FAC, the President, the Academic Dean, and a representative from the FAC should convey to the Board of Trustees the nature of the unresolved differences.*

The Academic Dean shall present in writing a detailed summary of the committee's recommendation(s) to the faculty member, the department chairperson, and the President. The President will communicate his or her decision regarding this review to the FAC through the Academic Dean. The President of the College makes the final decisions about positive and negative second and fourth year reviews, and about negative tenure and promotion reviews, reporting these decisions to the Board of Trustees. The President's positive decisions about tenure and promotion are presented as recommendations to the Board of Trustees who make the final decision. The

President provides reasons in writing for positive and negative final decisions through the Academic Dean to faculty members under review.

A faculty member who is denied reappointment, promotion or tenure, or who receives a negative review, may invoke the College's Appeals Process set forth in section 2.610.

## **2.340 Review Criteria**

The most important criterion in any faculty review is teaching excellence. Other criteria considered, but not prioritized, are effective advising, growth as a scholar, and service to the College community.

### **2.341 Teaching Excellence**

*[Revisions approved by the faculty, January 2011 and the Board of Trustees, February 2011]*

Continuing excellence in the quality of teaching is the first and foremost consideration in all faculty personnel decisions. The extent to which any teacher enables students to move towards a lifetime of self-education is a significant dimension of this quality of accomplishment. Guilford is in some ways like other schools, but it also has a specific mission and set of academic principles. Each teacher will articulate how her or his courses reflect the particular mission of the school and the 5 academic principles.

The College believes that the ability to involve students effectively in the learning process can be demonstrated in many ways. However demonstrated, it is excellence, rather than the potential or the hope for excellence that is sought. The College believes that established patterns of strength or weakness are more relevant to faculty evaluation than are short-term successes or failures in the classroom.

#### *Criteria and Assessment*

Excellence in teaching manifests itself in four general categories: content expertise, instructional design skills, instructional delivery, and course management. The following paragraphs describe these categories in terms of criteria and in terms of assessment.

Content expertise includes the faculty member's education and experiences that directly support the teaching of a particular subject. Content expertise is not static and includes ongoing expansion of one's disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge base. At Guilford, in addition to teaching courses in a specialty area, faculty teach courses that serve both the needs of their department and the general education requirements of the college.

When assessing content expertise, reviews may consider, among other things, the faculty member's education, professional background, scholarship specifically related to teaching, and reflections mentioned in the self-evaluation. The most fundamental consideration is the completion of the appropriate terminal degree. However, content expertise may also be assessed by disciplinary peers at the college and may be supported by an evaluative letter from a peer outside



the college solicited by the faculty member under review. This outside letter should demonstrate knowledge of the teacher's intellectual grounding in the subject and current teaching practices. Faculty members may further demonstrate growing expertise by such activities as participating in conferences, attending faculty development workshops, or taking classes.

Instructional design includes creating courses that are organized around clear objectives, and strategically sequenced to build named abilities over the course of the semester through specific assignments and exercises, all of which can be assessed for demonstrable skill. Good design is appropriate to the level and topic and also addresses the 5 academic principles as appropriate to the disciplines and subjects of those courses. It may also involve the use of information technology in ways that effectively support a course's objectives and desired outcomes.

When assessing instructional design, reviewers may consider, among other things, course syllabi, course materials (including assignments), peer reviews, and the faculty member's self-evaluation.

Instructional delivery includes the ability to create an environment that engages and stimulates diverse students to reflect on complex issues, think critically (in a disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary manner), to nurture imagination and creativity, and to communicate clearly the methods of one's academic discipline or subject.

Excellent teaching contributes to comprehension of material by students. Excellent teachers communicate enthusiasm about the subject matter that they teach. They organize their courses and class meetings in advance, but also demonstrate a willingness to adjust the course in response to their ongoing assessments of their students' comprehension and development of skills. They treat their students with respect, and they demonstrate a willingness to listen and respond to student concerns.

Instructional delivery may be assessed by student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching, course materials (e.g., rubrics, feedback sheets, etc.), and the faculty member's self-evaluation.

Course management skills include how the classroom and assignments are managed throughout the course. Skills required are record keeping: maintaining accurate grades, noting absences in accordance with course syllabus, and submitting grades (mid-term and final grades) on time in accordance with instructions from the office of the Academic Dean. Other skills include noting and accommodating students' documented special learning needs. Course management also includes timely grading and return of graded materials, maintaining office hours, timely processing of add/drop forms and incomplete forms.

When assessing course management reviewers may consider, among other things, syllabi, student evaluations, peer reviews, and self-evaluation. Information regarding compliance with grade submissions and related grade forms may be obtained from the office of the Academic Dean.

## **2.342 Scholarship and Creative Activity**

The College believes that there is an inherent connection between teaching excellence and the faculty member's continuing scholarship and creative activity. Making one's efforts public among professional peers and more general audiences brings with it mutual benefits from the exchange of insights and critiques. Both the College community and the wider network of professional colleagues elsewhere serve appropriately in the nurturing of the faculty member's scholarship and creative work. In considering the connection of the faculty member's scholarship and creative expression both to the teaching mission of the College and to professional peers, the College strives to balance the internal worth and external merit of that work.

### **Criteria and Assessment**

The faculty member's self-evaluation and supporting documentation are the primary means of assessment of scholarship and creative activity. Because teaching excellence is the primary focus of faculty members at Guilford (and the main criterion for tenure and promotion), the faculty member under review should describe their scholarship and reflect on the connection between their scholarly and creative activity and continued teaching excellence.

The self-evaluation provides a description of the connection between the faculty member's teaching and scholarship. Demonstration of this connection may include effects of the faculty member's scholarship on the content of existing or planned courses, on pedagogical methods, on the mentoring of student research or creative works, or other salutary effects on student learning. Peer review of the results of continuing scholarly activity is essential and is broadly construed. Publication, presentations or exhibits inside and outside the college, and reviews and application by others of one's work are some of the ways that a faculty member can demonstrate peer review of scholarly and creative work.

The College recognizes and evaluates a wide variety of scholarly and creative activities consistent with the College's mission. Drawing on Boyer's taxonomy in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), a faculty member's scholarship is demonstrated in one or more of the categories of discovery, integration, application, or teaching. Many activities and products can be classified as more than one type of scholarship. The faculty member may describe other activities that provide evidence for continuing scholarship that do not fall into the categories described below. The Summary of Scholarship Elements (below) summarizes criteria that the Faculty Affairs Committee will consider as it

evaluates scholarship. The College does not expect all pieces of scholarship to meet all these standards.

The *scholarship of discovery* refers to original research or creative work within the faculty member's discipline(s).

Evidence of scholarship of discovery is assessed through scholarly activities such as publication or presentation of original work within one's discipline or public exhibits of creativity such as art shows, concerts, and dramatic performances. Peer reviews and application of the faculty member's scholarship by others may also be used to demonstrate the scholarship of discovery.

The *scholarship of integration* speaks to the analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of research and creative work from one or more disciplines. It speaks to the College's emphasis on interdisciplinary studies (although interdisciplinary scholarship can be placed in any of these categories of scholarship).

Evidence of scholarship of integration is assessed through publication or presentation of theory, literature reviews, meta-analyses, multidisciplinary research, creative work, or other appropriate work for specialist or non-specialist audiences. Peer reviews and application of the faculty member's scholarship by others may also be used to demonstrate the scholarship of integration.

The *scholarship of application* refers to professional activities outside or within the College that require the use of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline(s). Such activities often reflect the College's commitment to Principled Problem Solving (PPS), although the scholarship of application is not limited to PPS.

Evidence of scholarship of application is assessed by publications, presentations, consultations, or the development of intellectual property in which the faculty member applies their disciplinary knowledge. Evidence includes but is not limited to developing and/or assessing programs for community agencies, original or creative work geared toward a general audience, shaping public policy, and consultation to schools, courts, businesses, and other institutions.

The *scholarship of teaching* specifically refers to the development and assessment of pedagogical methods in the faculty member's discipline(s) with the purpose of informing and influencing academic peers.

Evidence of scholarship of teaching is assessed by publication or presentation of research and theory relating to pedagogy as well as reviews and applications of the faculty member's scholarship of such work by others.

---

## Summary of Scholarship Elements

— Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I., *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, 1997.

### **Clear Goals**

Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

### **Adequate Preparation**

Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

### **Appropriate Methods**

Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does s/he modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

### **Significant Results**

Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?

### **Effective Presentation**

Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

### **Reflective Critique**

Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

## ***2.343 Effective Academic Advising***

Good academic advising is both an element and an extension of instruction: it enables the student to benefit more fully from the classroom and it can be an occasion for learning itself. Through the advising process, students can define and redefine goals and make intermediary plans to move towards them, evaluate and integrate past experiences, and come to productive assessments of their current status.

Individualized guidance for students is an integral component of a faculty member's responsibilities. Each student merits careful direction to the educational resources of the College as well as thoughtful assessment and development of his/her interests and abilities.

## **Criteria**

Effective academic advising includes the accurate and timely provision of information to one's advisees about academic policies, graduation requirements, courses of study, co-curricular programs, and post-graduate opportunities. As much as possible, effective academic advisors are regularly available to their advisees, work to establish a respectful and cordial rapport with them, and provide information that is relevant to their specific interests and needs. Effective academic advisors keep abreast of available on-campus offices, programs, and resources in order to give referrals to their advisees. As much as is possible and appropriate, effective academic advisors are in contact with their advisees' instructors, coaches, and other relevant college staff in order to be aware of their advisees' progress (both shorter- and longer-term) and in order to be able to serve as advocates for their advisees.

## **Assessment**

Effective academic advising is assessed by a faculty member's self-evaluation and written evaluations from major advisees, non-major advisees, students who seek and receive advising but are not that faculty member's advisees, and faculty and staff colleagues.

## **2.344 Service**

All faculty are expected to participate in the governance of the College by attending faculty meetings, serving their department, and serving on a committee or chairing a department or division. Such service is essential to the life of the College.

## **Criteria**

Service includes departmental service, committee work, and other activities sponsored by the College. Faculty may also demonstrate service by activities such as helping to develop or direct programs, working on accreditation or reaccreditation, participating in colloquia and other College events, facilitating faculty development projects, initiating helpful contacts with alumni, advising student organizations, participating in or directing College organizations, and participating in extracurricular or co-curricular student activities.

Faculty may make the case that service activities beyond the immediate college community should also be considered as service. Examples here include uncompensated service to professional or community organizations, service on a review panel for a funding organization, or other instances of the utilization of one's disciplinary or professional skills in service of an organization.

## **Assessment**

Service is assessed by a faculty member's self-evaluation and supporting documentation and letters from faculty and staff colleagues.

### **2.345 Evaluation of Full-time Non-tenure-track Faculty**

*[Approved April 2008]*

Full-time non-tenure-track (visiting) faculty members will be evaluated at the beginning of their second year and, if they are employed long enough to warrant it, every two years (so, at the beginning of their fourth year, their sixth year, etc.). The review will be conducted by the Division Chair and one other tenured faculty member selected by the Division Chair (preferably this person should be from the same department as the faculty member under review, and, if appropriate, this could be the department chair). Their review will follow the general guidelines for second-year reviews of tenure track faculty: the faculty member should be asked to write a self evaluation that focuses on his or her teaching but does not exclude other work if appropriate, the two faculty doing the review will look at the person's student evaluations, and the person under review will be asked to name as many as three colleagues from his or her department, including the chair, to write letters of recommendation supporting his or her work. Their written report will go first to the Academic Dean; after consultation with the Academic Dean, a letter will be sent from the Division Chair and the Academic Dean to the faculty member under review. This letter will go in the person's file. The expectations for this evaluation will be spelled out in the initial hiring agreement. If the appointment might extend to an additional year, or beyond, every effort will be made to inform the faculty member if in fact it will continue into the next year with as much advance time as is possible.

### **2.400 TENURE PROGRAM**

*[Revisions approved by the faculty, April 2, 2014 and the President, April 22, 2014]*

It is recognized that a tenure program is a vital aid in attracting and retaining instructional personnel of the high quality which Guilford College seeks. The purpose of tenure is to protect the academic freedom of its members while providing the teaching faculty with a reasonable degree of economic security. Tenure is granted by action of the Board of Trustees, subsequent to the completion of the College's formal review process. Immediately following the decision of the Board of Trustees, the President shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision to grant or withhold tenure. A faculty member who is denied reappointment with tenure may invoke the College's "Appeals Process" set forth in section 2.610. The normal probationary period for a non-tenured member of the faculty hired into a full-time tenure-track position is six years. The tenure review is generally conducted only once for each faculty member, during the fall semester of the sixth year of teaching at the College. Any reduction of the probationary period is agreed upon at the time of initial appointment and is stated as

a part of the first letter of agreement to a tenure track appointment. Occasionally, new faculty may be granted one or two years of credit toward tenure for prior teaching. In rare cases, three years of credit may be given. To earn credit, the faculty member must normally have completed an appropriate terminal degree, have taught on a full-time basis at a four-year college or university within the past two or three years immediately prior to the date of consideration, and have shown evidence of excellence in teaching. Candidates will recognize that credit will accelerate the review process. At the time of extending the initial appointment, the Academic Dean, in consultation with the department, recommends to the President that teaching credit be given. The decision as to whether to grant such credit is made by the President.

Under extraordinary circumstances, after a successful four-year review, the tenure review may be conducted at an earlier date upon the written request of the faculty member who will bring the request to the FAC and the Academic Dean, who will consult with the President and/or other appropriate persons before taking action. If the Academic Dean's recommendation is to proceed with the review, the Committee will follow the normal procedure for a tenure review and complete its deliberations as quickly as possible. Its written recommendation will be forwarded to the President who will respond to the recommendation. The final decision to grant tenure rests with the Board of Trustees.

In exceptional situations, senior faculty and administrators may be hired with tenure. Such a decision shall be approved by the academic department, the FAC, the Academic Dean and the President before proceeding to the Board of Trustees for a final decision.

The practice of renewing annual letters of agreement for non-tenured faculty members should not be construed as a commitment by the College to grant tenure subsequently. Renewal of letters of agreement and the extension of tenure are different decisions and must be considered separately. Unless otherwise explicitly stated, only full-time annual teaching letters of agreement are considered as a part of the probationary period of employment that must pass before tenure can be granted. This specifically excludes part-time, summer school, one semester or other limited teaching agreements, as well as summer school contracts, and leaves of absence, unless specific agreements have been reached and recorded in writing. When an untenured faculty member is appointed to a full-time administrative position, the administrative work is not counted as a teaching letter of agreement. By accepting an administrative appointment, the untenured faculty member relinquishes all claim to a continuing faculty position unless there is a written statement to the contrary. Full-time faculty whose teaching load is reduced by some administrative responsibility still accrue years toward tenure. Research grants or fellowships that take the faculty member away from the institution normally do not count toward tenure. Any exceptions will be determined by the Academic Dean. Faculty who receive grants to work on campus with students during the academic year normally must teach 2/3 time in order to accrue time toward tenure.

## **2.410 Tenured Faculty with Administrative Status**

If a tenured member of the faculty accepts an administrative appointment, the tenured status does not apply to the administrative position, but will be in force at any future date that administrative duties are relinquished and teaching duties are resumed.

Tenure is not affected by a leave of absence when such leave is officially approved by the President; however, tenure is relinquished by the faculty member upon resignation from the College.

## **2.420 Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty**

*[Section replaced in April 2005, approved by the corporate faculty; change in review components approved by the Clerk's Committee, August 23, 2011]*

In a process separate from faculty reviews for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion that are conducted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), the Academic Dean, in conjunction with the Director of Faculty Development, will conduct periodic, five-year reviews of all tenured faculty in order to

Support the efforts of tenured faculty members to renew, deepen, and strengthen their pedagogical skills;

Encourage continuous professional and personal growth and service to the community; and

Facilitate the use of Faculty Development resources by tenured faculty members.

Post-tenure, five-year reviews will address the same four areas as FAC reviews: teaching, advising, community service, and scholarly growth, but the outcome of these five-year reviews will have no impact on the tenured status of faculty members.

Grounds for dismissal of tenured faculty remain unchanged, and Guilford College continues to adhere to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement of Principles.

The first five-year review will be conducted five years after the tenure review or five years after a promotion review. Subsequent reviews will be conducted on a five-year cycle, and the last review within five years of retirement. The Academic Dean may grant requests to alter the review schedule to accommodate study leaves, imminent promotion reviews, or other contingencies. No more than two post-tenure reviews will be conducted per semester.

A Faculty Development Associate for Tenured Faculty will be appointed by the Director of Faculty Development and approved by the Clerk's Committee and the Academic Dean to coordinate the review procedure. This Associate will serve for at least two, and no more than three, consecutive academic years, at the end of which she or he will be compensated with a course release within two years of his or her last year of service. Associates may only be reappointed after a three-year lay-off.



The Academic Dean and Director of Faculty Development will establish a rotating schedule for the reviews. Within the first two months of the semester when the review will be conducted, the Associate will initiate the procedure by contacting the faculty member and the department chairperson. The Associate will explain the procedure to all faculty members involved and keep the process on schedule, assuring that each review is completed within one semester.

Two tenured faculty members and the Faculty Associate will constitute the three-member panel that will conduct the review. The faculty member under review will choose one member of the panel, either from members of the faculty member's department, or if there are no other tenured members of the department, from among the faculty at large. If the faculty member under review chooses to do so, he or she may invite a tenured faculty member in her or his field from a department with a comparable discipline at another institution to participate in the review if the invited reviewer does not require financial compensation. The Academic Dean will choose the second panel member.

The three members of the review panel and the faculty member under review will establish a schedule for completing the review. The Associate will serve as clerk of the review panel and will collect and distribute copies of the review material to the panel. All material will be considered confidential, and except for the final report, will be destroyed when the review is completed.

The review will consist of the following components:

A self-evaluation that addresses the faculty member's achievements and challenges in the four components of faculty responsibility: teaching, advising, community service, and scholarly growth. The self-evaluation should include copies of syllabi, abstracts, or examples of research or creative works. The faculty member will forward these to the Associate.

On at least two different occasions, two members of the panel will visit at least one class taught by the faculty member under review, according to a schedule established between the faculty member and the panel. Following these visits, panel members will summarize their observations about the teaching effectiveness of the faculty member and submit them to the Associate.

Panel members and the Associate will have access to advising evaluations and course evaluations for all courses taught by the faculty member during the four teaching semesters prior to the year of the review.

Using class lists secured by the Academic Dean's office, the Associate will request letters from at least 25 students, chosen at random, who have taken classes from the faculty member under review within the previous two years. In addition, the faculty member under review will provide the names of three students of her or his choice from whom the Associate will also request letters.

After the Associate has gathered all the review material and the panel has reviewed the material, the Associate will submit a final, written report, including suggestions for Faculty Development, to the individual under review and to the Academic Dean. After a conference with the Academic Dean, the faculty member will discuss the review with the Faculty Associate and the Director of Faculty Development to determine if and how he or she should use Faculty Development Resources to address any issues raised in the review. The Academic Dean's copy of the review will be kept in the faculty member's confidential files in the Dean's Office, along with any written response deemed appropriate by the faculty member who has been reviewed.

### **2.500 Promotion**

Guilford College does not adhere to a system of automatic promotions after a specific time of service in rank. Neither is there a rigid quota system. Promotions are based on merit. In judging merit, the President, the Academic Dean, the FAC and the faculty as a whole have agreed to guidelines described in "Review Criteria" (2.340).

### **2.510 Promotion to Assistant Professor**

Criteria for promotion to assistant professor include (a) a terminal degree appropriate to the teaching appointment, (b) previous teaching experience, and (c) strong evidence of potential for growth as a teacher and scholar/artist. Faculty are promoted from Instructor to Assistant Professor at the start of the first academic year after they have earned the appropriate terminal degree. The College recognizes that in some disciplines the appropriate terminal degree may not be the doctorate.

### **2.520 Promotion to Associate Professor**

Minimum criteria for promotion to Associate Professor include a terminal degree and completion of at least five years of teaching at the college level. Additionally, faculty should have demonstrated (a) excellence in teaching, (b) scholarly or creative achievement, (c) high quality academic advising, and (d) service as described in the review criteria. Faculty are typically promoted to Associate Professor when they are awarded tenure, since the criteria and standards are the same for both.

### **2.530 Promotion to Full Professor**

Faculty are promoted from associate professor to full professor when they are able to demonstrate substantial and sustained excellence in teaching, and marked or sustained achievement in at least two of the other areas set out in section 2.340 ("review criteria"), since the promotion to associate professor. Minimum criteria for promotion to full professor include (a) a terminal degree, (b) completion of at least five years at the rank of associate professor, although exceptions may be considered for equivalent experience in past academic appointments. Additionally, faculty should have

demonstrated (a) sustained excellence in teaching, (b) continued record of peer-reviewed scholarly or creative activities, (c) excellent advising, and/or (d) excellent service to the college community, including leadership roles.

### **2.540 Endowed Professorships**

Each endowment establishes its own criteria. Endowments require recommendations of the Academic Dean and President and approval by the Board of Trustees.

### **2.550 Emerita/Emeritus Status**

On recommendation by the Academic Dean and President, Faculty who are retiring from Guilford may receive the designation “emerita”/“emeritus” as an addition to their rank at the time of retirement. Faculty eligible for those designations must have taught at Guilford for at least 10 years before retirement, and during that time have exemplified both the highest standards of the profession and distinguished service to the Guilford community.

### **2.560 Process for Promotion to Associate and Full Professor**

Tenured faculty members may stand for promotion at any time when they have met the criteria for promotion. To be considered for promotion, the faculty member should notify the Academic Dean and their department chair in the spring semester prior to the FAC review. The information gathering, materials reviewed, and review process for promotion is the same as is described above. Any exceptions to the minimum requirements specified above must be approved by FAC and the Academic Dean.

## **2.600 APPEALS PROCESS (FOR REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION) AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES**

### **2.610 Appeals for Review, Tenure and Promotion**

The faculty member under review shall be notified by the Academic Dean and the FAC of their recommendation(s) to the President.

If the faculty member wishes to appeal a negative recommendation for second-year, fourth-year, tenure or promotion review, by the Academic Dean, or the FAC, a special Appeals Board will be created to consider questions of procedural correctness, claims of discrimination, and/or questions regarding the accuracy, appropriateness, or completeness of the data upon which the negative recommendation was based.

*[Updated by the Teachers, Officers and Curriculum Committees of the Guilford College Board of Trustees, January 28, 2000]*

It is not sufficient grounds for an appeal to purposefully withhold information from the FAC so that the Appeals Committee will have information the FAC did not have. The

formal appeal shall be filed with the Academic Dean within thirty calendar days of the receipt of the letter concerning the negative recommendation. The Academic Dean shall notify the Clerk's Committee immediately to constitute the Appeals Board.

From the time the faculty member files the appeal with the Academic Dean, the Appeals Board shall have forty calendar days to reach its conclusions and submit a recommendation to the FAC. The FAC shall have twenty calendar days from the receipt of the recommendation of the Appeals Board to write a response to the Appeals Board conclusion which will be sent to the President. The Appeals Board, chosen to hear just one case, will consist of three individuals, one of whom will be a former FAC member, selected by the Clerk's Committee of the faculty, from among the tenured faculty of the College. The faculty member will have the right to disqualify summarily up to two individuals recommended for appointment. If an appointee is so disqualified by the faculty member, a replacement will be selected by the Clerk's Committee. In all cases, the attempt should be made to select individuals who are both judicious and uninvolved in the earlier decisions of the specific case being appealed and who are generally representative of the population of the College, but specific constituencies are not required to be appointed. The Appeals Board will re-examine all materials relevant to the appeal, including the FAC review file and teaching evaluations, and will interview the candidate (who may be accompanied by a Guilford College faculty member), the Academic Dean, and the chairperson of the FAC, as well as any other individuals it believes may have information helpful in reaching a decision.

If the Appeals Board concludes that a significant error in process, accuracy, appropriateness, or completeness of data, or that discrimination has occurred, it will send its findings and recommendations to the President, Academic Dean, the FAC, and appellant faculty member. If the Appeals Board agrees with the negative recommendations, it will send its findings and recommendations to the President, Academic Dean, the FAC, and appellant faculty member. The FAC may write a response to the Appeals Board's conclusion and send it on to the President. The Academic Dean will then reconsider the original decision that is being appealed, the Appeals Board's findings and recommendations, and, if forthcoming, the FAC's written response to the Appeals Board's report and send his/her recommendation to the President within twenty calendar days of the Appeals Board's decision. The President reviews all reports and recommendations, and then forwards his or her recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee for appropriate action.

If the faculty member remains unsatisfied with the recommendation(s) of the FAC or President in matters regarding procedure, the Board of Trustees, through its Academic Affairs Committee, will entertain a final appeal. In this appeal, the Board of Trustees will not consider any issues other than whether or not proper procedures were followed in reaching the recommendations in the earlier appeals process.

The work of the Appeals Board, and any materials it gathers for its hearing, will be kept confidential as far as is legally possible.

## Summary Timetable for Tenure Appeals

<b>Example Date</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
Jan. 15	The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) or the Academic Dean issue a negative recommendation on a Review decision, which is conveyed to the faculty member under review.
Jan. 20	The faculty member contesting the negative recommendation files a written appeal with the Academic Dean within 30 days of receipt of the letter stating the negative recommendation. The Academic Dean immediately requests that the Clerk's Committee set up an Appeals Board.
March 1	The Appeals Board submits its report and recommendations to FAC within 40 days of the filing of the appeal.
April 10	FAC, if it so desires, responds to the Appeals Board recommendations within 20 days of the Appeals Board decision. The Academic Dean will then reconsider the original decision that is being appealed, the Appeals Board's findings and recommendations, and, if forthcoming, the FAC's written response to the Appeals Board's report and send his/her recommendation to the President within twenty calendar days of the Appeals Board's decision.
April 30	The President reviews all reports and recommendations and forwards his/her recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.
May 15	Date by which the faculty member is notified of the final decision on the review.