Executive Summary
Proposed Edits to the Faculty Handbook (H) & Bylaws (B)
Faculty Affairs Committee, March 2015

Issue #1: Sabbaticals
A. Sabbatical process needs simplifying in order for it to happen in a reasonable time frame.
B. Responsibility for ranking sabbatical applications should rest only with Advancement (language from previous drafts in which it was Faculty Development’s responsibility inadvertently included).
C. Rules regarding eligibility – both for full-time and part-time regular faculty – need clarification

Solutions:
A. Process streamlined and clarified.
B. Duties removed from Faculty Development Committee description, more fully explained in H & B sections on Advancement Committee.
C. Clarifications in H 4.4 & B 4.4.1.

Issue #2: Contradiction: Handbook says that members of Advancement should serve on Third-Year committees. Bylaws say that it should be a member of the Tenure and Promotion committee.

Solution: Membership of Third-Year committee revised

Issue #3: Shortage of tenured faculty to serve on Advancement, FAC and College/School TAP Committees.

Solution: Allow tenured faculty to serve on more than one under certain conditions.

Issue #4: Status of part-time regular faculty left unclear; descriptive language re. pro-rating needed.

Solution: Addition to H1.4.1.

Issue #5: Fuller description of Emeritus status needed.

Solution: Specify who is eligible, selection, timing, rights, and privileges.

Issue #6: The office hour requirement for faculty teaching at multiple campuses (and on line) is not clear.

Solution: The total number of office hours required by a faculty number is between five and seven hours, but these hours may be allocated proportionately between the various campuses.

Issue #7: Cumbersome procedure re. instructor absence.

Solution: Simplified.

Issue #8: No formal process for revisiting Departmental promotion & tenure guidelines
Solution: Chairs charged with reviewing every five years. Deans charged with reminding Chairs. Process inserted into descriptions of Tenure & Promotion Committees and Advancement Committee.

Issue #9: Description of Student Affairs Committee omitted.
Solution: Included

Issue #10: Charge of Core Curriculum Committee omitted.
Solution: Included

Issue #11: Advancement Committee’s responsibilities have always included making faculty aware of deadlines, policies, etc., related to advancement. This aspect of the Committee’s work was inadvertently omitted.
Solution: Now included

Issue #12: Conflict of interest when those serving on Advancement or TaP are themselves up for advancement.
Solution: Rule added re. temporary replacement in such cases.

Issue #13: Some Schools/Colleges do not have enough full professors to consistently provide members at that rank for TAP.
Solution: Rule relaxed.

Issue #14: Some established EPCC procedures for approval of new courses were omitted. Others were described erroneously.
Solution: additions/corrections

Issue #15: It sometimes happens that a Chair is not elected by Department faculty; description of hiring process for a Department Chair needs to be included.
Solution: Add language describing the circumstances that might necessitate hiring a Chair from outside and the process for doing so.

Issue #16: Membership of Academic Standards Committee does not include graduate school faculty.
Solution: Include graduate faculty.

Issue #17: Promotion process for contingent faculty stated incorrectly.
Solution: Correction

Issue #18: Description of BIT seems to imply that BIT is responsible for the welfare of faculty.
Solution: Correction
Issue #19: Section on retirement does not take into account timing of faculty replacement searches.
Solution: Retiring faculty urged to inform Chair and Dean earlier in the academic year.

Issue #20: Some policies outlined in the Employee Handbook do not apply to faculty.
Solution: Language added to Bylaws introduction and elsewhere.

Issue #21: The Abbey requires the Chair of Religious Studies to be a practicing Catholic.
Solution: Requirement made explicit in the Bylaws.

Issue #22: Regular procedure needed to ensure that faculty are reminded about sabbatical and tenure/promotion procedures and deadlines.
Solution: Advancement committee to provide information sessions covering the policies, procedures, and deadlines. Deans remind faculty and their Department Chairs of deadlines relevant to individual faculty.

Issue #23: Advancement Committee is variously called “Advancement,” “Faculty Advancement,” and “University Advancement.” It should have one name.
Solution: Consistently name the committee “Advancement” throughout.

Issue #24: Some programs exist within Departments. No reporting structure or other procedures described.
Solution: Description added.

Issue #25: Reporting structure unclear for staff within academic department.
Solution: Staff report to Chair.

Issue #26: Introduction to Handbook contains revision process that will be out of date at the start of the 2015-16 academic year.
Solution: Update.

Issue #27: Post-Tenure review process/timeline unclear.
Solution: Timeline and other clarifications added.

Issue #28: Annual Reports left out of descriptions of advancement portfolio.
Solution: Included.

Issue #29: Letters of support omitted from advancement process.
Solution: Included.

Issue #30: Limits on outside employment too stringent; some faculty’s outside employment essential to their professional practice/growth.
Solution: Insert the magic “typically.”
Issue #31: Description of ESL instructors’ teaching load left out of relevant section.
Solution: Included.

Issue #32: In transition from old to new handbook, language emphasizing effective teaching inadvertently omitted.
Solution: Included.

Issue #33: Rules for TAP review of promotions unworkable.
Solution: Simplified.
Issue #1: Sabbaticals

D. Sabbatical process needs simplifying in order for it to happen in a reasonable time frame.
E. Responsibility for ranking sabbatical applications should rest only with Advancement (language from previous drafts in which it was Faculty Development’s responsibility inadvertently included).
F. Rules regarding eligibility – both for full-time and part-time regular faculty – need clarification

Solutions:

D. Process streamlined and clarified.
E. Duties removed from Faculty Development Committee description, more fully explained in H & B sections on Advancement Committee.
F. Clarifications in H 4.4 & B 4.4.1.

H2.1.5.4. The Advancement Committee

The Advancement Committee oversees the faculty tenure and promotion process and evaluates and ranks sabbatical applications in order of merit before submitting these rankings to the Provost.

H 4.4. Sabbatical Leave

Sabbatical leaves are made available to Regular Faculty for the purpose of enabling them to engage in creative, intellectual or artistic activities appropriate to their discipline (i.e., research, writing, etc.).

Full-time Regular Faculty are eligible every seventh year of full-time continuous service to the University to apply for a sabbatical leave. In their sixth year of full-time continuous service to the University, regular full-time tenured faculty are eligible to apply for sabbatical leave the following year; eligibility of part-time Regular Faculty is pro-rated. E.g. In his/her thirteenth year of half-time continuous service to the University, a tenured Regular Faculty member is eligible to apply for sabbatical leave the following year.

Sabbatical leaves are approved by the University President, based on recommendations by the Faculty Development Committee, the Dean of the faculty member’s College/School, and the Provost, in that order and subject to budget.
availability. Advancement Committee and the Provost who may consult with the
faculty member’s Dean and/or Department Chair.

Faculty members are expected to submit written reports summarizing their professional
development while on sabbatical to the Department Chair, the Dean of their
College/School, and the Provost within six weeks after the conclusion of their sabbatical
leave. Faculty members are also obligated to complete a year of full-time teaching after
accessing a sabbatical.

B4.4.1. Eligibility

Any full time member of the Regular Faculty who has completed six (6) years of
continuous full time service to the University and has achieved tenure is eligible for a
sabbatical leave. In their sixth year of full-time continuous service to the University,
regular full-time tenured faculty are eligible to apply for sabbatical leave the following
year; eligibility of part-time Regular Faculty is pro-rated. E.g. In his/her thirteenth year
of half-time continuous service to the University, a tenured Regular Faculty member is
eligible to apply for sabbatical leave the following year. (See Bylaws Appendix F for
illustration.)

B4.4.2. Application Procedure

By September 20, the faculty member submits an application and supporting materials
to the University Advancement Committee and informs the Department Chair, Dean
and Provost that s/he has done so. The application should present the purpose that
will be served by the sabbatical and the proposed plan of activities; the application
should include a report from any prior sabbatical activities. and a recommendation by
the Chair in support of the application and arrangements concerning the continued
discharge of the applicant’s activities and responsibilities to the University during the
proposed sabbatical.

By October 10, TAP the Advancement Committee generates a written evaluation of
evaluates all applications from the College/School and ranks them in order of merit
before passing them on to the recommends their order of priority for funding to the
Dean of the College/School Provost. The evaluation of proposals should address the
following issues: the advantage to the applicant as a scholar and teacher; the advantage
to the applicant as a member of the College and University community; the subsequent
advantage to the University and the larger community.

By October 20, the Dean of the College/School adds a recommendation on the
candidacy of each applicant from his/her College/School and transmits the
applications and its recommendations to the University Advancement Committee.
By November 10, the University Advancement Committee evaluates the application and forwards their recommendation along with all supporting materials to the Provost.

By October 31, the Provost – who may consult with Department Chair and/or Dean – forwards the applications and the Advancement Committee recommendations, together with his/her own, to the President.

By December 1, the President considers all submitted materials and communicates his/her decision to the faculty member with copies to the Department Chair, Advancement Chair, Dean, and Provost. An applicant may request a review and re-evaluation of his/her application evaluation by the Provost and/or the President. As a courtesy, funded applicants are encouraged to consult with their Department Chair and provide them with advice and guidance regarding curricular matters.

B4.4.6. Sabbatical Report

Faculty members are expected to submit written reports summarizing their professional development while on sabbatical to the Department Chair, the Dean of their College/School, and the Provost within six weeks after the conclusion of their sabbatical leave. They should also present their sabbatical work at an appropriate faculty forum.

Illustration of Sabbatical Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Teaching At SMU</th>
<th>Sabbatical Year</th>
<th>Countdown Clock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010-1</td>
<td>6 hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011-2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012-3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013-4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2014-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015-6</td>
<td>1 eligible to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016-7</td>
<td>0 sabbatical, if granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017-8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2018-9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2022-3</td>
<td>1 eligible to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2023-4</td>
<td>0 sabbatical, if granted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue #2: Contradiction: Handbook says that members of Advancement should serve on Third-Year committees. Bylaws say that it should be a member of the Tenure and Promotion committee.

Solution: Membership of Third-Year committee revised:

B3.2.1. Composition of the Third Year Review Committee...

a. the candidate’s Department Chair
b. a tenured peer selected by the candidate
c. a member of the College Tenure and Promotions Committee Advancement Committee
Issue #3: Shortage of tenured faculty to serve on Advancement, FAC and College/School TAP Committees.

Solution: Allow tenured faculty to serve on more than one under certain conditions.

H2.1.5. Faculty Senate Committees

Important Qualifier

Regular Faculty may serve on only ONE among the following Faculty Committees at a time: University Advancement Committee, College/School Tenure and Promotion Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee.

In the event that a College or School is unable to elect faculty as designated above to serve on each of the above committees (because of the limited number of tenured and ranked faculty in the College/School), alternate arrangements will be made through consultation among the following: the Dean of the College/School, the Provost, the Faculty President, and / or members of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The School/College may elect a representative to serve on either the Advancement Committee or the College/School Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Faculty affairs Committee concurrently, but s/he must recuse him/herself from consideration of the file in case of an appeal.
Issue #4: Status of part-time regular faculty left unclear; descriptive language re. pro-rating needed.

Solution: Addition to H1.4.1. See below.

H1.4.1. Regular Faculty

... Regular Faculty typically hold full-time appointments, but under certain circumstances faculty may hold part-time appointments; this designation does not refer to faculty with part-time administrative duties, but refers only to Regular Faculty with half-time or three quarter-time contracts. For regular part-time faculty, a general guiding principle of pro-rating is applied for determining schedules for third year review, tenure, advancement, and post-tenure review. Regular part-time faculty undergo post-tenure review every five years, following the same schedule as other regular faculty.

If part-time faculty teach additional courses beyond their contractual appointment, they are compensated by a pro-rated increase in pay, up to a maximum of full-time, rather than at an adjunct rate. Regular part-time faculty maintain regularly scheduled office hours of lengths pro-rated to those required of full-time faculty. Regular part-time faculty receive available medical and retirement benefits and available faculty development funds at full, non-pro-rated, rates.
Issue #5: Fuller description of Emeritus status needed.
Solution: Specify who is eligible, selection, timing, rights, and privileges.

H1.4.3. Professors Emeriti

Regular faculty members may earn emeritus status upon retirement in recognition of meritorious service to the University. Regular Faculty who retire may be recommended to their Chair by any other regular faculty member. The Chair will forward his/her recommendation to the Dean, who, after endorsing the nomination, must present his/her candidacy to the Provost through a formal letter to the Provost. The honorary rank of Professor Emeritus takes effect post retirement.

This title acknowledges that:

a. The rank is granted in recognition of long-term, distinguished service to the University and denotes a position of highest honor. By definition, it is not automatically accorded; nor may faculty members apply for this rank. Sitting Deans, the Provost, and other full-time academic leaders who have never served as regular teaching faculty may not be granted emeritus status, since the title, though subject to final approval by the Board of Trustees, constitutes recognition by faculty peers of meritorious service to the University by colleagues in their roles as faculty.

b. Upon receiving a recommendation from the Department Chair (see Bylaws 1.3.3), the Dean of the College / School recommends candidates for Emeritus status to the Provost, who in turn recommends the candidate for Professor Emeritus to the President, who makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, who make the final decision in these cases.

B1.3.3 Procedures for Granting Emeritus Status

Any tenured Regular Faculty member may nominate a retiring colleague who qualifies for Emeritus status to the Chair of the appropriate department. The Chair will forward his/her recommendation to the Dean, who, after endorsing the nomination, must present his/her candidacy to the Provost through a formal letter representing the case for granting Emeritus status. The Provost considers the nomination and makes a recommendation to the University President who makes his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The decision to grant Emeritus status is granted by the Board of Trustees.

Professors Emeriti are granted their ranks for life. Teaching appointments, if given, are for one semester or one year at a time. They typically retain their e-mail account at Saint Martin’s, parking privileges, and access to the library and recreation facilities;
they are also included in University communications and invited to attend University functions, as appropriate. Professors Emeriti typically also have the following privileges:

- Notification of retirement, and the awarding of the honorary rank of Professor Emeritus, in both internal and external media;
- Discounts at University events and the University bookstore;
- Request that their name be retained in the Academic catalogue and on appropriate webpages
- Course auditing – informal auditing of courses at no charge, provided that space is available, with the consent of the offering department or school and the faculty member teaching the course prior to the first class meeting.

Access to email, parking, and other privileges should be renewed annually upon recommendation of Department Chair.
Issue #6: *The office hour requirement for faculty teaching at multiple campuses (and online) is not clear.*

Solution: *The total number of office hours required by a faculty member is between five and seven hours, but these hours may be allocated proportionately between the various campuses.*

H5.1. General Expectations: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Regular faculty at Saint Martin’s University have three distinct but essential duties: to teach, to engage in scholarship, and to serve the University and community by engaging in activities such as committee work, recruiting events, student life, and the like. Regular full-time faculty are typically expected to be on campus at least four days a week during each regular semester of the academic year so that they can fulfill their teaching and other responsibilities. **Faculty members who teach on multiple campuses during the same semester may divide their on-campus time and their office hours proportionately among different campuses as appropriate.**

H5.5. Maintaining Office Hours

Regular Faculty and continuing Contingent Faculty members are expected to be available to their students through appointments as well as through regularly-scheduled office hours during the semesters in which they teach. It is recommended that Faculty post a schedule of their office hours and submit a copy of their hours to their Dean. **Regular Faculty members are typically expected to maintain five – seven office hours a week. Some office hours, especially in the case of faculty who teach online, may be held online with approval by the Department Chair.** Faculty members who teach on multiple campuses during the same semester, office hours may be proportionately divided between the different campuses. **Faculty members who teach on multiple campuses during the same semester may divide their on-campus time and their office hours proportionately among different campuses as appropriate.**

B2.2.4. Departmental Procedures and Faculty Responsibilities

Teaching

Faculty are required to meet their classes as scheduled. All class cancelations for any reason have to be recorded by faculty members with the Department Chair.

Regular full-time Faculty are typically present on campus at least four days a week during the academic year, which starts formally at Convocation and ends at Commencement. **Faculty members who teach on multiple campuses during the same semester may divide their on-campus time and their office hours**
proportionately among different campuses as appropriate. Some office hours, especially in the case of faculty who teach online, may be held online with approval by the Department Chair and Dean.

B5.2. Other Responsibilities and Duties
Presence on Campus

Regular part-time and full time faculty members are normally expected to be on campus on days during which they are scheduled to teach. In any event, Regular Faculty are minimally expected to be on campus four days a week during the academic year. Continuing Contingent Faculty, such as ESL Instructors, are expected to be on campus during the period of their contract. Faculty members who teach on multiple campuses during the same semester may divide their on-campus time proportionately among different campuses as appropriate.

Office Hours

Each faculty member establishes and posts regular and adequate office hours. These are distributed throughout the week. A minimum of five hours are scheduled by Regular Faculty, although scheduled office hours and meeting times should reflect the number of academic advisees assigned to a faculty member, and additional office hours may be needed during registration and examination periods. ESL Instructors are expected to keep regular office hours as recommended by the Chief International Programs Officer. Some office hours, especially in the case of faculty who teach online, may be held online with approval by the Department Chair and Dean. Faculty members who teach on multiple campuses during the same semester may divide their office hours proportionately among different campuses as appropriate.
Issue #7: *Cumberose procedure re. instructor absence.*
Solution: *Simplified.*

**H5.3.** Course Syllabi and Teaching Responsibilities
Faculty must meet their assigned classes at the scheduled times. Changes in the schedule requested by the instructor are approved by the Department Chair, communicated by the Chair to the Registrar. If, for some valid reason, the instructor cannot meet a class, he/she informs the Chair, who will notify the students of the cancellation of the class and inform the Dean. If a longer-term absence is foreseen, the Department Chair is notified by the faculty member. If an instructor must cancel more than one class, s/he notifies the Department Chair and Dean to ensure that arrangements, satisfactory to assuring student progress, are made. with the Dean.

**B2.2.4.** Departmental Procedures and Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty are required to meet their classes as scheduled. All class cancellations for any reason have to be recorded by faculty members with the Department Chair. Faculty must meet their assigned classes at the scheduled times. Changes in the schedule requested by the instructor are approved by the Department Chair and communicated by the Chair to the Registrar. If, for some valid reason, the instructor cannot meet a class, he/she notifies the Registrar and the students of the cancellation of the class. If an instructor must cancel more than one class, s/he notifies the Department Chair and Dean to ensure that arrangements, satisfactory to assuring student progress, are made.

Also see B5.2.
**Issue #8:** No formal process for revisiting Departmental promotion & tenure guidelines  
**Solution:** Chairs charged with reviewing every five years. Deans charged with reminding Chairs. Process inserted into descriptions of Tenure & Promotion Committees and Advancement Committee.

**H2.2.5.1.** Department Chairs

- Initiate the creation of Departmental documentation on Faculty advancement by consulting all members of the Department; submit the documentation to the Dean for cross-departmental parity in expectations; work with the faculty in the Department to evolve written tenure and promotion guidelines, especially in the category of scholarly/creative activity, disciplinary currency within the Academy, and disciplinary credibility of faculty among their academic peers within and outside SMU; in consultation with Department faculty, re-visit tenure and promotion guidelines every five years, and submit any proposed revisions to TaP and Dean;

**H1.3.2.** Deans

...The Deans have direct responsibility for:

- Keeping track and notifying Faculty of schedules for the advancement and post-tenure review of Faculty within the School/College.

**H2.1.5.4.** The Advancement Committee

...When a Department, in consultation with the appropriate Tenure and Promotion Committee and College/School Dean, proposes revisions to its tenure and promotion guidelines, Advancement vets the guidelines before passing them on to the Provost.

**B2.2.2.1.** College/School Tenure and Promotions Committee (TAP)

...TAP will also review any proposed revisions to guidelines submitted by Department Chairs and, following the same process, will consult with the College/School Dean before passing on the revisions to Advancement for vetting.
Issue #9: Description of Student Affairs Committee omitted.
Solution: Included, as follows:

H2.3.1.12. Student Affairs Committee

The Committee reviews policies affecting student life and recommendations for improving conditions and policies as they affect student affairs; recommends policies governing extra-curricular activities; and serves as a liaison body among University constituencies on matters such as student publications, social conduct, and the student role in University governance.

Membership:

- Dean of Students
- Two faculty members (elected at large for two-year terms)
- One staff member appointed by the Dean of Students
- Two undergraduate students and one graduate student elected by the Student Senate
**Issue #10:** Charge of Core Curriculum Committee omitted.
**Solution:** As follows:

**H2.1.5.2. The University Core Curriculum Committee**

The Saint Martin’s Core provides a foundation of courses which are collectively designed to expose students to diverse ways of thinking and to provide the intellectual, spiritual and ethical base for meaningful, satisfying and productive lives. In consultation with the Director of the Core, the Core Committee defines the qualifications of Core courses; implements, oversees and evaluates the Saint Martin’s Core; and may initiates revisions to the curriculum to ensure that it is current and responsive to changes in the Academy as well as evolving needs of students.

**Other Duties and Responsibilities:**

The Committee, in consultation with the Director of the Core:

- determines the need for, and solicits the creation of, new courses designed to meet the needs of the Core program;
- coordinates faculty development opportunities that specifically target the Core;
- provides for the resolution of student appeals and requests for exceptions to the core program, in consultation with Department Chairs as needed;
- reviews courses for inclusion in the Core and recommends courses for inclusion in the program to the Faculty Senate. Courses approved by the committee are submitted to the faculty for a three-week comment period; comments are resolved by the committee. If a comment remains unresolved, the action is put to a vote of the faculty senate;
- systematically reviews the Core program every five years.

When the Committee recommends a significant change requiring the Board of Trustees’ approval, the recommendation is forwarded to EPCC; if approved, EPCC forwards the proposed change to the Senate and full faculty for approval. The Provost makes final decisions on recommendations made by the Core Committee and forwards these, as appropriate, to the University President or Board of Trustees.
**Issue #11:** Advancement Committee’s responsibilities have always included making faculty aware of deadlines, policies, etc., related to advancement. This aspect of the Committee’s work was inadvertently omitted.

**Solution:** Now included:

H2.1.5.4. The Advancement Committee

... The committee is responsible for ensuring that faculty are aware of all deadlines, guidelines, policies and procedures related to the advancement and sabbatical application processes.
**Issue #12:** Conflict of interest when those serving on Advancement or TaP are themselves up for advancement.

**Solution:** Rule added re. temporary replacement in such cases.

**H2.1.5.4.** The Advancement Committee

... Faculty representatives serve three-year terms. Faculty members who are themselves applying for advancement may not serve on this committee; if a sitting member of the committee applies for advancement, an appropriate substitute will be elected to serve as a replacement for the academic year.

**B2.2.2.1.** College/School Tenure and Promotions Committee (TAP)

...Faculty members who are themselves applying for advancement may not serve on this committee; if a sitting member of the committee applies for advancement, an appropriate substitute will be elected to serve as a replacement for the academic year.
**Issue #13:** Some Schools/Colleges do not have enough full professors to consistently provide members at that rank for TAP.

**Solution:** Rule relaxed.

**B2.2.2.1.** College/School Tenure and Promotions Committee (TAP)

TAP will consist of three faculty members elected from the full-time tenured and promoted faculty members in the College or School. **If possible, at least one of the three elected members should be a full Professor.** If this proves impossible because the College/School does not have a significant number of eligible candidates at the rank of full Professor, the Dean will work with the Chair of the Faculty to identify a full Professor from a related discipline in another College or School.
**Issue #14:** Some established EPCC procedures for approval of new courses were omitted. Others were described erroneously.

**Solution:** The following additions/corrections:

**H2.1.5.3.** Educational Policies and Curriculum Committee – University level

...The University EPCC reviews and initiates changes in the academic policies and academic standards prescribed under the academic information section of the official University Catalog. The Committee also reviews and may initiate changes in the University curriculum. The Committee’s reviews, recommendations, and approvals are forwarded to Senate before going to the full faculty for approval. Procedures regarding deliberations of the Educational Policies and Curriculum Committee are determined by the Committee itself. The Provost makes final decisions on recommendations made by EPCC and forwards these, as appropriate, to the University President or Board of Trustees. [sentence moved to H2.2.1.]

**H2.2.1.** College/School Assembly

...New programs and academic initiatives proposed by a College/School are formally approved by the Faculty in College/School Assembly except when the Faculty elects a College/School EPCC to undertake this task on its behalf. New programs, majors, and academic initiatives, when proposed by the faculty in a College/School, are forwarded, along with a recommendation by the Dean, to the University EPCC after approval either by the Faculty in College/School Assembly or by their representatives on College/School EPCC. New courses may be forwarded directly to the University EPCC with endorsement by the Department Chair/Program Director and the Dean. When the EPCC passes a proposed new course, the proposal is forwarded to the faculty for comment. If there are objections, the EPCC works with the interested parties in order to find a solution; if a solution cannot be reached, the matter is referred to the Senate. When the Committee passes a proposed new program or a significant program change requiring the Board of Trustees’ approval, the proposal is forwarded to the Senate for approval. The Provost makes final decisions on recommendations made by EPCC and forwards these, as appropriate, to the University President or Board of Trustees.
**Issue #15:** *It sometimes happens that a Chair is not elected by Department faculty; description of hiring process for a Department Chair needs to be included.*  
**Solution:** *Add language describing the circumstances that might necessitate hiring a Chair from outside and the process for doing so.*

**H2.2.5.1. Department Chairs**

The Department Chair serves as the academic leader within his/her Department. Departments elect their Chair, typically from among the tenured Regular Faculty and recommend his/her appointment to the Dean of the College/School, who finalizes the appointment. *Under special circumstances, a Department Chair may – with the consent of the majority of the department’s regular faculty – request that the Provost and Dean approve the hiring of the new faculty member to serve as Department Chair.*  
Department Chairs, *including those hired from outside the department*, are appointed to three-year terms and are subject to evaluation by the Department faculty and Dean prior to expiration of their appointed term and may be reappointed, in accordance with procedures outlined in the *Bylaws*. The selection and reappointment process for Department Chairs is outlined in greater detail in the *Faculty Bylaws, 2.2.3.*

**B2.2.3.1. Procedures for Electing Department Chairs and Program Directors within a College/School**

Election of the Chair is overseen by an external Chair. Chairs are elected by the Regular Faculty in a Department. The Dean is notified by the Department or Program about the election. The Provost appoints elected Department Chairs and Program Directors within a College/School, upon recommendation by the Department or Program and the Dean, for three-year terms that are renewable subject to evaluation and re-election by the faculty.

*Under special circumstances (if, for example, all the faculty in a department are newly-hired junior faculty), a Department Chair may – with the consent of the department’s regular faculty (indicated by a majority vote overseen by an external chair) – request that the Provost and Dean approve the hiring of the new faculty member to serve as Department Chair.*  
In the search to hire a new Chair, all regular departmental faculty may serve on the search committee if they choose, or, if the committee is large, they may arrange to advise/consult with members.
**Issue #16:** Membership of Academic Standards Committee does not include graduate school faculty.

**Solution:** Include graduate faculty.

**H2.3.1.1. Academic Standards**

...The Committee consists of Regular Faculty elected from the Colleges and Schools as follows: two members from the College of A & S; one member each from the College of Education, School of Business, and the School of Engineering. **At least one member of the Committee must be a faculty member who teaches graduate courses.**


**Issue #17:** Promotion process for contingent faculty stated incorrectly.

**Solution:** Correction below.

**H1.4.2.** Contingent Faculty

... Contingent Faculty members are not eligible to apply for tenure, but **Department Chairs and Deans may recommend** certain categories of **ranked** Contingent Faculty **may apply** for promotion **to the Provost**, in accordance with the requirements as represented below. Procedures for applying for promotion are outlined in Bylaws, 1.3.3.
**Issue #18:** Description of BIT seems to imply that BIT is responsible for the welfare of faculty.

**Solution:** As follows:

**H2.3.1.3. Behavior Intervention Team (BIT)**

The charter and responsibilities of BIT, which attends to student and employee welfare, are detailed in the *Employee Handbook*. Two faculty representatives are appointed by the Chief Student Affairs Officer from among faculty with expertise/scholarship in the area of mental health/psychology/counseling and/or social work.

The responsibilities of BIT do not extend to faculty. Faculty issues are resolved through appropriate channels described here (such as the grievance process) and in the *Employee Handbook*. 
Issue #19: Section on retirement does not take into account timing of faculty replacement searches.

Solution: Retiring faculty urged to inform Chair and Dean earlier in the academic year.

H8.1.5. Retirement

In keeping with AAUP recommendations, at the time of initial appointment and periodically thereafter, faculty will be “both counseled and urged to inform themselves about their retirement options and benefits” by the Chief Human Resources Officer of the University.

Faculty members should notify University leaders of their decision to retire as far in advance as possible in order to facilitate timely searches and appointments of replacement faculty. E.g., a faculty member intending to retire in May 2014 should notify his/her Department Chair and Dean as early as possible in the fall semester, and ideally no later than November 15th 2013, so that the Department, if approved to do so, can conduct a search for the 2014-15 academic year. Faculty should note that ordinarily, authorization of tenure track searches for appointments in the subsequent year are made by October. Also, retirements typically occur at the end of the academic year and exclude the summer term. A retiring faculty member may request to teach in the summer immediately following retirement for the specified percentage of his / her yearly salary; teaching assignments are approved by the Provost subject to programmatic and student needs.
**Issue #20:** Some policies outlined in the Employee Handbook do not apply to faculty.

**Solution:** Language added to Bylaws introduction and elsewhere.

...In the event of a conflict between the Employee Handbook and the Faculty Handbook and/or Bylaws with respect to faculty policies, the Faculty Handbook takes precedence.
Issue #21: *The Abbey requires the Chair of Religious Studies to be a practicing Catholic.*

**Solution:** *Requirement made explicit in the Bylaws.*

**B2.2.3.1.** Procedures for Electing Department Chairs and Program Directors within a College/School

...Typically, Chairs who have served two consecutive full terms will not be considered for a successive third term if there are other eligible candidates within the Department.

*Under agreement with the Saint Martin’s Abbey, the Chair of the Religious Studies Department must be a practicing Catholic.*
**Issue #22:** Regular procedure needed to ensure that faculty are reminded about sabbatical and tenure/promotion procedures and deadlines.

**Solution:** Advancement committee to provide information sessions covering the policies, procedures, and deadlines. Deans remind faculty and their Department Chairs of deadlines relevant to individual faculty.

H2.1.5.4. The Advancement Committee

The committee is responsible for ensuring that faculty are aware of all deadlines, guidelines, policies and procedures related to the advancement and sabbatical application processes.

B3. PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR FACULTY ADVANCEMENT

SMU appoints tenure-track faculty intending to support their professional growth towards tenure, and through the course of their career, to advancement in rank to Associate and full Professor.

Each semester, the Advancement Committee is responsible for hosting an information session to ensure that faculty are aware of all deadlines, guidelines, policies and procedures related to the advancement and sabbatical application processes.

H1.3.2. Deans

...The Deans have direct responsibility for:

... *Keeping track and notifying Faculty of schedules for the advancement and post-tenure review of Faculty within the School/College.
**Issue #23:** Advancement Committee is variously called “Advancement,” “Faculty Advancement,” and “University Advancement.” It should have one name.

**Solution:** Consistently name the committee “Advancement” throughout.

For example:

Handbook Table of Contents:

- **H2.1.5.** Faculty Committees
  - H2.1.5.1. Academic Computer Advisory Council
  - H2.1.5.2. The University Core Curriculum Committee
    - H2.1.5.2.1. Committee on the First (& Second) Year Experience
  - H2.1.5.3. Educational Policies and Curriculum Committee – University level
  - H2.1.5.4. **Faculty** Advancement Committee

**Another example:**

- **H2.2.2** College/School Committees

College/School Faculty may create Committees to undertake the work of the College/School. E.g., a College EPCC which approves and forwards new program and course proposals to the University EPCC, and College/School Tenure and Promotions Committee which forwards their recommendations regarding faculty promotion and tenure to the **University** Advancement Committee.
Issue #24: Some programs exist within Departments. No reporting structure or other procedures described.
Solution: Description added.

H2.2.4. Departmental and Cross-departmental Programs

Academic programs, whether within a Department or cross-departmental or cross-College/School are overseen by faculty Directors.

Programs within a Department may be led by a Director who is appointed by consensus within the Department and reports to the Department Chair. Typically, Program Directors are not given release time. Exceptions are approved by the Provost.
**Issue #25:** *Reporting structure unclear for staff within academic department.*  
**Solution:** *Staff report to Chair*

**H1.1.3. Academic and Academic Support Offices**

...Directors of University-wide academic support offices which serve the University community across Colleges/Schools report to the Provost. Academic support functions within individual Colleges/Schools report to the Dean of the College/School. **Academic support functions within a Department report to the Department Chair.**
Issue #26: Introduction to Handbook contains revision process that will be out of date at the start of the 2015-16 academic year.
Solution: Update as follows:

Addendum

Revisions may be made in accordance with the above processes at any time. However, the Faculty Affairs Committee and Provost will monitor the application of the Faculty Bylaws through the course of its first year of implementation, record all modifications that are needed, and present these to the Faculty, Deans, and academic staff for their input by April 10, and then to the University President for consideration by April 20 of the following year, and for final approval to the Board of Trustees at their next convened meeting.

The entire Handbook and Bylaws, once approved, will be assessed for their effectiveness by the Faculty Affairs Committee and Provost on behalf of the Faculty, Deans, and academic staff after three full years of first implementation. During the 2017-18 academic year, the Committee will make necessary revisions in consultation with the Faculty and the Provost and present the revised documents to the Faculty, and subsequently to the Board of Trustees, for approval, revised in the fourth year in accordance with identifiable and necessary directions, and reaffirmed by the Faculty prior to approval by University leaders and the Board. Subsequent assessments will typically be undertaken in decennial cycles.
**Issue #27:** Post-Tenure review process/timeline unclear.

**Solution:** Timeline and other clarifications added.

**B4.5. Post-tenure Faculty Development and Review Procedures/Timeline**

In every fifth year after achieving tenure, each faculty member will undergo formal evaluation overseen by his/her Chair, who will organize the review in consultation with the faculty member. **If a Department Chair is scheduled for post-tenure review, s/he should, in consultation with the Dean, find another Department Chair to oversee the evaluation.** The faculty member may request that one other faculty member of his or her choice from inside or outside the Department join the Chair in the peer review. The Chair will prepare a report summarizing findings of the multiple sourced evaluations.

**By May 1 of each academic year,** the College/School Dean notifies all faculty members coming up for post-tenure review and reminds them of the schedule/deadlines for the coming fall. Notification is copied to the appropriate Chairs.

By September 7, the Provost prepares and publishes a schedule indicating deadlines for each of the steps in the ongoing development and review process sends it to faculty members **will be scheduled for ongoing evaluation up for post-tenure review.**

**By October 1,** a faculty member **up for review** submits the following materials in a portfolio not to exceed six pages (excluding any student evaluations) to his/her Chair:

**by Wednesday of the first week of October each year:**

a. a narrative description of activities addressing teaching effectiveness; scholarly, creative, or interpretive activity; and service to the University community;

b. student evaluations of all courses taught in the previous year;

c. any additional information

While these materials are to be submitted to the Chair every year as part of the faculty member’s Annual Report, the formal more extensive review of these materials will occur during every fifth year of teaching. The fifth year period beginning date commences from the date on which tenure begins or the academic year following the last ongoing evaluation period, whichever occurs last (see illustration of typical review schedule below).

**By November 7, the Chair will discuss the resulting evaluation will be shared and discussed with the faculty member. by November 7th of the same year.** The faculty member will be given the opportunity to attach comments to the report.
By November 15, before it the Chair sends the report is sent to the Dean of the College/School.

By November 20, the Dean of the College/School will add a one-two page evaluative report and share a copy of the same with the faculty member and Department Chair.

By November 27, and after ensuring that the faculty member and Chair have no additional comments in response to this evaluation that they might want to attach as an addendum to their original evaluation, the Dean will forward the whole portfolio of materials to the Provost. The Provost may schedule a meeting with the faculty member and his/her Chair and Dean to discuss the evaluation.

By Dec 10, the post-tenure review concludes when:

- if the Provost deems the faculty member’s performance satisfactory without any areas of concern s/he notifies the faculty member with a copy to the Dean and Chair

  or

- if areas of concern are identified, the Provost works with the Chair and Dean, to develop and implement a plan year to address them. If agreement on the plan cannot be reached, the Faculty Affairs Committee may be asked to assist in reaching final agreement on the development plan.

Faculty members who have agreed to follow a plan of improvement will report on their progress in subsequent Annual Reports (see H5.9).

The post-tenure timeline will be suspended if it coincides with the year in which a faculty member applies for promotion; the cycle of post-tenure reviews will continue every fifth year post promotion.
**Issue #28:** Annual Reports left out of descriptions of advancement portfolio.

**Solution:** Included.

H5.9., B2.2.4., B3.2.2.

...Annual Reports are included in all portfolios submitted for purposes of advancement.

B3.2.2.h., B3.3.2.i

...All Annual Reports (see HB 5.9.) to date.
Issue #29: Letters of support omitted from advancement process.
Solution: Included.

B3.3.1.

• By August 1, the faculty member must notify their Department Chair of their intention to submit an application for tenure; upon notification, within seven days, the Chair informs the Faculty of the application, inviting letters of comment and support (which may be sent either to the Department Chair or to the Chair of the candidate’s school/college TAP, see B3.3.2);

B3.3.2

...All letters from colleagues and/or others to be included in the candidate’s file should be addressed to the candidate’s school or college Tenure and Promotion Committee, and must be either included in the packet submitted by the candidate to his/her Department Chair, or submitted directly to the Department Chair by August 15. These letters become part of the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion file, and are available to each of the bodies which review the file. Other than the letters generated by the Chair, Tenure and Promotion Committee, Dean, and Provost, letters cannot be added to the candidate’s file after August 15. These letters are given to the candidate upon completion of the tenure and/or promotion processes; or should there be an appeal, during the candidate’s preparation for an appeal.
**Issue #30:** Limits on outside employment too stringent; some faculty’s outside employment essential to their professional practice/growth.

**Solution:** Insert the magic “typically.”

**B6.2.** Outside Employment

...In any event **Typically,** no full-time Regular Faculty member **may will** be approved to undertake outside employment during the regular academic semesters that exceeds eight weekly hours of work.

**B6.3.** Consulting

...Departments whose members are likely to be called upon as consultants must have written Department policies which state specific terms concerning length of time and number of hours (which **typically** may not exceed eight weekly hours during the regular semesters of the academic year) to be spent on consulting. Consulting assignments must also identify use of University laboratories and equipment (for which the University reserves the right to charge a fee and/or impose contractual obligations with regard to usage, etc.) to the Dean.
**Issue #31**: Description of ESL instructors’ teaching load left out of relevant section.  
**Solution**: Included.

**B7.2.** Contingent Faculty Teaching Loads

*...ESL Instructors*

Contingent Faculty workloads are typically 3 ESL courses (9 hours in the classroom per week) each semester. In special circumstances a Contingent ESL Instructor’s workload may extend to, but shall not exceed, four ESL courses (12 hours in the classroom per week) in each semester.

- A Contingent ESL Instructor teaching one ESL course (3 hours in the classroom per week) during a regular semester carries a total work load of 6 weekly hours;

- A Contingent ESL Instructor teaching two ESL courses (6 hours in the classroom per week) during the regular semester carries a total work load of 12 weekly hours;

- A Contingent ESL Instructor teaching three ESL courses (9 hours in the classroom per week) during the regular semester carries a work load of 18 weekly hours;

- A Contingent ESL Instructor teaching four ESL courses (12 hours in the classroom per week) during the regular semester carries a work load of 24 weekly hours.

ESL Instructors must liaise with the Director of the ESL program before considering / undertaking teaching or work-load commitments outside the ESL program. The Provost’s Office monitors the work loads of Contingent Faculty across the University.
**Issue #32:** *In transition from old to new handbook, language emphasizing effective teaching inadvertently omitted.*

**Solution:** *Included.*

B3.2.4. (and elsewhere)

*Teaching Effectiveness*

To evaluate the candidate’s teaching abilities, the Committee should consider the relevant materials submitted for review in the applicant’s file. At least two members of the Committee should make class observations of the candidate during the fall semester of the candidate’s third-year. *Among the three criteria for faculty advancement, effective teaching is of paramount importance; strong performance in the other two areas (service and scholarship) cannot compensate for poor teaching; scholarly accomplishment, service to the University community, and strong teaching are all essential for advancement.*
Issue #33: Rules for TAP review of promotions unworkable.
Solution: Simplified.

3.4. Procedures for Applying for Promotion

Applications for tenure and promotion may be submitted simultaneously. Candidates must indicate their intent to apply for both and all evaluators must indicate their vote regarding both applications as separate considerations of each.

Applications for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are reviewed by all three members of TAP and all members of the University Advancement committee. All members of these committees have to be ranked at the Associate professor level or above. Applications for promotion to the rank of full Professor are reviewed by full professors who serve on TAP and full professors who serve on the University Advancement Committee.