

FACULTY BYLAWS

Contents

INTRODUCTION	87
B1. ACADEMIC STRUCTURE.....	88
B1.1. COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, DIVISIONS, AND ACADEMIC OFFICES	88
B1.1.1. <i>Procedures for making changes (e.g. merging, splitting, adding) to Colleges or Schools</i>	88
B1.1.2. <i>Procedures for making changes (e.g. merging, splitting, adding) to Divisions</i>	88
B1.1.3. <i>Procedures for adding or making changes (e.g. merging, splitting, adding moving) to Departments and Programs</i>	88
B1.1.4. <i>Procedures for placing a College/School, Division, Department, or Program in Academic Receivership.....</i>	89
B1.1.5. <i>Procedures for closing Schools, Colleges, Divisions, Departments, or Programs.....</i>	90
B1.2. ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP/LEADERS.....	90
B1.2.1. <i>Procedures for Selecting and Appointing the Provost.....</i>	90
B1.2.2. <i>Procedures for Selecting and Appointing Deans.....</i>	91
B1.2.3. <i>Procedures for Evaluating Deans.....</i>	91
B1.2.3.1. <i>Procedures for Evaluating College/School Deans</i>	91
B1.2.3.2. <i>Procedures for Evaluating Division Deans and Associate Deans of University-wide Programs.....</i>	92
B1.3. THE FACULTY	93
B1.3.1. <i>Procedures for Recruiting and Appointing Regular Faculty</i>	93
B1.3.1.1. <i>Procedures for Requesting Faculty Hires</i>	93
B1.3.1.2. <i>Procedures for Appointing Regular Faculty.....</i>	96
B1.3.2. <i>Procedures for Appointing Contingent Faculty</i>	97
B1.3.3. <i>Procedures for Granting Emeritus Status.....</i>	98
B1.3.4. <i>Procedures for Appointing Librarians.....</i>	98
B1.3.5. <i>Policies Pertaining to Documents and Records</i>	100
B1.3.5.1. <i>Pre-Employment File</i>	100
B1.3.5.2. <i>Official Personnel File.....</i>	100
B2. GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES.....	101
B2.1. PROCEDURES RELATING TO FACULTY (SELF) GOVERNANCE: UNIVERSITY LEVEL	101
B2.1.1. <i>The Conduct of Full Faculty Assembly</i>	101
B2.1.2. <i>The Conduct of Faculty Senate</i>	102
B2.1.3. <i>Procedures for Electing the Faculty President.....</i>	102
B2.1.4. <i>Procedures for Electing Faculty Committees and Replacement Rules</i>	103
B2.2. PROCEDURES RELATING TO FACULTY (SELF) GOVERNANCE: COLLEGE/SCHOOL LEVEL	103
B2.2.1. <i>Conduct of College/School Assembly</i>	103
B2.2.2. <i>Procedures for Creating Faculty Committees at the College/School Level</i>	104
B2.2.2.1. <i>College/School Tenure and Promotion Committee (TAP)</i>	104
B2.2.3. <i>Procedures for the Election, Appointment, and Evaluation of Department Chairs and Faculty Program Directors.....</i>	104
B2.2.3.1. <i>Procedures for Electing Department Chairs and Program Directors within a.....</i>	104
College/School	104
B2.2.3.2. <i>Procedures for Removing a Departmentally-Elected Chair from Office</i>	105
B2.2.3.3. <i>Procedures for Evaluating Department Chairs within a College/School</i>	106
B2.2.4. <i>Departmental Procedures and Faculty Responsibilities.....</i>	106
B2.3. PROCEDURES RELATING TO SHARED GOVERNANCE.....	108
B2.3.1. <i>Procedures for Electing Faculty to University Committees.....</i>	108
B2.3.2. <i>Procedures governing Faculty Participation in Board of Trustees (BOT) Committees</i>	109
B3. PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR FACULTY ADVANCEMENT	110
B3.1. PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE FIRST-YEAR REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	111
B3.1.1. <i>The Department Chair conducts class visitations of all first-year tenure-track faculty.</i>	111

B3.1.2.	<i>A meeting is held between the Department Chair and the first-year tenure-track faculty member by January 15 to answer any employment-related questions and so that the Chair can provide an assessment of the faculty member's classroom performance.</i>	111
B3.1.3.	<i>The Department Chair writes an evaluation of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses and transmits it along with his/her recommendation regarding renewal to the Dean and the faculty member by February 1.</i>	111
B3.1.4.	<i>An opportunity is afforded to the faculty member to respond in writing to the evaluation; this response must be submitted to the Chair with a copy to the Dean by February 15.</i>	111
B3.1.5.	<i>A recommendation to renew or not renew the faculty member beyond the current academic year is made by the Dean to the Provost by March 1 based on the recommendation by the Chair.</i>	111
B3.1.6.	<i>A decision to renew or not renew the faculty member beyond the current academic year is made by the Provost no later than by March 15; a copy of the decision is sent to the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean.</i>	112
B3.2.	PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE THIRD-YEAR REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	112
B3.2.1.	<i>Composition of the Third-year Review Committee</i>	112
B3.2.2.	<i>Procedure and Documentation</i>	112
B3.2.3.	<i>Timeline</i>	113
B3.2.4.	<i>The Committee's Evaluation Criteria</i>	114
B3.2.5.	<i>The Role of the Review Committee</i>	116
B3.3.	PROCEDURES FOR APPLYING FOR TENURE	116
B3.3.1.	<i>Timeline</i>	116
B3.3.2.	<i>Tenure and/or Promotion Portfolio</i>	118
B3.4.	PROCEDURES FOR APPLYING FOR PROMOTION	119
B3.4.1.	<i>Criteria</i>	119
B3.4.2.	<i>Timeline</i>	121
B3.5.	SALARY INCREASES	122
B4.	PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA WHICH ATTEND TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT	123
B4.1.	CONFERENCES AND RESEARCH / DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT	123
B4.2.	SELECTION / APPOINTMENT OF MENTOR AND THE MENTORING PROGRAM	123
B4.2.1.	<i>Objectives</i>	123
B4.2.2.	<i>Timeline</i>	123
B4.2.3.	<i>Procedures</i>	124
B4.2.4.	<i>Confidentiality Policy</i>	124
B4.3.	APPLICATIONS PROCESS FOR JUNIOR FACULTY FOURTH-YEAR TEACHING REDUCTION	124
B4.3.1.	<i>Procedures and Timeline</i>	124
B4.4.	PROCEDURES FOR APPLYING FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES	125
B4.4.1.	<i>Eligibility</i>	125
B4.4.2.	<i>Application Procedure</i>	125
B4.4.3.	<i>Length of Sabbatical Leave</i>	126
B4.4.4.	<i>Sabbatical Agreement</i>	126
B4.4.5.	<i>Salaried Activities during Sabbatical Leave</i>	126
B4.4.6.	<i>Sabbatical Report</i>	126
B4.5.	POST-TENURE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PROCEDURES/TIMELINE	127
B4.6.	APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR LEAVES OF ABSENCE	129
B4.6.1.	<i>Criteria and Important Dates</i>	129
B4.6.2.	<i>Procedure</i>	129
B5.	STANDARDS, CRITERIA, AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY	130
B5.1.	GENERAL EXPECTATIONS: TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE	130
B5.2.	OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES	130
B6.	TIMELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY CONTRACTS/APPOINTMENT LETTERS	132

B6.1. FACULTY CONTRACTS/APPOINTMENT LETTERS	132
<i>B6.1.1. Terms Specified on Letters of Appointment and / or Faculty Contracts</i>	132
<i>B6.1.2. Contract Changes</i>	133
<i>B6.1.3. Contract / Letters of Appointment Negotiations</i>	133
B6.2. OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT	133
B6.3. CONSULTING	134
B7. PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING AND ASSIGNING FACULTY WORKLOAD.....	134
B7.1. STANDARD TEACHING LOAD FOR REGULAR FACULTY.....	135
<i>B7.1.1. Calculation of Studies and Independent Studies in Workload</i>	135
B7.2. CONTINGENT FACULTY TEACHING LOADS	135
<i>B7.2.1. Sample Loads</i>	135
B7.3. PROCEDURES GOVERNING REDUCTIONS IN TEACHING LOAD.....	136
<i>B7.3.1. Calculation of Directed Studies and Independent Studies in Workload</i>	137
<i>B7.3.2. Types of Reductions in Teaching Load</i>	137
B7.3.2.1. Approved Reductions	137
B7.3.2.2. Unplanned Reductions	137
B7.4. PROCEDURES FOR ASSIGNING AND CALCULATING TEACHING OVERLOADS	137
B7.5. PROCEDURES FOR ASSIGNING SUMMER TEACHING AND/OR OTHER ASSIGNMENTS.....	137
B8. PROCEDURES FOR APPLYING FOR BENEFITS SPECIFIC TO FACULTY	138
B8.1. LEAVE FOR EXPECTANT MOTHERS.....	138
B8.2. PARENTAL SUPPORT THROUGH REDUCED TEACHING.....	138
B8.3. EXTERNALLY-FUNDED LEAVES WITH SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY	138
B9. PROCEDURES GOVERNING FACULTY NON-RENEWAL, DISMISSAL, AND TERMINATION	139
B9.1. NON-RENEWAL OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	139
<i>B9.1.1. Procedure</i>	139
<i>B9.1.2. Terms</i>	139
B9.2. TERMINATION WITHOUT PREJUDICE OF TENURED FACULTY	139
B9.3. DISMISSAL FOR CAUSE	140
<i>B9.3.1. Dismissal for Cause of Tenure-track or Tenured Faculty</i>	140
B9.3.1.1. Timeline.....	140
B9.3.1.2. Procedure	140
B9.3.1.3. Terms.....	141
<i>B9.3.2. Dismissal of Tenured Faculty for (Involuntary) Ineffectiveness</i>	142
B10. PROCEDURES GOVERNING FACULTY APPEALS AND GRIEVANCES	142
B10.1. APPEALS BY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY AGAINST NON-RENEWAL	142
<i>B10.1.1. Basis of Appeal</i>	142
<i>B10.1.2. Notification, Petition and Time Frame</i>	143
<i>B10.1.3. Committee Responsibilities</i>	143
<i>B10.1.4. Responsibilities of the University President</i>	143
B10.2. APPEALS BY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY AGAINST A NEGATIVE DECISION ON TENURE AND BY TENURE-TRACK OR TENURED FACULTY AGAINST A NEGATIVE DECISION ON PROMOTION	143
<i>B10.2.1. Appeals by Tenure-track Faculty against a negative recommendation on Tenure</i>	143
<i>B10.2.2. Appeals by Tenure-track or Tenured Faculty against a negative decision on Promotion</i>	145
B10.3. APPEALS BY TENURED FACULTY AGAINST DECISIONS TO TERMINATE FOR CAUSE.....	146
<i>B10.3.1. Basis of Appeal</i>	146
<i>B10.3.2. Notification, Petition, and Time Frame</i>	146
<i>B10.3.3. Committee Responsibilities</i>	147

<i>B10.3.4. Responsibilities of the University President</i>	147
B10.4. GRIEVANCES	147
<i>B10.4.1. The Faculty Affairs Committee</i>	147
<i>B10.4.2. Faculty Covered by the Grievance Process</i>	147
<i>B10.4.3. Grievance</i>	148
<i>B10.4.4. Informal Resolution</i>	148
<i>B10.4.5. Petition</i>	148
<i>B10.4.6. Committee Action and Time Frame</i>	148
APPENDIX A	151
APPENDIX B	153
APPENDIX C	157
AAUP 1966 STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES	157
1. <i>Introduction</i>	157
2. <i>The Academic Institution: Joint Effort</i>	158
a. <i>Preliminary Considerations</i>	158
b. <i>Determination of General Educational Policy</i>	158
c. <i>Internal Operations of the Institution</i>	159
d. <i>External Relations of the Institution</i>	159
3. <i>The Academic Institution: The Governing Board</i>	160
4. <i>The Academic Institution: The President</i>	161
5. <i>The Academic Institution: The Faculty</i>	161
<i>On Student Status</i>	162
NOTES.....	163
APPENDIX D	165
AAUP 1940 STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE.....	165
<i>Academic Freedom</i>	165
<i>Academic Tenure</i>	166
APPENDIX E	167
AAUP STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS.....	167
<i>Introduction</i>	167
<i>The Statement</i>	167
APPENDIX F	169
AAUP MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR GOOD PRACTICE IF A FORMAL SYSTEM OF POST-TENURE REVIEW IS ESTABLISHED	169
NOTES.....	170
NOTES	171
RECOMMENDED FURTHER READING	173

Introduction

Bylaws are the rules which govern the internal management of our work lives as faculty members and as members of the Saint Martin's University community. Bylaws help us regulate ourselves in the conduct of our everyday work lives and provide a framework for our operation as a community of teachers and scholars.

Examples of items included in our Bylaws are how faculty meetings and Assembly are conducted, how faculty apply to advance in rank, how Department Chairs are selected and reviewed, and how often faculty meetings are held. Bylaws help us map our purpose as members of the SMU community and the practical day-to-day details of how we function as colleagues with a shared commitment to the values, principles, and policies as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* and shared by members of the Academy.

All Faculty members and their academic and University leaders should familiarize themselves with the *Employee Handbook*, the *Faculty Handbook*, and the *Faculty Bylaws* because these collectively are important documents which govern our work lives individually and collectively. *The Faculty Handbook* gives guidance and authority through the principles it articulates to the procedures described in the *Faculty Bylaws*. While the *Faculty Handbook* presents enduring principles and policies which govern faculty work life, *Faculty Bylaws* detail practices and procedures which are likely to evolve and change; the *Bylaws*, unlike the *Handbook*, therefore, are more likely to undergo amendment as the Faculty initiates and responds to evolving practices and procedures.

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.

The Board of Trustees approves changes to the *Employee Handbook*, the *Faculty Handbook* and *Faculty Bylaws* in accordance with procedures outlined in pp. 1-7.

B1. ACADEMIC STRUCTURE

B1.1. Colleges, Schools, Divisions, and Academic Offices

B1.1.1. Procedures for making changes (e.g. merging, splitting, adding) to Colleges or Schools

Faculty members, Departments, Deans, the Provost, or the University President may propose the addition of new Colleges or Schools in keeping with the mission and strategic goals of the University, in response to growth in programs or in the University as a whole, and if they see the potential to better serve the needs of current students or to recruit new students by housing closely-related programs within a new College or School.

The procedure for adding or combining Schools and Colleges is as follows: Proposals must typically be submitted to the University EPCC, who will endorse and submit the proposal to the Senate. At the discretion of the Senate, the full Faculty may be asked to endorse the proposal. The proposal, after it is endorsed by the Senate and/or the full Faculty is sent (with any proposed modifications) to the Provost. The proposal, with a recommendation by the Provost, is sent to the University President, before being approved by the Board of Trustees.

The University President may take proposals to add or combine Colleges/Schools directly to Senate or the Full Faculty in Assembly. The Senate or the full Faculty may, in turn, charge EPCC with reviewing the proposal before responding to the proposal.

The naming of the new College/School should follow the same process, except in cases where the Board of Trustees honors major donors for their significant philanthropic support of the University by naming Colleges or Schools. In such instances, the donor's support typically benefits the particular College or School and the University President will inform the faculty of the College/School of the BOT's determination.

All proposals for the creation of a new College or School must include the following rationale, program description, proposed administrative structure, infrastructural needs (including facilities), staffing needs, plans for student recruitment, accreditation plans, marketing strategies, budget.

B1.1.2. Procedures for making changes (e.g. merging, splitting, adding) to Divisions

Parallel procedures are to be followed in creating new Divisions within the University.

B1.1.3. Procedures for adding or making changes (e.g. merging, splitting, moving) to Departments and Programs

Proposals to add, merge, [move](#) or split Departments may be made by the Faculty, Chairs, Deans, or the Provost. In general, they should cover the same points as proposals for new Colleges/Schools or

Divisions, including providing a clear rationale, addressing budgetary and marketing considerations, etc.

Chairs, Deans, or the Provost are required to call meetings of all affected faculty members to discuss reasons for the proposed allocation/reallocation of resources, staffing needs, and the academic viability of the affected unit(s). The proposal then moved forward to the Faculty of the College/School(s) involved, the EPCC, and the Faculty Senate for their recommendations and then to the Provost for approval.

B1.1.4. Procedures for placing a College/School, Division, Department, or Program in Academic Receivership

A recommendation to place a Department or Program or unit in academic receivership may be made by faculty within that Department collectively or by a majority, the Faculty Senate, the College/School Chair of the Faculty, or the Dean.

Recommendations to place a Department or Program or unit in academic receivership must include a written report which outlines the reason for the recommendation. Valid reasons may include but are not limited to cases where a unit is unable or unwilling to govern itself in accordance with the principles of shared governance, where it is in noncompliance with the University's Program Review process, where it is failing to fulfill its teaching mission, where disregard for student and faculty welfare is evident, or where it is unable to deliver its programs to current or prospective students.

Procedures to guide a unit through the receivership process must include a plan for a return to self-governance within three years.

In placing a Department or academic unit in receivership, the Dean consults with the Provost who must, in turn, inform the Senate within five working days of notification by the Dean. The Senate may charge the Faculty Affairs Committee to review and report on the situation or undertake such review directly and then provide a recommendation to the Provost with a copy to the Dean.

The Dean, after receiving a recommendation from the Senate and in consultation with the Provost, may place the Department or unit in receivership by appointing an external Chair or by undertaking direct oversight of the unit for a defined period of time to be followed by a review of the situation. At the end of this defined period, the Dean may return the Department to self-governance or on the basis of a review of the situation by the FAC, continue the unit in receivership for a further period that cannot extend beyond one academic year.

Should the unit in receivership prove to be unwilling, unable, or incapable of adequately addressing the issues within a defined period of time as noted above, and additional actions are needed, the Dean informs the Provost. The following steps must be undertaken:

- The Provost notifies the Senate within five working days and consults with them;
- The Senate charges the FAC to independently review the situation;

- In consultation with the Provost, the FAC may bring outside reviewers to campus to assess the situation and help re-vitalize the unit;
- The FAC submits its assessment of the situation to the Provost and the Senate with a copy to the Dean.

On the basis of such review, and if the situation persists, the Provost may suspend admissions to the Department/Program, or transfer, consolidate, disestablish, and discontinue academic programs within the unit.

In any event, every attempt will be made by the University to relocate all Regular Faculty affected by the decisions to close a unit into related departments.

B1.1.5. Procedures for closing Schools, Colleges, Divisions, Departments, or Programs

The University and the Faculty recognize that circumstances may arise that require closing a Program, Department, Division, or College/School. While the most common reason for decisions to close a program is financial, other valid reasons may arise that warrant such a consideration. The University and Faculty also recognize that low enrollment by itself is not necessarily a reason to close essential programs and that the academic integrity of the institution, its identity as a liberal-arts centered University, and fulfillment of its Catholic Benedictine mission will be essential components in discussions focused on the closure and non-viability of programs, Departments, Divisions, or Colleges/Schools.

University leaders will ensure faculty participation at all levels of the discussion in declarations of financial exigency and/or departmental closure for any reasons. Typically, declarations of financial exigency will be based on five years of the University's audited financial statements, current and following-year budgets, and detailed cash-flow estimates for future years. Program cuts and the tenure-track job losses that usually accompany them are typically a last resort and will follow attempts to cure budget ills by furloughs and other means.

Before an academic unit at any level is closed because of financial exigency, the following actions are required:

- a. Public declaration by the University of financial exigency that is demonstrably *bona fide*;
- b. Reasonable classification of all the faculty members affected thereby, and a procedure for establishing priority order of terminations.

A definition of Financial Exigency and the terms which attend to a declaration of financial exigency by the University are outlined in detail in the *Faculty Handbook*, 9.2.

B1.2. Academic Leadership/Leaders

B1.2.1. Procedures for Selecting and Appointing the Provost

The University Provost is typically selected through a national search process initiated by the University President in collaboration with the Faculty and academic leaders and staff. The Search Committee will

consist of at least four faculty members (at least three of whom are elected by the Faculty and one of whom is appointed by the University President in consultation with the Faculty President or from a list of names provided by the Faculty President of those willing to serve on the Committee), one Dean selected to represent the Deans, and one Academic staff member. The University President typically appoints additional members from Cabinet, the monastic community, and the BOT.

Finalists identified by the Search Committee will be available through public presentations and meetings to the Faculty and faculty assessments of the candidates will be solicited by the Search Committee before the Committee makes its recommendation to the University President who makes the final decision internally and recommends endorsement of the finalist by the BOT.

B1.2.2. Procedures for Selecting and Appointing Deans

College/School Deans are typically selected through a national search process initiated by the Provost. The Search Committee will consist of at least four faculty members elected from the College/School and one appointed by the Provost from outside the College/School in consultation with the Chair of the College/School Faculty, a member of the monastic order, a Dean, and one staff member.

Finalists identified by the Search Committee will be available through public presentations and meetings to the College/School Faculty and faculty assessments of the candidates will be solicited by the Search Committee before the Committee makes its recommendation to the Provost who makes the final appointment.

B1.2.3. Procedures for Evaluating Deans

B1.2.3.1. Procedures for Evaluating College/School Deans

Evaluations of College/School Deans are initiated by the Provost in the fall semester of the fifth year of their appointment prior to renewal for a further five-year term. The Provost shares with each Dean, a template for evaluating them based on their responsibilities, and solicits their feedback before finalizing the template. This template is used to generate a set of survey questions that are evolved by the Provost in consultation with the Chief Human Resources Officer. The finalized survey questions are shared with the Dean for input and then with the Chair of the College/School faculty.

The survey questions are sent by the Provost's Executive Assistant to all Regular Faculty in the Dean's College/School, select Faculty Committee Chairs who are from other Colleges/Schools, select members of the College/School Advisory Board (in the case of professional schools which have ABs), and select staff members from co-curricular and other support offices. This list will be compiled by the Provost in consultation with the Dean and the Chair of the College/School Faculty.

Evaluators will be identified on the returned survey only by category as either faculty or staff, though individuals returning the survey will have the option of identifying themselves.

The results of the survey, along with the Provost's independent assessment of the Dean, will be shared with the Dean as part of his/her ongoing development. If significant and serious issues requiring attention have been identified through the evaluation process, the Provost may work with the Dean to design a structured development plan and subsequent assessment of growth, typically in the following semester. The Provost

typically informs the Dean about reappointment by April 15 of the spring semester of the Dean's fifth year; in the case of Deans with retreat rights who are not renewed, the Provost will also inform the appropriate Department Chair of the Dean's return to full-time teaching in the Department. Deans without retreat rights may receive renewable annual appointments as a faculty member in their area of expertise.

Current Deans will undergo evaluation as described above in 2015-16, and typically, every five years thereafter.

Deans complete *Annual Reports* which are submitted to the Provost for feedback.

Vacated Dean positions are filled in accordance with procedures described in 1.2.2. During the period of the search, the Provost may appoint an Interim or Acting Dean.

B1.2.3.2. Procedures for Evaluating Division Deans and Associate Deans of University-wide Programs

Division Deans and Associate Deans of University-wide programs (E.G. the Graduate Studies Office) are evaluated every five years. Evaluations of Division Deans and Associate Deans are initiated by the Provost in the fall semester of the fifth year of their appointment prior to renewal for a further five-year term. The Provost shares with the Division Dean(s) and Associate Dean(s) a template for evaluating them, based on their responsibilities, and solicits their feedback before finalizing the template. This template is used to generate a set of survey questions that are evolved by the Provost in consultation with the Chief Human Resources Officer. The finalized survey questions are shared with the Division Dean(s) and Associate Dean(s).

In the case of the Division Dean(s), the finalized survey is sent by the Provost's Executive Assistant to select Contingent Faculty in the Division, Regular Faculty from the Lacey campus who regularly teach in the Division, Chairs of all Departments which offer courses in the Division, and select staff affiliated with or who work closely with the Division. This list will be compiled by the Provost in consultation with the Division Dean.

In the case of Associate Deans, the survey is sent to all Graduate Program Directors, select Deans, and select staff who work closely with the Associate Dean. The list of those who will be surveyed is compiled by the Provost in consultation with the Associate Dean(s).

Evaluators will be identified on the returned survey only by category as either faculty or staff, though individuals will have the option of identifying themselves.

The results of the survey, along with the Provost's independent assessment of the Division Dean(s) and Associate Dean(s), will be shared with each as part of their ongoing development. If significant and serious issues requiring attention have been identified through the evaluation process, the Provost will work with the Division Dean(s) and Associate Dean(s) to design a structured development plan and subsequent assessment of growth, typically by the subsequent semester. The Provost typically informs the Division Dean and Associate Dean about reappointment by April 15th of the spring semester of their fifth year; in the case of Division Deans or Associate Deans with retreat rights who are not renewed for a further term, the Provost will also inform Program Directors, as appropriate. Division Deans without retreat rights may be appointed to a renewable faculty appointment in an area of their disciplinary expertise.

Current Division Deans and Associate Deans will undergo evaluation as described above during the 2015-16 academic year and every five years thereafter.

Vacated Division Dean and Associate Dean positions in University offices may be filled through a formal search process. During the period of the search, the Provost may appoint an Interim or Acting Division Dean or Associate Dean.

B1.3. The Faculty

B1.3.1. Procedures for Recruiting and Appointing Regular Faculty

B1.3.1.1. Procedures for Requesting Faculty Hires

B1.3.1.1.1. Departmental Requests for Regular Faculty

Departments through their Chair typically identify curricular and personnel needs, both replacements and new personnel needs, at the start of each academic year – typically, by October 1 – for the following year/s and discuss these with the Dean of their College/School. The schedule for approving and advertising positions should be coordinated with national disciplinary calendars in order to maximize the Department or program’s success in searching for and hiring the best candidates. The list of all Regular Faculty searches for the following year, once authorized, will be shared with the full faculty through an announcement / communication by the Provost.

Annually, in the first half of the fall semester, the Provost requests Deans to submit their hiring requests for Regular Faculty in their College/School along with justifications for the same. All requests for the recruitment and appointment of Regular Faculty are discussed by the Provost individually with Deans before these requests are prioritized and searches are authorized, subject to the availability of funding and approval by the University President. The Provost and Dean may together also meet with the Department requesting a search to better understand contexts.

In prioritizing requests for Regular Faculty, the Provost considers departmental and programmatic needs as represented by the Chair and Dean as well as the Faculty’s collective responsibility for the Saint Martin’s Core and/or the particular responsibility of some programs, Departments, or Colleges/Schools, for graduate education and programs on our satellite campuses. All formal requests for searches will receive a written response from the Dean, typically by November 1.

The appropriate Department Chair works closely with his/her faculty in developing position profiles for approved searches, which are then vetted by the Dean and Provost before being advertised. The Department of Human Resources will serve as a resource for faculty, Chairs, Deans, and the Provost on legal and compliance issues.

The Department carries primary responsibility for vetting (considering) applicants and candidates for their disciplinary expertise, teaching strengths, and scholarly potential. They are also responsible for working with the search committee on identifying appointable finalists to the Dean of the College/School. Deans are responsible for identifying finalists committed to the goals and aspirations of the particular College/School and the University’s identity as a liberal arts centered University with a strong Core Curriculum that

provides a foundation for professional programs. The Provost is responsible for vetting finalists for their commitment to the University's mission and values.

Departments are encouraged to use electronic resources such as Skype or other video or teleconferencing programs in order to maintain cost-effectiveness in the search process.

B1.3.1.1.2. Requests by Program Directors and Deans for Regular Faculty

Requests to conduct searches for Regular Faculty may also be initiated by Program Directors who oversee cross-disciplinary / cross-departmental programs within a College/School and by Deans who identify vital areas of growth and development within their College/School. In both instances, Directors and Deans should discuss these requests in advance with involved Departments and their faculty and Chair(s) and achieve consensus regarding these personnel requests before presenting them to the Provost. Appointments of Regular Faculty initiated by cross-disciplinary Program Directors will nevertheless be in particular Departments and such faculty will typically carry dual responsibilities to their home Department and the interdisciplinary program. These dual responsibilities will be determined in advance of advertising a search by those requesting the position through discussions with faculty and the Dean and will be specified to the appointee in writing by the Provost at the time of appointment.

B1.3.1.1.3. Requests by Faculty or Deans for appointments that cross Colleges/Schools

Faculty across Colleges/Schools and/or two or more Deans may identify areas of cross- College/cross- School development for the University which requires the addition of Regular Faculty. In all such cases, broad consensus among all constituents with interest in such initiatives, including Chairs, and among those who are likely to contribute to them is a vital first step in presenting hiring proposals to the Provost. Appointments will typically be made to a specific Department even if the faculty member carries responsibilities beyond that Department and College/School. The full spectrum of the faculty member's responsibilities and their weighted consideration in his/her progress towards tenure and promotion will be clearly specified at the point of hire.

The following procedure is used for the screening and selection process in the three kinds of requests for Regular Faculty appointments represented above.

- a. The, Department Chair or interdisciplinary Program Director or Dean in consultation with faculty members and/or the Dean or Deans, having determined that a Department or interdisciplinary program requires additional or replacement personnel, and having secured funds and approval from the Provost for the same, initiates a search
- b. In consultation with and with the approval of the Dean/Deans, the Department Chair or Program Director or faculty forms a search committee. The Committee consists of appropriate departmental or program faculty, one faculty member of a closely allied discipline; one monastic representative (if available). Members of other University constituencies may also be appointed to the search committee if the search committee chair chooses. The Department Chair or the Program Director determines who serves as committee chair in consultation with the Dean. Typically, search committees do not exceed seven members.
- c. The search committee, in consultation with the Department Chair/Program Director, the Dean,

and the Abbot of Saint Martin's Abbey, first determines whether a qualified member of the Abbey is, or will be in a reasonable period of time, available to fill the position. If a qualified member of the Abbey is available, the position is reserved. If not, the process continues.

- d. The Dean makes known, through the Office of Human Resources and through appropriate professional vehicles the availability of the faculty position, together with an appropriate job description, qualifications, and closing date for applications
- e. The search committee screens applications, interviews selected candidates, and compiles a short list of finalists for review by the Department Chair and the Dean. It then arranges visits by up to three finalists to campus for interviews with the committee, the Dean, Provost, and other appropriate University personnel. The search committee also consults the Department faculty prior to making its recommendation. After completing the search and selection process, the committee makes its written recommendation to the Department Chair, who, with his/her own recommendation, transmits a recommendation to the Dean of his/her College/School
- f. The Dean reviews the recommendations and consults with the search committee chair, then makes his/her recommendation to the Provost
- g. The Provost makes a recommendation to the University President

B1.3.1.1.4. Provost-initiated Regular Faculty Appointments

The Provost may initiate "Cluster Hires" in areas of importance across the University; requests for such hires have to proceed from Department Chairs, Program Directors, and/or Faculty. E.g. A call may be put out to Department Chairs, Program Directors, and Deans to consider getting three or more constituents together across Departments, programs, or Colleges/Schools to discuss parallel needs in related areas. Examples of such areas include but are not limited to Environmental Studies or Arts Administration or Professional Science or Forensic Science or Health Studies. If constituents reach consensus on areas such as these that might benefit through multiple hires in multiple departments, they may submit a proposal for consideration to the Provost.

Cluster hires are not intended to initiate the creation of new programs at point of hire but rather to expand the curricular footprint through expertise that may result, at a future date, in the creation of additional programs. All proposed curricular expansion in these or other directions, if and when initiated, will undergo the standard vetting process for the approval of new programs outlined elsewhere in this *Handbook* and the *Bylaws*. Guarantee of programmatic expansion, in other words, is not a condition for the approval of cluster hires.

The Provost will meet with those who propose appointments within the "Cluster Hire" initiative and with Deans, and discuss the process to be adopted for such a search if it is to be authorized and funded. Searches for Regular Faculty through such initiatives could result, for example in the simultaneous or staggered appointments over consecutive years of two or more individuals into multiple Departments. E.g. in support of a possible program in Environmental Studies, a faculty member with expertise in Environmental Policy may be appointed in the Department of Political Science, a Geo-Chemist may be appointed in the Department of Physics, and an Environmental Chemist may be appointed in the Department of Chemistry. Department Chairs, Deans, and the Provost must

agree in advance on the particulars relating to such appointments. Appointments in the case of cluster hires will typically be to a specific Department, though the faculty member's teaching responsibilities may extend to other programs.

B1.3.1.2. Procedures for Appointing Regular Faculty

The President of the University appoints the new Regular Faculty member with authority as delegated by the Board of Trustees.

The rank, tenure eligibility, time line towards tenure, Departmental affiliation(s), and all other particulars which relate to the position will be specified in writing by the Provost to all Faculty at the time of their appointment.

In special circumstances, Departments or Directors/Deans may request the appointment of Regular Faculty members who have dual responsibilities as faculty and staff. Particulars which attend to such appointments have to be evolved and specified in advance of advertising and conducting the search, and the person appointed to a position with faculty and staff responsibilities should receive written clarification about the exact balance of duties in these roles as well as how he/she will be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure.

All Regular Faculty, both tenure-track and tenured, receive Letters of Appointment each year which are evolved by the Office of the Provost in consultation with Deans, and sent no later than by March 15th of the year for the academic term which begins on August 16th of the same year and concludes on May 15th of the following year. The Letter of Appointment must specify rank, tenure status, and salary. A sample Letter of Appointment is attached in Appendix A. Regular Faculty who are on the tenure track must return a signed copy of the Letter of Appointment to indicate their acceptance of employment by the University. Failure to return a signed copy by April 15th immediately following receipt of the letter of appointment may result in loss of employment.

First appointments of Regular Faculty are made upon conclusion of the search process, and may be made at any point in the year.

Failure of the University to inform a faculty member about renewal or non-renewal of his/her tenure-track probationary faculty appointment will result in their automatic renewal for the following academic year.

B1.3.1.2.1. Length / Terms of Regular Faculty Appointments

B1.3.1.2.1.1. Probationary Appointment into the Tenure-Track

Regular faculty members are initially appointed on a per-year basis during the period leading up to their tenure decision; the date by which a faculty member must apply for tenure is specified in his/her Letter of Appointment.

Failure to apply for tenure by the date specified in the Letter of Appointment will result in the faculty member being issued a terminal, non-renewal contract for the following year.

Regular tenure-track Faculty in the rank of Assistant Professors should show strong commitment to teaching, to scholarly engagement that is likely to reach fuller fruition as they advance in rank, and

service at the Departmental, College, or University level.

B1.3.1.2.1.2. Tenured Appointments

Regular faculty members are eligible to be considered for tenure by the date specified in their Letter of Appointment. They may be granted such status by the Board of Trustees after formal recommendations by the Advancement Committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the University President.

Faculty members who held tenure-track appointments at comparable institutions may be credited upon hire with a maximum of two years towards tenure upon appointment.

Faculty members who have achieved tenure at comparable Universities or Colleges may be appointed in tenured and ranked positions at Saint Martin's. Determination regarding ranked and tenured appointments is made by the Provost in consultation with the Department Chair and the Dean.

Regular Faculty who hold the rank of Associate Professor should show strong commitment to teaching, consistent and ongoing commitment through presentations and publications or creative activity to scholarship, and increasing commitment to service at the Departmental, College, or University level.

Regular Faculty who hold the rank of Full Professor should be strong and accomplished teachers who commit also to leadership in their academic discipline through ongoing scholarly/creative work **AND/OR** to significant and ongoing leadership/service within the academy.

In appointing University leaders – such as Deans or the Provost – with Departmental rank and tenure, the home Department of the appointee will be asked by the University President or Provost (in the case of College/School Deans) to endorse the appointee and review his/her credentials. Though this remains a courtesy consideration by the Department, it is an essential step for all University leaders who are appointed with rank and tenure and hold retreat rights into their home department upon relinquishing their administrative responsibilities.

Such courtesy consideration by an academic Department will not be required if the Dean or Provost is appointed without tenure and retreat rights.

B1.3.2. Procedures for Appointing Contingent Faculty

Contingent Faculty members are selected to teach during regular semesters and summer sessions on the Lacey campus by Department Chairs or Program Directors in consultation with the Dean and approval of the Provost.

Contingent appointees for extension campuses are identified by the Dean of ELD or the Dean of the College/School, vetted by the appropriate Lacey Campus Chair/Director and Dean, and approved by the Provost.

Contingent appointments are made by the semester or term and are not eligible for tenure. Titles used in contingent appointments are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* and are determined on the basis of the

University's needs and qualifications of the candidates; titles and the terms and conditions of the appointment are specified at the point of hire in the appointment contract.

ESL Instructors are recommended to the Provost for appointment, and renewal subject to annual evaluations, by the Chief International Programs Officer.

Laboratory Instructors are recommended to the Dean by the Department Chair and renewed by the Provost upon recommendation by the Dean. They are subject to annual review.

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. 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.

B1.3.4. Procedures for Appointing Librarians

The search and approval process for Librarians is similar to that for faculty. The Dean/Director of the Library identifies hiring needs in the Library. Once approved by the Provost, searches are advertised through the Office of Human Resources.

The Dean/Director of the Library will identify a search committee chair. In consultation with the Dean, the chair forms a search committee, which will typically include two librarians, two Regular Faculty members (from departments with which the librarian will most closely work), one monastic representative (if available), and one library staff member. Members of other University constituencies may also be appointed to the search committee as appropriate. Typically, search committees do not exceed seven members.

The search committee, in consultation with the Library Dean/Director and the Abbot of Saint Martin's Abbey, first determines whether a qualified member of the Abbey is, or will be in a reasonable period of

time, available to fill the position. If a qualified member of the Abbey is available, the position is reserved. If not, the process continues.

The search committee screens applications, interviews selected candidates, and compiles a short list of finalists for review by the Dean. It then arranges visits by up to three finalists to campus for interviews with the committee, the Dean, the Provost, and other appropriate University personnel. The search committee also consults Librarians and library staff not on the committee prior to making its recommendation. After completing the search and selection process, the committee makes its written recommendation to the Dean, who, with his/her own recommendation, transmits a recommendation to the Provost.

All Librarians receive Letters of Appointment each year which are evolved by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the Dean/Director of the Library, and sent no later than by March 15th of the year for the academic year which begins on July 1 and concludes on June 30 of the following year. The Letter of Appointment must specify the Librarian's status, rank, and salary step.

Librarians must return a signed copy of the Letter of Appointment to indicate their acceptance of employment by the University. Failure to return a signed copy by April 15th immediately following receipt of the letter of appointment may result in loss of employment.

Librarians are evaluated annually by the Dean/Director who works with the Director of HR to implement the standard evaluation process used for all employees. However, because Librarians work closely with faculty members, the Dean/Director will also work closely with the Provost to ensure input from faculty in evaluating Librarians in their first and third years and at every point at which Librarians apply for promotion in rank.

Librarians are appointed in Continuing or Term Appointments; this is specified at point of hire.

Promotion Procedures

The following procedures will be followed when Librarians apply for promotion in rank:

1. The Librarian informs his/her Dean/Director of intent to apply for promotion;
2. The Dean/Director informs the Provost;
3. The Dean/Director evolves, in consultation with the Librarian, a list of seven faculty members with whom he/she has worked closely, and submit this list to the Provost;
4. The Provost constitutes an Evaluation Team consisting of two faculty members from the above list, two additional faculty members drawn from among the Regular Faculty, and one College/School Dean other than Director/Dean of the Library.

Important Note: If there are two or more promoted Librarians in the Library, this Evaluation Team will consist of two promoted Librarians, two Regular Faculty, and a College/School Dean other than the Director/Dean of the Library

5. The Evaluation Team solicits a recommendation from the Dean/Director of the Library regarding the Librarian's candidacy for promotion;

6. The Evaluation Team solicits two additional letters from members of the Library and/or the Regular Faculty;
7. The Evaluation Team evaluates the portfolio for promotion submitted by the Librarian along with the letters of recommendation;
8. The Evaluation Team makes a written recommendation to the Provost regarding the Librarian's candidacy for promotion and sends a copy to the candidate.
9. The Provost makes a written recommendation to the President and sends a copy to the candidate.
10. The applicant may appeal any negative recommendation. The University President must wait for a period of three weeks; the applicant may file an appeal, if he/she wishes to do so, during these three weeks;
11. The FAC hears the appeal – based on violation of academic freedom, fundamental fairness, or inadequate consideration of materials submitted by the applicant.

Important Note: When the Library has three or more promoted Librarians, a three-member Appeals Committee will be constituted by the Provost to hear the appeal. The Appeals Committee will consist of one member from FA, one member from among promoted Librarians who has not served on the Evaluation Team, and one Dean (not the Library Director/Dean or the Dean who served on the original Evaluation Team)

12. The University President makes the final decision.

B1.3.5. Policies Pertaining to Documents and Records

B1.3.5.1. Pre-Employment File

An applicant for a faculty position is required to provide official transcripts; a professional resume; letters of recommendation attesting to professional qualifications and personal integrity; and a brief statement on his/her teaching and scholarship as it supports the University's mission. This file is open to academic and University leaders, the Dean of the College/School to which the candidate is applying, the Department Chair of the Department to which the candidate is applying, and the members of the search committee duly constituted to carry out search and selection procedures. If the candidate is employed by the University, the pre-employment file becomes part of that individual's official personnel file from the date of his/her employment.

Application materials of finalists who are not appointed to the position are stored in electronic format in the Provost's Office for a period of six years.

B1.3.5.2. Official Personnel File

The personnel records of each faculty member are filed in the Office of the Provost. These records ordinarily include official transcripts of the highest earned degree, a professional resume, letters of

recommendation, letters of appointment, and contracts with the University. The faculty member may submit letters of recommendation or commendation or other appropriate documents to the Provost and request that these be included in his/her file. The faculty member has access to his/her personnel file any time.

No part of that official personnel file will be relinquished, nor may anyone other than the President and the Provost, have access to the file without permission of the faculty member. Other individuals such as the respective College/School Deans and the Chief Human Resources Officer may request access to a faculty member's official personnel file; the Provost's Office is required to notify the faculty member about these within three working days of receiving such requests. The faculty member whose personnel file has been requested may request that the Dean or Chief Human Resources Officer inform them of the reasons for the file request.

The above policy does not prevent the Dean of a College/School from retaining a file (electronic or physical) containing documents such as a faculty member's resume, application materials, and copies of Letters of Appointment or other communications with the faculty member on which the Dean is copied, in a file in the Dean's Office. The faculty member may access this file at any time by requesting to do so.

B2. GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES

B2.1. Procedures Relating to Faculty (Self) Governance: University Level

B2.1.1. The Conduct of Full Faculty Assembly

Standard Procedures

The Faculty President chairs the full Faculty Assembly, which is typically conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order. While the Senate typically acts on behalf of the Faculty on most matters, it may refer items to the full Faculty for deliberation, consideration, and/or a vote during Faculty Assembly. All Regular Faculty members may exercise their right to a vote in full Faculty Assembly.

The Faculty typically designates a Regular Faculty member who has been elected to Senate to also serve as Parliamentarian for the academic year during Faculty Assembly and Senate; the Parliamentarian clarifies procedures when questions arise on the floor and is responsible for making sure that Faculty Assembly is run according to standard rules. The Parliamentarian is consulted by the Faculty President on issues ranging from allowing motions to extending Assembly beyond its scheduled time to what constitutes a quorum. The Parliamentarian advises the Faculty President on all matters relating to the conduct of Faculty Assembly, while the Faculty President chairs and ultimately rules on matters of order in the Senate and in Assembly. The University President, Provost, College/School Deans, and other academic leaders may attend Faculty Assembly and participate in deliberations and discussions of the Faculty when recognized by the Faculty President and called upon to do so.

The University President may not vote in Faculty Assembly.

The Provost, Deans, and other academic leaders do not typically vote in Faculty Assembly, but may do so if invited by the Faculty President. In inviting the Provost, Deans, or other academic leaders to participate in voting on an issue, the Faculty President must first achieve a majority consensus from the assembled

Regular Faculty.

The University President or Provost may call the Faculty to a Special Assembly, as needed. Typically, the University President and/or Provost before calling a Special Assembly of the Faculty, will inform the Faculty President of the context and reasons for the same.

Special Procedures

At either a regularly scheduled Assembly or special Assembly of the University Faculty, with at least fifteen days' written notice, and by a two-thirds majority, providing they constitute a Quorum of the Regular Faculty, the Faculty may discharge the Faculty President and/or the Senate as a whole from their role as elected representatives of the full faculty for the remainder of the academic year.

If the Regular Faculty discharges the Faculty President, or the Senate as a whole from serving as their representatives for the remainder of the academic year from the point at which such action is taken, they must, within ten days of taking such action, elect a new Faculty President and/or members of the Senate, as the case warrants.

Alternately, if a determination is made by the Faculty to discharge the whole Senate, they may rule that by a majority vote that the full Faculty Assembly will act on behalf of the faculty on all matters thereafter until the conclusion of that academic year or until a determination is made by the full faculty to elect a Faculty President and/or Senators.

B2.1.2. The Conduct of Faculty Senate

The Faculty President shall act on behalf of the Faculty Senate during summer months when the Faculty Senate is not in session. The Faculty President must inform the full Faculty of any action(s) undertaken during this period.

B2.1.3. Procedures for Electing the Faculty President

The Faculty President-Elect is elected by the faculty on an annual basis. This election occurs at the last regularly scheduled faculty meeting of the year for the following academic year.

The Faculty President

- a. chairs and holds the full Faculty Assembly on a regular basis;
- b. chairs meetings of the Faculty Senate;
- c. in consultation with the Provost, establishes Faculty Senate and Assembly agendas;
- d. oversees elections for standing faculty committees;
- e. appoints *ad hoc* faculty committees;
- f. attends Provost's Council monthly;
- g. assists the Faculty Welfare Committee in recommending equitable faculty salaries, benefits and working conditions to the Provost;
- h. represents faculty concerns to other University constituencies and leaders (i.e., the President, the Provost, the Board of Trustees);
- i. meets regularly and as needed with the University President and the Provost;

- j. undertakes other responsibilities at the request of the full Faculty or which may benefit the work life of faculty.

B2.1.4. Procedures for Electing Faculty Committees and Replacement Rules

Faculty are elected in full faculty Assembly to serve on Faculty Senate Committees. The current standing Committees of the Senate are listed in the *Faculty Handbook*, 2.1.5.

Committees typically consist of three Regular Faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences and one member from each of the other Colleges/Schools. Certain Committees (E.g. Advancement, Faculty Affairs, and Faculty Development) require that all or some members are tenured and/or hold a specific academic rank. The Faculty President will ensure that elections are conducted in accordance with these restrictions; the Parliamentarian will ensure that processes are followed. The general charge of each Committee is outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*; each Committee is encouraged to create its Charter and specific procedural details; these should be made available on the Senate web pages.

If an elected faculty member relinquishes his/her position on a committee during the academic year, either

- (a) an election will be conducted and a replacement faculty member will be elected, in accordance with prescribed guidelines for membership on the committee, to complete the original member's term,

OR

- (b) the Faculty President will appoint a faculty member in accordance with prescribed guidelines for membership on the committee, to complete the original member's term.

B2.2. Procedures relating to Faculty (Self) Governance: College/School Level

B2.2.1. Conduct of College/School Assembly

College/School Assembly will be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order. The Chair of the College/School Faculty may appoint a Regular Faculty member to serve as Parliamentarian during Assembly.

The College/School faculty elects a Chair of the Faculty from among their Regular full-time tenured members to Chair the College/School Assembly and serve as a representative of the Faculty to their Dean and other academic or University leaders. The Chair of the College/School Faculty does not receive a teaching load release; his/her role typically extends to working with the Dean to set the agenda for College/School Assembly.

Typically, the Chair and Dean of the College/School Faculty call for agenda items from the Faculty, and meet to discuss the agenda for Assembly. The Dean's report to the Faculty and a report from the Chair of the Faculty will typically be included in the agenda of Assembly.

Deans may also call the faculty of the College/School to a Special Assembly, as needed. In such circumstances, the Dean typically informs the Chair of the Faculty about the context and reasons for calling a

Special Assembly of the College/School.

B2.2.2. Procedures for Creating Faculty Committees at the College/School Level

While the Faculty in a College or School may create committees to undertake College/School business, the only mandated committee at the College/School level is the Tenure and Promotion Committee (TAP).

College/School Committees will typically consist of three elected faculty members, who will elect a chair from among their membership.

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

TAP will consist of three faculty members elected from the full-time tenured and promoted faculty members in the College or School. Members serve three-year terms. If possible, at least one of the three elected members should be a full Professor. 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.

TAP elects a chair from its membership. TAP's responsibilities include

- Evaluating all applications for advancement submitted by tenure-track faculty within their College or School, and voting on their candidacy for tenure and promotion, before forwarding its recommendation to the Dean of the College/School.
- Review any proposed revisions to Department-specific tenure and promotion guidelines submitted by Department Chairs and will consult with the College/School Dean before passing on the revisions to Advancement for vetting and to the Provost for approval and implementation.
- Ensuring that Department-specific tenure and promotion guidelines are consulted in their evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion and that these Department-specific guidelines are forwarded with the candidate's file to the Advancement Committee.

B2.2.3. Procedures for the Election, Appointment, and Evaluation of Department Chairs and Faculty Program Directors

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.

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.

A Dean may initiate removal of a departmentally-elected Chair at any point by following the procedures described below.

Program Directors are elected by the Regular Faculty who routinely teach in the Program. When the Program is within a college/School, the Dean identifies all faculty members who teach in the Program in consultation with the College/School Chair; when the Program is inter-college, the Provost identifies the roster of faculty. The Dean or Provost, as appropriate, is notified of the election. The Provost appoints the Program Director upon recommendation by the faculty for three-year terms that are renewable subject to evaluation and re-election by the faculty. Typically, Program Directors who have served two consecutive full terms will not be considered for a successive third term if there are other eligible candidates within the Program.

B2.2.3.2. Procedures for Removing a Departmentally-Elected Chair from Office

A Dean who wishes to remove an elected Department Chair from office initiates the process by informing the Chair and presenting the Chair and the Provost with written reasons with all supporting documentation for the recommended removal.

The Provost convenes a Council of five tenured Chairs, at least three of whom should be from a different College or School than that of the Chair against whom reasons for removal from office have been presented by the Dean.

The Council reviews these reasons and all supporting documentation and makes a recommendation to the Provost. In reviewing the situation, the Council may meet with and discuss issues with the Chair and Dean.

The Provost takes the recommendation of the Council into consideration in determining if the Chair is to be removed from office. The Provost conveys his/her decision in writing to the Chair with a copy to the Dean and members of the Council.

The Chair, if removed from office, may appeal the Provost’s decision to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The FAC will consider the appeal on the basis of violations of process and/or violations of the Chair’s academic freedom and/or the professional well-being of the Department/Program. FAC submits its findings to the University President. The University President makes the final determination on the

appeal.

B2.2.3.3 Procedures for Evaluating Department Chairs within a College/School

Department Chairs are evaluated by their Department faculty and the Dean of their College/School prior to reappointment by the Provost in the spring semester of their third year. Chairs submit their Annual Summaries to the Dean.

Process:

1. The Dean reminds the Department by February 1 that a review of the Chair will occur prior to reelection and reappointment for another three-year term;
2. The Dean calls a meeting of all Regular Faculty within the Department by February 10 and charges a senior member of the faculty to lead the process;
3. If the Department has fewer than two Regular Faculty members, the Department may request that additional Regular Faculty from a related Department join the Department in its evaluation of the Chair; no more than two additional faculty may be thus invited to join departmental deliberations;
4. The Department faculty and any additional faculty selected to join them meet and evaluate the Chair against the list of Chair duties outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*; a template listing these duties is provided to the Department by the Dean;
5. The faculty member selected to lead/facilitate the evaluation submits the results of the evaluation to the Department faculty with a copy to the Dean.
6. The Dean may also add a letter of evaluation, based on the Chair's Annual Report and other observations, share the letter with the Chair, and place it in the Chair's personnel file.

B2.2.4. Departmental Procedures and Faculty Responsibilities

Meetings

Academic Departments are required minimally to meet monthly during the academic year in addition to meeting as needed on departmental searches and revising the curriculum, to elect a Chair, conduct assessments, support the accreditation process, and other issues.

Nurturing and Evaluating Junior Faculty

Senior faculty are responsible for contributing to the development of tenure-track faculty within their Departments and to their evaluation, which is led by the Department Chair.

It is generally expected that junior faculty will begin to engage in service by participating on committees, but that commitment to service will strengthen and deepen as faculty progress through the ranks. The Chair,

senior faculty members, and the Department as a whole must ensure, therefore, that tenure-track faculty are protected from over-extending themselves through service and teaching commitments so that they can attend in their probationary years to establishing a strong teaching portfolio and successfully initiating their scholarly life. The Chair is the primary agent who ensures work load balance for all faculty in the Department.

Teaching

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 and the Dean. 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.

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.

Annual Summaries

All Regular Faculty, faculty on continuing appointments, and Faculty who are moving from contingent status to tenure track in the Department submit Annual Summaries detailing their annual activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to their Department Chairs. Annual Summaries are included in all portfolios submitted for purposes of advancement.

Chairs review Annual Summaries with individual faculty members in their Department, before submitting them, along with any comments they may wish to add, to the Dean. Deans review Annual Summaries within their College/School, acknowledge each Annual Summary individually in writing to faculty members and summarize any concerns, as applicable, with a copy to the Chair, and then submit a summary report to the Provost regarding all Annual Summaries from their College/School. Annual Summaries and all written evaluations of them become part of the faculty member's Advancement and post-tenure assessment file.

Faculty submit Annual Summaries to their Chair for the prior academic year by September 15 each year; Chairs submit these with any additional comments to their Deans by October 15; Deans discuss and communicate in writing any issues with individual faculty members and their Chairs by November 15, and submit a summary report for their College/School to the Provost by December 1. Deans send reminders to faculty and Chairs in their College/School by the end of the previous academic year and again by August 15 of the new academic year about these deadlines.

If any serious issues have been identified through the Annual Summary process, the Provost may schedule a meeting with the faculty member, his/her Chair, and Dean to discuss the Summary and any follow up actions and/or developmental support that might be necessary.

Program Review

Program Reviews/Assessments are undertaken by Departments every seven years. In a College such as CAS, which has no accrediting body, Program Reviews serve a similar function. Accredited programs may use their accreditation review as the equivalent of Program Review, but all programs which do not undergo accreditation are required to undertake program review.

The cycle of Program Reviews within a College/School is established during the 2014-15 year through discussions and collaboration between Departments and their Deans and publicized by the Dean to members of the College/School. The Provost will publicize the master list of scheduled Program Reviews across the University.

The first cycle of Program Reviews will begin in 2015-16. Programs which undertake their first review in 2015-16, for example, will undertake one again in 2023-2024; programs which undertake their first Program Review in 2022-2023 will undertake one again in 2030-2031. It is expected that across the University, no more than five Program Reviews will typically be undertaken in any academic year.

Procedures:

- Each College/School is part of a cycle of Program reviews; each Program is reviewed every 7-years;
- Each program identifies a team of two peers from comparable nearby universities to visit and assess their program (the scope of the review might extend to curriculum, possibilities for expansion and growth, assessment of resources, personnel needs, staffing needs, the program's fulfillment of mission, etc. and is determined by the Department in advance in collaboration with the Dean);
- The Review Team meets with the Department Chair, faculty, affiliated faculty from other Departments, the Dean, and the Provost;
- The Team submits a Report verbally to the Department and other interested members of the community at the conclusion of their visit and in written format subsequently to the Department Chair and Dean;
- The Report is also submitted to the Provost;
- The Provost meets with the Department and Dean to discuss how issues (such as personnel needs, or curriculum enhancement) might be addressed by the faculty and supported by the Dean and Provost.
- The results of the Review will be shared with the President and Board of Trustees. The Program Review Team is reimbursed for travel and paid a modest honorarium.

B2.3. Procedures Relating to Shared Governance

B2.3.1. Procedures for Electing Faculty to University Committees

University Committees may consist of appointed and/or elected faculty members. University

Committees and their membership criteria are listed in the *Employee Handbook*, 2.7 through 2.7.14, and the *Faculty Handbook*, 2.3.1.

The Faculty Senate organizes the election of faculty to University Committees in accordance with criteria for each committee as outlined in the *Employee and Faculty Handbook*.

If an elected faculty member is unable to serve out his/her term on a University Committee and resigns or vacates his/her seat on the Committee during the academic year, either

- (1) An election will be held in full Faculty Assembly to identify another faculty member who will serve out the term of the previously-elected faculty member, if the remaining period of service extends beyond a year

Or

- (2) The Faculty President will appoint a faculty member to serve out the term of the previously-elected faculty member if the remaining period of service is less than a year

B2.3.2. Procedures governing Faculty Participation in Board of Trustees (BOT) Committees

The following procedures will be followed for selecting faculty representatives to serve as voting members on Board of Trustees committees, to develop a structure for faculty representatives to report to the faculty, and to develop a structure for faculty representatives to receive input from their faculty constituents.

Faculty Representation

Faculty representatives sit as voting members of **some** Board of Trustee committees, **including:**

- Academic Affairs
- *Ad Hoc* Compensation Sub Committee
- Enrollment Management
- Facilities
- Finance
- Investment
- International Programs & Development
- Institutional Advancement
- Marketing

The faculty representatives to the Board's Academic Affairs Committee will be a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee (usually the Committee Chair) and the Faculty President. The Faculty President and Faculty President-Elect will both serve on the Board's Finance Committee (with the President-Elect serving as a non-voting member). For the Board's Facilities Committee, the faculty will elect a representative from among the future occupants of any ongoing building projects. If none are currently being undertaken, the position will be elected at large.

Faculty representatives serving on all other committees (Compensation, Enrollment Management, Investment, International Programs, Development, Institutional Advancement and Marketing) will be

elected at large from the tenured faculty. These representatives serve two year terms, with a term limit of three terms. At the Board of Trustees’s behest, the Faculty President may be asked to represent the Faculty on any, and multiple, Board Committees or Subcommittees. **As the Board of Trustees forms additional regular and ad hoc committees, unless the Faculty Senate specifies some other means of selection, faculty representatives will be elected at large from the tenured faculty.**

Upon receipt of committee agendas, the Faculty President will post these agendas on the intranet in a folder accessible to faculty. At the Faculty Senate meeting following a meeting of Board Committees, faculty representatives will provide a brief report to the Faculty.

The Faculty President may choose to caucus with Faculty Board representatives prior to Board Meetings.

Replacements for faculty unable to complete their elected term will be made in accordance with *Senate Bylaws*.

The chart below will be used to regulate the selection of faculty representatives.

Faculty serve as members of ten Board of Trustees committees. These ten committees fall into three broad categories: those that have a mandate/synergy with an existing faculty committee; one that has an evolving focus; and those that do not have overlap with an existing faculty committee.

BoT Committee	Faculty Representative	Term
Academic Affairs	Faculty Affairs and Faculty President	Not to exceed 6 years
Compensation Subcommittee [ad hoc]	Faculty Welfare	Not to exceed 6 years
Finance	Faculty President/FP-Elect	2 years (one as FP, one as FPE)

Evolving focus—the current focus is on the new Science building; therefore, having a CAS/Science faculty member serve on the committee maximizes the communication.

BoT Committee	Faculty Representative	Term
Facilities	CAS/Science	Not to exceed 6 years

BoT Committee	Faculty Representative	Election Years
Enrollment Management	At-large	Odd
Institutional Advancement	At-large	Even
International Programs	At-large	Even
Investment	At-large	Even
Marketing	At-large	Odd
Development [ad hoc]	At-large	Odd

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.

Tenure-track faculty members are evaluated annually during their first three years and if they are unlikely to reach their fullest potential at SMU, they will be informed of this no later than the conclusion of their third year. Additional annual reviews may be initiated by the College/School Dean in one or all years prior to the faculty member submitting his/her application for tenure.

Once they reach their sixth year, only the most unusual circumstances should result in their not achieving tenure; likewise, promotion in rank is the expected norm at point of tenure or thereafter, based on criteria outlined below.

B3.1. Procedures governing the First-year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

First-year tenure-track faculty are evaluated prior to being renewed for a subsequent year. In their first year, tenure-track faculty are encouraged to refrain from taking on major committee assignments; they are encouraged instead to focus on transitioning into the life and culture of the University and becoming effective and compelling teachers. The First-Year Review necessarily focusses, therefore, on teaching effectiveness and the promise of future scholarship and service.

B3.1.1. The Department Chair conducts class visitations of all first-year tenure-track faculty.

B3.1.2. A meeting is held between the Department Chair and the first-year tenure-track faculty member by January 15 to answer any employment-related questions and so that the Chair can provide an assessment of the faculty member's classroom performance.

B3.1.3. The Department Chair writes an evaluation of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses and transmits it along with his/her recommendation regarding renewal to the Dean and the faculty member by February 1.

B3.1.4. An opportunity is afforded to the faculty member to respond in writing to the evaluation; this response must be submitted to the Chair with a copy to the Dean by February 15.

B3.1.5. A recommendation to renew or not renew the faculty member beyond the current academic year is made by the Dean to the Provost by March 1 based on the recommendation by the Chair.

B3.1.6. A decision to renew or not renew the faculty member beyond the current academic year is made by the Provost no later than by March 15; a copy of the decision is sent to the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean.

The appeals process, if the faculty member wishes to appeal on the basis of violations of academic freedom, is described in *Bylaws* 9.

The Second-Year Review typically consists of the submission of an Annual Report by the tenure-track faculty member and a written evaluation by the Department Chair; both become part of the tenure application file of the faculty member at a later date. Based on the results of the First-Year Review, the Department Chair may require additional elements (such as class visitations by peers) as part of the second-year review.

B3.2. Procedures governing the Third-Year Review of Tenure-track Faculty

The Third-Year Review is intended to provide the candidate with accurate and thorough feedback about his/her teaching and professional development, service to the University community, and scholarly activity. The Third-year Review enables the Department, College, and University to determine if the faculty member is making due progress towards a successful application for tenure in future. If the candidate is making due progress towards tenure, it provides preparatory guidance toward the tenure process by generating substantive letters from peers and supervisors that will become an important part of the candidate's tenure file.

B3.2.1. Composition of the Third-year Review Committee

Membership of the Third-year Review Committee is broad-based to provide the candidate substantive and diverse evaluative feedback in several areas.

The Committee consists of:

- a. the candidate's Department Chair
- b. a tenured peer selected by the candidate
- c. a member of the Advancement Committee

Should the candidate be a Department Chair, the Chair of a closely related department will be appointed by the Dean to serve on the Committee.

B3.2.2. Procedure and Documentation

Each fall, the College/School Dean initiates the Third-year Review process for eligible faculty by informing individual faculty members and their Chair.

By December 1 of the candidate's third year, (or the equivalent for regular part-time faculty member), the candidate informs his/her Department Chair about the tenured peer who has agreed to serve on the Review Committee. With guidance from the Chair, the candidate completes his/her review file for the Committee.

The Committee is charged to review the candidate's file and make statements of evaluation and recommendation in the areas of (1) teaching effectiveness and professional development, (2) University service and (3) scholarly activity.

Documents relating to the First-Year and Second-Year reviews will serve as initial documents in the portfolio built by the tenure-track faculty member to be used in his/her Third-Year file and application for Tenure and Promotion.

Saint Martin's University recognizes that its diverse faculty members may choose any number of ways to present an argument for first-year review, Third-Year Review, tenure, and promotion. Therefore, the list below represents the core of the file. Candidates must submit all the materials listed below, but may elect to augment their arguments with further materials. The portfolio should evidence the faculty member's activities in the three traditional areas: teaching and professional growth, scholarly activity, and service to the University community. Documents to be included in the portfolio include the following:

- a. Letter of appointment / hiring letter
- b. All teaching evaluations, both student and peer evaluations, to date;
- c. All syllabi from the courses taught;
- d. Representative teaching materials (handouts, worksheets, lab experiments, paper assignments, etc.);
- e. Dated curriculum vitae (normally includes education, degrees earned, home and business address, employment experience, professional publications and presentations, university and community service, professional organizations, courses taught, distinctions, references, professional memberships);
- f. Copies of all publications, papers presented, etc. listed in curriculum vitae;
- g. A personal statement of 5-8 single-spaced pages, wherein the candidate will reflect upon his/her pedagogical approaches, achievements, service, and growth as a professor. The statement should consider, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

Pedagogical strategies and theoretical assumptions in the classroom;
Professional and scholarly activities; and
Any additional materials

- h. All Annual Summaries (see HB 5.9.) to date.

Additionally, the Chair and Dean are responsible for sending all written communications which are evaluative and reference or speak to the candidate's progress or lack of progress towards tenure and promotion to the Department and the candidate two weeks prior to the deadline by which the candidate has to submit his/her portfolio for the Third-Year Review.

The candidate may incorporate any responses to these evaluations in his/her personal statement.

B3.2.3. Timeline

- The faculty member hands the completed file to his/her Chair by January 5;

- The Chair hands the file to the Third-Year Review Committee by January 20 along with a letter (copied to the faculty member) containing his/her evaluation of the faculty member, a written recommendation to renew or not renew the faculty member, and (if recommending renewal) any suggestions the Chair may have for the faculty member's continued growth in teaching, service, and/or scholarship;
- The Committee submits the file to the Dean of the College/School by February 1 along with a letter (copied to the faculty member) containing recommendation to renew or not renew the faculty member, and any additional comments or suggestions it may wish to add to the Chair's letter;
- The Dean submits the file to the Provost by February 15 along with a letter (copied to the faculty member) containing his/her recommendation to renew or not renew the faculty member, and any additional comments or suggestions the Dean may wish to add to the previous letters;
- The Provost evaluates the file and all recommendations and informs the faculty member in writing of his/her decision to renew or not renew his/her tenure-track appointment by March 1.

All recommendations, evaluations, suggestions and decisions from the Chair, the Third-Year Review Committee, the Dean and the Provost must:

- Be substantive, thorough and communicated in writing;
- Be based on evidence in the candidate's file;
- Cite criteria articulated in the Faculty Handbook, Faculty Bylaws and the appropriate departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion; and
- Be responsive to any previous letters in the third-year review process.

If a determination is made to not continue the faculty member's tenure-track appointment beyond the year of the third-year review, the Provost will extend a one-year, non-renewable, terminal contract to the faculty member for the subsequent year (typically the fourth year). The process by which a faculty member may appeal a decision not to renew his/her tenure

track appointment and to move him/her into a terminal, non-renewable, one-year appointment in the subsequent year, based on violations of academic freedom, is outlined in *Bylaws 9*.

B3.2.4. The Committee's Evaluation Criteria

The Committee must rely on the criteria outlined in *Departmental Guidelines*, the *Faculty Handbook*, and *Faculty Bylaws* to evaluate the tenure-track faculty member's application file during his/her third year. The Third-year review is intended in part as preparation for the fuller review process which attends to a candidate's application for tenure and / or promotion.

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.

Service to the University Community

To evaluate the candidate's service to the University community, the Committee should consider the relevant materials submitted for review in the applicant's file. Though faculty members contribute to the University Community by teaching and scholarship, they are also expected to serve the Community in other ways. In the context of applying for advancement, service includes any roles and responsibilities – apart from teaching and scholarship – that support the interests of students and/or the mission and function of the institution, whether at the Departmental, School/College or University level.

Faculty service usually involves, but is not limited to, serving on committees, which may be standing or ad hoc. Some committees are faculty committees, others are convened by other campus constituencies such as Student Services, the Board, or the Abbey. All committee service is considered a positive contribution to the faculty and the University community. Special consideration is given to particularly active service: membership on demanding or challenging committees, serving as committee chair, etc.

Other members of the faculty are welcome to contribute letters of support for the candidate in relationship to these activities.

Scholarly Activity

To evaluate the candidate's scholarly activity, the Committee should consider the relevant materials submitted for review in the applicant's file. Evidence of scholarly activity may include scholarly research and/or publications, leadership of workshops and/or conferences, presentations at such events, creative products, active membership on the Boards or in leadership of professional organizations, or a systematic ongoing program of study which shows promise of developing into a publishable or creative piece. Faculty may also demonstrate their commitment to scholarship by regularly engaging students in research projects that result in presentations by students (who have been mentored) at regional or national conferences in their discipline or by publishing on the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Since expectations with regard to "scholarly engagement" vary widely based on disciplines, faculty must create departmental documents describing criteria for documenting scholarly engagement in their discipline(s). The Dean and Provost must ensure that there is parity in expectations across Colleges/Schools. The Department Chair must ensure that all Regular Faculty in the Department are familiar with these criteria, once finalized, and that they are included in the tenure and promotion applications of candidates.

If, because of limited resources or inadequate facilities, a junior faculty member is precluded from research in his/her area of expertise, he /she may place special emphasis on the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or work out comparable alternative plans for pursuing scholarly work in consultation with his/her home Department. Departments should aim to account for the kinds of work that might constitute "equivalent scholarly work" in their departmental documentation in order to enable tenure-track faculty members to present a successful portfolio for tenure and promotion to the Associate Professor rank. Faculty who are precluded from scholarship in their area of expertise must demonstrate accomplishments equivalent to scholarly work as outlined in approved departmental guidelines.

B3.2.5. The Role of the Review Committee

By January 20, the Committee submits a letter to the candidate for inclusion in his/her tenure file that outlines its response and evaluation of the stated criteria. The letter is sent to the candidate with a copy to the Dean and Provost.

The Committee's letter should reflect the general consensus of the group and include statements of concern from any dissenting members. The letter should give the Dean and Provost a thorough analysis of the candidate's contributions to the University in each of the required areas, and give the candidate a clear indication of the Committee's concerns for growth. Further, it should indicate if the Committee recommends continuation of the faculty member in his/her tenure-track status, and if the recommendation is to make such renewal, the Committee should point the candidate to areas that need attention prior to consideration for tenure.

If the Committee has serious concerns regarding the candidate's progress towards tenure but recommends that the candidate be renewed in the tenure track for a fourth year, the Committee may additionally request a formal review during the candidate's fourth year. This fourth year review process will mimic the review process conducted in the third year. Copies of Committee's letter and recommendation are sent to the Dean for consideration.

Irrespective of its recommendation, the third-year Review Committee's report does not bind TAP or the Advancement Committee in their future decisions.

The candidate may respond to the Committee's letter by composing an additional letter that will be placed in the candidate's personnel file with the report from the Committee.

B3.3. Procedures for applying for Tenure

Tenure-track faculty must apply for tenure by the date specified in their Letter of Appointment. Failure to do so by the specified date will result in the faculty member receiving a terminal, non-renewable, contract for the following year.

B3.3.1. Timeline

- Achieving tenure requires strong teaching, commitment to engaging with peers through scholarship (E.g. presentations at national and/or regional conferences in their field of expertise especially beyond the third year), and service to the faculty member's Department, College, and/or the University at large.
- By **May 1 of the prior academic year**, the College/School Dean notifies all eligible faculty members and their Chairs in his/her College/School about their eligibility to apply for tenure;
- 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. Letters should be sent to the Chair by September 1.

- By **August 15** of that year they must submit their application and all supporting materials to the Chair of their Department;
- **September 1: Deadline for all letters of comment/support.**
- By **September 15** the Chair writes a letter of evaluation, after consulting tenured and ranked colleagues, regarding the candidacy of the applicant and sends his/her letter and the candidate's file to TAP and a copy of his/her letter to the candidate; in her/his letter, the Chair must clearly indicate support or lack of support for the candidate's application for tenure based on the criteria outlined in Departmental guidelines, the *Faculty Handbook*, and *Faculty Bylaws*;
- By **October 15** the College/School Tenure and Promotion Committee evaluates and votes on the candidacy of the applicant and sends all materials along with their recommendation on tenure to the Dean of the faculty member's College/School; the Committee also sends a copy of their recommendation to the candidate;
- By **October 30**, the Dean writes a letter evaluating the candidate's application based on the criteria outlined in Departmental Guidelines, the *Faculty Handbook*, and *Faculty Bylaws* and forwards his/her letter along with all application materials to the University Advancement Committee; the Dean also sends a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate;
- By **November 21**, the Advancement Committee evaluates and votes on the candidacy of the applicant and sends all materials to the Provost; the Committee also sends a copy of their recommendation to the candidate;
- By **December 15**, the Provost evaluates and votes on the candidacy of the applicant and sends all materials to the University President; the Provost sends a copy of his/her letter to the candidate; further evaluation of the application ceases from this point until January 26 to allow the candidate to lodge an appeal;
- By **January 5**, the candidate must notify the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Provost if he/she plans to appeal any recommendations made up to this point on his/her candidacy;
- From **January 5 until January 15**, the candidate may appeal any negative recommendation regarding his/her candidacy – by his/her Chair, Dean, College/School TAP, or the Provost – by notifying and filing an appeal with the Faculty Affairs Committee;
- By **January 25**, the FAC must review the appeal and notify the University President of their decision on the appeal;
- By **February 10**, the University President acts on the application for tenure and notifies the candidate, the Advancement Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Department Chair, Dean of the applicant's College/School, and the Provost. The University President then forwards his/her recommendation to the BOT;
- By **May 15**, the BOT, through its Academic Affairs Committee and then its full membership, makes a final determination regarding the candidate's tenure application.

NOTE: All recommendations, evaluations, and decisions from the Chair, Tenure and Promotion Committee, Dean, Advancement Committee, Provost, and President must:

- Be substantive, thorough, and communicated in writing;
- Be based on evidence in the candidate's file;
- Cite criteria articulated in the Faculty Handbook, Faculty Bylaws, and the appropriate departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion; and
- Be responsive to any previous letters in the review process – particularly when a recommendation, evaluation, or decision is in disagreement with those in previous letters.

B3.3.2. Tenure and/or Promotion Portfolio

- a. Appointment / hiring letter;
- b. All teaching evaluations, both student and peer evaluations, to date;
- c. All syllabi from courses taught;
- d. Representative teaching materials (handouts, worksheets, lab experiments, paper assignments, etc.);
- e. Dated curriculum vitae (normally includes education, degrees earned, home and business address, employment experience, professional publications and presentations, university and community service, professional organizations, courses taught, distinctions, references, professional memberships);
- f. Letters of evaluation by the Department Chair, or an appropriate substitute (in case the Chair is the candidate) to be determined by the Dean;
- g. Any additional letters solicited by the faculty member from colleagues, former students, and/or alumni. Letters should reflect specific and direct experience. For example, letters about a candidate's teaching should be based upon class visits; comments about service should be based upon serving with the candidate; letters about scholarship should be based upon one's own relevant expertise, the testimony of others in the field, the perusal of published materials, etc.;
- h. Copies of all publications, papers presented, etc. that are listed in the curriculum vitae;
- i. A personal statement of 5-10 single-spaced pages, wherein the candidate will reflect upon his/her pedagogical approaches, service, scholarly achievements, and growth as a professor. The statement should consider, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

Pedagogical strategies and theoretical assumptions in the classroom;
Professional and scholarly activities; and
Any additional materials.

- j. Any additional letters solicited by the faculty member from colleagues, former students, and/or alumni. Letters should reflect specific and direct experience. For example, letters about a candidate's teaching should be based upon class visits; comments about service should be based upon serving with the candidate; letters about scholarship should be based upon one's own relevant expertise, the testimony of others in the field, the perusal of published materials, etc.;
- k. All Annual Summaries (see HB 5.9.) to date.

Additionally, the Dean of the College/School must send all written communications accumulated during the candidate's annual reviews prior to applying for tenure and which are evaluative and reference the candidate's progress or lack of progress towards tenure and promotion to the Department Chair and to the candidate two weeks prior to the deadline by which the candidate has to submit his/her portfolio.

The candidate may incorporate any responses to these evaluations by the Dean in his/her personal statement.

All letters from colleagues and/or others to be included in the candidate's file should be addressed to the candidate's Department Chair, 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 September 1. 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 September 1. 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.

B3.4. 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.

B3.4.1. Criteria

Achieving advancement in rank to an Associate Professor requires strong teaching, ongoing commitment to scholarship and service to one's Department, College, or the University at large.

Scholarship is activity that advances knowledge and shares new ideas and understandings with a broader public in meaningful or impactful ways. Saint Martin's University strives to sustain a culture of scholarship consistent with our institutional priorities and reflective of our Benedictine values. To this end, we encourage, support, and recognize a wide range of scholarly endeavors.

One of the goals of faculty scholarship is to remain current and credible within an academic community or field of expertise. Faculty may demonstrate currency and credibility in traditional ways, such as publishing books, articles in peer-reviewed or refereed venues, book reviews, or contributions to scholarly texts such as encyclopedias; applying for and receiving external research grants; and presenting original work at regional, national, or international conferences. Faculty are also recognized for works in creative scholarship, including theatrical, literary, or musical performances; exhibitions of visual arts; video or film productions; and the composition and publication of original music or creative writing. Faculty can also demonstrate currency and credibility in the scholarship of teaching, which aims to transform or extend knowledge about pedagogy, and which results in contributions to textbooks; articles published in peer-reviewed or refereed venues; conference papers or posters; external grants for developing innovative pedagogies; or publications or public research presentations by mentored students.

Saint Martin's University also values engaged scholarship equally with the traditional definitions, as part of our core mission and as reflective of our Benedictine values. Engaged scholarship advances knowledge by applying academic expertise to collaborative problem solving with local, regional, national, or global communities. The New England Resource Center for Higher Education offers the following definition:

The scholarship of engagement (also known as outreach scholarship, public scholarship, scholarship for the common good, community-based scholarship, and community engaged scholarship) represents an integrated view of the faculty role in which teaching, research, and service overlap and are mutually reinforcing, is characterized by scholarly work tied to a faculty member's expertise, is of benefit to the external community, is visible and shared with community stakeholders, and reflects the mission of the institution.

Faculty can demonstrate achievement in engaged scholarship by developing research projects that involve faculty and students in a sustained, collaborative manner with a community external to the university; that emphasize shared authority during the research process, from identifying a research problem and choosing a theoretical or methodological approach, to developing a final product; and that result in publicly shared work, such as articles published in peer-reviewed or refereed venues, collaborative reports printed or presented in a public forum, a documentation of the project's impact, or receiving external funding.

Faculty can also demonstrate engaged scholarship through teaching within the Saint Martin's University Core curriculum, especially but not exclusively in developing *Ora et Labora* seminars, which situate academic work in an ethical context and strive to create vital connections between student learning and community service. Faculty are encouraged to integrate projects of engaged scholarship into their Core courses, applying their academic expertise to involve students in the creation of knowledge that engages external communities, offers solutions to community problems, or fosters growth and development in community relations. This integration of faculty teaching, engaged scholarship, and service learning reflects our institutional priorities, in that it has been shown to enhance academic success for all students, including those in underserved groups.

When evaluating faculty scholarship, we recognize that different scholarly endeavors require varying levels of institutional support and often have different gestation periods. Attempts to create collaboration across academic fields, or to build and find funding for new research, require time and energy and may result in reduced scholarly output in the short term. This is also true of engaged scholarship. Collaboration with partners and communities beyond the university may take years to develop. It is the responsibility of the faculty to address capacity and timeline issues early in their scholarship process before their third-year review and long before coming up for tenure and promotion.

Finally, we recognize that some scholarly endeavors are not readily subjected to external evaluations, including but not limited to research geared to revitalizing or creating curriculum, institutionalizing service-learning opportunities for students, and fostering an academic climate of faculty-student collaborative research. Faculty should explain these forms of scholarship, identify issues that prevent rapid development of scholarship and provide a timeline for successful completion. The explanation of this form of scholarship should include a detailed description of the projects in development, provide supporting evidence, and illustrate the scholarly impact they have had. Supporting evidence may include, but is not limited to, personal correspondence, meeting minutes, testimony from students, alumni, or community members, or revised syllabi or other course materials.

Since expectations with regard to "scholarly engagement" vary widely based on disciplines, faculty should refer to their Department Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for specific expectations. The Department Chair must ensure that all Regular Faculty in the Department are familiar with these criteria and that they are included in the tenure and promotion applications of candidates.

All evaluators at all stages of the process must consult Departmental documents regarding criteria for promotion, which serve as supplemental and complementary information to that provided in the *Faculty Handbook* and *Faculty Bylaws*.

Achieving advancement in rank to a full Professor requires strong teaching, sustained accomplishments through regular / ongoing publications, creative work, or the scholarship of teaching and learning, i.e. ongoing commitment to scholarly activity, and a strong commitment to leadership/service within the SMU community at many levels.

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.

B3.4.2. Timeline

- By **May 1 of the prior academic year**, the College/School Dean notifies all eligible faculty members and their Chairs in his/her College/School about their eligibility to apply for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and from Associate to full Professorial rank;
- By **August 1** the faculty member must notify their Department Chair of his/her intention to submit an application. Department Chair sends an e-mail within seven days of receipt notifying all faculty of the faculty member's intent;
- By **August 15** of that year the faculty member must submit **his/her** application, **portfolio (see B3.3.2.)** and all supporting materials to the Chair of his/her Department. All letters from colleagues and/or others must be submitted to the Departmental Chair by September 1. When a Department Chair applies for promotion, s/he should notify all faculty of his/her intent by August 1 and should submit all materials directly to the Chair of TAP by August 15; in this case, all letters from colleagues and/or others must be submitted to the TAP Chair by September 1.
- **September 1: Deadline for all letters of comment/support.**
- By **September 15** the Chair writes a letter of evaluation, after consulting tenured and ranked colleagues, regarding the candidacy of the applicant for promotion and sends his/her letter to the Dean of the College/School; in his/her letter, the Chair must clearly indicate support or lack of support for the candidate's application for promotion based on the criteria outlined in the Departmental Guidelines, *Faculty Handbook* and *Faculty Bylaws*; the Chair must also forward the entire application file along with his/her letter to the College/School Tenure and Promotion Committee; the Chair must also send a copy of his/her recommendation to the faculty member;
- By **October 15**, the College/School Tenure and Promotion Committee evaluates and votes on the candidacy of the applicant for promotion and sends all materials to the Dean of the College/School; the Committee also sends a copy of their recommendation to the candidate;
- By **October 30**, the Dean writes a letter evaluating the candidate's application for promotion based on the criteria outlined in the Department Guidelines, the *Faculty Handbook*, and *Faculty Bylaws* and forwards his/her letter along with all application materials to the Advancement Committee; the Dean also sends a copy of his/her recommendation to the faculty member;

- By **November 21**, the Advancement Committee evaluates and votes on the candidacy of the applicant for promotion and sends all materials to the Provost; the Committee also sends a copy of their recommendation to the candidate;
- By **December 15**, the Provost evaluates and votes on the candidacy of the applicant for promotion and sends all materials to the University President; the Provost also sends a copy of his/her letter to the candidate; further evaluation of the application for promotion ceases from this point until January 26 to allow the candidate to lodge an appeal;
- By **January 5**, the candidate must notify the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Provost if he/she plans to appeal a negative recommendation by the Provost;
- Between **January 5 and January 15**, the candidate may counter any negative recommendations made throughout the process at any level in a letter to the University President; this submission becomes part of the application file for promotion;
- If the Provost's recommendation is negative, the University President defers his/her decision on the candidate's promotion until the conclusion of the appeals process;
- By **January 15**, the faculty member must submit his/her formal appeal of the Provost's recommendation and all supporting documents to the FAC;
- By **January 25**, the FAC must review the faculty member's appeal and notify the University President of their decision on the appeal;
- By **February 10**, the University President acts on the application for promotion and notifies the candidate, the Advancement Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee (if there has been an appeal), TAP, the Department Chair, Dean of the applicant's College/School, and the Provost. The University President then forwards his/her recommendation to the BOT;
- By **May 15**, the BOT, through its Academic Affairs Committee and then its full membership, makes a final determination regarding the candidate's tenure application.

NOTE: All recommendations, evaluations, and decisions from the Chair, Tenure and Promotion Committee, Dean, Advancement Committee, Provost, and President must:

- Be substantive, thorough, and communicated in writing;
- Be based on evidence in the candidate's file;
- Cite criteria articulated in the Faculty Handbook, Faculty Bylaws, and the appropriate departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion; and
- Be responsive to any previous letters in the review process – particularly when a recommendation, evaluation, or decision is in disagreement with those in previous letters.

B3.5. Salary Increases

The granting of tenure and promotion is each accompanied by an increase in salary (in addition to the annual step increase). Determination regarding the exact amount of this salary increase is made by the University President and the allocation is reviewed every six years.

B4. PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA WHICH ATTEND TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

B4.1. Conferences and Research / Development Support

Procedures for applying for funds from the Faculty Development Committee are evolved and publicized by the Committee at the start of each academic year. The Committee will aim to create a hierarchy of funding support in keeping with criteria for tenure and promotion. E.g., faculty presentations at conferences may be more substantially supported than attendance at conferences, except in the first two years of a tenure-track faculty member's career when faculty are encouraged to attend conferences as a first step towards connecting with their academic peers.

Faculty requesting funds, when available, from the Office of the Provost must submit a proposal and budget to the Provost with a copy to the College/School Dean. Provost's funds, when available, are used to support faculty development in areas such as the Core Curriculum, cross- College/School initiatives, and other University-wide programs and activities.

B4.2. Selection / Appointment of Mentor and the Mentoring Program

B4.2.1. Objectives

Based on the mission of Saint Martin's University to further teaching excellence and in reflection of the Benedictine virtue of hospitality, our Mentor Program is designed to:

- a. Promote teaching excellence;
- b. Introduce and guide new faculty to all aspects of their academic work life;
- c. Ensure that each new faculty member receives support in academic orientation to the University;
- d. Ensure that each new faculty member be offered a risk-free and non-threatening environment in which to develop and refine teaching skills;
- e. Nature of Mentor Program: Mentoring is a support/coaching system provided by experienced faculty for new faculty. Its emphasis for each of the two semesters is orientation to the University and alignment of new faculty teaching skills to University standards.

B4.2.2. Timeline

Phase I: Initial Semester

Emphasis: Academic Orientation to University and instructional expectations (syllabi writing, developing exams, etc.).

Phase II: Second Semester

Emphasis: Instructional coaching, planning, teaching strategies, student-teacher relationships, development of courses, exams, securing teaching materials, etc.

B4.2.3. Procedures

- a. Mentors are matched with new faculty members by Department Chairs during the second week of the fall semester. Typically, mentors will be members of the faculty who are not holding the position of Dean;
- b. A mentor will ensure initial contact to get acquainted and set up a regularly scheduled meeting (at least one every other week);
- c. The mentee will make at least one observational visit to the mentor's classroom in the initial semester;
- d. The mentor will make at least one observational visit first semester and two visits second semester. Verbal or written feedback will be given to the mentee after each classroom visit.

B4.2.4. Confidentiality Policy

The relationship between the mentor and the new faculty will remain confidential and supportive. The following procedures will be followed:

- a. Mentors will refrain from sharing any information regarding a mentee with the mentee's Department Chair, administration, colleagues or students. The single copy of written comments used in conferences between mentor and mentee will be given to the mentee;
- b. If a new faculty member's retention or future contract to the University is in question, the confidentiality of the mentor/mentee role will not be violated;
- c. Under unusual circumstances, a mentee may request a letter of recommendation from a mentor for purposes of review. In such circumstances, it is up to the discretion of the mentor whether to write such a letter and what to include in it.

B4.3. Applications process for Junior Faculty Fourth-year Teaching Reduction

Regular tenure-track faculty members who typically (a) teach a twelve semester credit load in each of the two semesters of the academic year, (b) are eligible to apply for tenure in their sixth year, and (c) successfully complete their third-year review, may take a two-course (6 credits) reduction during their fourth year. The reduction may be taken in a single semester of the fourth year (teaching load of 4/2 or 18 credits for the year) or spread through both academic terms (teaching load of 3/3 or 18 credits for the year).

B4.3.1. Procedures and Timeline

1. By **March 1** of his/her third year, the Faculty member submits to the Chair of his/her Department an application of no more than three pages responding to issues documented in the Third-year Review and by proposing a plan to attend to his/her scholarly development in preparation for building a successful tenure file in his/her sixth year;
2. By **March 5**, the Chair of the Department makes a recommendation to the Dean regarding this application for a reduced load in the fourth year; the Chair must also clarify how the teaching needs of the Department will be met during that year, especially if the University has restricted additional Contingent Faculty appointments;

3. By **March 12**, the Dean evaluates the application from the faculty member and the Chair's recommendation, and makes a recommendation to the Provost;
4. By **March 19**, the Provost makes a decision and communicates this in writing to the faculty member with copies to the Dean and Chair.
5. By **October 1** of the year immediately following this year of reduced teaching responsibilities, the faculty member must submit a one-two page report to the Provost, with a copy to his/her Dean and Chair, regarding work successfully undertaken during the previous year.

B4.4. Procedures for Applying for Sabbatical Leaves

B4.4.1. Eligibility

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.

Illustration of Sabbatical Timetable

Years Teaching At SMU	Year	Sabbatical Countdown Clock
1.	2010-1	6 hired
2.	2011-2	5
3.	2012-3	4
4.	2013-4	3
5.	2014-5	2
6.	2015-6	1 eligible to apply
7.	2016-7	0 sabbatical, if granted
8.	2017-8	6
9.	2018-9	5
10.	2019-20	4
11.	2020-1	3
12.	2021-2	2
13.	2022-3	1 eligible to apply
14.	2023-4	0 sabbatical, if granted

B4.4.2. Application Procedure

By September 20, the faculty member submits an application and supporting materials to the 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.

By **October 10**, the Advancement Committee passes the application on to the Provost along with a written

evaluation (copied to the applicant). The evaluation 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. In the event of a negative recommendation, the Committee should make a specific and substantive argument for denying a sabbatical based on the application and on the criteria in the Faculty Handbook and Bylaws.

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 written evaluation (copied to the applicant), to the President. The Provost’s recommendation, like that of the Advancement Committee, should be based on the application and on the criteria in the Faculty Handbook and Bylaws.

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.

B4.4.3. Length of Sabbatical Leave

Sabbatical leave is granted for a semester at full salary, or for one academic year at three-quarters salary. The period of the sabbatical leave is credited as service for the purposes of promotion and the granting of salary step increases.

B4.4.4. Sabbatical Agreement

Sabbaticals are granted upon the expressed agreement that the faculty member will continue to serve the University for at least one year after the expiration of the term of leave, unless this provision is expressly waived by the President. Should the faculty member fail to fulfill the terms of the sabbatical agreement, including the sabbatical report, fail to serve for at least one year, he/she is liable for repaying the whole or a proportionate share of the salary paid during the sabbatical leave to the University.

B4.4.5. Salaried Activities during Sabbatical Leave

Faculty may not undertake teaching responsibilities at SMU while on sabbatical leave. Faculty may, however, seek approval to undertake salaried activities outside SMU during their sabbatical that may directly benefit their development as teachers and scholars. New salaried activities outside SMU should be enabling in nature, such as those associated with fellowships, scholarships or stipends that enable the faculty member to undertake a sabbatical leave.

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.

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 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:

- 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 with the faculty member. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to attach comments to the report.

By November 15, the Chair sends the report 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, 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 Summaries (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. 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.

TYPICAL REVIEW CALENDAR FOR REGULAR FACULTY

Academic Year	Fall	Spring
1		1 st year review
2		
3		3 rd year review
4		
5		Annual review in preparation of applying for tenure and promotion
6		Tenure and promotion application
7	Five-year cycle begins (5-year cycle is mandated by the NWCCU)	Tenured appointment begins
8		
9		
10		
11	Post-tenure Development and Review	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	Post-tenure Development and Review	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	Post-tenure Development and Review	
Academic Year	Fall	Spring
21	Post-tenure Development and Review	
22		
23		

24		
25		
26	Post-tenure Development and Review	
27		
28		
29		
30		
31	Post-tenure Development and Review	
32		
33		
34		
35		
36	Post-tenure Development and Review	

B4.6. Applications and Procedures for Leaves of Absence

B4.6.1. Criteria and Important Dates

A Regular Faculty member may request an unpaid leave of absence from the University. A leave of absence without pay may be granted for a period not to exceed two years. Applications for leaves must be submitted for a year at a time even in instance where leaves are undertaken in two consecutive years.

A leave of absence shall not affect the faculty member's eligibility for continued employment, promotion or contract renewal. Leaves of absence may be granted for reasons such as faculty exchange, faculty loan to another University through an inter-university arrangement, advanced study, scholarship and research, public service, or familial / personal obligations.

During a faculty member's unpaid leave of absence from the University, his/her office and laboratory spaces will be reassigned by the Dean for other use. Either the original space or other comparable spaces will be assigned to the faculty member upon his/her return to Regular Faculty status after completing the leave of absence.

By **December 1** during the period of his/her leave of absence, the faculty member must inform the Provost of his/her intention to return during the following academic year to Regular Faculty status. Failure to do so may result in forfeiture of the faculty member's Regular Faculty status and continued appointment with the University.

B4.6.2. Procedure

By **October 1**, a Regular Faculty member seeking to apply for leave during the following academic year submits an application to his/her Department Chair;

By **October 15**, the Chair forwards the request with his/her endorsement, to the Dean;

By **November 1**, the Dean forwards the request with his/her recommendation, to the Provost;

By **November 15**, the Provost forwards his/her recommendation along with the request for unpaid leave, to the University President;

By **December 1**, the University President communicates his/her decision regarding the application for unpaid leave to the faculty member with a copy to the Chair, Dean, and Provost. Faculty members already on their first year of unpaid leave must follow the above process and timeline in requesting a second-year of unpaid leave. If a request for an additional year following the first year of leave is not received in the Provost's Office by December 1, the faculty member will forfeit his/her Regular Faculty status and continuing appointment with the University.

B5. STANDARDS, CRITERIA, AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY

B5.1. General Expectations: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Teaching

Commitment to excellence in teaching is a distinguishing characteristic of Saint Martin's University. Each faculty member, Regular and Contingent, is expected to strive for excellence in teaching. Indeed, teaching effectiveness is an essential criterion in evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion.

Scholarship

The University expects scholarly, creative or interpretive activity from its Regular Faculty. Personal involvement with the academic pursuits of one's discipline strengthens a teacher's ability to transmit the processes by which new knowledge is attained. In addition, a faculty of active learners provides a model of life-long learning for Saint Martin's University students. Finally, the reputations of academic departments and the University are enhanced by scholarly and creative work.

Service

The University calls on its Regular Faculty to participate in its governance and in other activities that cannot strictly be defined as teaching or scholarship. The formulation and review of University policy, participation in departmental administration, and leadership in developing new programs are central to the operation of the University and are necessary components of professional service to the University. No single pattern of service to the University is expected of all faculty members, but each Regular Faculty member is expected to share in activities, which contribute to the governance, operation, and general welfare of the University.

B5.2. Other Responsibilities and Duties

Student Advising

In an effort to assist each student to reach his/her full personal and professional potential, the University emphasizes the role of Regular and Continuing Contingent Faculty, such as ESL Instructors, in the academic advising of students. Faculty advising includes the following areas:

- a. advising the student with regard to the student's work in classes taught by the faculty member;
- b. advising the student on requirements of the Core and guiding advisees through the University's foundational Core curriculum;

- c. advising the student on major requirements;
- d. assisting the student in setting academic goals;
- e. recognizing when the student needs professional assistance with personal problems or problems related to academic skill deficiencies and directing the student to the appropriate office or person for assistance.

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.

Course Syllabi and Course Responsibilities

Faculty are required to file a syllabus for each course taught, including grading procedures, in the Dean's Office by no later than the end of the first week of class.

All Faculty are responsible for planning and presenting the course material, establishing course objectives and requirements and making them known to the student, selecting and ordering texts and supplemental materials in a timely manner, preparing, administering and grading papers and examinations, and assigning grades.

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.

The period of final examinations is scheduled at the end of the semester by the Registrar's Office. No examinations are to be administered to classes during the last regular week of scheduled classes in lieu of the final examination. Final examinations, if given, must be administered at the date and time specified by Registrar. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Provost.

All Faculty members are expected to maintain adequate records of student progress and attendance.

Team Teaching Criteria

Team teaching has to be approved by the appropriate Department Chairs and the Dean(s), and may be restricted based on a College/School's curricular and teaching needs.

Faculty members who elect to team teach a course with a colleague are required to abide by the following policies:

- Team-taught classes will count as in-load teaching for each faculty member provided he class enrolls a minimum of 15 students if team taught by two faculty members and 24 students minimally if team taught by three faculty members;
- Both Faculty members are required to attend all scheduled class sessions so that students benefit from the expertise of both faculty members and the exchange of ideas between them;
- All effort must be made by faculty engaged in teaching a class together to equalize their workloads for the course with regard to grading and evaluating assignments.

Adherence to University Policies and Procedures

Each faculty member is expected to be familiar with and adhere to the policies and regulations of the University. The *Employee Handbook*, *Faculty Handbook*, and *Faculty Bylaws* constitute an effort to summarize such regulations. When questions of interpretation arise, clarification should be sought from the appropriate official of the University. Adherence to these regulations is understood to be incorporated as part of the contract of every faculty member.

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.

B6. TIMELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY CONTRACTS/APPOINTMENT LETTERS

B6.1. Faculty Contracts/Appointment Letters

Regular Faculty members receive Letters of Appointment annually by March 15th of the year for the following year. Contingent Faculty members receive Contracts prior to the date of appointment. Letters of Appointment and Contracts are typically signed by the University President or by the Provost on behalf of the University President.

B6.1.1. Terms Specified on Letters of Appointment and / or Faculty Contracts

Academic Rank

Each faculty member's Letter of Appointment or Contract specifies his/her academic rank. Length of

Appointment

Each faculty member's Letter of Appointment or Contract states the term of the contract by specific dates.

Salary and Pay Schedule

Each faculty member's Letter of Appointment or Contract specifies his/her nine-month salary. The Pay Schedule is shared by the Provost electronically with all Regular Faculty at the start of each academic year.

Duties

Each faculty member's Letter of Appointment or Contract specifies his/her maximum teaching load, credit hours and other special duties, such as supervision, administration, research.

University Handbooks and Faculty Bylaws

Each faculty member's Letter of Appointment or Contract refers faculty members to compliance with the policies of the University as stated in the *Employee Handbook*, *Faculty Handbook*, and *Faculty Bylaws*. Both the University and the faculty member are bound by these written policies, procedures, and regulations.

B6.1.2. Contract Changes

Promotion in Rank

If a faculty member's promotion in rank becomes effective at the beginning of the spring semester, it is included as an amendment to his/her contract or a new updated Letter of Appointment is given to the faculty member.

Step Increases

If a faculty member receives a step increase that is effective at the beginning of the spring semester, it is included as an amendment to his/her contract or a new updated Letter of Appointment is given to the faculty member.

B6.1.3. Contract / Letters of Appointment Negotiations

A faculty member may reopen negotiations on any provision of his/her contract at any time without prejudice to her or his standing or rights and without invalidating in any way the existing contract.

The University may reopen negotiations on any provisions of any faculty member's contract without prejudice to its standing and rights, or to the standing and rights of the faculty member concerned, without invalidating the existing contract.

B6.2. Outside Employment

Before undertaking outside employment, full-time Faculty must make written application for approval to their College/School Dean, stating the rationale for outside employment and the benefit to the

University and/or the larger community. The Dean ascertains whether the outside employment runs a risk of conflict of interest or commitment or interference, then – with his/her written recommendation attached – sends the request on to the Provost for approval.

Faculty undertaking outside employment are expected to ensure that neither the quantity nor the quality of their time spent on University responsibilities is compromised in any way. Deans must update the Provost annually through a written report about all outside unemployment undertaken by the full-time Faculty in their College/School.

In the event that a request to accept outside employment is denied by the Dean or Provost, the Faculty member may petition the Provost for a temporary reduction of contract for the duration of the outside employment. (This reduction can apply to regular part-time faculty, but only if they are more than half-time and less than full-time, since part-time faculty must be at least half-time to be considered eligible for tenure.)

As Faculty are not hired on the basis of an hourly wage, it is understood that the hours that constitute a work week may vary significantly from one week to the next. Nonetheless, for the sake of providing Faculty with well-defined guidelines on outside employment, the University limits full-time faculty to an average of 12 weekly hours of outside employment.

Regular Faculty who undertake outside employment during the three summer months of the year when they are not on contract with the University (May 15 – August 15) are not required to seek permission to do so from the University.

To the extent that it informs their scholarship, Faculty are encouraged to share the work they do outside the university with colleagues and students.

For further information, please refer to the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitments Policy in H1.5.4.

B6.3. Consulting

Insofar as consulting work is most often akin to outside employment, the guidelines on outside employment (H6.1. and B6.2.) are the same, including the process for applying for permission and the limit of an average of 12 weekly hours. If a faculty member intends to use 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.) s/he should provide details of such when applying to the Dean.

For further information, please refer to the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitments Policy in H1.5.4.

B7. PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING AND ASSIGNING FACULTY WORKLOAD

The faculty teaching load at Saint Martin's is defined in terms of teaching semester credit hours.

B7.1. Standard Teaching Load for Regular Faculty

Normally, a full-time Regular Faculty member with commitments to teaching, scholarship, and service, regardless of rank, teaches twenty-four (24) semester hours each academic year.

The teaching load of the individual faculty member is evaluated by the Dean, subject to review by the Provost.

In its effort to assure equity in the distribution of assignments, the University recognizes that an adequate definition of a Regular Faculty member's workload takes into account the full spectrum of his/her professional and institutional services.

B7.1.1. Calculation of Studies and Independent Studies in Workload

B7.2. Contingent Faculty Teaching Loads

Contingent Faculty workloads are calculated as follows: 1 hour of teaching requires 1.25 hours of preparation. Each semester teaching hour therefore equates to 2.25 weekly work load hours.

Contingent Faculty are typically encouraged to maintain one weekly office hour per course, which are included in the total hours represented below in calculations of a Contingent Faculty member's weekly work load.

Contingent Faculty workloads do not typically exceed three 3-credit semester courses on the Lacey Campus in each semester. Contingent Faculty workloads do not typically exceed two three-credit courses in each eight-week term on extension campuses.

B7.2.1. Sample Loads

Lacey Campus

- A Contingent Faculty member teaching one 3-credit course during a regular semester carries a total work load of 7.75 weekly hours;
- A Contingent Faculty member teaching one 4-credit course during a regular semester carries a total work load of 10 weekly hours;
- A Contingent Faculty member teaching two 3-credit courses during the regular semester carries a total work load of 15.5 weekly hours;
- A Contingent Faculty member teaching two 4-credit courses during the regular semester carries a work load of 20 weekly hours;
- A Contingent Faculty member teaching three 3-credit courses during the regular semester carries a work load of 23.25 weekly hours;

- Any hours constituting required attendance at University meetings or required service on committees or additional weekly office hours are calculated as additional hours of commitment within a Contingent Faculty member's work load. All additional required hours are approved by the Provost and may be additionally compensated.

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.

Extension Campuses and/or 8-week terms

- A Contingent Faculty member teaching a 3-credit course (5.5 hours per week of class time) during an eight-week term carries a total work load of approximately 13.5 weekly hours;
- A Contingent Faculty member teaching two 3-credit courses (11 hours per week of class time) during an eight-week term carries a work load of approximately 27 weekly hours.

B7.3. Procedures Governing Reductions in Teaching Load

The University may request that a Regular Faculty member assume non-teaching activities on a temporary basis. If this involvement is heavier than would normally be expected in general service to the University, the teaching load of the faculty member is reduced. Such a request on the part of the University is agreed upon by the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean, and approved by the Provost.

Reductions in load for Regular Faculty, for substantial service or administrative responsibilities, are typically for three credit hours each semester, and typically do not exceed 9 semester credits during the year. Faculty with releases above 12 credits in the academic year function as academic leaders/academic administrators.

B7.3.1. Calculation of Directed Studies and Independent Studies in Workload

A Regular Faculty member who typically teaches twelve semester credits each semester and has undertaken Directed or Independent Studies totaling 27 semester credits of teaching through the course of several regular semesters may request to be placed on a reduced teaching load of nine semester credits (typically three courses) in any semester following such accumulation during which he/she is typically expected to teach a 12-credit load. The Dean recommends this reduction to the Provost who approves it. It is the faculty member's responsibility to keep track of independent/directed studies; faculty members are encouraged to include such teaching in their Annual Summaries. If a faculty member accumulates enough such credits for two or more course reductions, s/he may not take more than one per semester. This policy only applies to independent/directed studies taught since fall 2014.

Faculty members do not lose the credits they accumulate by teaching Independent/Directed Studies but may activate their access to a reduced load only during a semester in which they would normally be expected to teach a 12-credit load.

B7.3.2. Types of Reductions in Teaching Load

B7.3.2.1. Approved Reductions

Faculty who receive approved teaching reductions as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook 7.2.1.* may not teach more courses than their approved reduced load. In exceptional circumstances, the Provost may approve an exception to this rule.

B7.3.2.2. Unplanned Reductions

The principles and policies governing unplanned reductions in teaching loads are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook 7.2.2.*

B7.4. Procedures for Assigning and Calculating Teaching Overloads

Regular Faculty are normally discouraged from teaching overloads, with exceptions resulting only from pressing and temporary Departmental and/or College/School teaching needs. Exceptions to this practice must be approved by the Provost.

B7.5. Procedures for Assigning Summer Teaching and/or Other Assignments

Assignments of summer teaching are not guaranteed and are determined by the Dean and approved by the Provost based on teaching needs.

Regular Faculty members may elect to be compensated on the basis of their nine-month contracted salary or as a Contingent Faculty member for summer teaching. The former carries with it continued commitment to Regular Faculty duties and responsibilities (such as advising

and service on committees) during the period of the summer contract. Faculty members who elect to teach

during the summer on contingent appointments are relieved of all duties and responsibilities other than teaching and maintaining office hours for students in their classes. Regular Faculty are required at point of appointment to indicate their choice of contract for summer teaching responsibilities.

B8. PROCEDURES FOR APPLYING FOR BENEFITS SPECIFIC TO FACULTY

B8.1. Leave for Expectant Mothers

Regular Faculty members who are eligible to access leave as expectant mothers, as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* 8.1.1., are encouraged to inform their Department Chair and Dean as early as possible in accordance with terms outlined in the *Handbook*. The Provost approves Leave for Expectant Mothers. Failure to give sufficient advance notice may prevent the faculty member from being able to access the paid leave benefit for the desired semester.

B8.2. Parental Support through Reduced Teaching

Regular Faculty members who are eligible to apply for parental support through reduced teaching as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* 8.1.3. are encouraged to inform their Department Chair and Dean as early as possible in accordance with terms outlined in the *Handbook*. The Provost approves parental support through reduced teaching. Failure to give sufficient advance notice may prevent eligible faculty members from being granted their preferred reduced teaching schedule.

B8.3. Externally-Funded Leaves with Supplemental Support from the University

Regular Faculty members who receive external grants for semester-long or year-long research and who wish to request a supplemental grant from the University as a “top-up” if the external award they receive falls short of their normal income for the period of the grant must submit a formal request with supporting documentation to the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost who approves the “top-up” grant; the total remuneration to the faculty member from grant funds and the University contribution may not exceed his/her contracted salary for the nine-month period of the academic year.

Within the next semester after they return from leave, faculty members must submit a report to their Dean and Provost.

The University requires that a faculty member granted research leave which includes pay from SMU will return to full-time service to the University for the equivalent period following his/her leave. If this obligation is not fulfilled, the faculty member will be expected to reimburse the University for the “top-up” salary paid while on leave, unless specifically relieved of the obligation by the University President.

Faculty members on research leaves are required to notify the Provost by December 1st of the year about their return to the University in the following fall semester and by September 1st of their return to the University in the following spring semester.

B9. PROCEDURES GOVERNING FACULTY NON-RENEWAL, DISMISSAL, AND TERMINATION

B9.1. Non-renewal of Tenure-track Faculty

Non-renewal of tenure-track faculty is typically initiated by the Department Chair who must consult with all tenured Faculty members in the Department in making this determination. If there are no tenured faculty in the Department or only one other tenured faculty member in the Department, the Chair consults with two tenured faculty members from a related Department. The terms which govern a Chair's / Department's determination not to renew a Regular tenure-track faculty member are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* 9.1.

B9.1.1. Procedure

- By **December 1**, the Chair makes a recommendation not to renew a tenure-track faculty member in writing, with all supporting documentation, to the Dean;
- By **December 10**, the Dean forwards the recommendation to the Provost with a written recommendation to renew or not renew the tenure-track faculty member;
- By **December 20**, the Provost reviews both recommendations and all supporting documentation and makes a determination; in making this determination, the Provost may consult with faculty leaders, members of the Department, or any other individuals who may be familiar with the faculty member's performance; the Provost conveys the University's decision not to renew the tenure-track faculty member's appointment in writing to the faculty member with copy to the Chair, Dean, and University President.

B9.1.2. Terms

If the tenure-track faculty member is in the first year of his/her appointment, his/her contract will end at the conclusion of the same academic year in which he/she is notified about non-renewal, i.e., by the end of his/her current contract in May of that year;

If the tenure-track faculty member is in his/her second or subsequent year in the tenure track, he/she will be informed that he/she will be given a terminal, non-renewable contract for the subsequent year by March 15th of the academic year in which he/she is informed about non-renewal in the tenure track; he/she may accept or reject the terminal contract for the subsequent year, but is typically expected to do so by March 31st.

B9.2. Termination without Prejudice of Tenured Faculty

The terms and conditions under which a tenured faculty member may be terminated without prejudice are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* 9.2.

A recommendation to terminate a tenured faculty member without prejudice is typically initiated by the

Provost, Dean, or Chair. The recommendation to terminate a tenured faculty member without prejudice may be made at any point in the year; the decision can be made only by the University President.

If the recommendation to terminate a tenured faculty member without prejudice is made because of disability, the Chair or Dean must consult with the Provost who is required to inform the Chief Human Resources Officer. The Chief Human Resources Officer will guide the Provost, Dean, and Chair in documenting “total disability” as defined by the Saint Martin's University long-term disability insurance plan, by which the disability should be of such a degree that the faculty member is unable to perform the material and substantial duties which attend to his/her contractual obligations. The Chief Human Resources Officer will ensure that all supporting documentation is provided to the University President who makes the final decision to terminate a tenured faculty member without prejudice because of disability.

If the recommendation to terminate a tenured faculty member without prejudice is made because of permanent or protracted revision of the University curriculum, academic program closure, *bona fide* financial crisis, or *bona fide* financial exigency, the University will give the affected faculty member one year's written notice prior to termination and make all reasonable efforts to secure appropriate internal employment for the terminated faculty member. The University will also provide reasonable assistance in the identification and facilitation of other employment opportunities.

B9.3. Dismissal for Cause

B9.3.1. Dismissal for Cause of Tenure-track or Tenured Faculty

The circumstances under which a tenure-track or tenured faculty may be dismissed for cause are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* 9.3.

B9.3.1.1 Timeline

A recommendation to terminate a tenure-track or tenured faculty member for cause may be initiated by the Provost, Dean, or Chair. The recommendation to dismiss a tenured faculty member for cause may be made at any point in the year, but the decision can be made only by the University President. The causes for which a decision to dismiss a tenure-track or tenured faculty member may be made are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*.

B9.3.1.2 Procedure

The Chair, Dean, or Provost who initiates the process to dismiss a tenure-track or tenured faculty member for cause must present reasons in the form of a written “Charge” with all supporting documentation to the University or academic leader to whom he/she reports;

- If a Chair or Dean initiates the process to dismiss for cause and presents a “Charge” to the Provost, the Provost must convene a Council of tenured faculty members in consultation with the Faculty President. The Council should consist of five tenured faculty members who carry rank at or above that of the faculty member being terminated.

- The Provost must take the discussion and recommendation of the convened Council into consideration, schedule a meeting with the affected faculty member to discuss the charges and the Council’s evaluation of the circumstances, and then make a recommendation to the University President to dismiss the tenure-track or tenured faculty member for cause. The Provost must inform the Chair and Dean about his/her recommendation.
- If the Provost initiates the process to dismiss for cause and presents a “Charge” to the University President, he/she must first meet with the affected faculty member and present the “Charge.” The Provost also informs the Chair and Dean. The Provost then convenes a Council of five tenured faculty members in consultation with the Faculty President. The Council should consist of five tenured faculty members who carry rank at or above that of the faculty member being terminated.
- The Provost must take the discussion and recommendation of the convened group into consideration before either dismissing the charge, in which case, the process ends.
Or
- The Provost makes a recommendation to the University President to dismiss the tenure-track or tenured faculty member for cause.

The affected faculty member may appeal the Provost’s recommendation to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

- (1) If the appeal is submitted by a tenure-track faculty member, the FAC will consider it on the basis of violations of academic freedom only;
- (2) If the appeal is submitted by a tenured faculty member, The FAC will consider it on the basis of violations of process, violations of academic freedom, and violations of the *Faculty Handbook* and *Faculty Bylaws*.

Within ten days of receipt of the appeal, the FAC submits its determination to the University President, who must await the results of the appeals process, if activated by the faculty member, before making a decision with regard to dismissal for cause of a tenure-track or tenured faculty member.

B9.3.1.3. Terms

In the event of a dismissal for cause, the services, appointment, and employment of the faculty member may be terminated by the University before the end of his/her contract expiration date. The faculty member must be given written notice of his/her termination at least thirty days in advance of the termination date, which must specify the grounds for “termination for cause” in accordance with Section 9.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

If dismissal proceedings are initiated against a tenured faculty member and result in a finding of cause, dismissal or disciplinary action other than dismissal may be recommended and imposed. Disciplinary action other than dismissal may include, but is not limited to, reprimand, suspension with or without pay, reassignment of duties, reduction in appointment, mandatory counseling, and/or continued monitoring of behavior and performance.

B9.3.2. Dismissal of Tenured Faculty for (Involuntary) Ineffectiveness

The circumstances under which a tenured faculty member may be terminated for ineffectiveness are outlined in detail in the *Faculty Handbook*, 9.4.

Current ongoing failure or ineffectiveness by a faculty member in performing his/her major contractual teaching obligations has to be documented by a faculty member's Department Chair and/or Dean and presented in writing to a faculty member, and the faculty member should be given an opportunity to respond in writing.

Efforts have to be made by the Chair and Dean to assist the faculty member in regaining his/her effectiveness; these efforts must be documented.

If such efforts do not result in desirable levels of effectiveness and do not hold the promise of returning to desirable levels of effectiveness, and because successfully serving our students in the classroom remains a primary commitment of all faculty and their Departments and Colleges/Schools, a recommendation to terminate the faculty member may be made by the Dean to the Provost.

The Provost must examine the recommendation to terminate in the context of the faculty member's professional life as a member of the Saint Martin's University community and determine whether to proceed with recommending termination to the University President.

Alternatively, the Provost may, if possible, offer the tenured faculty member a transitional period of reassigned responsibilities in a redefined role within the University. The specific period of such reassigned duties and the terms which attend to this redefined role have to be provided in writing to the faculty member. These reassigned duties and the reassigned role are provided for a specific limited time prior to separation in order to give the faculty member a transitional period and to enable the affected Department to search for and replace the faculty member and thus meet its teaching obligations to students.

The faculty member may elect to accept or reject this offer of reassigned duties. The Provost must then determine whether to proceed with a recommendation to the University President to terminate the faculty member and also inform the faculty member about his/her decision.

The Provost should consult faculty leaders in initiating dismissal of tenured faculty members for ineffectiveness.

B10. PROCEDURES GOVERNING FACULTY APPEALS AND GRIEVANCES

B10.1. Appeals by Tenure-track Faculty against Non-renewal

B10.1.1. Basis of Appeal

A tenure-track faculty member may appeal the decision to not renew his/her contract/Letter of Appointment, if he/she believes the decision was made in violation of his/her academic freedom.

B10.1.2. Notification, Petition and Time Frame

Within one week of receipt of notification of the non-renewal decision, the faculty member notifies the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the intent to appeal. The FAC Chair informs the University President and Provost.

Within two weeks of the non-renewal notification, the petitioner submits an appeal petition to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The petition must detail the fact and circumstances, which gave rise to the violation of his/her academic freedom and the presumed relationship between the violation and the non-renewal decision. The petition may contain any evidence, which the petitioner deems pertinent to the case.

Upon receipt of the petition, the Chair of the FAC again notifies the University President and Provost and requests materials relevant to the decision in the case, including a copy of the document specifying the reasons asserted as the basis for non-renewal of employment.

B10.1.3. Committee Responsibilities

The FAC is limited to the question of whether the non-renewal decision is related to a violation of the faculty member's academic freedom. The responsibilities of the Committee are as follows:

- a. to consider the case carefully, including the specific reasons asserted as a basis for non-renewal, the petitioner's and respondent's arguments and such other testimony, arguments and evidence as the Committee deems necessary;
- b. within five working days of completion of deliberations, to forward the petition and relevant evidence to the University President, and to report, in writing, its findings and rationale for its recommendation to uphold or reject the non-renewal decision (in addition, a minority report may be submitted);
- c. to provide copies of its report to the appellant and the Provost;
- d. to maintain the confidential nature of its proceedings, except as noted above.

B10.1.4. Responsibilities of the University President

The President will consider the relevant materials and provide a decision and justification, in writing, to the faculty member and the Faculty Affairs Committee within ten working days. If the faculty member chooses, a timely and dated written response will be made part of the faculty member's permanent record.

B10.2. Appeals by Tenure-track Faculty against a negative decision on Tenure and by Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty against a negative decision on Promotion

B10.2.1. Appeals by Tenure-track Faculty against a negative recommendation on Tenure

Basis of Appeal

A faculty member may appeal a negative tenure recommendation of the Provost by following the

procedures below. The basis for appeal must rest on errors in procedure, inadequate consideration, gross abuse of the faculty member's rights and privileges, violation of academic freedom, or violation of the principle of fundamental fairness. The faculty member should cite appropriate sections of the *Faculty Handbook* and *Faculty Bylaws*.

Timeline

A Regular Faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation by the Provost regarding tenure to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

- By **January 5** following notification of the negative recommendation on his/her candidacy, the faculty member must notify the FAC and the Provost of his/her intent to appeal. Rather than passing on the faculty member's file to the President, the Provost retains the file;
- By **January 15**, the faculty member must submit his/her formal appeal petition and all supporting documents to the FAC Chair. The Chair informs the University President and Provost. The Provost passes on the faculty member's file to the FAC Chair;
- By **January 25**, the FAC must review the faculty member's appeal and forward it and the appellant's file to the University President along with the Committee's decision. (In addition, a minority report may be submitted.)

The Committee Procedure

The FAC considers the appeal petition, the tenure file, the Advancement Committee's and Provost's letters and other materials or information pertaining to the process that was followed. The Faculty Affairs Committee will base its evaluation of the appeal on the specific claim(s) set forth in the petition.

Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Faculty Affairs Committee are as follows:

- a. The Committee reports to the University President, in writing, its findings and rationale for its recommendation to uphold or reject the appealed recommendation(s); in addition, a minority report may be submitted;
- b. The Committee provides copies of its report to the petitioner, the Advancement Committee, and the Provost;
- c. The Committee must maintain confidentiality with regard to its proceeding and findings.

Responsibilities of the University President

If the Provost's recommendation on tenuring the faculty member is negative, the University President must wait until the candidate has had time to complete the appeals process to evaluate the candidate's application for tenure.

If an appeal is made,

- (a) By **February 10**, the University President evaluates the candidate's application for tenure and renders a decision on the same. The University President considers all materials which are part of the candidate's application for tenure; the President's notifies the applicant and sends a copy of his/her letter to the Provost, the Dean of the applicant's College/School, and Department Chair.

If the faculty member chooses, he or she may submit a timely and dated written response to the University President's decision on his/her appeal and/or tenure decision. This written response will be made part of his or her permanent record.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Faculty members may appeal negative decisions on tenure and promotion simultaneously.

B10.2.2. Appeals by Tenure-track or Tenured Faculty against a negative decision on Promotion

Basis of Appeal

A faculty member may appeal a negative promotion recommendation of the Provost following the procedures below. The basis for appeal must rest on errors in procedure, inadequate consideration, gross abuse of the faculty member's rights and privileges, violation of academic freedom, or violation of the principle of fundamental fairness. The faculty member must cite the appropriate sections from the *Faculty Handbook* and *Faculty Bylaws*.

Timeline

A Regular Faculty may appeal a negative recommendation by the Provost regarding promotion to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

- By **January 5** following notification of the negative recommendation on his/her candidacy, the faculty member must first notify the FAC and the Provost about his/her intent to appeal. Once notified of the faculty member's intent to appeal, the Provost retains the faculty member's file;
- By **January 15**, the faculty member must submit his/her formal appeal petition and all supporting documents to the FAC Chair. The Chair informs the University President and Provost. The Provost passes on the faculty member's file to the FAC Chair;
- By **January 25**, the FAC must review the faculty member's appeal petition and forward it and the appellant's file to the University President along with the Committee's decision. (In addition, a minority report may be submitted.)

The Committee Procedure

The FAC considers the petition, the promotion file, the Advancement Committee's and Provost's letters and other materials or information pertaining to the process that was followed. The Faculty Affairs Committee will base its evaluation of the appeal on the specific claim(s) set forth in the petition

Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Faculty Affairs Committee are as follows:

- a. The Committee reports to the University President, in writing, its findings and rationale for its recommendation to uphold or reject the appealed recommendation(s); in addition, a minority report may be submitted;
- b. The Committee provides copies of its report to the petitioner, the Advancement Committee, and the Provost;
- c. The Committee must maintain confidentiality with regard to its proceeding and findings.

Responsibilities of the University President

If the Provost's recommendation on promoting the faculty member is negative, the University President must wait until the candidate has had time to complete the appeals process as described above before evaluating the candidate's application for promotion.

If an appeal is made,

By February 10, the University President must render a decision on the appeal. The University President considers all materials which are part of the candidate's application for promotion; the President's notifies the applicant and sends a copy of his/her letter to the Provost, the Dean of the applicant's College/School, and Department Chair.

If the faculty member chooses, he or she may submit a timely and dated written response to the University President's decision on his/her appeal and/or promotion decision. This written response will be made part of his or her permanent record.

B10.3. Appeals by Tenured Faculty against Decisions to Terminate for Cause

B10.3.1. Basis of Appeal

A tenured faculty member may appeal the decision to terminate his/her contract of employment for cause on the basis of violations in process, gross abuse of the faculty member's rights and privileges, and/or violations of the *Faculty Handbook* and *Faculty Bylaws*.

B10.3.2. Notification, Petition, and Time Frame

Within one week of receipt of notification of the decision to terminate a tenured faculty member for cause, the faculty member notifies the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the intent to appeal.

Within two weeks of notification of termination, the petitioner submits a petition to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The petition will set forth the reasons why the petitioner believes the termination decision was in error. It may contain any evidence, which the petitioner deems pertinent to the case.

Upon receipt of the petition, the Chair of the Committee notifies the University President and Provost and

requests materials relevant to the decision in the case, including a copy of the document specifying the reasons asserted as the basis for termination of employment.

B10.3.3. Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Faculty Affairs Committee are as follows:

- a. to consider the case carefully, including the specific reasons asserted as a basis for termination, the petitioner's and respondent's arguments and such other testimony, arguments and evidence as the Committee deems necessary;
- b. to report to the University President within five working days of completion of deliberations, in writing, its findings and rationale for its recommendation to uphold or reject the termination decision (in addition, a minority report may be submitted);
- c. to provide copies of its report to the petitioner and the Provost;
- d. to maintain the confidential nature of its proceedings, except as noted above.

B10.3.4. Responsibilities of the University President

The President will consider the relevant materials and provide a decision and justification, in writing, to the faculty member and the Faculty Affairs Committee within ten working days.

If the faculty member chooses, a timely and dated written response will be made part of the faculty member's permanent record.

B10.4. Grievances

The University recognizes and endorses the importance of academic due process, the right of redress, and of adjudicating grievances without fear of prejudice or reprisal. Accordingly, the University encourages the informal and prompt settlement of grievances where possible as well as the formal processes set forth in this section to respect and protect academic due process, academic, and professional conduct.

B10.4.1. The Faculty Affairs Committee

Grievances by faculty members are heard by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

B10.4.2. Faculty Covered by the Grievance Process

Faculty governed by the grievance process include ranked faculty, unranked teaching faculty, and librarians with faculty status. When the grievance involves faculty other than ranked faculty, the grieved issue must relate directly to the individual's instructional (faculty) function rather than staff or administrative function. When in question, the Faculty Affairs Committee will determine jurisdiction. If the jurisdiction cannot be satisfactorily resolved, the Provost will decide.

B10.4.3. Grievance

The grievance process is intended to include those matters not accorded the opportunity for redress through the appeals process established for recommendation/decision for promotion, tenure, non-renewal and termination. This is an internal process of self-governance and does not include legal counsel for either party.

B10.4.4. Informal Resolution

The University encourages the resolution of grievances on an informal basis whenever possible. Faculty members should first seek remedy through normal peer-to-peer and/or administrative channels. If this proves unsatisfactory, the faculty member may then petition the Faculty Affairs Committee for redress.

B10.4.5. Petition

The petition must be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee within thirty working days of a significant incident related to the grievance.

The petition will set forth in detail, the grievance and state against whom the grievance is directed. It will contain any evidence, which the petitioner deems pertinent to establishing a prima facie case.

B10.4.6. Committee Action and Time Frame

Preliminary Procedures

Once a grievance is filed in writing with the FAC, the Committee must determine the following:

- a. Whether the grievant has standing under the Faculty Grievance Policy;
- b. Whether the grievance has been filed in a timely fashion;
- c. Whether the grievance identifies an appropriate respondent(s);
- d. Whether the grievance adequately identifies the existing policies alleged to have been violated; and
- e. Whether the grievance contains an adequate statement of the facts relevant to the complaint.

If the Committee decides that the facts do not warrant a hearing, it will notify the petitioner in writing. The Committee may also seek to bring about a settlement of the issue satisfactory to the parties. If, in the opinion of the Committee, such a settlement is improbable or inappropriate, the Committee will hear the dispute, following the procedures outlined below. The hearing will be held within thirty calendar days of receipt of the petition.

If a party to the grievance feels that a member of the Committee has a conflict of interest in the case, the party should bring it to the attention of the Committee Chair. Should the FAC decide that one of its members has a conflict of interest in the case, that member shall remove himself/herself from the case or be removed by the Chair. An alternate member may be appointed by the Faculty President.

Hearing Procedures

1. Hearings shall be scheduled by the FAC with due regard for the schedule of both parties. Grievances involving faculty/academic staff who hold academic year appointments will normally not be held during summer semester unless the faculty/academic staff member has a summer appointment. On the rare occasion when a party fails to respond to repeated attempts to schedule a hearing or unreasonably delays the scheduling of a hearing, the FAC will schedule the hearing for the first date available to the Committee members and the other party;
2. The FAC shall provide written notice of the time and place of the hearing, the names of any witnesses, and copies of any documents submitted by the parties and deemed relevant by the Committee, to each party at least seven (7) days before the hearing;
3. The hearing shall be conducted in good faith and must be completed within 14 calendar days unless the FAC determines that an extension of time is necessary;
4. All hearings shall be recorded. A party may request and obtain a copy of the recording from the FAC;
5. Hearings shall be closed unless all parties agree otherwise;
6. The privacy of confidential records used in the hearing shall be respected;
7. All parties may present their cases in person and may call witnesses on their behalf. The names of witnesses must be provided to the FAC at least seven days prior to the hearing date;
8. All parties are entitled to bring a tenured colleague of their choice to the hearing. The name of the attending colleague must be provided to the FAC at least seven days prior to the hearing date;
9. Any party shall be entitled to ask pertinent questions of any witness or the other party at appropriate points in hearings. The Chair of the Committee shall determine what questions are pertinent;
10. The grievant bears the burden of proving that there has been a violation of policy;
11. The FAC, in confidential deliberations, after hearing all evidence presented by the grievant and respondent, shall decide whether the preponderance of the evidence supports the allegations made by the grievant;
12. After making a determination on the grievance, the FAC shall recommend appropriate redress consistent with existing policies, procedures, and practices to the Provost or President, as appropriate;
13. The Provost or President, once they receive the determination and recommendation of the Faculty Grievance Committee, shall decide on appropriate action, and in writing, within 14 working days of receipt of the findings and recommendations, inform the grievant and respondent, with a copy to the FAC and any other members of the community, as appropriate;
14. In cases regarding sensitive personal matters and not involving academic freedom, the records will

not be released without mutual agreement.

15. All original records are permanently retained by the University.

Indemnification

In accordance with the University's Indemnification Policy, indemnification shall be provided to all members of the Faculty Affairs Committee, members who attend and provide information at hearing and appeals sessions, and University faculty serving as unpaid, volunteer counsel for the parties to a grievance and in their roles as participants in a grievance. A copy of the

Indemnification Policy shall be provided to all participants who attend a hearing related to grievances or appeals.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE LETTER OF APPOINTMENT

Date: X

Dr. X
Address: X

Dear Dr. X:

I am pleased to offer you the position of Assistant Professor in the Department of X within the College/School of X at Saint Martin's University. Your Department Chair is Dr. X. Appointment

Details

- Rank and Status: XXX; Full-time - 9-month
- Salary: 9-months' salary of \$XXX, from August 16, XXXX to May 15, XXXX, payable in twelve monthly installments beginning on August 31, XXXX
- Tenure Status: Tenure-Track
- Date of First-Year Review: X
- Date of Third-Year Review: X
- Date of Tenure and Promotion Application: X (Year 6 of your Tenure-Track appointment)
- Effective Date of Tenure and/or Promotion, if awarded: X (Year 7 of your appointment)
- Benefits: Retirement contribution as currently authorized by the Board of Trustees; medical insurance and other coverage/options as defined by the Human Resources Office for all employees. Please consult with Ms. Cynthia Jonson, Associate VP for Human Resources, at 360-438-XXXX for details.

Appointment Terms

- Salary: \$XX per 9-month contract period
- Load: 12 semester credits in each regular semester of the academic year
- Moving Expenses: Reimbursement up to 10% of base salary for actual moving expenses to the Lacey area, within twelve months of the appointment, to be reimbursed upon submission of receipts

Your teaching responsibilities will include courses in your area of disciplinary expertise and in the University's core curriculum.

All Regular Faculty members are evaluated annually for reappointment in the tenure-track, and are expected to demonstrate a continuing commitment to effective teaching and professional development, scholarly activity, and service to the University community.

In preparing to progress towards a successful application for tenure and promotion in Year XXXX, you should discuss discipline-specific details regarding teaching and scholarship with your Chair and with your mentor, who will be assigned to you by your Chair. You must also consult your Department's *Tenure and Promotion Guidelines*, which are available on the Provost's web site at www.stmartin.edu/Provost/DepartmentalGuidelines.Tenure&Promotion; these will guide your Department in their annual evaluation of your progress towards tenure and promotion. They will also guide the College/School Tenure and Promotion Committee, your Dean, the Advancement Committee, and the Provost as they evaluate your application for tenure and promotion in the sixth year of your tenure-track appointment. Tenure and promotion are granted by the University's Board of Trustees upon recommendation by the University President.

For additional details concerning your appointment and conditions of employment and work life that pertain particularly to Regular Faculty, please refer to the *Faculty Handbook* and *Faculty Bylaws* which are available on the University's website at www.stmartin.edu/FacultyHandbook&Bylaws. You should also consult the *Employee Handbook*, which is available on the University's web site at www.EmployeeHandbook.com.

Please indicate in writing to my office, within ten business days, your acceptance of this offer of employment at Saint Martin's University. Please retain this Letter of Appointment for your records and for inclusion in the portfolio of materials you will be expected to submit in support of your application for tenure and promotion.

I am pleased to welcome you into the Saint Martin's University community and look forward to working with you in coming years. Please feel free to contact my office or Dean X in the College/School of X should you have any questions regarding this appointment.

Sincerely, XXX, Provost

cc: Dr. X, Dean of the College/School of X
Ms. X, Associate VP for Human Resources
Ms. X, Vice President of Finance

APPENDIX B

Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws

Preamble

The Faculty Senate is the voice of the Faculty and the centerpiece of faculty governance and of faculty participation in shared governance. Except when the Faculty Assembly is in session, the Senate exercises powers typically vested in the Faculty and represents its will.

The Faculty Senate consists of elected Senators drawn from the regular faculty of each College and School. It serves as the representative body of the Faculty for conducting faculty and academic business, the agent for overseeing and coordinating the Faculty committee structure, and a forum for discussing issues affecting the Faculty and the University.

The Faculty Senate promotes a climate of academic freedom, academic integrity, and inclusive diversity; equity in tenure, promotion, workload, and salary distribution; an optimal learning environment throughout the University; and an environment conducive to fundamental fairness, social and economic justice, and Benedictine hospitality.

Senate Constitution

Article I - Name

The name of this organization is the Faculty Senate of Saint Martin's University (hereafter referred to as Faculty Senate).

Article II – Powers and Responsibilities

The Faculty Senate serves as the representative body of the Faculty and, except when the Faculty Assembly is in session, exercises powers typically invested in it by the Faculty of Saint Martin's University. The Senate:

1. works to support, through the charters of its Faculty committees, an optimal learning environment and rigorous academic standards;
2. articulates the Faculty voice on academic matters such as curriculum, degree requirements, academic standards, admission policies, faculty research, faculty membership and aspects of student life which relate to the educational process;
3. oversees, coordinates, and, when appropriate, charges Faculty committees;
4. serves as a forum for the discussion of matters of importance affecting the Faculty, the University, and the Academy either through the Senate itself or by convening the Faculty Assembly;
5. coordinates with Faculty and University leaders in the appointment of academic leaders, such as Deans and the Provost, and serves in an advisory capacity to the Board of Trustees, President, and other leaders in searches for other administrative officers;
6. serves in an advisory capacity, both directly and through its committees, on budget and planning matters, university organizational structure, and in matters affecting faculty work life and the educational mission of the University.

Article III - Membership

The Faculty Senate shall be comprised of regular faculty members who represent the Faculty of Saint Martin's University.

Article IV Officers

The officers of the Faculty Senate and the process for their election shall be provided in the bylaws.

Article V - Meetings

The Senate shall have regular meetings during the academic year, as provided in the bylaws.

Article VI – Bylaws The bylaws adopted by the Faculty Senate shall be its governing rules so long as they are consistent with this Constitution.

Article VII - Amendment

Amendment of the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Senate with a subsequent majority vote of the Faculty Assembly. A proposed amendment must be distributed to members of the Faculty Senate at least two weeks prior to its consideration. The proposed amendment must be sent to the Faculty at least two weeks prior to a Faculty Assembly meeting. Amendment of the Constitution must be approved by a majority of the Regular Faculty voting at the Faculty Assembly in which the amendment is presented.

Senate Bylaws

Article I Membership

Section 1

The Senate shall consist of the Faculty President (presiding officer); the President-Elect; six (6) Faculty Senators elected from and by the Colleges and Schools; and five (5) Faculty Senators elected at-large by the Faculty Assembly.

Section 2

The School of Business, the Hal and Inge Marcus School of Engineering and the College of Education and Counseling Psychology will each have one designated Senator. The College of Arts and Sciences will have three designated Senators. Election of Senators is conducted in accordance with the rules and procedures adopted by each college and school.

Section 3

Election of the President-Elect and Senators-at-Large shall occur at the last Faculty Assembly meeting of the academic year.

Section 4

Nominations for President-Elect may occur at both the next-to-the last and/or last Faculty Assembly of the academic year. Faculty Senators-at-Large are nominated and voted on individually. Nominations for each position for Senators-at-Large are taken individually from the floor during the last Faculty Assembly of the academic year. Election of each position for Senators-at-Large is by secret ballot. The nominee for each position receiving the majority or plurality of votes is elected Senator-at-Large. In case of a tie vote, a run-off election is held until one of the candidates receives either a majority or plurality of votes from those voting.

Article II Officers and Senators

Section 1

The Officers of the Faculty Senate shall be the President and President–Elect.

Section 2

The responsibilities of the Officers and Senators are:

President: presides at all meetings of the Senate and Faculty Assembly, sends a written agenda to all faculty in advance of each meeting, provides official communication to the Faculty, University President, administration, and Board of Trustees, and executes all other responsibilities incidental to the office.

President-Elect: Assumes the responsibilities of the President during an absence or inability to act and performs other responsibilities incidental to the office, including meeting arrangements.

Senators: Participate with the President and President-Elect in making decisions on issues related to the Faculty Senate and perform other responsibilities incidental to the office.

Section 3

The terms of office are:

President: one year

President-Elect: one year

Senators: two years.

No Senator may serve more than four consecutive years. Terms are staggered so that one-half (1/2) of the Senators selected by the Colleges and Schools are elected each year and either two (2) or three (3) of the at-large Senators are elected each year.

Section 4

Mid-term vacancies in College and School positions are filled in accordance with rules and procedures adopted by each College and School. The term of office lasts only as long as the vacated term. Vacancies of longer than one semester for Senators-at-Large are determined by a vote of the Faculty. The election takes place at any Faculty Assembly meeting as determined by the Faculty President. The term of office lasts only as long as the vacated term. Vacancies of a semester or less for Senators-at-Large are filled by appointment made by the Faculty President. The term of office continues for the period specified by the Faculty President, but in no case continues beyond one semester.

Article III Meetings

Section 1

A quorum for the transaction of business consists of a simple majority of voting members.

Section 2

Robert's Rules of Order, the latest edition, is followed in conducting Faculty Senate meetings.

Section 3

The agenda, time, and location of a Faculty Senate meeting are sent to all Faculty on the Monday morning before the meeting occurs. Minutes of each Faculty Senate meeting are sent to all Faculty no later than one week after their approval.

Section 4

The presiding officer may not vote except in the case of a tie. Voting is conducted by voice or hand. At the request of any Senator, a vote is taken by secret ballot. Changes to the Faculty Handbook are considered by the Senate and sent to the Faculty Assembly for consideration. Except for Faculty Handbook changes, a 2/3 vote of the Senate is necessary to send an issue

to the Faculty Assembly for consideration. All motions, except amendments to the Faculty Senate Constitution and issues being referred to the Faculty Assembly, are approved by majority vote of those present. No voting by proxy is permitted.

Article IV Committees

Section 1

Faculty committees as described in the Faculty Handbook, and ad hoc faculty committees, report their findings and present recommendations to the Faculty Senate for consideration. The Senate submits and refers matters to the committees for their review, study and recommendations.

Section 2

In order that the Faculty be kept informed of the progress of its committees, all standing committees submit regular written reports of their actions to the Senate. The frequency and level of detail of the reports is determined by the individual committees in consultation with the Senate. In addition to those reports, by December 1 and April 15, the chair of each standing committee, in consultation with committee membership, develops and delivers to the Faculty Senate a written summary of committee deliberations, actions and plans. Committee reports and summaries, which are submitted to the Faculty President, are distributed electronically to the faculty as a whole.

Article V Executive Committee

Section 1

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate consists of the Faculty President, President-Elect and two Senators appointed by the Faculty President.

Section 2

The Executive Committee assists the Faculty President in setting meeting agendas, consults on Senate business between meetings, and serves in an advisory capacity.

Article VI Amendments to the Bylaws

Amendments to the Senate's Bylaws may be presented by any voting member of the Senate.

An amendment to the Senate Bylaws is deemed approved if it is endorsed by a two-thirds of the Senate's voting members present.

When a quorum, as defined in Article III, is present, rules of order may be suspended by a majority of the voting members of the Senate.

APPENDIX C

AAUP 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

The statement that follows is directed to governing board members, administrators, faculty members, students, and other persons in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution. The statement is intended to foster constructive joint thought and action, both within the institutional structure and in protection of its integrity against improper intrusions. It is not intended that the statement serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components of an academic institution, although it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures. The statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example, the United States government, state legislatures, state commissions, interstate associations or compacts, and other inter-institutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.

Students are referred to in this statement as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators, and faculty. There is, however, no main section on students. The omission has two causes: (1) the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without thorough study might prove unfair to student interests, and (2) students do not in fact at present have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities; it would be unseemly to obscure, by superficial equality of length of statement, what may be a serious lag entitled to separate and full confrontation.

The concern for student status felt by the organizations issuing this statement is embodied in a note, "On Student Status," intended to stimulate the educational community to turn its attention to an important need.

This statement was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). In October 1966, the board of directors of the ACE took action by which its council "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the institutions which are members of the Council." The Council of the AAUP adopted the statement in October 1966, and the Fifty-third Annual Meeting endorsed it in April 1967.

In November

1966, the executive committee of the AGB took action by which that organization also "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the governing boards which are members of the Association." (In April 1990, the Council of the AAUP adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.

1. Introduction

This statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities.

Understanding, based on community of interest and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authorities, at all levels, play a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

a. Preliminary Considerations

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process.

Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand, as developed hereinafter.

b. Determination of General Educational Policy

The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction. Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory

provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.

c. Internal Operations of the Institution

The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions. Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president.

The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty. Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part 5 of this statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well established.

d. External Relations of the Institution

Anyone—a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member

of the faculty, or a member of the student body or the alumni— affects the institution when speaking of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An individual who speaks officially for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent. The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution. There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board

The governing board has a special obligation to ensure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: for example, the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.

The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually, when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to ensure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation. One of the governing board's important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the overall policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction.

The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty. When ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.

4. The Academic Institution: The President

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership. The president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community. The president represents the institution to its many publics. The president's leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president's administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to ensure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly, the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities; is responsible for public understanding; and by the nature of the office is the chief person who speaks for the institution. In these and other areas the president's work is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the general support of board and faculty.

5. The Academic Institution: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general

educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity. Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies; and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

On Student Status

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

Notes

1. See the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure,” AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 10th ed. (Washington, D.C., 2006), 3–11, and the 1958 “Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings,” *ibid.*, 12–15. These statements were jointly adopted by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors; the 1940 “Statement” has been endorsed by numerous learned and scientific societies and educational associations. [Back to text](#)

2. With respect to faculty members, the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” reads: “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution” (*Policy Documents and Reports*, 3–4). [Back to text](#)

3. Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, system wide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP’s Council in June 1978.] [Back to text](#)

4. With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process. [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 2002.] [Back to text](#)

5. The American Association of University Professors regards collective bargaining, properly used, as another means of achieving sound academic government. Where there is faculty collective bargaining, the parties should seek to ensure appropriate institutional governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance in accordance with the “Statement on Government.”

[Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 1978.]

Appendix D

AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure

In 1940, following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This restatement is known to the profession as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The 1940 Statement is printed below, followed by Interpretive Comments as developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1969. The governing bodies of the two associations, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. ¹The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.[1] ²

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

Academic Freedom

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. [2] Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment. [3]
3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession

and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution. [4]

Academic Tenure

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

1. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.
2. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank,[5] the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years.[6] Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.[7]
3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have. [8]
4. Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges and should have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. The teacher should be permitted to be accompanied by an Advisor of his or her own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence, the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from the teacher's own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution. [9]
5. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

Appendix E

AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics

The statement that follows was originally adopted in 1966. Revisions were made and approved by the Association's Council in 1987 and 2009.

Introduction

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The *Statement on Professional Ethics* that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to ensure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and the Committee on Professional Ethics, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, or the applicable provisions of the Association's *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

The Statement

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end, professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the

relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

APPENDIX F

AAUP Minimum Standards for Good Practice If a Formal System of Post-Tenure Review Is Established

1. Post-tenure review must ensure the protection of academic freedom as defined in the 1940 *Statement of Principles*. The application of its procedures, therefore, should not intrude on an individual faculty member's proper sphere of professional self-direction, nor should it be used as a subterfuge for effecting programmatic change. Such a review must not become the occasion for a wide-ranging "fishing expedition" in an attempt to dredge up negative evidence.
2. Post-tenure review must not be a reevaluation or revalidation of tenured status as defined in the 1940 *Statement*. In no case should post-tenure review be used to shift the burden of proof from the institution's administration (to show cause why a tenured faculty member should be dismissed) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained).
3. The written standards and criteria by which faculty members are evaluated in post-tenure review should be developed and periodically reviewed by the faculty. The faculty should also conduct the actual review process. The basic standard for appraisal should be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position, not whether the faculty member meets the current standards for the award of tenure as those might have changed since the initial granting of tenure.
4. Post-tenure review should be developmental and supported by institutional resources for professional development or a change of professional direction. In the event that an institution decides to invest the time and resources required for comprehensive or "blanket" review, it should also offer tangible recognition to those faculty members who have demonstrated high or improved performance.
5. Post-tenure review should be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.
6. Except when faculty appeals procedures direct that files be available to aggrieved faculty members, the outcome of evaluations should be confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate college or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released otherwise only at the discretion, or with the consent of, the faculty member.
7. If the system of post-tenure review is supplemented, or supplanted, by the option of a formal development plan, that plan cannot be imposed on the faculty member unilaterally, but must be a product of mutual negotiation. It should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration or even its own abandonment. The standard here should be that of good faith on both sides—a commitment to improvement by the faculty member and to the adequate support of that improvement by the institution—rather than the literal fulfillment of a set of nonnegotiable demands or rigid expectations, quantitative or otherwise.
8. A faculty member should have the right to comment in response to evaluations, and to challenge the findings and correct the record by appeal to an elected faculty grievance committee⁵ or she should have the same rights of comment and appeal concerning the manner in which any individualized development plan is formulated, the plan's content, and any resulting evaluation.
9. In the event that recurring evaluations reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that do not lend themselves to improvement after several efforts, and that call into question his or her ability to function in that position, then other possibilities, such as a

mutually agreeable reassignment to other duties or separation, should be explored. If these are not practicable, or if no other solution acceptable to the parties can be found, then the administration should invoke peer consideration regarding any contemplated sanctions.⁶

10. The standard for dismissal or other severe sanction remains that of adequate cause, and the mere fact of successive negative reviews does not in any way diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause in a separate forum before an appropriately constituted hearing body of peers convened for that purpose. Evaluation records may be admissible but rebuttable as to accuracy. Even if they are accurate, the administration is still required to bear the burden of proof and demonstrate through an adversarial proceeding not only that the negative evaluations rest on fact, but also that the facts rise to the level of adequate cause for dismissal or other severe sanction. The faculty member must be afforded the full procedural safeguards set forth in the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings* and the *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, which include, among other safeguards, the opportunity to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.

Notes

1. These procedures are set forth in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, and the Association's "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure." These documents appear in AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11th ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 13–19, 91–93, and 79–90.
2. See William Van Alstyne, "Tenure: A Summary, Explanation, and 'Defense,'" *AAUP Bulletin* 57 (1971): 328–33, and Matthew W. Finkin, "The Assault on Faculty Independence," *Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP* 83 (July–August 1997): 16–21.
3. Here, and in other guidelines and standards set forth below, the procedures, in addition to conforming with established AAUP-supported standards, should also conform to the applicable provisions of any collective bargaining agreement.
4. For the applicable policy statements, see note 1.
5. See Regulation 16, "Recommended Institutional Regulations," *Policy Documents and Reports*, 88.
6. See Regulations 5–7, "Recommended Institutional Regulations," *ibid.*, 83–85.

NOTES

ⁱ The Faculty notes that the principles of fairness and collaboration/consultation derive also from the *Rule of Benedict*, Chapter 3. Though the specifics of the Rule apply to the monastic context of the Abbey and the Abbot's jurisdiction within the Abbey, the principles of consultation by University leaders and fairness constitute noteworthy models for the general conduct of University life at Saint Martin's:

As often as anything important is to be done in the monastery, the abbot shall call the whole community together and himself explain what the business is; and after hearing the advice of the brothers, let him ponder it and follow what he judges the wiser course. The reason we have said all should be called for counsel is that the Lord often reveals what is better to the younger. The brothers, for their part, are to express their opinions with all humility, and not presume to defend their own ways obstinately. The decision is rather the abbots to make, so that when he has determined what is more prudent, all may obey. Nevertheless, just as it is proper for disciples to obey the master, so it is becoming for the master on his part to settle everything with foresight and fairness.

These principles – of consultation among constituents and fairness in decision-making – also define aspects of University life and conduct as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* and *Bylaws*.

ⁱⁱ The Faculty notes that the University's transition to College/School Deans evolved as its footprint expanded, a context that is not unlike that prescribed by the *RB* for the creation of Deans in a monastery, and that the spirit of the University's transition, as in many of its activities, captures values articulated by the *RB* and the monastic order of Benedictine monks to whom the University owes its identity and essential character:

If the brotherhood is large, let brethren of good repute and holy life be chosen from among them and be appointed Deans; and let them take care of their deaneries in everything according to the commandments of God and the directions of their Abbot. Let such be chosen Deans as the Abbot may safely trust to share his burden. Let them not be chosen for their rank, but for the merit of their life and their wisdom and knowledge; and if any of them, puffed up with pride, should be found blameworthy and, after having been corrected once and again and even a third time, refuseth to amend, let him be deposed, and one who is worthy be placed in his stead.

ⁱⁱⁱ Current full-time Visiting Faculty members who were hired prior to December 2013 and have taught at Saint Martin's for two-three years may be considered for tenure-track appointments in the University within the next three-five years through a locally-advertised search, subject to the following contexts and conditions:

- They are not currently replacing a Regular Faculty member who has taken on administrative functions temporarily or has undertaken a leave of absence and is expected to return to the Department in due course;
- They have established a record of successful teaching, show promise of continuing scholarly engagement and activity, and have the potential to contribute to the life of the University through service;

- The Department involved can demonstrate the need for an additional tenure-track appointment in the area of the Visiting Faculty member's curricular expertise; if the Department is able to demonstrate curricular need but not in the Visiting Faculty member's area of expertise, the Department's request for an additional tenure-track hire will be considered among all such requests for the year;
- The Department endorses by a two-thirds majority vote the Visiting Faculty member as a candidate to be considered for a tenure-track position;
- The Dean endorses the request made by the Department;
- University finances permit this transition.

Final approval is granted by the University President upon a recommendation by the Provost.

Recommended Further Reading

American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

Faculty members are encouraged to consult Policy Documents and Position Papers on the AAUP web site: www.aaup.org

American Association of University Women (AAUW)

Faculty members are also encouraged to consult documents and statements on the AAUW website: www.aauw.org. The AAUW advances “equity for women and girls through advocacy, education, philanthropy, and research.” It is the nation’s leading voice promoting equity and education for women and girls. Since its founding in 1881, AAUW members have examined and taken positions on the fundamental issues of the day — educational, social, economic, and political.

Other sites of interest to faculty include:

www.chronicle.com

www.insidehighered.com

<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/>

<http://www.universitiesnews.com/>

E & OE