IV. APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

A. Types of Faculty Appointments

1. All part-time and half-time faculty appointments are non-tenure-track. All part-time and half-time appointments are made by the President upon consultation with the department and the Provost/CAO.

2. All full-time faculty appointments are either tenured, probationary (tenure-track), or non-tenure-track and are made by the President upon consultation with the department and the Provost/CAO.

   a) Appointments to tenure-track positions will ordinarily be made within specific departments at the rank of Assistant Professor.

   b) Appointment to a tenure-track position will ordinarily require the attainment of the Ph.D. (or highest degree expected in the field, as determined by the department and the Provost/CAO and approved by the RPT committee).

   c) At the time of hire, or conversion, to tenure-track, the Department or Program will provide a document to the candidate that enumerates the Department or Program’s expectations for tenure and promotion. This document will be approved by the Provost/CAO and will be made a part of the candidate’s permanent file. The file should be made accessible to RPT at the time of promotion and tenure, and any changes to the expectations must be approved by, and provided in writing to, the candidate.

   d) Full-time, non-tenure-track positions will be established by the President after consultation with the department and Provost/CAO. Non tenure-track appointments may include, but are not limited to, visiting faculty and reappointments of retired faculty under special conditions.

3. No positions, nor individuals in a position, will be granted on-going (more than 3 years), full-time, non-tenure-track status without consultation with the Budget and Planning Committee. In such cases, a compelling case must be made by the Provost/CAO and the department as to why the position is not tenure-track. The Provost/CAO and the Budget and Planning committee will periodically review the need for such positions.

4. In addition to the appropriate department and Provost/CAO, the RPT Committee will be consulted at the time of hiring when a candidate is to be appointed under any of the following unusual circumstances

   a) appointment with tenure

   b) appointment to a shared tenure-track position between two or
more departments

c) appointment to a tenure-track position at a rank higher than Assistant Professor
d) appointment to a tenure-track position prior to attainment of the Ph.D. (or highest degree expected in the field).
e) When such unusual appointments are contemplated, the RPT Committee and appropriate department consider the credentials submitted by the candidate and any additional evidence the committee feels is necessary to secure. The committee then makes a recommendation to the Provost/CAO concerning the implications of such an appointment for the RPT process. A written record of the terms of the initial appointment that pertain to the RPT process will become a part of the candidate’s file (see section IV.J.9). In cases of initial appointment with tenure, the department and the RPT Committee must be consulted and there must be evidence that the candidate has met the college’s criteria for tenure. As is provided in section IV.B.14 below, pertaining to normal promotion and tenure review, the faculty anticipates that the administration and Board will concur with faculty judgment as to whether the criteria for tenure have been met, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons. In the event that the President or Provost/CAO is the subject of the appointment, the Executive Committee of the Board will consider such appointment according to the procedures it adopts for this purpose.

B. The Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Process

1. Each year, all faculty members will complete an Annual Faculty Record describing their teaching, scholarship and service activities. The Provost/CAO will review the Annual Faculty Records.

2. The RPT Committee consults with the Provost/CAO’s office concerning the status of every faculty member each year to confirm eligibility of candidates for consideration and to ascertain that no one is overlooked as a candidate for an appropriate review procedure.

3. Reappointments. In cases of preliminary tenure review, reappointments without tenure are made by the President, upon recommendation of the department, the RPT Committee, and the Provost/CAO. In all other cases, reappointments without tenure are made by the President, upon recommendation of the department and the Provost/CAO.

4. Promotion is affirmatively granted by the Board. Promotion must be affirmatively granted by the Board according to this policy. It is never automatic, never the result of inaction or inadvertence, and never granted simply as the result of service to the college for a number of years. No
person will have any authority to make any representation concerning promotion to any faculty member, other than as provided in this policy.

5. Tenure Defined. Tenure is an employment status that is conferred by the College upon a faculty member who has achieved the required standard of performance established by the faculty in teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and service (section IV.F) and has been approved by the Board of Trustees. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to perform their assigned duties in a professionally competent manner that is consistent with professional ethics and integrity. The status of tenure creates a legitimate claim of entitlement to continued employment except for a) termination for adequate cause; b) termination due to financial exigency; c) termination due to formal discontinuance of a program or department; d) termination due to disability; and e) release of tenure by virtue of voluntary retirement, resignation, or abandonment.

6. Tenure Is Affirmatively Granted. Tenure must be affirmatively granted by the Board according to this policy. It is never automatic, never the result of inaction or inadvertence, and never granted simply as the result of service to the college for a number of years. No person will have any authority to make any representation concerning tenure to any faculty member, other than as provided in this policy.

7. Board’s Authority. All final tenure and promotion decisions are made by the Executive Committee of the Board, upon recommendation of the President. Before making such recommendation, the President will consult the Academic Affairs Committee and consider the recommendations of the appropriate department, the RPT Committee, and the Provost/CAO.

8. Voluntary retirement or resignation. A faculty member shall be deemed to have relinquished tenure or to have waived the right to tenure upon retirement or resignation from the college.

9. Faculty recommendations concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure originate with the appropriate department chairs, who send letters of recommendation to the President, with copies to the RPT Committee, the Provost/CAO, all tenured members of the candidate’s department, and the candidate. Using only the criteria established by the faculty (cf. section IV.F), the committee reaches its decisions in pre-tenure and tenure and promotion reviews and submits its written recommendation to the President, with copies to the Provost/CAO, the department chair, and the candidate. The recommendation must indicate whether the committee’s decision was unanimous and, if not, must indicate the votes for and against the decision and the number of abstentions, if any, together with the reasons for any differences from the recommendation of the department chair.
10. On the basis of the recommendations of the department chair and the RPT Committee, as well as whatever other considerations the Provost/CAO deems relevant, the Provost/CAO submits a written recommendation to the President, with copies to the RPT Committee, the department chair and the candidate. Procedures to address contradictory recommendations among the department, the committee, and/or the Provost/CAO may be found in section IV.N of this legislation.

11. At any point in the process, the candidate and/or the department chair may request a meeting with the Provost/CAO and/or the RPT Committee.

12. The President will share copies of all reports and recommendations with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board, and will consult with the committee before making a final recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Board. The Academic Affairs Committee may, but is not required to

   a) hold special meetings for the purpose of deliberating individual cases under this policy, and
   b) invite RPT Committee members to any meetings it may hold.

13. Upon review of all pertinent information, including but not limited to the reports and recommendations of the department, the RPT Committee, and the Provost/CAO and, after consultation with the Academic Affairs Committee, the President will prepare a formal written recommendation for presentation to the Executive Committee of the Board, with copies to the Provost/CAO, RPT Committee, department chair and faculty candidate.

14. Upon review of the report and recommendation of the President, the Executive Committee will make a final tenure and/or promotion decision.

   The faculty itself is best qualified to make evaluations related to faculty appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, and the granting of tenure. It is also the faculty’s responsibility to make such evaluations. The faculty anticipates that the Board of Trustees and the President will concur with the faculty judgment on whether the appropriate criteria have been met, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons.

15. If the candidate or, in unusual circumstances, the candidate’s department, alleges that the President’s recommendation on reappointment, promotion or tenure to the Executive Committee is the result of discrimination, or a violation of academic freedom or of college procedures, either party may request that the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee appoint a subcommittee to review the case. The request for an appeal must be made in writing to the President, with a copy to the Provost/CAO, RPT Committee, department chair, and candidate, within ten days of
notification of the intended recommendation of the President. The presentation of the case to the Board of Trustees will be postponed until the appeal has been resolved.

a) The subcommittee will consist of three appointed tenured members of the Faculty Grievance Committee who have not been previously involved with the case. No members of the RPT Committee or the candidate’s department will be included. In filing an appeal, a candidate may also request that an additional tenured member of the faculty serve as his or her advocate, without a vote in the final deliberations.

b) The subcommittee will review the case and, as necessary, interview the participants, discussing only matters related to the alleged violations. The subcommittee will not consider evidence relating to the merits for reappointment, promotion or tenure in the case (see section V.A.3)

c) Within fifteen calendar days of completion of the investigation,

(1) the subcommittee will submit a written report to the President,

(2) with copies to the Provost/CAO, RPT Committee, department chair, and candidate, indicating one of the following

(a) No violation is found, in which instance the appeal is denied and the matter closed. The case will then proceed with the President’s recommendation to the Board.

(b) A violation is found, in which instance the case will be reopened. In reopening a case, the President, depending on the circumstances and time of year, will either initiate an immediate review of the case based upon the recommendations of the Grievance subcommittee, or offer a one-year contract so that the case can be reviewed during the following academic year. After the second review process has been completed, the President will forward the final recommendation to the Board (section IV.B.13). If this final recommendation is negative, the report of the subcommittee from the initial review will be forwarded, along with the final recommendation.

16. The President will inform the Provost/CAO and the appropriate department chair and the chair of the RPT Committee of the action of the Board at the time that the President notifies the faculty member concerned. When a candidate is not reappointed or is not granted tenure or promoted when eligible, the President must provide to the candidate
written reasons for the decision by the Board of Trustees.

C. Time Schedule for Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review Processes

1. Notice of Non-reappointment.

It being understood that a faculty member’s duties normally terminate June 30, full-time and half-time faculty members should receive timely notice of non-reappointment as follows:

a) Written notice by March 1 for full-time and half-time members during the first academic year of service at Goucher College.

b) Written notice no later than December 15 during the second academic year of such service for full-time and half-time members, if the appointment expires at the end of that academic year; or, if the second year of service ends during the academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.

c) Written notice at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service at Goucher College.

2. Notice of Reappointment and Acceptance or Resignation By a Faculty Member.

All full-time and half-time faculty should receive timely notice of reappointment, ordinarily 30 days prior to the termination of his/her duties at the end of each academic year. When the college offers a contract to a faculty member, the recipient will respond to the President in writing, indicating acceptance or resignation, within thirty days. If a contract is accepted and the acceptance is not superseded by a letter of resignation within the same thirty day period, the contract will be considered to have been accepted and will be binding, i.e., resignation after this point will be considered a breach of contract. The Provost/CAO’s Office will send a reminder one-week prior to the expiration of the thirty-day period to those faculty members from whom no response to the contract letter has been received.

3. Schedule for Preliminary Tenure, Tenure and Promotion Reviews

a) Tenure will ordinarily be established at the beginning of the seventh year of service in a full-time tenure-track appointment to the teaching faculty, at least five years (or 10 semesters) of which have been at Goucher College. Consideration for tenure ordinarily occurs in the sixth year (or 11th semester) of service, but may be delayed as described in section IV.C.3.h. All candidates for tenure are required to have completed a minimum of five years of full-time college-level teaching within his or her
discipline, including five full-time semesters of teaching at Goucher College prior to consideration. At least two semesters must precede the pre-tenure review, and at least two must follow the successful pre-tenure review; section IV.E. Exceptions to this timeline must be recommended by the candidate’s department chair and RPT and approved by the Provost/CAO and the President. As described in section IV.B.6, tenure must be affirmatively granted.

b) A candidate with previous teaching experience at another college or university may elect to count, at most, the equivalent of two years of full-time teaching service toward tenure (sections IV.C.3.f-g), provided that such service occurred after granting of the candidate’s Ph.D. or terminal degree. The candidate should make this decision in consultation with the department chair. By the end of the first year (or 2nd semester) of tenure-track appointment at Goucher College, the department chair must notify the RPT Committee and the Provost/CAO of the decision in writing, with a copy to the candidate.

c) The rare candidate who is appointed to a tenure-track position prior to attainment of the Ph.D. (or highest degree expected in the field) may elect to count, at most, the equivalent of two years of full-time teaching service at Goucher College prior to obtaining said degree toward tenure (sections IV.C.3.f-g). The candidate should make this decision in consultation with the department chair. By the end of the academic year (or 2nd semester) following the granting of the degree, the department chair must notify the RPT Committee and the Provost/CAO of the decision in writing, with a copy to the candidate.

d) Service at Goucher College prior to appointment to a tenure-track position, up to the equivalent of two years of full-time teaching service, may be counted toward tenure, if the candidate so chooses. The candidate should make this decision in consultation with the department chair. By the end of the first year (or 2nd semester) of full-time tenure-track appointment at Goucher College, the department chair must notify the RPT Committee and the Provost/CAO of the decision in writing, with a copy to the candidate.

e) A faculty member appointed to a tenure-track position with no previous service will ordinarily go through a preliminary tenure review during the sixth semester of full-time service at the college and tenure review during the eleventh semester.

f) A faculty member appointed to a tenure-track position with the equivalent of one year of previous full-time service will ordinarily go through a preliminary tenure review during the sixth semester of full-time tenure-track service at the college and tenure review during the ninth semester.

g) A faculty member appointed to a tenure-track position with two years or more of previous full-time service will ordinarily go
through a preliminary tenure review during the fourth semester of
full-time tenure-track service at the college and review during the
seventh semester.

h) At the request of the candidate and the department, with the
assent of the Provost/CAO in consultation with the RPT
Committee, consideration for tenure may be deferred, for no more
than two years, to compensate the individual for medical or family
circumstances that have impeded professional progress during the
probationary period of service.

i) The year following a positive tenure decision marks the
establishment of tenured status and eligibility for a sabbatical leave
(unless the sabbatical leave schedule was “reset” as a result of
taking a pre-tenure leave; see section IV.C.4.a below).
Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
ordinarily occurs at the time of a positive tenure decision.

j) If a candidate is denied tenure, the year of service following the
negative tenure decision is the terminal year of employment at the
college.

k) Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor will require
tenured status and ordinarily not occur before the rank of
Associate Professor has been held for six years (or 12 semesters).
In no case will years in rank be considered as the sole factor for
promotion to the rank of Professor. Professional leaves of
absence will count toward time in rank for promotion unless the
faculty member and the college agree to the contrary at the time
leave is granted.

l) Time in rank at other institutions will be considered toward
promotion, except that no promotion will be made with less than
two years of service at Goucher College.

4. Approved Academic Leaves

a) Pre-Tenure Leaves and Effect on the “Sabbatical Clock”

After successfully completing the preliminary tenure review, a
candidate will be eligible for a half-year, pre-tenure leave with full
pay or a full-year pre-tenure leave with half pay. If a candidate
elects to take a leave, the candidate has the right to decide
whether or not to stop the “tenure clock,” meaning that an
additional year may be added, if the candidate so chooses, to the
time before the final tenure review. By the end of the semester
following the pre-tenure leave, the candidate should make this
decision, in consultation with the department chair. The
department chair must notify the RPT Committee of the decision
in writing, with a copy to the candidate. For faculty electing to
take the pre-tenure leave, the “sabbatical clock” will be reset in
accordance with sabbatical leave policies described in Section
IV.P below.
b) Fellowships and Effect on Tenure and Sabbatical Schedules

(1) A candidate who, after consultation with the department chair, accepts a fellowship prior to the pre-tenure or tenure review (whichever applies) has the right to decide whether or not the “tenure clock” stops provided that the following hold:
   (a) In the case of the pre-tenure review, the candidate will have taught full-time at Goucher College for at least two semesters prior to the review
   (b) In the case of the tenure review, the candidate will have taught full-time at Goucher College for at least two semesters following the successful pre-tenure review, and prior to the tenure review.

(2) If the candidate accepts a fellowship, the “sabbatical clock” will stop for the duration of the fellowship, and continue where it left off prior to the fellowship once the candidate resumes teaching full-time at Goucher College. Accepting a fellowship does not reset the “sabbatical clock.”

D. Annual Reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Annual Departmental Review

   All tenure-track faculty will be reviewed annually by their departments. The department chair assumes responsibility for conducting said departmental review. After consultation with all tenured members of the department, the chair will submit a letter summarizing the department’s recommendation to the President, with copies to the Provost/CAO, the candidate, and all tenured members of the department. The chair’s letter should reflect a careful evaluation by the department’s tenured members of the candidate’s progress towards meeting the criteria for tenure. Appropriate members of other departments, as determined by the department chair and the Provost/CAO, may be asked to share in this responsibility. Tenured and non-tenured members may communicate their views on reappointment directly to the Provost/CAO. A chair who is non-tenured will fulfill all of these obligations. The Provost/CAO will appoint a tenured faculty member to act as a surrogate chair to fulfill these responsibilities with regard to review of a department chair.

2. Candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure may, after receipt of their departmental-review letters, submit confidential letters to the RPT committee and Provost/CAO, providing rebuttal to those letters if the candidate deems it necessary.

3. Response to Negative Review (in other than Preliminary Tenure, Tenure,
and Promotion Reviews)

The RPT Committee will undertake a formal review in cases where the department makes a negative recommendation concerning reappointment of a tenure-track faculty member after an annual review (other than pre-tenure or tenure and promotion reviews). If the department’s recommendation is negative, the chair informs the individual in writing and, if the candidate so requests, advises the candidate of the reasons that contributed to the decision. The candidate may then request reconsideration and may submit to the committee any additional materials required for an adequate review of the case. The RPT Committee will then make a final written recommendation to the President, with copies to the Provost/CAO, department chair and the candidate.

E. Preliminary Tenure Review

1. Recommendations concerning preliminary tenure review normally originate with the department. At the required time, the RPT Committee will request a department recommendation. The department chair will inform the person involved, collect the necessary information, and forward the department’s written recommendation, negative or affirmative, to the President, with copies to the RPT Committee, and the Provost/CAO. At the same time, the candidate’s portfolio (see section IV.J.1) will be forwarded to the RPT Committee and to the Provost/CAO for consideration.

2. The preliminary tenure review is based on the same criteria as those applied in the tenure decision - effective teaching, growth as a scholar, and contributions to the college - but the application of these criteria is necessarily less strict. In the preliminary tenure review, for example, evidence of scholarship should be assessed more by reference to scholarly activities than by finished products.

3. At the time the chair submits a written recommendation to the RPT Committee, he/she will provide a copy of the recommendation to the candidate and all tenured members of the department and will communicate the nature of the recommendation to all full-time, non-tenured members of the department. The candidate may request that he/she be advised of the reasons that contributed to the decision. If the department’s recommendation is negative, the candidate may request reconsideration and may prepare an additional statement for submission to the President, the RPT Committee, and the Provost/CAO along with the department’s recommendation regarding reconsideration of the decision.
F. Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The RPT Committee seeks to provide an objective viewpoint from its position outside the department concerned, basing its recommendations solely on criteria established by the faculty and, thereby, excluding those financial or other considerations that may bear on the President’s recommendations to the Board. The following three criteria will serve as guides to the committee in making its recommendations regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

1. Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching is the most important responsibility of the college faculty. Tenure should not be granted without evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. Moreover, this should be demonstrated over a reasonably wide range of subjects. The faculty member must be able to arouse the intellectual curiosity of students, to transmit knowledge to them, and to assist them in developing skills and critical thinking as well as mastery of subject matter. Such teaching effectiveness takes place both in and out of the classroom, through formal instruction, individual advising, and supervision of student research in the department.

2. Scholarly Activities

Scholarly research resulting in publication, especially in peer-reviewed publications, provides an objective measure of the continuing intellectual vigor and growth that are the bases of excellence in teaching. Evidence of scholarship will be assessed more by reference to its quality (and reasonable regularity) than by its quantity. Expectations will take into account the varied nature of scholarly work, and the varied means and criteria for assessing such work, across the disciplines of the liberal arts. For example, the quality of individual performance will be a measure in the fine arts and other fields where there is a relationship between performance and professional development (see section IV.L for guidelines for evaluation of scholarship in the performing arts). The committee will also take into account the availability of time and resources provided by the college to facilitate scholarly activity. While these are the principal measures of accomplishment, the college will not ignore other evidence such as the faculty member’s activity and standing in professional societies as well as grants, fellowships, or other juried awards when these are in the candidate’s academic discipline.

Furthermore, additional evidence will include public presentations on campus, since these help to create a genuine community of scholars. In evaluating scholarly activity, the committee will be guided by input from the department and, in tenure reviews and reviews for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, from qualified external reviewers, and will seek evidence that the scholarly activity satisfies the general...
standards outlined below.

a) It requires a high level of experience in one or more disciplines
b) It breaks new ground or is innovative
c) It can be replicated or elaborated upon
d) It can be documented
e) It can be peer reviewed
f) It has a significant impact on those affected directly by the effort, the discipline itself, or the larger community
g) In cases of promotion to full professor, it has taken place since the candidate’s promotion to associate professor

In adopting these standards, the RPT Committee recognizes that scholarship can exist in a variety of forms: scholarship that creates new knowledge, scholarship that integrates knowledge in new ways, and scholarship that applies knowledge in ways that better society. All of these forms of scholarship should be valued in a liberal arts college.

3. Service

Members of the faculty serve Goucher in many ways that go beyond formal teaching duties and scholarship. This service is essential in creating a community in which one’s work is best accomplished and is an indication of commitment to the college and its mission. This would include service in the form of participation in college governance, departmental service, curricular or program development, advising, and extracurricular activities devoted to the enhancement of the student experience or the intellectual life of the college. Such service cannot be considered as a substitute for achievement in teaching and professional development, but this work should not go unrecognized and should be valued along with teaching and scholarship.

Each faculty member is required to be involved in teaching, scholarly activity, and service throughout his/her career at the college, though different emphases may be temporarily appropriate at different stages of a career. When a faculty member has been asked to carry an abnormal load of service for the college, that circumstance will be considered when evaluating the individual’s professional development as part of an overall review.

a) Preliminary Tenure and Tenure Candidates. Special attention must be paid to untenured faculty members in regard to service. For these faculty members, development of teaching effectiveness and scholarship often must take precedence over service to the college and the community when such service would compromise their professional development. For this reason, an untenured faculty member should ordinarily not serve as chair of a department, except under the most extenuating of circumstances.
While untenured faculty are exempted from service on standing faculty committees during their first three years of service, they are encouraged to participate actively during the subsequent years leading up to the tenure review.

b) Promotion to Full Professor. Service to the college community will assume a greater importance in promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor (see section IV.M).

4. Care should be taken by the faculty member, the department and those in academic administrative positions to ensure that a balance in teaching effectiveness, scholarship and service is maintained and that no one component, over extended periods of time, threatens to compromise a faculty member’s overall performance.

G. Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship and Service by Departments

1. The chair and all tenured members of the department are responsible for carrying out in-class observations of all candidates for preliminary tenure, tenure, and promotion reviews. In cases involving candidates coming up for preliminary tenure and tenure reviews these observations should be carried out on an annual basis until the tenure decision. It is the responsibility of each tenured department member to visit at least one of the candidate’s classes per year. Appropriate members of other departments, as determined by the department chair and the Provost/CAO, may be asked to share in this responsibility. Written reports of these in-class observations should be shared with the candidate and copies should be filed with the chair. Candidates intending to seek promotion to professor should request class visitations by departmental colleagues starting at least three years prior to consideration.

2. Departmental evaluation of teaching should rely not only on classroom visitations but also annual reviews of syllabi, texts, and other course materials. In addition, the process of peer review should include ongoing interactions and discussions in the department to develop best teaching practices among all members. The goal of peer review should be to foster the growth of teaching skills in the department as a whole and not just a means to make judgments related to the RPT process.

3. At the beginning of each academic year, the RPT Committee will issue a request in writing to every full-time and half-time member of a department in cases involving preliminary tenure, tenure, and promotion reviews. This letter will ask members of the department to assess the candidate’s performance in light of the three criteria – teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and service - outlined in section IV.F. More specifically, the request from the committee will ask members of the department to assess the candidate in terms of the following questions: (1) How would you evaluate the candidate’s teaching
effectiveness? What evidence do you have for this evaluation? (2) How would you describe this individual’s contribution to the department (development of new courses, curriculum planning, advising, and other departmental activities)? (3) What evidence do you have of professional and developmental activities that have some bearing on teaching, curriculum development, and the life of the college (further training or schooling, attendance at workshops, seminars, and the like)? (4) How would you evaluate the candidate’s scholarly achievements? What evidence do you have for this evaluation?, and (5) Are there other interests, achievements, or contributions which, in your opinion, should be considered in any decision for reappointment, promotion, or tenure?

4. These evaluations will be submitted to the RPT Committee, and will be available to the Provost/CAO as part of the candidate’s file. These letters, as filed with the RPT Committee, are to be considered by the committee with whatever weight and emphasis it considers appropriate. Outside of their use by the Provost/CAO and committee, the letters will be entirely confidential.

H. Student Evaluation of Teaching

1. Course Evaluations

a) The revised evaluation form adopted by the faculty on December 3, 1993, will be used to evaluate all courses at Goucher College. The Information Technology Department will process the responses and distribute a summary for each course only to (1) each instructor for his/her courses (2) each department chair for courses in his/her department (3) the RPT Committee for courses taught by instructors who are to be considered by this committee (4) the Provost/CAO of the college

b) A candidate for pre-tenure, tenure, or promotion review can, if he/she wishes, make his/her course evaluations available to tenured departmental colleagues who are required to write individual letters. The candidate is responsible for putting his/her permission in writing to the chair of the RPT Committee for inclusion in the candidate’s file, and for notifying his/her colleagues that the evaluations are available.

c) Administration of course evaluations will be under the direction of the RPT Committee with provision for sufficient budget, secretarial assistance, and storage space. The returning of evaluation forms distributed and collected in class on behalf of the RPT Committee will ordinarily be expected from all students enrolled in each course.
2. Evaluation by Majors and Former Students

The Provost/CAO will solicit signed letters from approximately twenty-five present or former students, including recent alumni, who have taken one or more of the candidate’s courses. Candidates for preliminary tenure, tenure, and promotion reviews should nominate approximately 50% of these students, the rest to be selected by the department chair or by his/her delegates. (See section IV.J.7 for selection procedures.)

I. Evaluation of Service

1. Faculty will be evaluated on their contributions within the areas of service outlined below.

a) College Governance. Faculty members are expected to provide reliable service to the college through membership on standing committees of the faculty, administrative committees of the college or Board, and ad hoc committees or task forces. Participation in the following committees will be recognized as especially important to the life of the college: Academic Policies; Budget and Planning; Curriculum; Faculty Affairs; Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure; and service as Chair of the faculty or faculty Member At Large.

b) Service to the Department. Faculty members are expected to share the administrative work of their departments. This work includes service as chair or program director; participation in faculty recruitment, development and evaluation; curriculum review and implementation of curriculum changes; securing external funding for curricular development; overseeing library acquisitions and other academic resources; aiding in the recruitment of students; supporting departmental co-curricular activities; and participation in study abroad or other special programs.

c) Advising. It is expected that faculty members will be effective advisors to students. This includes working with pre-major advisees as well as departmental majors. Also included here is service on senior thesis committees and aiding students who seek post-graduate scholarships and/or admission to professional and graduate schools by providing counsel and, where appropriate, writing letters of reference.

d) Activities enhancing the life of the college. The contributions of faculty members enhancing the student experience and the intellectual life of the college will be recognized as valuable. Such contributions include collaboration with other departments and programs outside the faculty member’s own department, building links between the college and the broader Baltimore community, organizing and participating in campus teach-ins or conversations,
speaking in the community or to media sources, and organizing any of the following on campus: film, concert, or speaker series, workshops and summer programs, or professional conference sessions.

e) Activities enhancing the life of the discipline. The contributions of faculty members enhancing the intellectual life of their discipline will be recognized as valuable. Such contributions include organization of festivals, conferences, symposia, or summer study programs; acting as President or officer of professional organizations; serving as editor of a newsletter or list-server or an ad hoc peer-reviewer for professional publications; serving as an outside reviewer for tenure or promotion cases; and participation as a reviewer of self-study for other colleges.

2. Methods of Evaluation – Faculty members will be evaluated for their effectiveness in the area of service based on letters from chairs and members of committees and programs in which they have participated. Confidential letters will be requested and sent to the Provost/CAO and the chair of RPT to be archived in the candidate’s file. Candidates may also solicit:

a) letters from administrators with whom the faculty member has worked
b) letters from colleagues in other departments, or within the discipline, with whom the faculty member has collaborated
c) letters from advisees
d) other materials documenting the faculty member’s contributions

J. Normal Contents of Candidate’s File

1. The Candidate’s Portfolio

Revisions and additions to the candidate’s portfolio will be considered only until the date stipulated in the RPT timetable that is distributed to eligible candidates.

a) An up-to-date, chronologically ordered vita that includes educational background, employment history, publications, grants, awards, talks given at other institutions and at meetings of professional societies, and work (including grant proposals) in progress.

b) Copies of annual reports to the Provost/CAO for all years during which the candidate was a member of the Goucher faculty.

c) A statement from the candidate summarizing the candidate’s own view of his/her present and future growth and development as a teacher and advisor, accomplishments and promise as a scholar, and contributions to the department, college, and discipline. In this statement the candidate may wish to refer to matters such as:
changes, developments, special interests, or circumstances as they relate to the candidate’s teaching; the directions of scholarly activities in the past, considered separately and in relation to teaching; future plans in either or both of the areas; the publication status of any unpublished manuscripts; the significance of any research grants received or currently sought by the candidate; the character or quality of the candidate’s participation in departmental and college activities.

d) A copy of each scholarly publication, electronic media, or unpublished manuscript the candidate wishes to have considered, as well as any published reviews of these materials. For promotion to Full Professor, this should include only material produced since the candidate’s promotion to Associate Professor.

e) Copies of all teaching materials that the candidate wishes to have considered. For promotion to Full Professor this should include only material produced since the candidate’s promotion to Associate Professor.

f) Any documentation of service that the candidate wishes to have considered. Documentation may include departmental or college written reports (e.g. faculty legislation, departmental self-study, Middle States report, grant applications, curricular plans, etc.) which the candidate played a significant role in drafting; professional editorships, newsletters, or list-servers; conference proceedings; videotapes of co-curricular events (e.g. teach-in, film or speaker series, etc); study abroad programs; and service to the larger community (e.g. media clips or interviews, panel discussions etc).

2. A copy of any notification to the candidate indicating that departmental or institutional considerations might preclude the awarding of tenure.

3. Letters of evaluation of the candidate from all full-time and half-time colleagues in the candidate’s department. These letters should be as full and as substantial as department members can make them.

4. A summary letter from the department chair, including the balanced opinion on the candidate expressed by tenured members of the department. The chair’s letter should indicate how this departmental opinion was reached, reporting faithfully the tenor of the discussion, the division (if any) among the tenured members of the department, and the departmental recommendation.

5. A written report (a copy of which should be sent to the candidate) from the department chair providing an historical overview of trends in student opinion concerning the candidate’s teaching, explaining how the information was obtained, and comparing the evaluations with those received for other members of the department, both tenured and non-tenured. The report should also include such other indications of
teaching effectiveness as comments based on classroom observations by senior members of the department; course syllabi; the candidate’s participation in the shaping of the curriculum; or whatever other additional means the department uses to evaluate the performance and progress of its untenured members. Included in the report should be a list or tabulation of all courses taught by the candidate in the semesters leading up to the current review (normally going back at least five semesters, except when the process has been accelerated), and the number of students enrolled in each course.

6. Confidential letters solicited from chairs and members of committees and programs in which the candidate has participated, and any other letters solicited by the candidate addressing his/her performance in the area of service.

7. Signed letters from approximately twenty-five present or former students. The persons from whom these letters are solicited should include majors and non-majors, students who received a variety of grades (normally at least 4 A’s, 4 B’s, 4 C’s, and 2 Passes), some students who took introductory courses and some who took advanced courses. Some present or former advisees should also be represented.

   a) At the request of the Provost/CAO’s office, Student Administrative Services will provide that office with two sets of former student lists. The office of the Provost/CAO will forward one of the lists to the candidate and the other list to the department chair.

   b) The candidate will submit a list of fifteen names of present or former students to his or her department chair. The chair will submit a list of fifteen names of present or former students to the candidate.

   c) The department chair will submit a final list of thirty names of present or former students to the Provost/CAO’s office. The Provost/CAO’s office will select twenty-five of these names, half of which must come from the names supplied by the candidates. The Provost/CAO’s office will send a letter to these students requesting evaluation of the candidate.

   d) The office of the Provost/CAO will be responsible for collecting these and making them available to the RPT Committee in a timely manner.

8. Copies of all previous letters written by the department chair, RPT Committee, and Provost/CAO on the occasion of pre-tenure and tenure reviews of the candidate.

9. Documentation of any unusual circumstances of hiring that affect the tenure and promotion process (see section IV.A.4), and of any arrangements for acceleration or deceleration of the process made in
accordance with this legislation.

10. The candidate’s file may also include any additional letters, exhibits, or other materials submitted by the candidate or the candidate’s department, or solicited by the RPT Committee, and any other relevant material not covered in the provisions above.

K. Tenure Review Procedures

1. Recommendations concerning the tenure or promotion decision normally originate with the department. At the required time, the RPT Committee will request a department recommendation. The chair will inform the person involved, collect the necessary information, and forward the department’s recommendation, negative or affirmative, to the President [according to by-laws], with copies to the RPT Committee, and the Provost/CAO. At the same time, the candidate’s portfolio (see section IV.J.1) will be forwarded to the RPT Committee and to the Provost/CAO for consideration. The candidate should be evaluated by the criteria outlined in section IV.F.

2. At the time the chair submits a recommendation to the RPT Committee, he/she will provide a copy of the recommendation to the candidate and all tenured members of the department and will communicate the nature of the recommendation to all full-time non-tenured members of the department. The candidate may request that he/she be advised of the reasons that contributed to the decision. If the department’s recommendation is negative, the candidate may request reconsideration and may prepare an additional statement for submission to the President, the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure, and the Provost/CAO along with the department’s recommendation.

3. The Tenure review will be conducted as described in the Pre-tenure Review Procedures (section IV.E)

4. In addition to the normal contents of a candidate’s file, a tenure candidate’s file will include a list of all student correspondents, with a notation of each student’s major, year of graduation, course or courses taken with the candidate, semester and year in which each course was taken, and the course grade for each.

5. Evaluations of scholarly activity must include written evaluations of submitted scholarship and teaching materials by four outside objective referees. Evaluations of teaching and scholarship do not necessarily have to be written by the same person. (See section IV.L for Guidelines for External Peer Review in the Performing Arts)

a) Candidates will provide the names of four potential outside referees to the chair of the department.
b) The chair of the candidate’s department, in consultation with the other members of the department, will provide to the candidate four additional names of people who could potentially serve as outside referees.

c) The department chair will forward the eight names of potential outside referees, four of which have been supplied by the candidate, to the Provost/CAO.

d) Outside referees should not have had close personal association with the candidate.

e) The Provost/CAO will send letters to four of those nominated to be outside referees, with two of these letters going to individuals whose names were supplied by the candidate and two going to those who were selected by the department chair. These letters will indicate to the outside referees that Goucher College has a 3-3 course load and places considerable emphasis on teaching. The requests will also include section IV.F of Faculty Legislation, outlining the three criteria for assessing candidates. Accompanying these letters will be copies of each scholarly publication, portfolio, electronic media, or unpublished manuscript, as well as all teaching materials that the candidate has submitted as part of the review.

6. The Office of the Provost/CAO will be responsible for collecting these letters and making them available to the RPT Committee in a timely manner.

L. Guidelines for External Peer-Review in the Performing Arts

The college recognizes that those candidates for tenure and/or promotion whose scholarly activity is the practice of a performing art have requirements for external peer review different than those in other fields. (The practice of performing art includes playwriting, musical composition, choreography, and directing as well as acting, dancing, musical performance, etc.)

The Departments of Theatre and Dance, in particular, emphasize that external reviewers must have access to live performances in making their evaluations of a candidate. (Although the Department of Music prefers to submit taped performances to its external peer reviewers, a candidate in music who wishes his/her reviewers to attend live performances can have them do so, with permission of the department chair and upon timely request.)

In order to guarantee that the designated external peer reviewers will each be able to view at least one live performance (preferably two), these reviewers should be selected at the time of the candidate’s initial hiring by Goucher College in a full-time, tenure-track position. In the case of candidates for promotion, external reviewers should be selected as soon as the rank of associate professor has been achieved. In both cases, this provides a six-year period in which to advise reviewers of upcoming performances and to make arrangements for their
attendance. If the candidate was hired for a tenure-track position but has not yet received tenure, or if the candidate was promoted to associate professor prior to the establishment of this procedure, external reviewers should be identified as soon as possible.

1. The procedure for identifying external peer reviewers is the same as that outlined for other external peer reviewers (section IV.K.5): four names are supplied by the candidate, four by the department chair. The Provost/CAO selects the final four names, two from the candidate’s list and two from the chair’s list.

2. The Provost/CAO’s Office is responsible for contacting the external peer reviewers with a letter that explains the reviewer’s role and responsibilities within the allotted time frame.

3. The Provost/CAO’s Office is also responsible for providing adequate funds to cover a reviewer’s travel expenses and time.

4. Each reviewer is required to submit a letter of evaluation as soon as possible after attending a live performance. The letter should be addressed to the Provost/CAO, who sends a copy to the RPT Committee for inclusion in the candidate’s file.

5. The same four reviewers attending live performances will be sent the candidate’s full portfolio during the year of his/her tenure or promotion decision. If the candidate wishes, this portfolio may include a videotaped compilation of the candidate’s work during the time period under review. The reviewers will be expected to use this portfolio as well as their experiences of the candidate’s live performance(s) to provide an overall evaluation of the candidate’s achievements to the Provost/CAO.

6. Although all care should be taken to maintain the confidentiality of external peer reviewers, it is possible that any or all reviewers may become known to the candidate at a live performance. Nevertheless, each reviewer and the candidate are expected to maintain professional distance during the entire evaluation process.

M. Promotion to Full Professor

The procedures for reviewing candidates for promotion to Full Professor will be the same as those used in the Pre-Tenure Review and Tenure Review. In addition, tenured Associate Professors who wish to be considered for promotion to Full Professor should normally be reviewed annually during the three years immediately preceding their candidacy. Service to the college community will assume a greater importance in promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor. Tenured senior faculty are expected to assume more prominent roles in faculty governance (as department chairs, college-wide faculty committee chairs, initiators of curricular reform, developers of programs on behalf of the
goals of the college, and the like) than their untenured colleagues. Normally, heavy service commitments should not last longer than three consecutive years in order to ensure that every faculty member remains an active and engaged teacher and scholar.

N. Procedures To Address Negative And Contradictory Recommendations in Preliminary Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Cases

1. If the RPT Committee decides upon a recommendation contrary to that of the chair, or has questions about the chair’s recommendation, the committee will invite the chair to meet with it to discuss the matter.

2. If the committee’s preliminary recommendation is opposed to the reappointment, promotion or tenure of a candidate, the committee will so notify the candidate and invite the candidate to meet with the committee. At the meeting, the reasons for the committee’s preliminary determination will be stated and discussed. If the candidate desires a second meeting, the request for such a meeting will be granted.

3. Following the aforesaid meeting or meetings, the committee will advise the President of its final recommendation. The recommendation must indicate whether the committee’s decision was unanimous and, if not, must indicate the votes for and against the decision and the number of abstentions, if any, together with the reasons for any differences from the recommendation of the department chair. In all cases, the Provost/CAO, the department chair and the candidate will receive copies of the committee’s final recommendation to the President.

4. If the Provost/CAO reaches a preliminary conclusion which is contrary to the recommendation of the committee, the Provost/CAO will meet with the committee to discuss the matter prior to submitting a final recommendation to the President. Discussion must include disclosure of any materials relevant to the case that had not been available at the time of RPT deliberations.

5. In the event of continued disagreement between the Provost/CAO and the RPT Committee on a preliminary tenure, tenure, or promotion decision, there will be a meeting between the Provost/CAO, the RPT Committee and the President, after which time the President will put in writing a final recommendation that will be presented to the Board. Prior to meeting with any body of the Board, copies of the recommendation must be sent to the Provost/CAO, the RPT Committee, the department chair, and the candidate.
O. Post -Tenure Review

Post-tenure review is an opportunity to improve, support and guide the development of senior faculty. The post-tenure review process is not a re-evaluation of tenure, a justification process for retaining faculty, or a substitute for adversarial dismissal or suspension procedures. Associate and Full Professors ordinarily will be evaluated every six years by the department chair and the Provost/CAO. However, if significant concerns are identified, the Provost/CAO, in consultation with the department chair, may initiate a formal post-tenure review (described below) earlier than the next scheduled formal review. Ordinarily, faculty must complete scheduled post-tenure reviews in order to be eligible for sabbatical leave.

1. Review Procedures

The following must be submitted to the Provost/CAO during the fall semester of the review year (other items may be included at the faculty member’s discretion):

   a) Student evaluation data for the entire period.
   b) A self-evaluation provided to the department chair (or a senior colleague designated by the Provost/CAO) by the faculty member describing activities in teaching, professional growth and development, and other contributions to the college. As a part of this report, a statement of professional goals and a projection of future activities will be included.
   c) An evaluation of the faculty member prepared by the department chair (or a senior colleague designated by the Provost/CAO). The chair's evaluation will summarize the comments of the tenured faculty members of the department and will include:
      i) a judgment of the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness based on classroom visitations and other available evidence
      ii) an evaluation of the faculty member’s professional growth
      iii) comments on the candidate’s non-teaching college-related activities and
      iv) comments on student evaluation data.
   d) If the department chair is the subject of review, the Provost/CAO will appoint a tenured faculty member to serve as a surrogate chair as described in section IV.D.1.
   e) Ordinarily the review process should provide feedback regarding the faculty member’s professional life, and should help define both short and long term goals relating to the faculty member’s many roles. The review process should also help identify the institutional support necessary to realize these goals in a timely manner. If serious performance issues are identified in the post-
tenure review of a faculty member, an improvement plan to address the problem(s) will be devised by the department chair and the Provost/CAO in consultation with the faculty member under review. Faculty members will be expected to carry out the plan to the satisfaction of all parties involved.

2. Grievance Procedures

If the faculty member under review does not agree with the evaluation of the Provost/CAO and department chair, he/she can appeal their case to the Faculty Grievance Committee. The committee will then proceed with informal or formal proceedings as outlined in the section V of legislation.

P. Sabbatical Leave

A full-time tenured faculty member becomes eligible to apply for a sabbatical leave after twelve semesters of full-time service. Semesters in service after eligibility for a sabbatical are counted toward the next sabbatical. The semesters counted toward a sabbatical after eligibility are limited to 24, after which semesters of service are no longer counted toward sabbatical leave time. Ordinarily, faculty members who are granted a sabbatical leave are expected to return for at least one full academic year of service.

1. Sabbatical leave will be granted based on consideration of the following criteria:

a) The nature of the leave project and its significance to the research and instructional programs of the college and to the continued professional development of the candidate

b) Semesters in service since appointment or prior sabbatical leave

c) The faculty member must have completed a post-tenure review within the past five years, as is described in Section IV.O above.

d) The practical needs of the applicant's department and of the college, and the necessity for continuity in the standards of both.