

Faculty Roles Document

Outline of Materials

I. Faculty Roles at Winthrop

- A. Student Intellectual Development
- B. Scholarly Activity
- C. Professional Stewardship

II. Tenure at Winthrop

- A. Tenure
- B. Post-Tenure
- C. Post-Tenure with Excellence

III. Faculty Ranks at Winthrop

- A. Assistant Professor
- B. Associate Professor
- C. Professor
- D. Contingent Appointments

IV. General Review Procedures at Winthrop

- A. Applications for Tenure
- B. Applications for Post-Tenure Review
- C. Applications for Post-Tenure with Excellence
- D. Promotions in Rank

V. Annual Timelines for Review Procedures at Winthrop

VI. Works Cited

VII. Proposed Timeline for Implementation

I. Faculty Roles at Winthrop

Faculty roles at Winthrop University are varied in nature yet contain many common themes that are used to define our expectations as employees of the institution and set the parameters for tenure, promotion, and merit raise evaluations. The following sections outline for the entire community those items that are considered expectations of employment as well as those that require review by faculty committees for tenure and promotion considerations.

Academic Responsibility spans all the traditional areas of faculty evaluation, and includes involvement of faculty in ways that support the institutional mission, maintain the functions of the University, and sustain the faculty role in shared governance. All faculty members are expected to be academically responsible to their students and peers as a baseline for service in their academic departments. Faculty members are expected to establish and maintain a consistent record of academic responsibility while at Winthrop.

Academic Responsibility includes but is not limited to activities such as: academic registration support, availability to students through multiple platforms (e.g., office hours, emails, assignment feedback), engagement in faculty meetings at all levels, participation in department and college events, participation in university commencements and convocations, professional development that supports improvements in practice (e.g., participation in peer observations, attendance at professional conferences to explore current research, engaging in sessions through the Teaching and Learning Center), recruitment and retention efforts, and service on committees. Chairs and deans should ensure equitable distribution of assignments among faculty; and faculty should be supported in ways that allow for free exchange of ideas, broad participation, and balanced work expectations.

In addition to activities related to academic responsibility, other professional responsibilities are expected of faculty who hold full-time appointments, regardless of rank. These professional responsibilities are primarily documented through reviews by supervisors and are considered expectations of employment. These responsibilities include adherence to academic policies (e.g., the privacy and confidentiality of student information, intellectual property and copyright, treatment of human subjects in research, final exam schedule, meeting classes at the appointed times, adhering to deadlines for grade submission, submission of midterm grades as requested) and active participation in the collection of assessment data associated with teaching and/or work assignments. Although faculty may not report on these expectations regularly, chairs and deans will address areas of concern through meetings with individual faculty and annual evaluations.

Documentation and Support. When applying for tenure and promotion, faculty members are encouraged to have a portfolio of work that demonstrates accomplishment in the areas of *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship*, as well as the fulfillment of academic responsibility. Documentation of faculty accomplishments will be accumulated and reviewed through the annual report process. Periodically a more thorough presentation of materials for a process entailing peer and administrative review will be required for pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. In the areas of *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship*, faculty will provide evidence and reflection to demonstrate their level of engagement, their achievements, and the impact of their efforts.

Although examples for *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship* are provided at the University, Academic Unit, and/or Department levels, the examples should not be viewed as the only means for participation or as a list of specific expectations.

When discussing the various aspects of participation in the University and the profession it is inevitable that some accomplishments seem to fit under multiple areas of reporting. In such cases, the faculty member must identify the most appropriate single category for reporting. Further, given the growing multidisciplinary nature

of academic work, a faculty member may report work outside of the primary disciplinary field when tied to his/her role at the university.

In the area of academic responsibility, most documentation is explicit and objective and does not require extensive reflection. For example, faculty will be asked to document some activity through lists (e.g., number of advisees, membership on committees). Likewise, direct supervisors will be expected to comment on faculty involvement in fulfilling their academic responsibility (e.g., participation in faculty governance through attendance at meetings, adherence to academic policies) in responses to annual reports.

A. Student Intellectual Development

Because the mission of Winthrop University focuses on the development of students prepared to meet the challenges of future endeavors, *Student Intellectual Development* is a fundamental responsibility of all Winthrop faculty. Faculty in all disciplines are responsible for developing student potential as related to the University Level Competencies, supporting the delivery of the Touchstone Program, and providing opportunities for student development of expertise in the chosen discipline. As such, *Student Intellectual Development* is a critical factor in all evaluations.

Student Intellectual Development is a significant task for all Winthrop faculty. In 1780, Abigail Adams stated, "Learning is not attained by chance; it must be sought for with ardor and attended to with diligence" (as cited in Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Faculty play a key role in developing environments in which students seek such development—academic, personal, social, moral, and more. In these environments faculty provide opportunities for students to engage in thinking at various levels, with the goal being to develop graduates who evaluate, create, synthesize, and analyze—the highest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Forehand, 2005).

A broad range of faculty activities fits within the area of *Student Intellectual Development*. Activities include helping students to acquire disciplinary knowledge, develop critical thinking and problem solving skills, enhance interpersonal and social skills, cultivate effective communication skills, apply knowledge and skills across contexts, learn through service in the discipline, and pursue further academic exploration.

Effectiveness in *Student Intellectual Development* can be observed in various instructional environments including classroom, laboratory, studio, field-based, and digital settings, as well as through exhibitions, collections of academic and creative materials, support of independent exploration, and student mentoring. Effectiveness in this area is marked by an impact on student thinking and learning. Faculty members must provide evidence of an ability to engage students in ongoing and significant pursuits of knowledge, critical/reflective thinking, communication, and skill application. This evidence must also include a willingness and propensity to adapt instructional methods to promote student learning.

Evidence of *Student Intellectual Development* is related to the discipline, experience level, and appointment of the individual faculty member. However, all faculty members must show periodic, reflective self-assessment of the activities in which they engage and provide evidence of improved teaching and student learning. Documentation for *Student Intellectual Development* may include items such as reflective analyses of activities, student evaluation results, letters from peer observations, course materials, student learning outcome data, and teaching awards.

Examples of *Student Intellectual Development* may include but are not limited to:

- Connections made between instruction and program goals
- Course updates to maintain relevance and enhance teaching methods

- Course, curriculum, or program development
- Curricular revision efforts
- Development of instructional materials (e.g., software, original course supplements)
- Effective use of class time
- Engagement of students in service learning
- Evidence of student progress toward meeting course and/or program learning outcomes
- Implementation of a variety of instructional practices and assessment methods
- Implementation of high expectations for students (e.g., course tasks that require thinking at various levels of cognition, course assessments that measure student learning at various levels of cognition, impact on student development associated with University Level Competencies)
- Leading student groups on field experiences or international experiences
- Participation in goal assessment for courses and programs
- Response to observation data/evaluations of classroom performance, exhibition design, and/or other *Student Intellectual Development* activity from supervisors, peers, or students
- Student mentoring activities (e.g., undergraduate and graduate research, career direction, information literacy)

B. Scholarly Activity

Scholarly Activity is an essential part of University life and development and encompasses the many pursuits that broaden and expand the learning communities in which faculty function and the University is situated. Typically these activities are related to the faculty member's discipline but may include significant work that prompts the intellectual advancement of others in areas related to the faculty member's University appointment.

The evaluation of scholarly endeavors is greatly influenced by the disciplinary focus of the faculty member and regulations for evaluation established by accrediting agencies; however, the evaluation of scholarship must be flexible enough to recognize unique contributions that arise as faculty engage in discovery, integration, and application. Using Boyer's (1990) categories of scholarship presented in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, academic unit priority systems must recognize a variety of avenues for scholarly engagement. The scholarship of *discovery* encompasses those activities that have been traditionally considered scholarship and focuses on creation of knowledge or products. The scholarship of *integration* focuses more on activities that help non-specialists make connections to a discipline or on explorations that examine information in a new way. The scholarship of *application* differs from the focus on research and synthesis crucial to the first two forms of scholarship. Here the scholar uses knowledge to solve specific problems. The scholarship of *teaching* focuses on the work of scholars as they affect and change the students with whom they engage. This form of scholarship is seen when the faculty and students are pushed to explore and think in new ways, thus expanding what is known about the discipline, its connections, and related problems.

By using a broader lens through which to examine and evaluate scholarly engagement, we are encouraging an environment in which Winthrop faculty can actively affect the communities in which they directly engage. Therefore, unit level systems should recognize the importance of both theoretical study and the application of theory to solve problems in a variety of settings.

When submitting work to be considered in the category of *Scholarly Activity*, the faculty member should provide validation (internal or external) of the work's merit. Although the University Faculty Roles document does not include priority guidelines for scholarly work, provided examples are intended to show a range of scholarly activities. The academic unit priority guidelines will situate such engagement within the disciplines

and will be used to evaluate merit. In this category of evaluation, faculty members should only include scholarly activities associated with their roles as Winthrop faculty members.

Examples of *Scholarly Activity* may include but are not limited to:

- Academic presentations (e.g., academic conferences, professional conferences, on-campus colloquia)
- Academic publications (e.g., academic journals, conference proceedings, scholarly books, textbooks)
- Application of scholarship that results in documented change (e.g., collaboration with local schools, work with community organizations in problem solving, new professional certifications resulting from significant exploration, design of assessment systems/reports that require synthesis of expertise and exploration of data)
- Creation of scholarly materials or models (e.g., significant study that leads to change in University processes, policies, or widely-used materials)
- Creative endeavors, performances, and literary or artistic works
- Grant development and awards
- Significant study to expand areas of scholarly expertise promoting cross-disciplinary experiences and/or student research
- Invitational or juried exhibitions
- Patent applications

C. Professional Stewardship

Professional Stewardship—as it counts toward tenure, promotion, annual evaluations, and merit raises—is “service” that requires faculty members to use their knowledge and experience to enhance the University and/or community. Carol Geary Schneider (1998) asserts that “professional stewardship” captures the significance of activities that are vital to the health and well-being of universities and that require significant faculty time and the application of faculty knowledge or expertise. Activities that illustrate *Professional Stewardship* require faculty members to be involved in work that goes beyond regular teaching expectations and academic responsibility. Through such opportunities faculty impact circumstances, create opportunities for new knowledge or services, and/or support and enrich the function of existing structures on and off campus.

Professional Stewardship develops with experience at the University and is a vital component of the faculty’s role in the University mission. All faculty, regardless of rank, participate in *Professional Stewardship* activities that are reflective of their roles, ranks, and expertise. When providing evidence, faculty are encouraged to discuss the level of engagement, how expertise was applied, and/or the impact of activities.

Examples of *Professional Stewardship* may include but are not limited to:

- Active engagement with a campus student group (e.g., duties of a faculty advisor, participation in the design and delivery of programming, consultation related to discipline)
- Active membership on community committees, task forces, or similar groups
- Application of faculty knowledge or expertise to support university initiatives (e.g., student research activities, service learning opportunities, international experiences, support opportunities)
- Facilitation of professional development programs or continuing education programs
- Leadership roles in assessment initiatives that require significant time and expertise
- Leadership roles in international, national, or regional professional organizations
- Management of external grant programs
- Presentations, workshops, or demonstrations to professional, civic, or community organizations not seen as scholarship
- Program coordination (e.g., degree programs, academic support services)

- Service or leadership on a committee (typically at the college or university level) that has been shown to be complex in nature, require significant engagement, or demand considerable time
- Special assignments within the department, college, or university (e.g., fund raising, development of new programs, grant program evaluation, creation of a policy manual)

In a minority of cases, a faculty member whose job has been redefined by circumstances and who is applying for promotion may show exemplary work in the area of *Professional Stewardship* as the priority area for promotion. This exemplary work must be sustained, complex, and time consuming; have significant impact on the University or learning community; and receive recognition by peers. Individuals presenting accomplishments in this category as the priority area for promotion should have previously discussed the decision to do so with the department chair and the college dean. In addition, these faculty must provide evidence of impact for *Professional Stewardship* activities and engage in *Scholarly Activity*.

II. Tenure at Winthrop

Tenure is of great importance to the life of the institution. Tenure decisions reflect the University's recognition that the individual faculty member has demonstrated a level of performance that merits continued employment. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) defines tenure as 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." (AAUP, 1940)

Tenure also indicates the expectation that the faculty member will continue appropriate involvement in the life and mission of the University and its faculty. Tenure systems, according to Nelson (2010) in *No University is an Island*, are essential to the continuation of environments that allow for shared governance and academic freedom. The AAUP further describes the awarding of tenure as "a presumption of competence and continuing service." Thus, the tenure review and continued evaluations through post-tenure review should be rigorous, meaningful, and thoughtful.

A. Tenure

A nominee for tenure is required to hold the appropriate terminal degree for the nominee's discipline or to have professional achievements that the university recognizes as sufficient for tenure.

To be granted tenure, a faculty member must provide evidence of effective *Student Intellectual Development* that challenges students and promotes critical thinking skills through the exploration of knowledge. Furthermore, a tenure candidate must provide evidence of *Scholarly Activity* and the potential for sustained participation in activities associated with *Professional Stewardship*. Administrative reviews must also indicate a consistent record of academic responsibility.

Once tenure is granted, a faculty member must play an active role in the University and its mission by maintaining a consistent record of academic responsibility. The tenured faculty member must show continued growth and development in activities related to *Student Intellectual Development* and *Scholarly Activity*. In addition, the faculty member must show development in the area of *Professional Stewardship*.

B. Post-Tenure

A post-tenure review process was first established at Winthrop in response to the mandate in Act 359 (1996), South Carolina's performance funding legislation that public institutions of higher education include in their faculty performance review systems periodic peer evaluation of tenured faculty members. In line with the AAUP's definition, the Post-Tenure Review Process at Winthrop is a system focused on sustaining faculty development beyond the point at which tenure is granted. Therefore the process is focused on sustaining faculty involvement in all aspects of the University and providing support for all faculty members as identified through the review process.

To receive a "Satisfactory" post-tenure evaluation, the tenured faculty member should provide evidence that the level of activity associated with the rank held has been maintained throughout the years since the tenure decision or previous post-tenure review. This involvement should include a record of promoting *Student Intellectual Development*, continued *Scholarly Activity*, and ongoing *Professional Stewardship*. Further, the faculty member should provide evidence of a record of sustained academic responsibility.

C. Post-Tenure with Excellence

A faculty member seeking the distinction of Post-Tenure with Excellence must provide evidence of sustained excellence in the area of *Student Intellectual Development* and productive involvement in *Scholarly Activity* and *Professional Stewardship*. Administrative reviews should indicate a consistent record of academic responsibility, and the faculty member should demonstrate leadership among and mentoring of other faculty. Finally, the candidate must have established a record of excellence in *Scholarly Activity* and/or *Professional Stewardship*.

In annual reports and other evaluative portfolios, a faculty member seeking this distinction must provide evidence of progress and involvement that is responsive to feedback and exceeds expectations of the rank held. This recognition will be awarded primarily to faculty at the rank of Professor. Faculty at the ranks of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor are highly encouraged to actively engage in activities leading to promotion.

III. Faculty Ranks at Winthrop

Faculty ranks in the University allow for recognition and distinction among the faculty membership. Ranks not only help to define the focus of faculty members but also can direct the types of responsibilities they are given within the University. Further, inherent in the roles of faculty at the senior rank is the notion of continued involvement and support for the development of colleagues at all ranks. As faculty members earn promotion, they must meet and maintain the expectations for the rank achieved. Faculty should be supported in efforts for promotion and development through candid and focused feedback in annual and periodic reviews.

Administrators should assign responsibilities in an equitable manner to support faculty involvement in all areas. The following descriptions of faculty ranks are structured in such a way as to 1) identify the expectations for promotion to the rank, 2) indicate areas of focus while at the rank, 3) reinforce the need for on-going growth and development at all ranks, 4) remain flexible enough to appreciate the nature of assignments in all academic divisions, and 5) require colleges and departmental faculty to place these descriptions in the context of the demands of the disciplines and accreditation standards.

A. Assistant Professor

A nominee for appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is required to hold the appropriate terminal degree for the nominee's discipline or to have professional achievements that the University recognizes as sufficient for waiving the requirement for a terminal degree. A faculty member at this rank is eligible for tenure if in a tenure-track appointment.

At the time of appointment, an Assistant Professor should demonstrate a potential for effective *Student Intellectual Development*; have a plan for active engagement in *Scholarly Activity* to include research, creative activity, and/or other significant scholarly contributions to the learning community; and show the potential for engagement in activities related to academic responsibility.

As an Assistant Professor, the faculty member is expected to build a balanced record of accomplishment in the areas of *Student Intellectual Development* and *Scholarly Activity* that is appropriate for a junior member of the faculty. An Assistant Professor should demonstrate academic responsibility and explore ways to engage in *Professional Stewardship*. Furthermore, a faculty member at this rank should build a portfolio which showcases activities leading to effective *Student Intellectual Development* and engagement in *Scholarly Activity* to include research, creative activity, and/or significant contributions to the learning community.

In annual reports and other evaluative portfolios, an Assistant Professor must provide evidence of progress and involvement that is responsive to feedback and meets expectations of the rank.

B. Associate Professor

A nominee for appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is required to hold the appropriate terminal degree for the nominee's discipline(s) or to have professional achievements that the University recognizes as sufficient for waiving the requirement for a terminal degree. A faculty member at this rank is eligible for tenure if in a tenure-track appointment.

At the time of appointment or promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member is expected to have a portfolio and body of work that is balanced with respect to the responsibilities of the faculty member's position at the University. Evidence must indicate advanced skill in the area of *Student Intellectual Development*. The faculty member must also have a consistent record of academic responsibility.

In the majority of instances a faculty member will present a portfolio of *Scholarly Activity* that has examples of work at appropriate levels within the academic unit priority system and which provide evidence for a commitment to exploration, creativity, and/or change. Furthermore, the faculty member will show some involvement in activities identified as *Professional Stewardship* with the potential for continued involvement.

In a minority of cases, a faculty member whose job has been redefined by circumstances may show exemplary work in the area of *Professional Stewardship* to supplement *Scholarly Activity*. This exemplary work must be sustained, complex, and time consuming; have significant impact on the University or learning community; and receive recognition by peers. The *Scholarly Activity* of this individual should include external, peer-reviewed work and provide evidence of a commitment to exploration, creativity, and/or change.

Once at the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member must maintain an active role in the University and sustain a consistent record of academic responsibility. The faculty member must show continued growth and development in activities related to *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship*.

In annual reports and other evaluative portfolios, an Associate Professor must provide evidence of progress and involvement that is responsive to feedback and meets expectations of the rank.

C. Professor

A nominee for appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor is required to hold the appropriate terminal degree for the nominee's discipline or to have professional achievements that the University recognizes as sufficient for waiving the requirement for a terminal degree. A faculty member at this rank is eligible for tenure if in a tenure-track appointment.

At the time of appointment or promotion to Professor, the faculty member is expected to have a balanced portfolio and body of work that demonstrates attainment of the criteria for this rank and expectations for continued involvement with the University at this high level. In the category of *Student Intellectual Development*, the faculty member is required to show noteworthy accomplishments and sustained excellence, while demonstrating ongoing reflection, renewal, and development. The faculty member must have a continuous record of meeting academic responsibilities. At the rank of Professor, a faculty member must exhibit both leadership and academic maturity and support the continued development of other faculty.

In a majority of cases, the faculty member's portfolio of work will demonstrate a sustained record of *Scholarly Activity* at appropriate levels of the academic unit priority system and provide evidence of a commitment to exploration, creativity, and/or change. Furthermore, the faculty member should continue to demonstrate a commitment to the University through engagement in a variety of activities identified as *Professional Stewardship*.

In a minority of cases, a faculty member whose job has been redefined by circumstances may show exemplary work in the area of *Professional Stewardship* to supplement *Scholarly Activity*. This work must be sustained, complex, and time consuming; have significant impact on the University or learning community; identify the faculty member as a leader; and receive recognition by peers. Further, the *Scholarly Activity* of this individual must include external, peer-reviewed work and provide evidence of a commitment to exploration, creativity, and/or change.

Once at the rank of Professor, a faculty member must maintain an active role in the University and a consistent record of academic responsibility. The faculty member must show continued growth and development in activities related to *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship*.

In annual reports and other evaluative portfolios, a faculty member at this rank must provide evidence of progress and involvement that is responsive to feedback and meets expectations of the rank.

D. Contingent Appointments

Contingent (non-tenure track) appointments may be made at the professorial ranks discussed above. The following ranks are available for fixed-term assignments of various lengths and can be designated by titles that indicate either full-time or part-time status. Individuals in contingent appointments are not eligible for promotions in rank. If promotion in rank is appropriate, the faculty member should be transitioned into a tenure-track position.

1. Instructor

A nominee for appointment to the rank of Instructor is required to hold at least a master's degree in a related discipline and have sufficient course work in the discipline or to have professional achievements that the University recognizes as sufficient for waiving the degree requirements. The rank of Instructor should be assigned to an individual who, when appointed, lacks qualifications required by the University for appointment to a professorial rank. An instructor is a full-time employee of the University and is a full voting member of the instructor's respective department, unit assembly, and Faculty Conference. A faculty member at this rank is not eligible for tenure and is appointed for a term of one year; however, appointment to additional one-year terms is permitted.

At the time of appointment, an Instructor should demonstrate a potential for effective *Student Intellectual Development* and a commitment to academic responsibility. Throughout the time at this rank, the faculty member should develop more advanced skills in the area of *Student Intellectual Development* and demonstrate a consistent record of academic responsibility.

In annual reports and other evaluative portfolios, a faculty member at this rank must provide evidence of progress and involvement that is responsive to feedback and meets expectations of the rank.

2. Senior Instructor

A nominee for appointment to the rank of Senior Instructor is required to hold at least a master's degree in a related discipline and have sufficient course work in the discipline or to have professional achievements that the University recognizes as sufficient for waiving the degree requirements. The rank of Senior Instructor should be assigned to an individual who, when appointed, lacks qualifications required by the University for appointment to a professorial rank. A Senior Instructor is a full-time employee of the university and is a full voting member of the Senior Instructor's respective department, unit assembly, and Faculty Conference. A faculty member at this rank is not eligible for tenure; however, a Senior Instructor can be awarded multi-year contracts.

At the time of appointment, a Senior Instructor should demonstrate effective *Student Intellectual Development*, a consistent record of academic responsibility, and some *Scholarly Activity* or *Professional Stewardship*. The rank of Senior Instructor is granted as a result of work at Winthrop or other evidence that indicates a multi-year appointment is appropriate. Throughout the time at this rank, the faculty member should continue to develop skills in the area of *Student Intellectual Development*, must maintain a consistent record of academic responsibility, and is expected to stay involved in *Scholarly Activity* or *Professional Stewardship* associated with the individual's discipline.

In annual reports and other evaluative portfolios, a faculty member at this rank must provide evidence of progress and involvement that is responsive to feedback and meets expectations of the rank.

3. Adjunct Faculty

An Adjunct Faculty member is required to hold at least a master's degree in a related discipline and have sufficient course work in the discipline or to have professional achievements that the University recognizes as sufficient for granting an appointment at this rank.

Adjunct Faculty are hired on a part-time basis and for a fixed-term (e. g., one semester, one year) to teach one or more courses or to conduct a series of lectures. A faculty member at this rank is not eligible for tenure. Terms such as Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Artist-in-Residence, or Adjunct Associate Professor are used to indicate the type of appointment and level of expertise.

At the time of appointment, an Adjunct Faculty member should demonstrate a potential for, or offer evidence of, effective *Student Intellectual Development* activities and a commitment to those expectations within academic responsibility that are requirements for all faculty (e.g., adherence to academic policies, participating in the collection of assessment data necessary for course and program evaluation). Throughout the time at this rank, the faculty member should develop more advanced skills in the area of *Student Intellectual Development* and demonstrate a consistent record of academic responsibility.

In annual reports, Adjunct Faculty must provide evidence of progress and involvement that is responsive to feedback and meets expectations of the rank.

IV. General Review Procedures at Winthrop

The following procedures are established by the University to ensure appropriate review of materials and timely notification of decisions. The specific timeline for review procedures is updated annually by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and is included as [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#). General guidelines for submission of materials are provided, yet academic units may provide additional clarification on materials needed.

A. Applications for Tenure

The awarding of tenure to a tenure track faculty member will be based on the expectations described in [Section II: Tenure at Winthrop](#). Beginning with a tenure track appointment as an Assistant Professor or higher rank, the probationary period will not exceed six years, including credit for prior service. During the probationary period, a tenure track faculty member will have the same academic freedom as other members of the faculty.

Credit toward Probationary Period for Tenure. At the time a tenure track appointment is made, credit for prior service may be given toward the probationary period for tenure. The number of years of prior service credited toward the six years of probationary service will be stated in the Reasons/Remarks section of the Personnel Action Form. Policies for awarding credit are:

- a. Credit may be given for prior service as a temporary faculty member at Winthrop University if the appointment is changed from restricted to regular service.
- b. Credit may be given for prior full-time academic service at another institution of higher learning at the rank of Assistant Professor or above.
- c. Credit may be given for prior professional service, other than teaching at another institution of higher learning, when such service is related to the faculty member's appointment at Winthrop.
- d. Credit will not exceed 3 years except in unusual circumstances.
- e. In determining the amount of prior service to be credited to a faculty member, no credit shall be given for summer school teaching at Winthrop or elsewhere.

During the probationary period, a faculty member may be granted leaves of absence. The time spent in a leave of absence granted for medical or administrative reasons will not be counted toward the probationary period. The time spent in a scholarly leave of absence, as determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, for one year or less will count as part of the probationary period.

1. Pre-Tenure Review

A pre-tenure review shall be conducted in the third year for faculty hired with no credit for prior service. For faculty hired with one or two years of credit toward tenure, the review will take place in the second year of employment at Winthrop. If a faculty member is hired with three years' credit toward tenure, a pre-tenure review will ordinarily not be conducted unless the review is requested by the faculty member. The pre-tenure review will be conducted by the appropriate committee as specified by the academic unit. This review shall be completed and the results will be given to the faculty member no later than May 15. Results of this review shall be discussed with the candidate in a conference with the department chair and the dean. Results of this review need not be included in the tenure portfolio unless the candidate chooses to include the results.

Timelines are provided by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#) and updated annually to reflect changes in the calendar.

Portfolio Preparation. A faculty member standing for pre-tenure review must submit a portfolio to his/her department chair/direct supervisor that follows academic unit guidelines and contains all materials indicated

below. Further it is the responsibility of the faculty member to organize the portfolio in such a way as to facilitate review at all levels.

- A cover sheet containing the following information:
 - date employed at Winthrop,
 - rank at original appointment, and
 - prior service credit granted at employment.
- An application letter which includes an analysis/statement by the candidate explaining how he/she is progressing toward the qualifications of tenure and/or promotion.
- A table of contents.
 - Appropriate indexing tabs should be employed.
 - Indication of location of materials outside the original binder/notebook must be indicated.
- A current vita.
- Annual reports from all years since hire (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations).
 - Arrange in chronological order.
 - The semester/year should be clearly indicated on teaching evaluations.
- A Statement or report of activities associated with *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship* as defined by the college.
 - This should be accompanied by the additional departmental explanation (where applicable).
 - Evidence of the candidate's scholarship should be included. This may include copies of articles, other publications, video tapes, etc.
 - Each category should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities.
 - The faculty member is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.
- Peer evaluations, if available.
- Supporting documents pertinent to the review.
- A statement of the faculty member's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years.

2. Tenure Review Process

Faculty will stand for tenure in the sixth year of probation, including credit given for prior service. A faculty member standing for tenure submits to the department chair a tenure portfolio prepared according to the guidelines of the University and the academic unit. The general University expectations are included in this document and academic units are responsible for providing faculty members additional expectations electronically on the unit website at least six months prior to the portfolio due date. Timelines for the review process are provided by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#) and updated annually to reflect changes in the calendar.

When a faculty member is applying for tenure and for promotion concurrently, a single supporting portfolio for both processes will be used. The letters of application from the faculty member, recommendations from the chair and the dean, and all committee recommendations must be submitted separately, as the review processes for tenure and promotion will occur independently.

The membership of all reviewing committees upon formulation will be made known to the candidate and appropriate administrators. Each reviewing body, whether faculty or administrator, will forward its recommendations, along with the tenure portfolio, to the next level of review.

The faculty member under review will submit the review portfolio directly to his/her direct supervisor (chair or dean). The process of review will follow a procedure established by the unit that is consistent with the general guidelines from the university.

In units that include department level review committees, a committee of no fewer than five tenured faculty, of whom a majority will be tenured within the faculty member's department or academic unit (if possible), will be formed (as specified by the academic unit) and convened at the request of the department chair to review the tenure portfolio and to determine whether to recommend the faculty member for tenure. If there is not a sufficient number of tenured faculty within the department or academic unit, then tenured faculty outside the department or unit will serve as members of the committee.

Once the portfolio is submitted, the department chair will forward the portfolio to the department committee or begin the review process as described below.

Neither the department chair nor dean may serve on a review committee for a faculty member for whom they are a supervisor. However, any committee may request to meet with the chair or dean for clarification of information. In the case of a department chair's consideration for tenure, the dean will appoint a committee of no fewer than five tenured faculty, one of whom must be a member of the faculty member's department; but the committee may include a majority who are tenured outside the chair's department. Should there be no tenured faculty member in the department, the dean will appoint the committee members from tenured faculty outside the department.

The department level committee reviews and returns the portfolio with a report including a recommendation to the department chair. This report should outline reasons for the recommendation, addressing all appropriate areas of review (*Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibility) as appropriate for the rank held. When the decision of the committee is not unanimous, the report should indicate the areas of disagreement. If a single report cannot adequately represent the evaluation of committee members, a minority report must be submitted along with the primary report. All committee members must sign either the primary report or minority report. It is the role of the departmental committee to clarify any discipline-specific information concerning *Scholarly Activity* or *Professional Stewardship* that is provided in the faculty member's portfolio for reviewers unfamiliar with the norms of the discipline. At this juncture, no material may be deleted from the portfolio. At any stage of the review process, no material may be added to the portfolio by the candidate without the approval of all prior review bodies.

The department chair reviews all materials and submits a report including a recommendation, along with all of the materials, to the academic unit committee. The chair's report should outline reasons for the recommendation addressing all appropriate areas of review (*Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibility). The chair may clarify a faculty member's claims with regard to the discipline and department norms that may not be evident to a reviewer from another unit or discipline.

The unit committee reviews all materials and submits to the dean a report including a recommendation, along with the portfolio and all previous reports. The unit committee's response must include a clear statement indicating the recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies. The unit committee's recommendation can refer to previous recommendations and documents from the department committee and chair. When the decision of the committee is not unanimous, the report should indicate the areas of disagreement. If a single report cannot adequately represent the evaluation of committee members, a minority report must be submitted along with the primary report. All committee members must sign either the primary report or minority report. In the case of academic units without department level review

committees, the unit committee may clarify faculty member claims with regard to the discipline that may not be evident to a reviewer from another unit or discipline.

The dean reviews all materials, creates a written response, and forwards all materials to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The dean's response must include a clear statement indicating his/her recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies. In most cases, a rationale pointing to previous reports is sufficient. In cases of disagreement within and among the review bodies, the dean must clarify and address the issues of disagreement.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs provides all portfolios and reports/recommendations received from the deans to the University Personnel Committee for review. The University Faculty Personnel Committee reviews all materials and submits its recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Upon receipt of the recommendations, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall convene the University Faculty Personnel Committee to discuss the granting of tenure. The recommendations of the Vice President for Academic Affairs are forwarded to the President along with recommendations from each level of review.

Portfolio Preparation. A faculty member standing for tenure review must submit a portfolio to his/her department chair/direct supervisor that follows academic unit guidelines and contains all materials indicated below. Further it is the responsibility of the faculty member to organize the portfolio in such a way as to facilitate review at all levels.

- A cover sheet containing the following information:
 - date employed at Winthrop,
 - rank at original appointment,
 - date(s) promoted and years in each rank, and
 - prior service credit granted at employment.
- An application letter which includes an analysis/statement by the candidate explaining how he/she met the qualifications of tenure.
- A table of contents.
 - Appropriate indexing tabs should be employed.
 - Indication of location of materials outside the original binder/notebook must be indicated.
- A current vita.
- Annual reports from all years since hire (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations).
 - Arrange in chronological order.
 - The semester/year should be clearly indicated on teaching evaluations.
- A Statement or report of activities associated with *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship* as defined by the college.
 - This should be accompanied by the additional departmental explanation (where applicable).
 - Evidence of the candidate's scholarship should be included. This may include copies of articles, other publications, video tapes, etc.
 - Each category should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities.
 - The faculty member is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.
- Peer evaluations, if available.
- Supporting documents pertinent to the review.
- A statement of the faculty member's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years.

3. Notification of Tenure Decision

The President, acting as agent of the Board of Trustees, shall then determine whether to grant tenure to the faculty member in question. If *tenure is to be granted*, the faculty member shall be notified in writing no later than May 15 of the faculty member's sixth probationary year. The faculty member to whom tenure is to be granted will receive a tenured appointment for the seventh year of service, or its equivalent, at Winthrop. The President or designee reports to the faculty on the status of tenure by submitting for publication the names of those faculty who have been granted tenure. The names will be published in *FYI (For Your Information)*, the news bulletin for all employees.

A faculty member who is *denied tenure* shall receive written notice by certified mail postmarked no later than May 15 to allow for notification at least twelve months before the expiration of the appointment. This permits a faculty member to serve a final year after being denied tenure. (See *Notification of Nonrenewal of Appointment*.) A faculty member may appeal denial of tenure only if he/she considers that improper procedure has been followed. Any alleged improper procedure must have had a substantive impact on the outcome of the tenure denial decision. Such appeal must be filed with the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.

In the case where tenure is denied, the tenure portfolio will remain in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for one year.

The Board of Trustees delegates to the President the managerial and administrative authority for the ongoing operations of the University commensurate with the policies of the Board. Decisions made by the President may not be appealed to the Board of Trustees.

Any candidate who has reason to suspect discrimination as defined by South Carolina Code in 8-17-320 may file a grievance.

B. Applications for Post-Tenure Review

All tenured faculty will participate in post-tenure review every six years. Faculty members will be reviewed six years after the year in which their tenure was effective, a post-tenure review was conducted, or a promotion was awarded. Outcomes and recommendations from the post-tenure process will be used in merit raise decisions.

In the case of faculty seeking promotion during the year in which a post-tenure review is scheduled, the faculty should submit application materials based on the timeline for promotion established in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#). If promotion is granted then the post-tenure review is deemed to be satisfactory and the faculty member will stand for post-tenure review again in 6 years. If promotion is denied, the faculty member will stand for post-tenure review in the following academic year.

Exceptions to the six-year cycle of post-tenure review are as follows:

- Faculty who sign statements of an intention to retire (including TERI separation dates) within two years after they are scheduled for post-tenure review will not participate. Faculty exercising this option must complete a post-tenure review during the academic year following rescission of an intention to retire.
- Faculty who take personal leave (e.g., sick leave, maternity leave, etc.) for longer than one semester may request, through the Vice President for Academic Affairs, that their review be deferred for a period appropriate to the duration of leave taken. The Vice President will rule on the deferral in consultation with the faculty member's dean and department chair and inform the faculty member in writing of the year in which post-tenure review will take place. This deferral does not apply to faculty who have received sabbatical leaves or other leaves for development purposes.

- Faculty members who wish to request that their review be rescheduled (for example, because of a sabbatical or other leave for development purposes which will take them away from campus during the year post-tenure review is scheduled) should make their request in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will consult with the dean and department chair and inform the faculty member in writing whether the review will be rescheduled.
- Department chairs, associate deans, and assistant deans who are not full-time administrators will be reviewed according to the schedule and procedures for faculty members. Post-tenure review for full-time administrators holding faculty rank will be deferred. Regular review of full-time administrators is conducted through alternative processes involving faculty and staff from multiple units. Such faculty will stand for post-tenure after three annual review cycles in a position that is not full-time administration.

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs will maintain the post-tenure review schedule, notify the deans who will inform the faculty members when their post-tenure reviews will take place, and update annually the time-line for review in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#).

1. Required Materials

The Post-Tenure Review Portfolio will include the following items:

- A statement from the faculty member outlining work and development in the areas of *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, *Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibility since the last tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. Each category should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities. The faculty member is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.
- A statement of the faculty member's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years.
- Annual reports from all years since last review (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations).
- Peer evaluations, if available.
- Current vita.
- Information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year, post-tenure review period.
- Supporting documents pertinent to the review.

If desired by a faculty member, the committee may send evidence of *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, *Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibility to one or more reviewers outside the University. External reviewers will be selected by the committee in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed.

2. Post-Tenure Review Committee.

All members of post-tenure review committees will be tenured Winthrop faculty. No faculty member will serve on a post-tenure review committee in the year in which he or she is scheduled for post-tenure review. For review of faculty members, the committee will consist of one member from the candidate's department if available, one member external to the department, and preferably a second member from the candidate's department. For review of chairs and other administrators without full-time administrative duties, the committee will consist of one member from the candidate's academic department if available; one additional member from

the academic unit in which the candidate serves, and one chair, assistant dean, or associate dean from another academic unit.

The faculty member should submit a list of possible committee members to the department chair consistent with the composition described above. Review committees will be selected by the department chair in such a way that the majority of members come from the faculty member's list of possible candidates. The department chair will submit the list of committee members to the dean, who will approve the committee as complying with post-tenure review policies and procedures. The dean will notify the chair and faculty member of the composition of the committee. The faculty member can appeal to the dean the appointment of any committee members who are not selected from the list provided.

The review committee will write a post-tenure review report evaluating the faculty member's performance and including a rating of "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory." The report will provide evidence for the committee's rating and suggestions for future performance and development. The committee will send copies of the report to the faculty member under review. A copy of the report and the post-tenure portfolio will be forwarded to the department chair or to the direct supervisor in cases of faculty in administrative roles. If the faculty member wishes to provide a written response, the faculty member must submit this response to the department chair/direct supervisor within two weeks of the notification of the decision.

The department chair or direct supervisor will review the committee report and portfolio, write a response, and forward all materials to the dean. The dean will also review all materials and reports, write a response, and forward information/materials as described below to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. All statements will be sent to the faculty member as the portfolio moves to the next level of review.

3. Satisfactory Reviews

In the case of a "Satisfactory" review, the committee's report will document areas in which the faculty member has excelled and make recommendations for future performance and development. In the case of a "Satisfactory" evaluation, the committee report cannot be overturned nor the rating changed to "Unsatisfactory" by the chair/supervisor or the dean.

A copy of the report and all supporting statements will be kept in the dean's office. A list of faculty members who have received "Satisfactory" post-tenure reviews in a unit will be forwarded annually to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

4. Unsatisfactory Review

In the case of an "Unsatisfactory" review, the committee's report will document ways in which the faculty member's performance of specific duties and roles is unsatisfactory and will include a development plan.

The development plan must include:

- realistic goals and expectations for performance;
- activities to improve performance;
- a timeline for completing the development plan that allows for two annual review cycles by chairs/supervisors and deans that address the development plan;
- suggested resources to support the plan; and
- methods for assessing achievement of the goals and expectations, including peer and student evaluations of performance.

In the case of unsatisfactory reviews each response from the chair/direct supervisor and dean will include an indication of agreement or disagreement with the committee report. Further, copies of the responses will be forwarded to both the faculty member and the chair of the post-tenure review committee. The dean will forward all materials to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will respond in writing to the dean and the faculty member indicating agreement or disagreement with the committee report.

If the department chair, dean, or Vice President for Academic Affairs disagrees with the “Unsatisfactory” rating or with aspects of the development plan, they will discuss such disagreements. If two of them agree to either change the rating to “Satisfactory” or to modify the development plan, such changes will be made and communicated to the review committee and the faculty member.

If the department chair, dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs agree with the “Unsatisfactory” rating, another review of the faculty member’s performance will be conducted after the completion of the development plan. The department chair will retain a complete copy of the materials submitted for the review, the committee report, and any statements from the faculty member, department chair, dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

5. Appeals Process

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will serve as the appeals committee in all cases involving post-tenure review.

Basis for Appeals. A faculty member may appeal the results of a post-tenure review rating for any of the following reasons:

- An appeal on the basis that the procedures and timetable posted were not followed or that the post-tenure review committee was improperly constituted or improperly directed, which resulted in an incorrect finding or recommendation.
- An appeal of the substance of the committee’s evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as “Unsatisfactory.” Such appeals should reflect a set of unusual or extraordinary circumstances and will require considerable supporting evidence, particularly in cases in which the review committee, department chair, dean, or Vice President for Academic Affairs concurred in the evaluation.
- An appeal of the development plan, requesting an adjustment of the plan recommended by the review committee and approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Possible Courses of Action. Depending on the nature of the appeal, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure may recommend:

- that the evaluation of the post-tenure review committee be allowed to stand;
- that the development plan recommended by the review committee be revised; or
- that a new committee be constituted and the review process repeated in the following year, using the procedures established for all post-tenure reviews.

Procedures for Appeals. Any faculty member who desires to appeal should notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs within five days of notification. Then within two weeks of receiving the Vice President’s evaluation and development plan, the faculty member must forward to the President and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure:

- A letter outlining the basis for the appeal and stating the desired outcome (revision of development plan or review by a new post-tenure review committee).

- The entire post-tenure review package, including the committee’s report, any response from the faculty member, and the reports from the department chair, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Within two weeks of receiving the appeal materials, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will forward its findings to the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean, the department chair, and the faculty member. The committee’s report should reflect the basis and evidence for the appeal and recommend one of the courses of action listed above.

Within two weeks of receiving the report from the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the President will report to the Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean, the department chair, and the faculty member whether the development plan should be revised, whether a new review should be completed in the next academic year, or whether the post-tenure review committee’s evaluation should be allowed to stand. Should the President not respond to the Committee’s recommendation within two weeks, the Committee’s recommendation will be allowed to stand.

If this process results in a “Satisfactory” rating, the dean’s office will maintain a copy of all reports and supporting statements.

If the appeals process upholds an “Unsatisfactory” rating, the faculty member begins the development plan and will be reviewed again according to the timeline established in the development plan.

6. Second Review after an Unsatisfactory Evaluation

The second review will take place within three months of the completion deadline communicated in the development plan. If feasible, the committee that conducted the original review will be reconvened to conduct the second review. If a committee member is unavailable for the second review, a replacement will be chosen by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member.

The following materials will be provided to the committee by the faculty member and department chair:

- a complete copy of the materials from the first review;
- a statement from the faculty member delineating the activities undertaken during the development period with a self-evaluation of the outcomes;
- annual reports from all years since last review (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations);
- information on *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, *Professional Stewardship*, and/or academic responsibility needed to indicate progress identified in the development plan;
- copies of the results of any assessments required by the development plan;
- a statement from the chair documenting resources provided to support the development plan;
- an updated vita; and
- any other materials addressing progress within the context of the development plan.

The committee reviews the materials above and decides whether the faculty member has made significant progress toward addressing the problems identified in the initial “Unsatisfactory” review. The committee writes a report clearly indicating the recommendation and reasons for the decision. This report is forwarded to the chair and dean as established in post-tenure reviews to allow for statements to be provided. As in “Satisfactory” evaluations, this information is reported to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by the dean.

If the committee returns an “Unsatisfactory” evaluation on the second review, the faculty member may add a response to the committee report within two weeks of notification. As in the case for regular post-tenure review, the response from the chair/direct supervisor and dean will include an indication of agreement or disagreement with the committee report. Further, copies of the responses will be forwarded to both the faculty member and the chair of the review committee. The dean will forward all materials to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will respond in writing to the dean, the chair, the faculty member, and the review committee indicating agreement or disagreement with the report.

If the department chair, dean, and/or Vice President for Academic Affairs disagrees with the “Unsatisfactory” rating, they will discuss the rating. If two of them agree, the rating will be changed to “Satisfactory.”

As mandated by the Commission on Higher Education, if a faculty member fails to make substantial progress toward the performance goals outlined in the development plan within the specified time frame of the development plan and does not receive a “Satisfactory” on the subsequent review, the Vice President for Academic Affairs can require that the development plan be continued for a specific time frame to include two complete annual review cycles or can recommend that the institution initiate procedures for dismissal of the faculty member, as outlined in the Winthrop University *Faculty Manual*.

C. Applications for Post-Tenure with Excellence

The criteria for the designation of Post-Tenure with Excellence are outlined in [Section II: Tenure at Winthrop](#). Standards and suggested evidence are discussed in the opening of this document. The designation of Post-Tenure with Excellence is associated with sustained excellence, mature leadership, and active mentoring. Faculty may not stand for Post-Tenure with Excellence and promotion in the same year.

1. Eligibility for Post-Tenure with Excellence

To apply, the faculty member must have tenure from Winthrop University and be scheduled for a regular post-tenure review. The distinction of Post-Tenure with Excellence will primarily be awarded to faculty at the rank of Professor. Faculty at the ranks of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor are highly encouraged to actively engage in activities leading to promotion before seeking Post-Tenure with Excellence. Faculty receiving the distinction of Post-Tenure with Excellence may seek promotion, if eligible, at any point after the post-tenure review.

In the case of faculty seeking promotion during the year in which a post-tenure review is scheduled, the faculty member should submit application materials based on the timeline for promotion established in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#). At all review levels, the committee or administrator will produce separate reports, one with a recommendation on promotion and a second with a recommendation for post-tenure. The post-tenure recommendation should include an indication of eligibility for Post-Tenure with Excellence. Candidates in this situation should arrange for the required peer review letters to be sent directly to the chair by the date established for completion of promotion review by the department committee. These letters will be added to the materials reviewed and forwarded by the chair.

2. Post-Tenure with Excellence Review Process

Faculty must notify the department chair and dean of intent to seek the distinction, according to the schedule established in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#). The faculty member requesting the distinction of Post-Tenure with Excellence will follow the timeline for post-tenure review through the department chair level. For the faculty member’s portfolio to be considered for Post-Tenure with Excellence, a

“Satisfactory” evaluation for post-tenure must occur at the committee level. No material may be deleted from the portfolio after it is forwarded to the department chair. With the exception of peer review letters, no material may be added to the portfolio by the candidate without the approval of all prior review bodies.

The faculty requesting review for Post-Tenure with Excellence must request that a total of three to five peers submit letters of support outlining meritorious work in *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and/or *Professional Stewardship*. Letters should support the candidate’s claims of sustained excellence, mature leadership, and active mentoring. Letters must be sent directly to the department chair and must be received on or before the date indicated in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#). Faculty may choose to request letters from non-Winthrop employees; however, work addressed by letters of support must be tied to the applicant’s role as a Winthrop faculty member. The faculty member may request from the chair a list of letters submitted according to the established timeline to insure timely submission of all materials.

The department chair will write a report with a recommendation to forward with all materials to a unit-level committee for consideration (this may be the same committee that reviews tenure and promotion portfolios in the fall semester). The department chair report should outline reasons for the recommendation addressing all appropriate areas of review (*Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, *Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibility) and indicate the degree of agreement with the candidate’s assertions of sustained excellence, mature leadership, and active mentoring. The chair may clarify faculty member claims with regard to discipline and department norms that may not be evident to a reviewer from another unit or discipline.

The unit committee reviews all materials and submits a report and recommendation to the dean, along with all of the materials. The unit committee response must include a clear statement indicating the recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies. The unit committee recommendation can refer to previous recommendations and documents from the post-tenure committee and chair. When the decision of the committee is not unanimous, the report should indicate the areas of disagreement. If a single report cannot adequately represent the evaluation of committee members, a minority report must be submitted along with the primary report. All committee members must sign either the primary report or minority report.

The dean reviews all materials and creates a written response. The dean’s response must include a clear statement indicating his/her recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies. In most cases, a rationale pointing to previous reports is sufficient. In cases of disagreement within and among the review bodies, the dean must clarify and address the issues of disagreement. According to the established schedule, the dean notifies each candidate of his/her recommendation and the recommendations of the committee(s).

The dean submits all materials to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs reviews the portfolio and all recommendations. The recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is forwarded to the President, along with the recommendations from each level.

3. Notification of Post-Tenure with Excellence Decision

The President, acting as agent of the Board of Trustees, shall then determine whether to grant Post-Tenure with Excellence to the faculty member in question. According to the timeline established in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#), the President or designee will notify the faculty member of the decision on Post-Tenure with Excellence. The names of those faculty members who have been awarded the distinction will be published in *FYI (For Your Information)*, the news bulletin for all employees.

Any candidate who has reason to suspect discrimination as defined by South Carolina Code in 8-17-320 may file a grievance.

The Board of Trustees delegates to the President the managerial and administrative authority for the ongoing operations of the University commensurate with the policies of the Board. Decisions made by the President may not be appealed to the Board of Trustees.

4. Required Materials

To be considered for Post-Tenure with Excellence the review portfolio should include the following items:

- Letter of application that summarizes work over the past six years and is similar to a letter for promotion. The candidate must make the case for sustained excellence, mature leadership, and active mentoring.
- List of work and growth in the areas of *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, *Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibilities. Each category should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities. The faculty member must describe noteworthy accomplishments and activities. When appropriate the academic unit priority guidelines should be used to delineate work.
- Annual reports from all years since last review (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations)
- A statement of the faculty member's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years
- Three to five peer evaluations sent directly to the department chair. Each should describe meritorious work in *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and/or *Professional Stewardship*. These letters will not be used by the regular post-tenure committee but will be forwarded by the chair for all additional reviews.
- Current vita
- Detailed information about outcomes of sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year, post-tenure review period
- Supporting documents pertinent to the review

D. Promotions in Rank

Promotions are granted at Winthrop on a merit basis. The criteria for promotions are the same as those required for academic appointment (See [Section III: Faculty Ranks at Winthrop](#)). Standards and suggested evidence for meeting these criteria are discussed in the [Section I: Faculty Roles at Winthrop](#).

A promotion in rank is associated with the academic discipline and should be based on performance related to the academic discipline and/or assigned roles at Winthrop University. This does not preclude promotion of faculty holding administrative duties, provided that judgments can be made in matters relevant to the academic discipline.

A promotion review form will be made available to all faculty according to the review timeline established in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#). A faculty member requesting promotion returns the form to the department chair. In the absence of exceptional circumstances, failure to meet the deadline constitutes waiver of promotion review. Not included in this process are non-tenure track, multi-year, visiting, and adjunct faculty. Only faculty members holding tenure-track positions are eligible for promotions in rank.

1. Promotion Review Process

A faculty member requesting promotion submits to the department chair a promotion portfolio prepared according to the guidelines of the University and the academic unit. Timelines are provided by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#) and updated annually to reflect changes in the calendar. The general University expectations are included in this document and academic units are responsible for providing faculty members additional expectations electronically on the unit website at least six months prior to the portfolio due date.

When a faculty member is applying for tenure and for promotion concurrently, a single supporting portfolio for both processes will be used. The letters of application from the faculty member, recommendations from the chair and the dean, and all committee recommendations must address tenure and promotion separately and must be submitted separately, as the review processes for tenure and promotion will occur independently.

The membership of all reviewing committees upon formation will be made known to the candidate and appropriate administrators. Each review body, whether faculty or administrator, will forward its recommendations, along with the promotion portfolio, to the next level of review.

The faculty member under review will submit the review portfolio directly to his/her direct supervisor (chair or dean). The process of review will follow a procedure established by the unit that is consistent with the general guidelines from the university.

In units that include department-level review committees, a committee of no fewer than five tenured faculty, of whom a majority will be tenured within the faculty member's department or college (if possible), will be formed (as specified by the college) and convened at the request of the department chair to review the portfolio and to determine whether to recommend the faculty member for promotion. If there is not a sufficient number of tenured faculty within the department or college, then tenured faculty outside the department or unit will serve as members of the committee.

Once the portfolio is submitted, the department chair will forward the portfolio to the department committee or begin the review process as described below.

Neither the department chair nor dean may serve on a review committee for a faculty member for whom they are a supervisor. However, any committee may request to meet with the chair or dean for clarification of information. In the case of a department chair's consideration for promotion, the dean will appoint a committee of no fewer than five tenured faculty, which must include at least one member of the department but may include a majority who are tenured outside the chair's department. Should there be no tenured faculty member in the department, the dean will appoint the committee members from tenured faculty outside the department.

Department level committees review and return the portfolio with a report and recommendation to the department chair or direct supervisor. This review should outline reasons for the recommendation addressing all appropriate areas of review (*Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional Stewardship*, and academic responsibility) as appropriate for the rank held. It is the role of the departmental committee to clarify any discipline-specific information concerning *Scholarly Activity* or *Professional Stewardship* that is provided in the faculty member's portfolio for reviewers unfamiliar with the norms of the discipline. At this juncture no material may be deleted from the portfolio. At any stage of the review process, no material may be added to the portfolio without the approval of all prior review bodies.

The department chair reviews all materials and submits a report and recommendation, along with all of the materials, to the academic unit committee. This review should outline reasons for the recommendation addressing all appropriate areas of review (*Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, Professional*

Stewardship, and academic responsibility). The chair may clarify faculty member claims with regard to the discipline and department norms that may not be evident to a reviewer from another unit or discipline.

The unit committee reviews all materials and submits to the dean a report, the review portfolio, and all previous reports. The unit committee response must include a clear statement indicating the recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies. The unit committee recommendation can refer to previous recommendations and documents from the department committee and chair. When the decision of the committee is not unanimous, the report should indicate the areas of disagreement. If a single report cannot adequately represent the evaluation of committee members, a minority report must be submitted along with the primary report. All committee members must sign either the primary report or minority report. In the case of academic units without department level review committees, the unit committee may clarify faculty member claims with regard to the discipline that may not be evident to a reviewer from another unit or discipline.

The dean reviews all materials and creates a written response. The dean's response must include a clear statement indicating the recommendation and must highlight pertinent information or clarification for subsequent review bodies. In most cases, a rationale pointing to previous reports is sufficient. In cases of disagreement within and among the review bodies, the dean must clarify and address the issues of disagreement.

When the *dean's recommendation is positive*, all materials are submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. When the *dean's recommendation is negative*, no materials are submitted. Rather, the dean discusses with the faculty member strengths and weaknesses identified in the review process. If the dean disagrees with a positive academic unit committee recommendation in two consecutive years, the promotion portfolio will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs in the second year unless the faculty member requests otherwise according to the timeline established in [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#).

The Vice President for Academic Affairs provides to the University Personnel Committee all portfolios and reports/recommendations received from the deans. The University Personnel Committee reviews all materials and submits its recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Upon receipt of the recommendations, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall convene the University Personnel Committee to discuss the granting of promotion. The recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is forwarded to the President along with recommendations from each level.

Portfolio Preparation. A faculty member standing for promotion must submit a portfolio to his/her department chair/direct supervisor that follows academic unit guidelines and contains all materials indicated below. Further it is the responsibility of the faculty member to organize the portfolio in such a way as to facilitate review at all levels.

- A cover sheet containing the following information:
 - date employed at Winthrop,
 - rank at original appointment, and
 - prior service credit granted at employment.
- An application letter which includes an analysis/statement by the candidate explaining how he/she met the qualifications of promotion.
- A table of contents.
 - Appropriate indexing tabs should be employed.
 - Indication of location of materials outside the original binder/notebook must be indicated.
- A current vita.

- Annual reports from all years since hire (including student evaluation data, chair/immediate supervisor evaluations, and dean evaluations).
 - Arrange in chronological order.
 - The semester/year should be clearly indicated on teaching evaluations.
- A Statement or report of activities associated with *Student Intellectual Development*, *Scholarly Activity*, and *Professional Stewardship* as defined by the college.
 - This should be accompanied by the additional departmental explanation (where applicable).
 - Evidence of the candidate's scholarship should be included. This may include copies of articles, other publications, video tapes, etc.
 - Each category should include tables or lists clearly outlining activities.
 - The faculty member is encouraged to describe any noteworthy accomplishments and to describe activity where the impact or time needed may not be apparent to reviewers.
- Peer evaluations, if available.
- Supporting documents pertinent to the review.
- A statement of the faculty member's goals and plans for involvement and development over the next six years.

2. Notification of Promotion Decision

The President, acting as agent of the Board of Trustees, shall then determine whether to grant promotion to the faculty member in question. If promotion is to be granted, the faculty member shall be notified in writing by May 15. By May 15, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall notify in writing faculty who are not being promoted. The President or designee reports to the faculty on the status of promotions by submitting for publication the names of those faculty who have been promoted. The names will be published in *FYI (For Your Information)*, the news bulletin for all employees.

Any promotion candidate who has reason to suspect discrimination as defined by South Carolina Code in 8-17-320 may file a grievance.

In the case where promotion is denied, the promotion portfolio will remain in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for one year to allow for completion of an appeals process if necessary.

The Board of Trustees delegates to the President the managerial and administrative authority for the ongoing operations of the University commensurate with the policies of the Board. Decisions made by the President may not be appealed to the Board of Trustees.

V. Annual Timelines for Review Procedures at Winthrop

This section of the document will be created and maintained by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Academic Leadership Council.

No significant changes in timelines can be made without sufficient notice to faculty affected by such changes.

The timeline must allow for the differences in structures among academic units and also provide a structure that allows for adequate review at all levels, providing faculty with timely notification of decisions.

VI. Works Cited

- American Association of University Professors. (1940). *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm>.
- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives: Complete edition*. New York : Longman.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Forehand, M. (2005). Bloom's taxonomy: Original and revised. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*. Retrieved February 4, 2011 from <http://projects.coe.uga.edu/epltt/>.
- Nelson, C. (2010). No university is an island: Saving academic freedom. *Publishers Weekly*, 257(3), 41.
- Schneider, C. G. (1998). President's message. *Liberal Education*, 84(4), 1-2.

VII. Proposed Timeline for Implementation

1. Documentation
 - a. Academic units will revise documentation and submit such documentation to the University Rules Committee to review for consistency by November 1, 2011.
 - b. Academic units will revise annual report documents to reflect the terminology in the revised Roles and Rewards document for use by all faculty in the 2012-2013 academic year. (If available, faculty may use new formats in 2011-2012.)
 - c. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs will publish [Section V: Annual Timeline for Review Procedures at Winthrop](#) for the 2012-2013 academic year no later than January 15, 2012. Further, a similar posting date will be in place for subsequent academic years.
 - d. During the years of transition, faculty members will be responsible for stating clearly on the cover page of all portfolios the version of guidelines followed.
 - e. During the years of transition, the letter of offer (the initial contract letter) for new faculty will include specific information regarding the appropriate review process to follow.
2. Post-tenure
 - a. Post-tenure review will remain in its current form until the 2013-2014 academic year. During the 2013-2014 academic year, the new guidelines and review procedures will be fully implemented.
 - b. During the 2011-2012 academic year, faculty wishing to be considered for Post-Tenure with Excellence will be held to the new expectations for review.
3. Tenure
 - a. Full implementation of the new tenure guidelines will be in place by the 2014-2015 academic year.
 - b. Faculty who began employment in the 2009-2010 or 2010-2011 or subsequent academic years will be reviewed according to the new guidelines at all stages of review (pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure). Pre-tenure reviews should provide suggestions to probationary faculty based upon the revised document to allow these faculty to make necessary progress toward tenure and promotion.
 - c. Faculty hired during the 2009-2010 or 2010-2011 academic years with 2 or more years of service credit can appeal to the dean for exceptions to the previous guideline.
 - d. All faculty members regardless of hire date can elect to be reviewed under the new guidelines beginning in the 2012-2013 academic year.
4. Promotion
 - a. Full implementation of the new guidelines for promotion decisions will begin in the 2014-2015 academic year.
 - b. Faculty may request review for promotion based on the new guidelines beginning in the 2012-2013 academic year.