Executive Summary

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies and Procedures

Reappointments to the faculty, promotions in rank, and grants of tenure are made by the board of trustees upon nomination by the president, with the advice of the dean and the faculty.

The normal starting point for the review process is the entry-level tenure-track appointment at the rank of assistant professor. These policies describe the review process, beginning with the review of new faculty members and continuing through the review for promotion to full professor. These policies also cover exceptions to normal process for tenure-track faculty and the evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty.

Faculty members are evaluated on the basis of their teaching, scholarship, and service, with the highest priority given to teaching. The review process emphasizes the importance of growth at all stages of the career and considers the needs of the department and the college and the strengths and interests of the individual faculty member.

The core of the review process is peer review. At appropriate levels, this includes evaluation by the department, representatives of the faculty at large, the dean, and scholars from outside the college. The formal review process rests on a process of ongoing communication and planning involving the faculty member, the department, and the dean.

Each formal review through the tenure review is both a reappointment review and a formative evaluation. Formal reviews occur in the fall of the second year (new faculty review), the spring of the third year (midterm review), and the spring of the sixth year (tenure review); a successful tenure review results in promotion to associate professor. Faculty members may be reviewed for promotion to full professor as early as the sixth year at the rank of associate.

The new faculty review is conducted by the department, which recommends to the dean; the dean then recommends to the president. All other formal reviews are conducted by review committees consisting of representatives of the department and representatives of the faculty at large. Reviews are based on the evidence presented. A review committee considers the evidence, meets with the candidate and with the dean, and recommends to the president. The dean likewise considers the evidence, meets with the review committee, and makes an independent recommendation to the president.
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1.0 Preface

Reappointments to the faculty, promotions in rank, and grants of tenure are made by the board of trustees upon nomination by the president, with the advice of the dean and the faculty.

These policies describe the evaluation of faculty performance, beginning with the review of new faculty members and continuing through the review for promotion to full professor. The normal starting point for the review process is the entry-level tenure-track appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Exceptions to normal process for tenure-track faculty are covered in section 10. The evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty is covered in section 11.

1.1 Definitions

Most of the terms used in these policies are defined in place. A few terms simplified for convenience in the following sections are clarified here.

- **Dean** refers to the Vice President for Academic Affairs / Dean of the College.
- In descriptions of review committees and second year evaluation committees, **department** and **departmental** refer to discipline-based reviewers. Normally these are members of the candidate's academic department. Where the department is small or the appointment is interdisciplinary, departmental reviewers may come from related departments or programs.
- The term **junior faculty** refers to untenured tenure-track faculty.
- The **RPT committee** is composed of six elected members of the faculty at large. The committee works with the dean to oversee the review process, and faculty wide representatives to individual review committees are chosen from among its members. See section 6.1.
- The **review committee** is the group of faculty reviewers assigned to a specific review case; it includes tenured representatives of the department and members of the RPT committee representing the faculty at large. See section 6.2.
- In descriptions of normal review process, **tenure review** means review for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, and **promotion review** means review for promotion to the rank of full professor. Of the two pre-tenure reviews, **new faculty review** means the review normally held in the first semester of the second year of employment; **midterm review** means the review normally held in the third year of employment.

1.2 Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility

The review process respects the mission of the college, which requires that faculty members have full rights of academic freedom. The same mission requires that faculty members be responsible and ethical in their scholarship and in their dealings with students, colleagues, administrators, staff members, and others. These professional rights and responsibilities are interdependent; both rest on the values of critical inquiry, human respect, and respect for difference. To engage the challenges of the times is to enter into conversation and controversy. Faculty members must be free to act, and to express their views, as professionals and as community members, and must grant others the same freedom. We must also grant the right to learn and grow from experience. A career spent in fear of honest error would be unproductive.

1.3 Confidentiality

The success of the review process depends on strict confidentiality. All business pertaining to individual candidates and their reviews is confidential, including the names of those up for review, the names of the members of their committees, and the content of all review meetings and documents. Candidates may choose to talk publicly about their reviews, but RPT committee members and members of review committees are bound by this confidentiality policy.
1.4 Common Sense
If anything in these policies requires interpretation, or if the question of an exception arises, the RPT committee and the dean discuss the matter and work out a solution by consensus. If consensus is impossible, the matter is referred to the faculty executive committee for a ruling.

2.0 Faculty Performance and Standards of Evaluation
Agnes Scott College is a diverse community whose mission is to educate women "to think deeply, live honorably, and engage the intellectual and social challenges of their times." The pursuit of these goals requires intellectual freedom, respect for difference, and a commitment to the welfare of the individual and the group. We as faculty members are responsible for modeling these values and for creating an environment in which the mission of the college can be realized.

All faculty reviews evaluate the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, with the highest priority given to teaching. In a liberal arts setting, these are overlapping categories, and each can inform and inspire the others. The review process emphasizes the importance of growth at all stages of the career and considers the needs of the department and the college and the strengths and interests of the individual faculty member. Sections 2.1 through 2.3 define the three areas, and section 2.4 addresses the criteria and standards of evaluation.

As faculty members we must continue to grow, in response to changes in the world, the college, our academic disciplines, and ourselves. We must be willing to try new things, to take risks, and to learn from experience. A career undertaken on these terms may not move at a constant pace in a straight line, but it will have purpose and integrity, and it will be of value to the institution.

2.1 Teaching
Liberal arts teaching is rooted in knowledge but is not limited to the transfer of information; in presenting the materials and methods of the discipline, it develops skills of critical and creative thinking, analysis, and argumentation. Its goal is to produce active learners who are able to think for themselves, to speak and listen well, to engage in debate, to question received opinion, to solve problems separately and together, and to make connections between the classroom and the world outside.

Teaching and learning are a communal activity. Successful teaching methods depend on the discipline, the nature and level of the course, the talents and skills of the teacher, and the students in the room. Teaching and learning can take place in a lecture, a group discussion, a lab session, a studio critique, a seminar meeting, or an individual conference. The teacher's role as academic advisor extends the focus of the activity from specific subject matters to the overall shaping of the student's college career. The college itself is a larger learning community whose members share responsibility for the intellectual and cultural vitality of the whole. In every setting, the teacher must also be an active learner who leads by example and who is responsive to students, conversant with current research in the discipline, and aware of relevant curricular and pedagogical issues.

2.2 Scholarship
Scholarship fosters intellectual growth and vitality, provides knowledge and understanding, engages the issues of its day, grounds the scholar in the discipline, and underlies and inspires teaching and learning. The liberal arts setting encourages a broad view of scholarship, which recognizes the value of discipline-based and interdisciplinary research, creative effort, artistic performance, and pedagogical inquiry. Scholarship is a cooperative enterprise, engaging the scholar in interaction with the wider community. Scholarship is most valuable when it is shared, especially in a public forum, is subject to validation by fellow academics or other editors or critics, and demonstrates the principles of discovery, integration with existing knowledge, or application to questions of relevance to the classroom or the world. Liberal arts scholarship embraces opportunities for growth and transformation over the course of a
faculty member’s career. In addition to more traditional forms of research, classroom interests may lead to research on pedagogy; conversations with colleagues may raise scholarly questions that cut across disciplinary boundaries; and we may reshape our scholarship to provide students first-hand experience in research or creative endeavors.

2.3 Service

Through service we create and maintain the community as a whole. Service to students, the department, the college, the profession, and the broader community is essential to the day-to-day work of the college and to the shaping of an institution that values diverse perspectives and fosters a continuing exchange of ideas. Faculty participation in governance, in student- and staff-related events and activities, and in the wide array of opportunities available both on and off campus helps make the college a place where the values of inquiry, learning, and integrity are lived. In short, we view service as our duty as community members.

Service models the link between liberal education and a deeper and more inclusive kind of citizenship, providing the infrastructure of the teaching and scholarship that drives the college, and cultivating a compassionate imagination. In exercising these service roles we often discover the most about ourselves and how our profession operates, and find opportunities for professional growth and human connection. When faculty members from different disciplines work side by side to solve a wide variety of problems, they embody the principles of cooperation and engaged participation that will enable our students to become active citizens and leaders.

2.4 Standards of Evaluation

In keeping with liberal arts tradition, teaching is the first concern in any faculty review. Scholarship and service are also essential to the mission of the college and to the evaluation of faculty performance, both for their intrinsic worth and for their roles in providing contexts for transformative teaching.

At each review—second year, midterm, tenure, and promotion—the faculty member must demonstrate levels of accomplishment and growth appropriate to the review. The new faculty review evaluates the candidate's early growth as a teacher, scholar, and community member. The midterm review evaluates the candidate’s accomplishments to date and his or her potential for future growth. The tenure review requires that the candidate demonstrate maturity as a teacher, scholar, and community member. The promotion review requires that the candidate demonstrate sustained performance and substantial new achievement in all three areas.

It would not be possible to prescribe a uniform standard of achievement based on a number of publications or committee assignments or senior projects directed; nor would it make sense to do so in a community where teaching, scholarship, and service are defined as they are in the preceding sections. The priorities of the review process emerge from the goals expressed in sections 2.1 through 2.3 above. Section 2.1 emphasizes the communality of teaching and learning. Consistent with this emphasis, student evaluations of teaching and class visits by colleagues are important measures of faculty performance, along with the candidate's self-evaluation and other materials supplied by the candidate. With respect to scholarship (section 2.2), the range of relevant activities is wide, but the most valuable work in any field will be peer-reviewed and will find a public forum that extends beyond the college; scholarship of this kind is necessary for tenure and for promotion. With respect to service (section 2.3), the duties of membership in the department, the faculty, and the college community are of primary interest to the review process. In each area, however, the evidence may include any activity reported on the Professional Activities Report Form (PAR); and in any review, each measure of performance is seen in the context of other measures.
Beyond these basic requirements, the ability to plan a faculty career, or to plan for a specific formal review, depends on a process of communication that begins with appointment to the faculty and that involves the faculty member, the department, and the dean. This process includes the responsibility of the department to articulate standards and expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service in the department and the discipline; it includes the responsibility of the department and the individual faculty member to set priorities that take into account the needs of the department and the skills and interests of the faculty member; and it includes the responsibility of the dean to oversee the process by monitoring the annual PAR forms of faculty members and by communicating as needed with individual faculty members and department chairs. (On the process of communication and mentoring, see section 4.0; on the PAR, see section 4.2; on the dean's role in the review process, see section 6.3.) These policies lay the groundwork for such a process and thus for a shared understanding of expectations and goals at any point in the faculty member's career.

The heart of the review process at Agnes Scott is peer review. In each formal review, the candidate's work is evaluated by representatives of the department and by the dean. In midterm, tenure, and promotion reviews, representatives of the faculty at large are involved as well. In the tenure review and the promotion review, the candidate's scholarship is also evaluated by peers from outside the college. At all stages, peer review is designed to promote growth as well as to assess achievement.

The candidate's self-evaluation is an essential part of department communication and of the formal review process. For each review beginning with the midterm review, the candidate prepares statements on his or her philosophy and practice of teaching, scholarship, and service, discussing activities during the period under review and intentions for the period to follow. These statements contribute to the ongoing process of communication and guidance described in this section.

Sections 5, 7, 8, and 9 of these policies list required materials for the separate reviews but do not attempt to list all possible categories of teaching, scholarship, or service. The annual PAR form records accomplishments in all three areas; anything that can be listed under a heading in the PAR can be considered under that heading in a formal review.

3.0 Normal Review Process

The normal point of entry to faculty standing and to the review process is the entry-level full-time, tenure-track appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Exceptions to normal process for tenure-track faculty are covered in section 10. The review of non-tenure-track faculty is covered in section 11.

3.1 Contracts and Renewal

The year of employment is the academic year. The initial tenure track appointment is for two years. After a successful new faculty review, the appointment is extended for an additional year, through the year of the midterm review. After a successful midterm review, the appointment is renewed for an additional three years, through the sixth year of employment. A successful tenure review in the sixth year brings a continuous contract and promotion to associate professor. After an unsuccessful new faculty review, the initial two-year contract becomes terminal. After an unsuccessful midterm or tenure review, the faculty member receives a one-year terminal contract. A contract may not be changed from tenure-track to non-tenure-track. The junior faculty member is a fully participating member of the faculty from the beginning except that he or she is exempt from faculty committee assignments for the first year.

3.2 Sequence of Reviews

The performance of each faculty member is reviewed at prescribed intervals, always with regard to teaching, scholarship, and service. Detailed descriptions of these reviews appear in sections 5 through 9. Exceptions to normal process are covered in section 10, and the review process for non-tenure-track faculty is covered in section 11.
The new faculty review is conducted in the fall of the second year by the tenured members of the department, for the mutual benefit of the department and the candidate. In the second year, the department also recommends to the dean for or against reappointment. The dean considers the departmental recommendation in recommending to the president. (See Section 5)

Midterm reviews, tenure reviews, and promotion reviews are conducted by review committees representing both the academic department and the faculty as a whole. Each review committee includes the tenured department members senior in rank to the candidate, and includes either one member (for the midterm review) or three members (for tenure reviews and promotion reviews) of the RPT committee representing the faculty. In each case the review committee acts as one body. It considers evidence, meets on its own and with the dean, and recommends to the president. The dean also considers the evidence, including the review committee evaluation, and independently recommends to the president.

The review process described in these policies forms the basis for personnel decisions at key points in the career of the faculty member, and it also serves to formalize an ongoing process of communication which should involve the faculty member, the department, students (through course evaluation forms), the dean (through the monitoring of PAR forms), and the faculty at large (through the RPT committee).

4.0 Communication and Mentoring

Professional growth is crucial to advancement, and all parties have an interest in the growth of the individual faculty member. This shared interest, and the responsibility that comes with it, are especially important during the junior faculty stage but are important at all stages. Ongoing communication about the performance and departmental role of the faculty member, and about the direction and needs of the department, serves the interests of all parties. It is the responsibility of the department to articulate standards and expectations for work in the discipline, to suggest opportunities for development and areas for improvement, to work with the faculty member to find an appropriate balance between scholarship and service, to work with the faculty member to set priorities for scholarship that take into account the faculty member's skills and interests and the kinds of activity best suited to them, and in general to plan for the future and for an upcoming review. It is the duty of the department chair to oversee this process, to foster collegial relations within the department, and to protect the interests of both the faculty member and the department as a whole. This includes the need to watch for problems that may develop and to address them as needed. All parties, including the faculty member, share the responsibility for ongoing communication and for creating a professional environment of mutual respect.

The dean also shares the responsibility for monitoring the progress of the faculty member. If the dean sees a problem that could affect reappointment, promotion, or tenure, it is the dean's duty to discuss the problem with the faculty member concerned. (On the dean's role in the review process, see section 6.3.)

The junior faculty member is barred from membership on review committees but is in other respects a full member of the department and should be involved in the discussion and disposition of department matters.

4.1 Communication During the Review Process

Communication is particularly important during the review process. The candidate, the department, the RPT committee, and the dean share the responsibility of making the process work, and it works best when all parties communicate with one another. The department chair is a reviewer but also continues as advisor, in consultation with other senior department faculty.

When there are questions or concerns about the process, in new faculty reviews they should be raised with the department chair or the dean. In midterm, tenure, and promotion reviews, the candidate should
communicate with the review committee liaison, and other parties to the review should communicate as appropriate with the review committee chair, the RPT committee chair, or the dean.

4.2 The Professional Activities Report (PAR)

In addition to the formal review process, the dean monitors the activities of faculty members through the annual Professional Activities Report. The PAR covers the period June 1 through May 31, and is due in the dean's office June 1. Each faculty member sends one copy of the completed PAR and a current CV to the department chair and one copy to the dean. The dean may discuss this report with the faculty member or the department chair and is available to discuss it at the request of the faculty member or the department chair. The dean's role in the formal review process is described in section 6.3.

The PAR also provides a guide for candidates in the submission of review materials. All reviews make use of the candidate's reports for the period under review, and the candidate may submit evidence of any of the activities listed on the PAR. The department and the individual faculty member are responsible for the relative weighting of various types of scholarly activities and the establishment of individual priorities. (See section 2.4, paragraph 4 and section 4.0.)

The RPT committee and the dean review the PAR form from time to time in order to ensure that it reflects the interests of the review process.

The PAR form appears as an appendix to these policies; the form is faculty legislation and may be substantively changed by faculty vote.

5.0 The New Faculty Review

The department reviews the performance of the junior faculty member in the fall of the second year. This review is both a formative departmental review and a reappointment review.

For the formative review, the purpose is to offer a fair assessment of the new member's strengths and weaknesses as a teacher, progress as a scholar, and service to the department, the college, and the profession; the effect of the review should be to assist in the overall development of the new faculty member. Departmental reviews should be both candid and supportive and should help build good working relationships within the department.

Because the new faculty review focuses mainly on performance during the first year of employment, the candidate is unlikely to have an extensive record of scholarship or service. The new faculty review provides an opportunity to formalize the ongoing process of communication and planning with respect to these areas. The departmental recommendation letter arising from the review serves the midterm review as evidence documenting this communication.

The new faculty review also serves as a reappointment review; the department recommends for or against reappointment to the dean, and the dean then recommends to the president. A successful new faculty review extends the initial two-year appointment for an additional year, through the year of the midterm review. After an unsuccessful second-year review, the initial two-year contract becomes terminal.

5.1 Committee Structure for New Faculty Review

The review is conducted by all full time tenured department members. If there are fewer than two tenured members, tenured faculty from related disciplines are chosen, by agreement of the department chair, the candidate, and the dean, to make up a group of two. If the department chair is ineligible to serve as chair of the review committee, the group elects its own chair. The group meets at least once to discuss the candidate's performance. The discussion should cover the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
The review of service recognizes that first year faculty members are ineligible to serve on faculty committees.

At the end of the meeting, reviewers vote for or against reappointment. After the vote is taken, the chair writes a letter to the dean, summarizing the discussion and recording the department recommendation for or against reappointment. (See section 5.3, October 15 deadline, for details.)

The chair meets with the candidate to discuss the review; this discussion should be based on the content of the chair's letter to the dean.

A department member on sabbatical may choose to participate or not in the review session.

If the appointment is interdisciplinary, an eligible representative from a related department or program may be added to the review committee by agreement of the candidate, the department, and the dean.

5.2 Review Materials for New Faculty Review

The new faculty review makes use of the following required means of assessment:

- Student evaluations of teaching
- Classroom visits by at least two members of the department committee; the review may also discuss classroom visits made during the previous year.
- Course syllabi
- A current curriculum vitae
- Professional Activities Report for the first year of appointment
- Comments solicited by the review committee from untenured department members.

In addition to these required means of assessment, the department may ask for comments from faculty members outside the department who would have pertinent information about the candidate's teaching (for example, someone who had team-taught a course with the new member). The review committee may draw on other evidence as appropriate, including evidence of the candidate's professional ethics. The candidate may also submit additional evidence of any of the activities reported on the PAR.

5.3 Timetable for New Faculty Reviews

The dates below are deadlines, which under special circumstances may be adjusted by agreement of the candidate, the department, and the dean. If a deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, it is extended to the next weekday.

**Deadlines, Fall of 2nd year**

**September 1.** The composition of the departmental review committee is determined. If there are fewer than two tenured members, tenured faculty from related disciplines are chosen, by agreement of the department chair, the candidate, and the dean, to make up a group of two. If the department chair is ineligible to serve as chair of the review committee, the group elects its own chair.

**October 1.** At least two department members observe the candidate's teaching. Department members should consult with the candidate when scheduling a date to observe his or her teaching.

**October 15.** Eligible department members meet to evaluate the candidate and to vote on reappointment. The chair writes a report based on the review session and the materials collected. This report should be as specific as possible with respect to the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, and should be signed by all reviewers. One copy is given to the candidate; a second is kept in department.
files; a third is given to the dean to be kept in the candidate's personnel file. Any material gathered for the review is returned to the source. In the same letter, the chair gives the department's recommendation for or against re-appointment.

**November 1.** The department chair meets with the candidate to discuss the review. The discussion is based on the content of the chair's letter to the dean.

**November 10.** If the dean has serious concerns about a department recommendation, the dean consults with the president and informs the review chair in writing and meets with the department to discuss the matter.

**November 20.** The dean sends a written recommendation to the president.

**December 1.** The candidate is informed of the president's decision.

### 6.0 Midterm, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews: Committee Structure and Role of Dean

Midterm reviews, tenure reviews, and promotion reviews are conducted by review committees representing both the candidate's department and the faculty as a whole. The review committee meets by itself and again with the dean, and the review committee and the dean make independent recommendations to the president.

#### 6.1 The RPT Committee

In midterm reviews, tenure reviews, and promotion reviews, the RPT committee represents the interests of the faculty as a whole. Together with the dean, the committee orients candidates to the review process. RPT committee members serve together with department representatives on individual review committees, and the RPT committee works with the dean to ensure that the review process is fair and consistent.

a. Six members are elected for three-year terms. Additional members may be elected for one-year terms as needed. All members must be tenured, full-time members of the teaching faculty; at least three must be full professors.

b. The committee on committees sets a slate of nominations for the RPT committee, and members of the faculty may add to the list of nominees before voting. Terms of members are staggered to ensure continuity. Elections are held at the March faculty meeting to replace members whose terms end at the conclusion of the academic year. Any other vacancy is filled by a special election. New terms begin upon election.

c. Members of the RPT committee are relieved of other faculty committee assignments.

d. The RPT committee works with the department chair and the dean to ensure that each case is handled in a way consistent with these policies and with other cases. For each academic year, the members of the RPT committee elect a chair who convenes and presides over meetings of the RPT committee, supervises the scheduling of reviews, and monitors their progress by communicating with review committee chairs. The RPT committee chair may chair a review committee on which he or she serves, but need not do so.

The RPT committee, together with the dean, considers requests for exceptions to the normal review process (see section 10). The committee holds a meeting to introduce new faculty to the review process during their first year of employment. The committee holds an orientation meeting in the spring (no later than May 15) for faculty members scheduled for reviews during the following academic year. This meeting is attended by RPT committee members, review candidates, and the dean.
The RPT committee and the dean review the PAR form from time to time in order to ensure that it reflects the interests of the review process.

The RPT committee may develop procedures as needed, for example a template for the letters sent to external reviewers of scholarship, a format for the initial consultation between the RPT liaison and the review candidate, or guidelines for the length and form of candidates' statements on teaching, scholarship, and service. The RPT committee keeps records of such procedures in order to provide continuity as committee membership changes. Such procedures must be consistent with RPT policies, but they do not have the force of faculty legislation; they should be reexamined periodically by the RPT committee, and they may be modified as needed, as long as the principles of fairness and consistency are upheld.

6.2 The Review Committee

Each midterm review, tenure review, and promotion review is conducted by a review committee representing both the RPT committee and the candidate's department and acting as one body. The review committee considers the needs of the department and the college and respects both the specific knowledge of department members and the role of RPT committee members as representatives of the faculty and guardians of the review process.

The review committee meets by itself and with the dean and makes a recommendation to the president. In all its meetings the review committee seeks consensus and maintains confidentiality. Each review committee member has one vote in the review and composes a letter of recommendation to the president. The review committee chair writes an additional one-to-two page summary letter recording the vote and explaining the committee's position. This letter stands as the review committee's recommendation to the president.

Review committees for specific reviews are described in sections 7 through 9.

6.3 The Role of the Dean in the Review Process

The dean is not a member of any review committee but considers the evidence, including the review committee's evaluation, and composes an independent recommendation to the president. During a review, the dean communicates with the review committee as necessary and meets with the review committee at least once to discuss the review. The dean serves as liaison between the review committee and the president and works with the RPT committee to coordinate all review activities. During the review process, all review materials are kept in the office of the dean. The dean makes materials available to review committee members, the president, and the candidate; keeps the president informed of the review process; keeps review committees informed of the president's concerns; monitors the work of all review committees in order to ensure that standards of evaluation are applied consistently; and works with the RPT committee to ensure the fairness of the review process.

As described in section 4.2 above, the dean also contributes to the ongoing process of communication by monitoring the annual Professional Activities Reports of faculty members. The dean brings to the attention of individual faculty members and department chairs any potential problems that appear during the monitoring of these reports. On the basis of the reports, the dean may also suggest to a long-time associate professor that he or she apply for promotion. Together with the RPT committee, the dean reviews the PAR form from time to time in order to ensure that it reflects the interests of the review process.

Together with the RPT committee, the dean considers requests for exceptions to the normal review process (see section 10).
No later than September 30 each year, the dean provides the president with a written summary of the previous year's reviews and the current year's scheduled reviews. The president conveys the outcome for each of the previous year’s reviews to the board during the fall term.

7.0 The Midterm Review
The midterm review, in the third year of employment, is conducted jointly by a faculty review committee and the dean. A successful review extends the appointment for an additional three years, through the sixth year of employment. An unsuccessful review results in a one-year terminal contract for the fourth year of employment.

The midterm review is a crucial point in the junior faculty member's career, and it is in the interest of all parties to evaluate the candidate candidly, fairly, and constructively. The review should reflect seriously on the candidate's past and present performance, but it should also reflect the ability of the candidate and the department to plan for the future together. The period under review is the period of employment to the time of the review.

The candidate submits material evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service. The review committee draws on this and other evidence and meets by itself and with the dean. The review committee and the dean make independent recommendations to the president. The candidate may also request a meeting with the committee or the dean or both.

On exceptions to the normal review schedule, see section 10.

7.1 Midterm Review Committee
The review committee is made up of all tenured members of the department and one representative from the RPT committee, with the RPT representative serving as chair and also fulfilling the role of liaison. No RPT Committee member may serve as RPT representative to a review committee if the candidate is a member of his or her academic department; his or her role in that instance is as a departmental member of the review committee.

A department member on sabbatical may choose to be a member of the review committee, may choose to have a letter placed in the RPT review file, or may decline to participate. The review committee considers the needs of the department and the college and respects both the specific knowledge of department members and the role of the RPT Committee member as a representative of the faculty and guardian of the review process.

If there are not at least two eligible department members, additional members are added from the teaching faculty to bring the number up to two. The RPT chair secures the participation of additional members after conferring with the dean, the department chair, and the candidate.

If the appointment is interdisciplinary, an eligible representative from another department or program may be added to the review committee by agreement of the candidate, the department, and the dean.

The review committee solicits information from the candidate and others as appropriate, meets to discuss the review, meets with the dean, and recommends action to the president. The review committee also meets with the candidate if either the review committee or the candidate wishes.

In all its meetings the review committee seeks consensus and maintains confidentiality. Each member has one vote in the review, and composes a letter of recommendation to the president. The
review committee chair writes an additional summary letter recording the vote and briefly summarizing the committee's position. This letter stands as the review committee's recommendation to the president.

7.2 Materials for Midterm Reviews
    The candidate submits the following required materials:
    • A current curriculum vitae
    • Statements on the candidate's philosophy and practice of teaching, scholarship, and service, discussing the period under review and the candidate's intentions for the period to follow.
    • Professional Activities Reports for the period under review
    • Student course evaluations for the period under review
    • Course syllabi for the period under review (sample syllabi for frequently taught courses)
    • Material evidence of finished scholarship, of scholarship in progress, if ready for review, and, if appropriate, of unpublished scholarship.

    The candidate may also submit additional evidence of any of the activities reported on the PAR. The midterm review does not include the external review of scholarship.

    In addition to evidence submitted by the candidate, the review committee draws on the departmental recommendation letter from the new faculty review and on the comments of at least two committee members who have visited the candidate's classes. The review committee draws on other evidence as appropriate, including evidence of the candidate's professional ethics.

7.3 Timetable for Midterm Reviews
    The dates below are deadlines, which under special circumstances may be adjusted by agreement of the candidate, the review committee, and the dean. The review calendar starts during the spring term of the academic year before the review. If a deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, it is extended to the next weekday.

    **Deadlines, spring preceding year of review:**
    - **February 15.** The dean writes to faculty members scheduled for review the next year, reminding them of their candidacy, requesting confirmation, and calling their attention to the relevant sections of these policies.
    - **March 15.** The RPT Committee for the coming year elects a chair and informs the dean.
    - **April 1.** The dean sends the incoming RPT chair the names of faculty members scheduled for review in the coming year.
    - **May 1.** The composition of the review committee is determined. The RPT chair chooses one of the RPT committee members to serve on the review committee in the role of review committee chair. The RPT chair determines the departmental component of the review committee in consultation with the dean, the department chair and the candidate.
    - **May 15.** Candidates attend an orientation meeting with the dean and the RPT committee for the coming year. At this time, candidates will be informed of the membership of their review committee.

    **Deadlines, year of review:**
    - **September 1.** Each candidate sends a current CV to the dean and to the review committee chair. Upon receipt, the review committee chair sends copies to all review committee members and informs them of the schedule for the upcoming review.
October 1. The review committee chair meets with the candidate to go over the review process and timetable.

December 1. The review committee chair and at least one departmental member of the review committee observe the candidate's teaching. Review committee members should consult with the candidate when scheduling a date to observe his or her teaching.

January 15. The candidate submits all required review materials to the office of the dean of the college. The candidate may update the CV at any time during the review and may add any materials that become available after this deadline. The candidate should date and initial such additional materials and inform the review committee chair. The review file is kept in the office of the dean and may be signed out by review committee members.

February 15. The review committee meets to discuss the file. It seeks consensus, and it gives weight to the information and opinions given by both RPT and discipline-based members. Before and after this meeting, the review committee may communicate with the candidate as needed through the chair, and either the review committee or the candidate may request a meeting to address concerns. Except for such communication, the contents of this meeting are confidential. (See the confidentiality statement, section 1.3.)

February 25. The review committee meets with the dean to discuss the evidence and their recommendations. After this meeting, the committee chair informs the candidate of any remaining concerns and gives the candidate a reasonable amount of time to respond in writing. Any such response is filed with other permanent records of the review.

March 15. The review committee delivers its recommendation to the dean. This recommendation consists of a letter of evaluation by each member and an additional summary letter by the chair recording the vote and briefly describing the committee's position. Before sending the recommendation, the review committee chair circulates the cover letter within the committee; committee members sign the letter when they are satisfied that it fairly characterizes the outcome of the review session. The review committee chair sends one copy of the cover letter to the candidate.

April 1. The dean makes written recommendation to the president and forwards to the president the review committee's cover letter and the individual letters of all committee members. The dean also sends the candidate and each review committee member a copy of the dean's recommendation.

April 20. If the president has any concerns about the candidacy or the recommendations, the president meets with the dean and the review committee.

May 1. The president informs the candidate in writing of the president's recommendation for or against reappointment. The president sends positive recommendations to the board with the other materials for the spring board meeting.

Late April or early May. If the president has recommended reappointment, the president notifies the candidate in writing of the board's decision within five working days of its spring meeting.

8.0 Tenure Review

The tenure review is conducted in the sixth year. By granting tenure to a member of the teaching faculty, the college determines that the person has fulfilled the promise on which the original granting of a probationary contract was based. A successful tenure review brings a continuous contract and promotion
to associate professor. An unsuccessful tenure review brings a one-year terminal contract for the seventh year of employment. Once tenure is granted, the college cannot terminate employment before retirement except for just cause, financial exigency or curricular exigency, or medical reasons. (See separate Dismissal Policies and Procedures.)

In no event is tenure granted by mere completion of the probationary period of service, or by any delay in the review process. A specific award of tenure by the board of trustees is required.

The tenure review is conducted jointly by a faculty review committee and the dean. The review committee meets by itself and with the dean, and both the committee and the dean recommend to the president. The period under review is the time spent at the rank of assistant professor.

On the dean's role in the review process, see section 6.3 above.

On exceptions to the normal review schedule, see section 10.

8.1 Tenure Review Committee

The tenure review committee includes representatives of the department and members of the RPT committee, representing the faculty. The committee considers the needs of the department and the college and respects both the specific knowledge of department members and the role of RPT Committee members as representatives of the faculty and guardians of the review process. The review committee meets by itself and with the dean, and the review committee and the dean make independent recommendations to the president. The candidate may also request a meeting with the review committee or the dean or both.

In all its meetings the review committee seeks consensus and maintains confidentiality. Each member has one vote in the review and composes a letter of recommendation to the president. The review committee chair writes an additional summary letter recording the vote and briefly explaining the committee's position. This letter stands as the review committee's recommendation to the president.

Faculty-wide Component. The RPT chair chooses three RPT members to serve on each review committee and assigns the roles of chair and liaison for each major review. The chair of the review committee schedules meetings, presides at meetings, enforces RPT policies, solicits and receives external evaluations, and writes the review committee recommendation letter recording the vote and summarizing the committee's position. The liaison communicates with interested parties as needed but serves primarily as liaison with the candidate and guardian of the candidate's interests.

No RPT Committee member may serve as RPT representative to a review committee if the candidate is a member of his or her academic department; his or her role in that instance is as a departmental member of the review committee.

Departmental Component. The departmental component of a tenure review committee includes all tenured members of the department. The review committee chair notifies all eligible members of the candidate’s department, including faculty members on sabbatical, of the pending review. A department member on sabbatical may choose to be a member of the review committee, may choose to have a letter placed in the RPT review file, or may decline to participate.

If there are not at least two eligible department members, additional members are added from the teaching faculty to bring the number up to two. The RPT chair secures the participation of additional members after conferring with the dean, the department chair, and the candidate.
If the appointment is interdisciplinary, an eligible representative from another department or program may be added to the review committee by agreement of the candidate, the department, and the dean.

8.2 Materials for Tenure Review

The candidate submits the following required materials:

- A current curriculum vitae
- Statements on the candidate's philosophy and practice of teaching, scholarship, and service, discussing the period under review and the candidate's intentions for the period to follow (see section 2.4).
- Professional Activities Reports for the period under review
- Student course evaluations for the period under review
- Course syllabi for the period under review (sample syllabi for frequently taught courses)
- Annotated list of six qualified external reviewers of scholarship. This list should be compiled in consultation with the department chair and the review committee liaison.
- Material evidence of finished scholarship, of scholarship in progress, if ready for review, and, if appropriate, of unpublished scholarship.

Portfolio of scholarship for external review. This portfolio may be designed with the help of the department chair and the review committee liaison. It must contain a current CV, a statement about the candidate’s scholarship, and tangible evidence of the candidate's work as a scholar.

The candidate may also submit evidence of any of the activities reported on the PAR.

In addition to evidence submitted by the candidate, the review committee draws on the following kinds of evidence:

- Copies of the review committee chair's cover letter and the dean's recommendation letter from the midterm review (supplied by the dean)
- Comments of at least two review committee members who have visited the candidate's classes
- Responses of external reviewers of scholarship.

The review committee draws on other evidence as appropriate, including evidence of the candidate's professional ethics.

8.3 Timetable for Tenure Review

The dates below are deadlines, which under special circumstances may be adjusted by agreement of the candidate, the review committee, and the dean. The review calendar starts during the spring term of the academic year before the review. If a deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, it is extended to the next weekday.

Deadlines, spring preceding year of review:

February 15. The dean writes to faculty members scheduled for review the next year, reminding them of their candidacy, requesting confirmation, and calling their attention to the relevant sections of these policies.

March 15. The RPT Committee for the coming year elects a chair and informs the dean.

April 1. The dean sends the incoming RPT committee chair the names of faculty members scheduled for review in the coming year.

May 1. The composition of the review committee is determined. The RPT chair chooses three RPT committee members and assigns the roles of review committee chair and liaison to two of them. The RPT chair determines the departmental component of the review committee in consultation with the dean, the department chair and the candidate.
May 15. Candidates attend an orientation meeting with the dean and the RPT committee for the coming year. At this time, candidates will be informed of the membership of their review committee.

Deadlines, year of review:

September 1. Each candidate sends a current CV to the dean and to the review committee chair. Upon receipt, the review committee chair sends copies to all review committee members and informs them of the schedule for the upcoming review.

October 1. The review committee liaison meets with the candidate to go over the review process and timetable. The candidate consults with the liaison and the department chair about the list of six possible external reviewers of scholarship specified in section 8.2.

October 10. The candidate sends the review committee chair a list of six possible external reviewers of scholarship. Those named should be able to give unbiased professional appraisals of the candidate's work. The candidate should annotate the list as to his or her relationship with each reviewer and the reviewer's area of expertise. The review committee chair forwards the candidate’s CV and the list of potential external reviewers to the RPT committee.

October 20. The RPT committee meets to pick three names from the list of six external scholars, ranking the other three names as backups. The review committee chair writes letters of inquiry to the three scholars chosen by the RPT committee.

November 1. The candidate gives the review committee chair three paper copies of or electronic access to the portfolio to be sent to external reviewers of scholarship.

November 5. The review committee chair secures three external reviewers and mails copies of the portfolio and cover letter. The cover letter includes a description of the college, notes the candidate's normal teaching load and other duties, and describes the criteria and standards for the evaluation of scholarship. It asks the reviewer to evaluate scholarship but not to recommend for or against tenure. The candidate may review the cover letter before it is mailed.

December 1. At least one RPT review committee member and at least one departmental member of the review committee observe the candidate's teaching. Review committee members should consult with the candidate when scheduling a date to observe his or her teaching.

January 15. The candidate submits all required review materials to the office of the dean of the college. The candidate may update the CV at any time during the review and may add any materials that become available after this deadline. The candidate should date and initial such additional materials and inform the review committee chair. The review file is kept in the office of the dean and may be signed out by review committee members.

Letters of external reviewers should be in the file. Letters from the midterm review (from the review committee chair and the dean) should also be in the file.

February 15. The review committee meets to discuss the file. It seeks consensus, and it gives weight to the information given and opinions offered by both RPT and discipline-based members. Before and after this meeting, the review committee may communicate with the candidate as needed through the liaison, and either the review committee or the candidate may request a meeting to address concerns. Except for such communication, the contents of this meeting are confidential. (See the confidentiality statement, section 1.3.)
February 25. The review committee meets with the dean to discuss the evidence and their recommendations. After this meeting, the committee liaison informs the candidate of any remaining concerns and gives the candidate a reasonable amount of time to respond in writing. Any such response is filed with other permanent records of the review. Either the review committee, the dean, or the candidate may also request a meeting to address concerns.

March 15. The review committee delivers its recommendation to the dean. This recommendation consists of a letter of evaluation by each member and an additional summary letter by the chair which records the vote and briefly describes the committee's position. Before sending the recommendation, the review committee chair circulates the cover letter within the committee; committee members sign the letter when they are satisfied that it fairly characterizes the outcome of the review session. The review committee chair sends one copy of the cover letter to the candidate.

April 1. The dean makes written recommendation to the president and forwards to the president the review committee's cover letter and the individual letters of all committee members. The dean also sends the candidate and each review committee member a copy of the dean's recommendation.

April 20. The president meets with the dean and the review committee if the president has any concerns about the candidacy or the recommendations.

May 1. The president informs the candidate in writing of the president's decision to recommend or not recommend tenure. The president sends positive recommendations to the board with the other materials for the spring board meeting.

Late April or early May. If the president has recommended tenure, the president notifies the candidate in writing of the board's decision within five working days of the spring board meeting.

9.0 Promotion Review

Promotion to professor requires six years of full-time employment at the rank of associate professor. A promotion review may be conducted as early as the fall of the candidate's sixth year at the rank of associate professor. The candidate submits evidence of teaching, scholarship, and service, and submits works of scholarship for evaluation by external reviewers. A successful review brings promotion to full professor, effective in the academic year following the review. An unsuccessful review carries no penalty, and the faculty member may reapply for review as early as the next year. The period under review is the time spent at the rank of associate professor.

The promotion review is conducted jointly by a faculty review committee and the dean. The review committee meets once by itself and once with the dean, and the committee and the dean make independent recommendations to the president. The candidate may also request a meeting with the committee or the dean or both.

On the dean's role in the review process, see section 6.3 above.

On exceptions to normal process (for example, the case of a faculty member hired at the rank of associate professor), see section 10.

9.1 Promotion Review Committee

The promotion review committee includes representatives of the department and the faculty at large acting together. The committee considers the needs of both the department and the college and respects both the specific knowledge of department members and the role of RPT Committee members as representatives of the faculty and guardians of the review process. The review committee meets by itself
and with the dean and makes recommendation to the president. The candidate may also request a meeting with the review committee or the dean or both.

In all its meetings the review committee seeks consensus and maintains confidentiality. Each member has one vote in the review and composes a letter of recommendation to the president. The review committee chair writes an additional one-page letter recording the vote and briefly explaining the committee's position. This letter stands as the review committee's recommendation to the president.

All members of a promotion review committee must be full professors.

**Faculty-wide Component.** The RPT chair chooses three RPT members to serve on the review committee and assigns the roles of chair and liaison for each review. The chair of the review committee schedules meetings, presides at meetings, enforces RPT policies, solicits and receives external evaluations, and writes the review committee recommendation letter recording the vote and summarizing the committee’s position. The liaison communicates with interested parties as needed but serves primarily as liaison with the candidate and guardian of the candidate's interests.

No RPT committee member may serve as RPT representative to a review committee if the candidate is a member of his or her academic department; his or her role in that instance is as a departmental member of the review committee.

If there are not three RPT committee members who can serve on the review committee, the RPT committee, in consultation with the review candidate and the dean, fills out the faculty-wide component from among the eligible members of the faculty at large.

**Departmental Component.** The departmental component of a promotion review committee includes all full professors in the department. The RPT chair notifies all eligible members of the candidate’s department, including faculty members on sabbatical, of the pending review. A department member on sabbatical may choose to participate in the review session, may choose to have a letter placed in the RPT review file, or may decline to participate.

If there are not at least two eligible department members, additional members are added from the teaching faculty to bring the number up to two. The RPT committee chair secures the participation of additional members after conferring with the dean and the candidate.

If an appointment is interdisciplinary, an eligible representative from another department or program may be added to the review committee by agreement of the candidate, the department, and the dean.

### 9.2 Materials for Promotion Review

- A current curriculum vitae
- Statements on the candidate's philosophy and practice of teaching, scholarship, and service, discussing the period under review and the candidate's intentions for the years to follow (see section 2.4). These statements may also place the period under review in the context of earlier work, discussing important points of continuity or changes of direction in the candidate's overall career.
- Professional Activities Reports for the period under review
- Student course evaluations for the period under review. If the period under review is greater than six years, the review considers evaluations for the six most recent years.
- Annotated list of six qualified external reviewers of scholarship
- Course syllabi for the period under review (sample syllabi for frequently taught courses)
• Material evidence of scholarship, of scholarly work in progress, if ready for review, and, if appropriate, of unpublished scholarship
• Portfolio of scholarship for external review. This portfolio may be designed with the help of the department chair and the review committee liaison. It must contain a current CV, a statement about the candidate’s scholarship, and tangible evidence of the candidate's work as a scholar.

The candidate may also submit evidence of any of the activities reported on the PAR.

In addition to evidence submitted by the candidate, the review committee draws on the following kinds of evidence:
• Comments of at least two review committee members who have visited the candidate's classes
• Responses of external reviewers of scholarship.

The review committee may draw on other evidence as appropriate, including evidence of the candidate's professional ethics.

9.3 Timetable for Promotion Review
The dates below are deadlines, which under special circumstances may be adjusted by agreement of the candidate, the review committee, and the dean. The review calendar starts during the spring term of the academic year before the review. If a deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, it is extended to the next weekday.

Deadlines, spring preceding year of review:
February 1. The dean asks candidates for promotion to identify themselves and invites faculty members to nominate colleagues for promotion.

February 15. Candidates and faculty nominators submit written responses to the dean and the RPT chair.

March 15. The RPT Committee for the coming year elects a chair and informs the dean.

April 1. The dean sends the incoming RPT chair the names of faculty members scheduled for review in the coming year.

April 15. The composition of the review committee is determined. The RPT chair chooses three RPT committee members and assigns the roles of review committee chair and liaison to two of them. The RPT chair determines the departmental component of the review committee in consultation with the dean and the candidate. The RPT chair informs the candidate, the dean, and the members of the candidate’s review committee of the membership of the review committee.

May 1. The review committee liaison meets with the candidate to go over the review process and timetable. The candidate also consults with the liaison and the department chair about the list of six possible external reviewers of scholarship specified in section 9.2. However, if the department chair is not a full professor the candidate should consult with a departmental representative on the review committee instead of the chair about the list of six possible external reviewers.

May 10. The candidate sends the review committee chair a current CV and a list of six possible external reviewers of scholarship. Those named should be able to give unbiased professional appraisals of the candidate's work. The candidate should annotate the list as to his or her relationship with each
reviewer and the reviewer's area of expertise. The review committee chair forwards the candidate’s CV and the list of potential external reviewers to the RPT committee.

**May 15.** Candidates attend an orientation meeting with the dean and the RPT committee for the coming year.

**May 20.** The RPT committee meets to pick three names from the list of six external scholars, ranking the other three names as backups. The review committee chair writes letters of inquiry to the three scholars chosen by the RPT committee.

**June 20.** The review committee chair secures three external reviewers.

**Deadlines, year of review:**

**August 1.** The candidate gives the review committee chair three paper copies of or electronic access to the portfolio to be sent to the external reviewers of scholarship.

**August 1.** The review committee chair sends the three external reviewers copies of the portfolio and a cover letter. The cover letter includes a description of the college and of the candidate's normal teaching load and other duties and describes the criteria and standards for the evaluation of scholarship. It asks the reviewer to evaluate scholarship but not to recommend for or against promotion. The candidate may review the cover letter before it is mailed.

The candidate sends a current CV, to the dean and to the review committee chair. Upon receipt, the review committee chair sends copies to all review committee members and informs them of the schedule for the upcoming review.

**September 1.** The candidate submits all review materials to the office of the dean of the college. The dean’s letter and the review committee chair’s summary letter from the tenure review are placed in the candidate’s file by the dean. The candidate may update the CV at any time during the review and may add any materials that become available after this deadline. The candidate should date and initial such additional materials and inform the review committee chair. The review file is kept in the office of the dean and may be signed out by review committee members.

**September 15.** Letters of external reviewers should be in the file.

**September 20.** At least one RPT review committee member and at least one disciplinary member of the review committee observe the candidate's teaching. Review committee members should consult with the candidate when scheduling a date to observe his or her teaching.

**October 1.** The review committee meets to discuss the file. It seeks consensus, and it gives weight to the information given and opinions offered by both RPT and discipline-based members. Before and after this meeting, the review committee may communicate with the candidate as needed through the liaison, and either the review committee or the candidate may request a meeting to address concerns. Except for such communication, the contents of this meeting are confidential. (See the confidentiality statement, section 1.3.)

**October 10.** The review committee meets with the dean to discuss the evidence and their recommendations. After this meeting, the committee liaison informs the candidate of any remaining concerns and gives the candidate a reasonable amount of time to respond in writing. Any such response is filed with other permanent records of the review. Either the review committee, the dean, or the candidate may also request a meeting to address concerns.
November 1. The review committee delivers its recommendation to the dean. This recommendation consists of a letter of evaluation by each member and an additional summary letter by the chair which records the vote and briefly describes the committee's position. Before sending the recommendation, the review committee chair circulates the cover letter within the committee; committee members sign the letter when they are satisfied that it fairly characterizes the outcome of the review session. The review committee chair sends one copy of the cover letter to the candidate.

December 10. The dean makes written recommendation to the president and forwards to the president the review committee's cover letter and the individual letters of all committee members. The dean also sends a copy of the recommendation to the candidate and the review committee members.

December 20. If the president has any concerns about the candidacy or the recommendations, the president meets with the dean and the review committee.

January 10. The president informs the candidate in writing of the president's decision to recommend or not recommend promotion. The president sends positive recommendations to the board with the other materials for the winter board meeting.

February. If the president has recommended promotion, the president notifies the candidate in writing of the board's decision within five working days of the board's winter meeting.

10.0 Exceptions to Normal Review Process

Exceptions to the normal schedule of reviews may be granted when a faculty member is hired at an advanced rank (associate or full professor) or with prior teaching experience at the rank of assistant professor (sections 10.1 and 10.2). In such cases, an effort is made to ease the transition between institutions and to keep the faculty member on a normal schedule with respect to accumulated time in rank (six years total as assistant professor and at least six years total as associate professor).

Rarely, and only in extraordinary circumstances, the normal requirement for accumulated time in rank may be modified (section 10.3).

The normal schedule of reviews may be lengthened in response to specific circumstances (section 10.4).

When a faculty member hired with prior college teaching experience is reviewed for tenure or promotion at Agnes Scott, the review evaluates scholarship performed in rank, both at Agnes Scott and elsewhere. Such a review may also consider evidence of service to the profession performed while at another institution, but it evaluates only teaching performed at Agnes Scott.

With respect to tenure reviews, time in rank is irrespective of visiting status; a year spent as visiting assistant professor is still a year in rank. With respect to promotion reviews, time in rank is irrespective of tenure status at Agnes Scott; a year spent as untenured associate professor at Agnes Scott is still a year in rank.

A request for an exception to normal review schedule, timetable, or process may be made on any of the grounds listed below. Such a request is made in a letter from the candidate to the dean, accompanied by a letter from the department chair supporting the request. The dean and the RPT Committee working together decide the matter, in consultation with the candidate and the department chair. The dean conveys the decision in writing to the candidate and the department chair, and places a written copy of the decision...
in the candidate’s file. Work-related leaves at Agnes Scott College (e.g., research fellowships or pre-tenure leaves) do not affect the normal schedule of major reviews.

**10.1** A faculty member hired at the rank of assistant professor with prior college teaching experience may ask that the review schedule be modified on the basis of that experience to accommodate an early tenure review. (For example, a faculty member with three years of full-time experience might ask to waive the midterm review in favor of a tenure review in the third year at Agnes Scott.)

Similarly, a faculty member hired at the rank of associate professor may ask that the review schedule be modified to permit an early promotion review. (For example, a faculty member with three years at associate rank at another institution may ask to be reviewed for promotion in the third year at Agnes Scott.)

Up to three years of full-time teaching in other institutions of higher learning or on visiting appointment at Agnes Scott may be counted toward the total of six years experience required for tenure.

**10.2** A faculty member hired at the rank of associate professor or professor is eligible for tenure review as early as the first year of full-time appointment at Agnes Scott, and must be reviewed for tenure no later than the third year of full-time appointment of Agnes Scott.

**10.3** An exception to normal process may be granted if extraordinary circumstances justify the expedited consideration of a faculty member for a review. In such a case, appropriate modifications may be made to the schedule of reviews for the candidate concerned (for example, an early tenure review and a waiver of the midterm review); however, tenure cannot be granted without a tenure review.

**10.4** An exception to the normal schedule of reviews can be granted if there are special personal or family circumstances, such as pregnancy, new parenthood (for either a male or female faculty member and for either childbirth or adoption), medical leave, or the serious illness of a family member. Any faculty member who takes leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act will automatically be granted a one year extension on the six year tenure clock. Others with special circumstances may request a one year extension, and those automatically granted an extension may decline it. The clock may be so extended on two such occasions. Anyone facing special circumstances should discuss the tenure clock with the dean and the department chair as soon as is practicable. Whenever possible, a faculty member should accept, decline, or request an extension by March 15 of the spring preceding the scheduled review.

**11.0 Review of Non-tenure-track Faculty**

The college is committed to the principle of tenure as fundamental to a productive faculty. When special circumstances justify the hiring of non-tenure track faculty, their evaluation, like the review of tenure-track faculty, reflects a concern for the needs and interests of the department, the college, and the individual faculty member. Teaching is normally the only area reviewed and is always given the first priority; the relevance of scholarship and service to the review depends on the terms of appointment. It is the responsibility of the department, with the leadership of the department chair, to supervise the faculty member, to establish and maintain lines of communication, and to work to ensure good working relations within the department as a whole. The faculty member should not hesitate to approach the department chair or the dean with questions or concerns about the review process.

**11.1 Full-time temporary positions (for example, leave replacements, visiting scholars and artists)**

In a one-semester appointment, the department chair meets with the faculty member before the end of the semester, after making at least one class visit. The chair then writes a letter of evaluation to be kept
in department files. One copy of the letter is sent to the temporary faculty member, and one copy is sent to the dean to be kept in the faculty member's personnel file.

In a one-year appointment, the department chair meets with the faculty member before the end of fall semester, after making at least one class visit during the semester, to discuss the faculty member's teaching and any other relevant matters. After making another class visit spring semester, the chair meets with the faculty member no later than April 1. Before this meeting, the faculty member provides the chair a current CV and any other relevant materials. In the meeting, the chair considers the CV, the class visits, and the fall semester teaching evaluations. After this meeting, the chair writes a letter of evaluation to be kept in department files. One copy of the letter is sent to the faculty member, and one copy is sent to the dean to be kept in the faculty member's personnel file. These copies are due April 10. The chair discusses the letter with the faculty member after the review meeting. The faculty member may send a response to the chair if he or she wishes, with a copy to the dean.

11.2 Full-time renewable positions subject to the six-year limit (convertible to tenure track)

When a faculty member has the terminal degree in the field, and is thereby eligible for tenure-track appointment, the college subscribes to the principle that he or she must either be converted to tenure-track after six years of full-time non-tenure-track appointment (with allowance for time served as provided in section 10 above) or must be let go. The position itself must be converted to tenure-track or cancelled after eight years.

When an appointment is subject to renewal, the department reviews the performance of the faculty member in the spring semester of the final year of each contract. All tenured department members participate in the review, the purpose of which is to offer a fair assessment of the faculty member's work and to assist in his or her development. The review session draws on the faculty member's CV, PAR forms for the years under review, reports on class visits, and other relevant information. The faculty member's performance as a teacher remains the area of primary concern. If the position is defined in the appointment letter as including scholarship or service, then these areas are also evaluated as appropriate. If scholarship or service is to be evaluated for the period of the current contract, this must be clear in the appointment letter.

After the review session, the chair writes a letter of evaluation to be kept in department files; the letter is signed by all reviewers. One copy is sent to the faculty member, and one copy is sent to the dean to be kept in the faculty member's personnel file. These copies are due March 1. The chair discusses this letter with the faculty member after the review session. The faculty member may send a response to the chair if he or she wishes, with a copy to the dean.

11.3 Full-time, indefinitely renewable, non-tenure track positions

The concept of tenure is fundamental to the liberal arts, but in extraordinary circumstances (for example, a lectureship or instructorship not requiring the terminal degree in the field), a permanent, non-tenure-track position may be justified. When a full-time non-tenure track position is defined in the appointment letter as subject to indefinite renewal past the six-year and eight-year limits, the faculty member is reviewed as in section 11.2 through the fifth year of employment. Beginning with the sixth year of employment, the faculty member is reviewed in the fall semester of the final year of each contract, as described in sections 11.3a-c.

11.3.a Review committee structure

The review is conducted by a committee composed as for the midterm review (section 5). The review committee is made up of all tenured members of the department and one representative from the RPT committee, with the RPT representative serving as chair and also fulfilling the role of liaison. No RPT committee member may serve as RPT representative to a review committee if the candidate is a
member of his or her academic department; his or her role in that instance is as a departmental member of the review committee.

A department member on sabbatical may choose to be a member of the review committee, may choose to have a letter placed in the RPT review file, or may decline to participate. The review committee considers the needs of the department and the college and respects both the specific knowledge of department members and the role of the RPT Committee member as a representative of the faculty and guardian of the review process.

If there are not at least two eligible department members, additional members are added from the teaching faculty to bring the number up to two. The RPT chair secures the participation of additional members after conferring with the dean, the department chair, and the candidate.

If the appointment is interdisciplinary, an eligible representative from another department or program may be added to the review committee by agreement of the candidate, the department, and the dean.

11.3.b Review materials

The candidate submits the following required materials:

- A current curriculum vitae
- Statements on the candidate's philosophy and practice of teaching, discussing the period under review and the candidate's intentions for the period to follow.
- Professional Activities Reports for the period under review
- Student course evaluations for the period under review

The candidate may also submit additional evidence of any of the activities reported on the PAR.

In addition to evidence submitted by the candidate, the review committee draws on the comments of at least two committee members who have visited the candidate's classes. The review committee draws on other evidence as appropriate, including evidence of the candidate's professional ethics.

The faculty member's performance as a teacher is the area of primary concern. If the position is defined in the appointment letter as including scholarship or service, then these areas are also evaluated as appropriate.

11.3.c Review timetable

The dates below are deadlines, which under special circumstances may be adjusted by agreement of the candidate, the review committee, and the dean. The review calendar starts during the spring term of the academic year before the review. If a deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, it is extended to the next weekday.

**Deadlines, spring preceding year of review:**

**March 15.** The RPT Committee for the coming year elects a chair and informs the dean.

**April 1.** The dean sends the incoming RPT chair the names of faculty members scheduled for review in the coming year.

**April 15.** The composition of the review committee is determined. The RPT chair chooses one of the RPT committee member to serve on the review committee in the roles of review committee chair. The RPT chair determines the departmental component of the review committee in consultation with the dean, the department chair and the candidate.
May 15. Candidates attend an orientation meeting with the dean and the RPT committee for the coming year. At this time, candidates will be informed of the membership of their review committee.

Deadlines, year of review:

August 1. The candidate sends a current CV to the dean and to the review committee chair. Upon receipt, the review committee chair sends copies to all review committee members and informs them of the schedule for the upcoming review.

September 1. The candidate submits all required review materials to the office of the dean of the college. The candidate may update the CV at any time during the review and may add any materials that become available after this deadline. The candidate should date and initial such additional materials and inform the review committee chair. The review file is kept in the office of the dean and may be signed out by review committee members.

September 20. At least one RPT review committee member and at least one disciplinary member of the review committee observe the candidate's teaching. Review committee members should consult with the candidate when scheduling a date to observe his or her teaching.

October 1. The review committee meets to discuss the file. It seeks consensus, and it gives weight to the information given and opinions offered by both RPT and discipline-based members. Before and after this meeting, the review committee may communicate with the candidate as needed through the liaison, and either the review committee or the candidate may request a meeting to address concerns. Except for such communication, the contents of this meeting are confidential. (See the confidentiality statement, section 1.2.)

October 15. The review committee meets with the dean to discuss the evidence and their recommendations. After this meeting, the committee chair informs the candidate of any remaining concerns and gives the candidate a reasonable amount of time to respond in writing. Any such response is filed with other permanent records of the review.

November 1. The review committee delivers its recommendation to the dean. This recommendation consists of a letter of evaluation by each member and an additional summary letter by the chair which records the vote and briefly describes the committee's position. Before sending the recommendation, the review committee chair circulates the cover letter within the committee; committee members sign the letter when they are satisfied that it fairly characterizes the outcome of the review session. The review committee chair sends one copy of the cover letter to the candidate.

December 10. The dean makes written recommendation to the president and forwards to the president the review committee's cover letter and the individual letters of all committee members. The dean also sends a copy of the recommendation to the candidate and the review committee members.

December 20. If the president has any concerns about the candidacy or the recommendations, the president meets with the dean and the review committee.

January 10. The president informs the candidate in writing of the president's decision whether or not to reappoint.

11.4. Part-time contract faculty

For a half-time, salaried appointment, the review process is the same as that for full-time appointments in 11.1.
For an adjunct appointment at a per-course stipend, the review process is the same as for a full-time, one-semester appointment in 11.1.

12.0 The Role of the President

The president considers the recommendations of review committees and of the dean before sending positive recommendations to the board of trustees. The president informs candidates of presidential decisions and of board actions, according to the timetables in these policies. Each year during the fall term the president conveys to the board the outcome for each of the previous year’s reviews. (see section 6.3).

13.0 Disposition of Review Documents

During a review, the following documents are kept in RPT Committee files in the dean's office: letters from external reviewers, review materials submitted by the candidate, and any additional materials for ongoing midterm, tenure, and promotion reviews.

After a review is complete, the candidate may peruse the letters from the external reviewers and the review committee, except that the names of the letter writers (and in the case of external reviewers, the affiliation) shall be deleted from the copies of the letters made available to the candidate. The candidate may take notes on the materials but may not remove documents from the dean’s office or make photocopies of them.

After a review is complete and any resulting grievance proceedings concluded, the letters from the review committee chair and individual members of the review committee, letters from external reviewers, the dean's letter, and any administrative responses are added to the candidate's personnel file in the dean's office. Other review materials (such as the candidate's scholarly materials) are returned to the source.

RPT members and review committee members should properly destroy or delete all documents (including notes, email messages, and voicemail messages) pertaining to a review by the end of the semester in which the review takes place. The RPT Committee periodically reviews the methods of document disposal. The letters submitted to the dean by the review committee chair and the members of the review committee, along with the dean's letter, stand as the record of the review process.

Reviews are confidential, so there are no publicly available minutes of review meetings. RPT committee minutes include copies of minutes covering business not related to reviews.

Revised by the faculty February 5, 2010.