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FACULTY REVIEWS,1 Caspersen School of Graduate Studies

1. CRITERIA, EVIDENCE, STANDARDS

1.0. OVERVIEW
The basic criteria for all faculty reviews—reappointment, promotion in rank, tenure, senior review, and annual review—are established by the University Faculty Personnel Policy. These criteria are “integrity, effectiveness as a teacher, recognition as a scholar, and total contribution to the life and task of the University.” All faculty members are expected to demonstrate overall excellence, and exhibit strength in all three areas. In assessing overall excellence, which encompasses teaching, scholarship, and service, the university honors all areas of faculty endeavor and respects differences among disciplines and schools; it further acknowledges that the balance and interaction of teaching, scholarship, and service will vary according to each person and context. The criterion of integrity is fundamental to each of these areas and is interpreted in accordance with the 1987 “Statement on Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors (see Appendix III).

This University Faculty Handbook provides broad definitions of what constitutes strength in each area and at each level, and offers guidelines for their assessment. The individual faculty handbooks of the three schools and of the library, in turn, describe the specific measures and standards for teaching, scholarship and service most appropriate to each faculty body (see Appendix i). Faculty with joint appointments will be reviewed by the body specified in their appointment letters.

1 The main body of this document is the Drew University Committee on Faculty Handbook, as adopted by the University faculty on November 18, 2009, reproduced here in full. Sections of this Handbook are amplified for faculty of the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies, based on the draft of the CSGS Committee on Faculty Handbook discussed at the CSGS meeting of October 21, 2011.
Appointment letters for faculty with joint appointments in the College and either the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies (CSGS) or the Theological School, or addenda to such letters, will also specify particular responsibilities for the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the CSGS Committee on Faculty to support the review conducted in the appointing school.

1.1. TEACHING
Defining itself as “an independent center of higher learning dedicated to the creation and maintenance of a community of scholars, faculty members and students” (University Faculty Personnel Policy), the university calls upon faculty members to share their expertise and passion for their disciplines in such a way as to facilitate the intellectual, artistic, and/or professional development of their students in scheduled courses and in other contexts in which instruction occurs (including independent studies and tutorials; civic, service, and experiential learning programs; research and the broad spectrum of research assistance provided by the library faculty; and other co-curricular activities). As teachers, faculty members must vigilantly uphold standards of professional ethics (see point 2 of the “Statement on Professional Ethics” in the Appendix).

1.1.1. A broad definition of teaching:
Any evaluation of the teaching of a faculty member should take into account the following four features of teaching.

- **Content expertise** is reflected in the accurate and effective presentation of a discipline or an interdisciplinary framework to students through a faculty member’s own interpretive and evaluative perspective, informed by, and regularly adjusted in relation to, recent developments in the field.

- **Course design** includes the careful selection of course content and sequencing of learning experiences to meet the learning goals of the course; the identification and development of effective course materials; the crafting of laboratory and other exercises, individual and group activities, writing assignments, and examinations; and the incorporation of experiential and other components where relevant. It also entails regular updating and responsiveness to student and peer evaluation.

- **Pedagogy** involves the range of strategies and approaches (e.g., lecture, discussion, small group activities, student presentations and reports, writing, and experiential components) by which teachers bring course content alive and make it accessible to students. Successful teachers create a productive learning environment in the classroom, fostering student engagement in the process of learning and responding respectfully to a variety of learning styles and perspectives. They also articulate clearly their course goals, expectations, and policies, along with grading standards, assignments, and deadlines in course syllabi; they provide timely and helpful feedback on student work and make themselves readily accessible for academic consultation outside of class (e.g., by holding regularly posted office hours); and they keep accurate records and provide progress reports and grades in a timely manner.
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Mentoring extends beyond the classroom, as faculty members encourage students to become independent learners by modeling the high standards of professionalism appropriate to their disciplines, providing students with guideposts toward attaining those standards, and holding them consistently accountable. Mentoring may overlap with, but is not restricted or reducible to, academic advising (see 1.3.1 below).

1.1.1.A. Caspersen School of Graduate Studies affirmation of the role of teaching
The Committee on Faculty of the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies (CSGS) affirms the centrality of teaching to all the categories of faculty effectiveness. Recognized scholarship contributes to teaching but does not supersede it. Basic to all effective teaching is current knowledge in one's field, coupled with a clear manner of presentation that informs and stimulates students. Regardless of success in other areas, an ineffective teacher should not look forward to reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

Candidates for promotion in the CSGS must demonstrate teaching in which the four features interact to facilitate master’s and doctoral students’ proceeding through course work in a manner appropriate to the completion of their graduate degrees. In particular, graduate instructors must demonstrate a record of holding students to standards of research and writing as commonly practiced in their disciplines, and of modeling for their students “the high standards of professionalism appropriate to their disciplines” (1.1.1).

Evaluation of teaching comes from faculty peers, who are qualified to judge competence, and from students, who are in a position to testify to effectiveness. The chief means for such evaluation are the teaching portfolio, the cumulative record of graduate course evaluations, reports of classroom visits by CSGS faculty peers and area convenors, and optional letters of evaluation solicited by the COF (as described below in 1.1.2).

1.1.1.B. Role of the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies Committee on Faculty in faculty development
The Committee on Faculty of the Caspersen School, working with the area convenor and the Dean, has the responsibility to assess and to support each graduate faculty member's development as a teacher. During regularly scheduled reappointment or other periodic status reviews, the Committee will seek to identify strengths and weaknesses in order to encourage improvement and to assist faculty in developing their craft as teachers.

1.1.2. Evidence of strength in teaching:
Each time a faculty member is reviewed, he or she is expected to produce a teaching portfolio including course syllabi accompanied by judiciously selected supporting materials (such as samples of handouts, examinations, or websites) that document the features of teaching described above. Further evidence of a faculty member’s success in teaching comes from detailed review and analysis of student course evaluations, and from the report of two or more recent peer reviews.
assessments including classroom observations and a follow-up interview with the faculty member, whether carried out routinely by the area or conducted especially for the review. In some cases, the reviewing committee may also, in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, choose to solicit letters of evaluation from colleagues (e.g., a faculty member with whom the person being reviewed has co-taught) or from current or recent students whom they have taught in more than one course setting. With regard to the confidentiality of all letters of evaluation, see 2.1.2 below.

1.1.2.A. CSGS faculty evaluation of teaching
Areas should designate either the convenor or another tenured member of the Area to conduct at least one classroom visit and follow up interview with untenured faculty in each semester. A written evaluation should also be shared with the untenured faculty member and submitted to the Dean as part of the candidate’s file. If concerns about the teaching of tenured faculty should emerge, similar peer observations may be recommended by the area convenor or the Dean.

1.1.3. Standards:
For reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate effective teaching and show promise of continued progress toward meeting the standards for promotion to Associate Professor; he or she should be building a repertoire of courses and increasing skills in all of the areas described above.

For promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member must show him or herself to be an accomplished teacher who effectively performs his or her share of area or programmatic teaching and displays the promise of continued progress.

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate exemplary performance in teaching across a range of courses so as to show mastery of the craft of teaching in his or her areas of competence, as reflected, e.g., in the ability to mentor other teachers and in the development of courses or pedagogical methods that make innovative, distinctive, and significant contributions to the teaching mission of the university.

1.1.4. The teaching component of the work of library faculty:
Library faculty members are responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating programs to acquire, organize, and retrieve information, and to make it available through the development of collections (comprising both traditional, print-based and electronic resources), tools of bibliographic control and organization, and skills of reference and on-line searching services and strategies. These activities may (but need not in all cases) extend to guidance of the research of individual students or to Classroom instruction, including work as guest lecturers or co-instructors. Insofar as their duties include traditional Classroom or course-related teaching, members of the library faculty are subject to common university expectations regarding teaching and may be judged successful according to the features and kinds of evidence described above. However, standards for reappointment and promotion will necessarily be applied somewhat differently in the case of the library faculty, as articulated in the Library Faculty Regulations.
1.2. SCHOLARSHIP
Successful teaching is necessary but not in itself sufficient for achieving excellence as a faculty member and indeed should be nurtured, over time, by the development of synergy with scholarly pursuits. “Scholarship” is here understood to encompass artistic, performative, and applied aspects of disciplinary practice, in addition to a range of kinds of oral presentations and written publications. This latter category includes essays as well as monographs; electronic as well as print media; collaborative or co-authored as well as individually produced works; publication or presentation of research conducted, co-authored, or co-presented with students as well as with colleagues; texts addressed to the Classroom or a broader readership as well as to specialists; editions and translations as well as authored articles, books, and reports of research. It may also be understood to include components of “service to the broader academy” (see 1.3.1 below) that are both intellectually and/or artistically substantive and directly linked to the faculty member’s broader scholarly and/or artistic agenda.

Regardless of the genre, medium, or format of the contribution, the university expects faculty members to remain actively engaged as participants and not just observers with the continuing conversations and innovations that constitute the lifeblood of an academic career. Because scholarly work differs by academic field or discipline, faculty work will be evaluated according to discipline-specific descriptions of appropriate forms of scholarly and/or artistic productivity, as well as standards of expectation for reappointment, promotion to Associate, and promotion to Professor. These descriptions are developed and approved by each academic unit of the university (whether area, as in the case of the College, or school, as in the case of the Theological School, for example) in consultation with appropriate governance bodies and administrative leadership.

1.2.1. A broad definition of scholarship:
Given the span of disciplines, the differences among teaching contexts, and the diversity of our faculty, there are many appropriate ways for faculty members to fulfill the expectation that they remain actively engaged with their fields and earn recognition for their work. Specifically, the university affirms that scholars and/or artists may contribute in a variety of ways creative, integrative, practical, or pedagogical. The University values all four kinds of contribution equally, while recognizing that they will take a different form in each discipline and that no faculty member is expected to contribute in all ways. Disciplinary and teaching contexts must be taken into account in assessing the effectiveness and significance of a particular scholarly or artistic work.

Creativity stamps the scholarly contribution with originality or innovation, whether empirical, theoretical, interpretive, or artistic.

Integration places the contributions of one’s own and/or of others into broader disciplinary and interdisciplinary contexts, producing syntheses, dialogues, or critiques that yield new insight and understanding.

Praxis bridges the gap between the academy and the world beyond it through an application of theory, activist engagement, and/or artistic performance rooted in, and also formative of, disciplinary knowledge and expertise.
Pedagogy as an aspect of scholarship addresses problems of teaching or learning through methods and in venues of critical engagement appropriate to and recognized by the discipline field, or subject matter.

1.2.1.A. CSGS and the scholarship of praxis

While maintaining the centrality of traditional scholarship in the assessment of graduate faculty, the CSGS Committee on Faculty accepts the CLA Committee on Faculty’s definition and process of evaluating the scholarship of praxis:

“The Committee on Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts defines the scholarship of praxis to include scholarship, public intellectual, and creative work often, but not always, associated with civic engagement projects (for example, research designed to address broad questions of public interest as well as to enable community organizations, schools, and other community partners to more effectively achieve their stated mission, goals, and objectives). The scholarship of praxis may be closely related to a faculty member’s teaching of Community-Based Learning courses, but should also result in specific products (reports, programs, educational materials, exhibitions, creative works, grants, etc.) that can be submitted for external review and assessed along with traditional scholarship (see 1.2.2).”

1.2.2. Evidence of strength in scholarship:

Each time a faculty member is reviewed, he or she is expected to produce a portfolio of prior and ongoing scholarly and/or artistic work. This work should have already received positive recognition from disciplinary peers, as evidenced, e.g., by invitations to speak or perform, by the acceptance of one’s conference paper proposals, journal articles, or book manuscripts for presentation or publication, or by the selection of one’s artistic work to be performed, exhibited, or recorded.

As a general rule, high quality work will be marked by some combination of the following as appropriate to the discipline or field: attention to questions or applications whose significance can be articulated in light of relevant issues in the field; clear goals; adequate preparation; appropriate methods; significant or interesting conclusions, results, or artistic products; effective presentation; and reflective self-critique. The expectations, challenges, styles of presentation and standards for scholarship vary considerably by discipline and within disciplines. Accordingly, the evaluation of a faculty member’s work should be informed by the assessments of peers who are knowledgeable regarding disciplinary norms and conditions, both in the broader field and in the specific research and teaching context occupied by the person under review. In the case of tenure and/or promotion, the scholarly and/or artistic portfolio will be evaluated by three to six outside specialists deemed capable of offering a balanced assessment of the positioning, significance, and reception of the faculty member’s work in his or her own field; at least three of these should be individuals who have no close professional relationship to the person being reviewed, and in no case should a former doctoral advisor or mentor be included among the external evaluators. External review should be complemented by rigorous internal review. In the case of reappointment as well as tenure and promotion, the reviewing committee will also solicit letters of evaluation from area conveners and/or other colleagues who are able to provide further context for assessing the scholarly and/or artistic contribution in disciplinary as well as areal context. With regard to the confidentiality of all letters of evaluation, see 2.1.2 below.
1.2.3. Standards:
For reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate a developing habit of scholarly and/or artistic productivity, as evidenced by an emerging agenda of research or creative activity, with the promise of continued involvement so as to develop towards meeting the standards for promotion to Associate Professor.

For promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate a sustained habit of scholarly and/or artistic productivity, as evidenced by success in advancing some aspect of an established research or creative agenda beyond the dissertation (or other work completed to satisfy the requirements of the terminal degree); such productivity must involve publications, presentations, works, or performances of sufficient quality and quantity to have received positive review by disciplinary peers; finally, the faculty member must display the promise of continued engagement with their field.

For promotion to Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate a well established habit of scholarly and/or artistic productivity, as evidenced by success in completing some substantial aspects of his or her research or creative agenda beyond what was accomplished at the time of the promotion to Associate Professor; such productivity must involve publications, works, or performances of sufficient quality and quantity to have received positive review by disciplinary peers and to have achieved a significant degree of visibility and recognition in the discipline. Professors are expected to have developed a mature perspective on their field that enables them to situate both their own work and the work of their students in the landscape of their disciplines. They are also expected to show promise of continued engagement with their field.

1.2.3.A. CSGS definition of strength in scholarship
The Committee on Faculty of the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies holds that tenure in the Caspersen School requires scholarship at a level appropriate for a graduate school appointment. That level signifies both recognition for one’s scholarship in and of itself and for the graduate professor’s credibility as a director or committee member on doctoral and master’s theses.

The Committee affirms the four equally valued elements the Handbook lists of scholarly and artistic production—creativity, integration, praxis, and pedagogy (1.3). Even so, given the particular humanities and social science disciplines that make up current CSGS programs, the Committee expects that most CSGS faculty members’ scholarly and artistic work will appear in the form of written publications and public performance or exhibition.

“Recognition as a scholar” implies recognition not only by one’s colleagues on campus, but by the larger scholarly community as well. The common component of evidence of strength in scholarship is positive recognition from disciplinary peers as detailed and demonstrated in 1.2.2. Accordingly, books, publications in professional journals, commissions, off-campus performances, exhibitions, concerts, and the like, are considered appropriate forms of recognition, particularly if judged by competent persons in appropriate fields. Other appropriate additional forms of recognition are a successful grant proposal that requires demonstrable expertise in one’s field; lectures/papers presented at professional meetings, as well as such professional activity as editing, reviewing, or refereeing for a journal or scholarly press;
mentoring student research, especially when such work achieves professional recognition; developing and applying new pedagogies and educational technology for classroom use; serving as a critic, curator, or judge for artistic endeavors. Supplemental forms of recognition are: on-campus performances, lectures, exhibitions, readings, and presentations.

A candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies is expected to achieve "recognition as a scholar." A candidate for promotion to full professor is expected to continue to achieve such recognition. In both instances, the Committee will consider the frequency, substantiveness, and placement or occasion of the scholarly or creative production. Because disciplines have differing opportunities, occasions, and media for scholarly production, the Committee will assess individual faculty production in a manner informed by knowledge of procedures in individual fields and of the principal means that individual disciplines have for publishing, disseminating, producing, performing, or exhibiting work.

More detailed information can be found in the statements developed by disciplines, as prescribed in 1.2 above and included in Appendix iv. The statements should be reviewed periodically by areas in consultation with the CSGS Committee on Faculty and the Dean, and should be used in faculty development and mentoring.

1.2.4. The scholarship component of the work of library faculty:
Scholarship is a smaller and more variable component of the work of the library faculty members, due to the nature of their appointment. Standards for reappointment and promotion will necessarily be applied somewhat differently in the case of the library faculty, as articulated in the Library Faculty Regulations.

1.3. SERVICE
The faculty participates with the administration in the governance of the university and its schools. In particular, faculty members share authority and responsibility in the areas of curriculum and instruction, academic advising, faculty development, administration, and the definition, nurturance, and critical engagement of university culture more broadly. Because of its crucial importance to the educational mission of the university, all faculty members must participate effectively in the realm of institutional service. Faculty members may also contribute to the university by strengthening its connections to the world beyond, through relevant contributions to the work of the academy and the wider society.

1.3.1. A broad definition of service
The broad categories described below indicate the range of professional activities that faculty members can undertake in order to fulfill their responsibilities in service to the university. Faculty members are not expected to perform active service in all of these categories in any one review period or even across an entire career; differences of talent, interest, and balance of energies are recognized and affirmed. However, all faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are effectively performing their share of this important faculty work.
Curricular and instructional oversight and faculty development take place at multiple levels institutionally, including attendance and active participation in areaal meetings and faculty meetings and conversations; service as convener of a area, division, area, or program; service as member or convener of a committee charged with responsibility for the curriculum or academic standards; service on a committee charged with responsibility for faculty reviews and sabbaticals; service as mentor to a faculty colleague, including observations of teaching and written evaluations; service as member or convener of a faculty search committee; as well as other less formalized ways of supporting the work of colleagues, such as attendance or contribution to an academic or artistic event or responsive engagement of a work written, performed, or produced by a colleague.

Academic advising has many facets, all of which entail availability and timely responsiveness. While some advising takes the form of academic and career mentoring (see 1.1.1), other tasks are time-consuming but largely administrative, such as assisting students in planning academic programs and approving registration, providing feedback to advisees regarding their overall academic performance and progress, writing letters of recommendation, making referrals to university support services, assisting students in working through and resolving academic problems.

Administration includes service as member or convener of a university committee involved in participating with administrators in mutually respectful processes of institutional planning and policy-setting; service as member or chair of such a committee in one of the schools or library; or service as member or chair of a non-faculty search committee.

Nurturance of university culture is the area of service least amenable to strict definition but encompasses the range of activities that contribute to a communal spirit of intellectual inquiry, civic engagement, and ritual celebration, e.g., delivering, organizing, attending, or otherwise participating in the success of campus lectures, performances, worship services, conferences, workshops, social and student life, athletic events, etc.

Service to the broader academy consists in such contributions as serving as the officer or board member of a professional society, serving as the member or convener of a conference program or planning committee, serving on editorial boards of journals or presses or advisory boards of arts organizations, serving as a referee or reviewer for journals, publishers, grant applications, or research proposals, or engaging in other forms of consulting in the service of one’s discipline or professional community.

Service to the broader community may be considered a form of university service when it directly contributes to the university’s educational mission and/or draws on the faculty member’s disciplinary expertise, as in some areas of civic, religious, and/or ecological engagement and activism.

1.3.1.A. CSGS definition of service
The Committee on Faculty of the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies confirms that service is expected of all faculty whose primary appointments are in the CSGS. Its evaluation will be part
of the overall review of the candidate. "Contribution to the life and task of the University" encompasses service on committees or governing bodies. It also includes service to one's CSGS area and significant contributions to the development of CSGS programs based in one’s CSGS area, including those designed to foster students’ capacities to put their graduate degrees to work in the world.

A particularly important aspect of a graduate professor’s service is effective advising of graduate students, as shown by consistency and faithfulness as a mentor. A graduate professor must be responsive to his or her graduate students’ work—from in-class presentations, seminar papers, master’s essay sections, and dissertation chapters—in timely, constructive fashion. He or she must respond to a reasonable amount of student requests for guidance in the conception, development, and execution of written work or of practicums central to gaining professional expertise.

A broad definition of service is offered above in 1.3.1. Candidates for promotion to associate professor are expected to have achieved a consistent record of service to the CSGS or University, as well as to their areas and/or programs. Candidates for promotion to full professor are typically expected to have served actively on a minimum of two “major” CSGS or University committees or governing bodies while at the rank of associate professor. Service as an area convenor or director also constitutes a significant service contribution by associate professors, equivalent to one major committee.

1.3.2. Evidence of strength in service
Each time a faculty member is reviewed, he or she is expected to produce a portfolio providing an overview of service contributions since the last review, including any relevant documentation, e.g., examples of materials used in student advising and professional mentoring, documents produced as part of work on a committee, work done in the service of professional organizations, etc. In evaluating service, not only the quantity but also, and more important, the quality of a faculty member’s service should be considered. For example, in addition to attending the meetings of a committee to which he or she has been elected or appointed, a faculty member is expected to contribute actively. Quality service is characterized by specific and effective contributions made, such as work performed, projects completed, documents drafted, historical perspective or constructive criticism provided, new questions raised, students well served. In some cases, the reviewing committee may, in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, choose to solicit letters of evaluation from colleagues or students able to testify to some significant aspect of the service contribution. With regard to the confidentiality of all letters of evaluation, see 2.1.2 below.

1.3.3. Standards
For reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, a faculty member must present evidence of effective contributions in the area of service.

For promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member must present evidence of effective contributions in service that have made a positive difference to the university, with promise of continued contributions over time.
For promotion to Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate a long-standing record of effective contributions in service that have not only made a positive difference but have also substantially advanced some specific and identifiable area or areas of this shared faculty work.

2. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS
Details of the review process, including time-table, are determined by the Committee on Faculty of the school conducting the review. The following represent general university guidelines. It should be noted that the library faculty is exceptional in the particular use of the rank of Instructor and lack of eligibility for tenure; the review process for library faculty should be adapted accordingly, as articulated in the Library Faculty Regulations.

2.A. Charge and composition of the CSGS Committee on Faculty
(CSGS Faculty Regulations)

The Caspersen School of Graduate Studies Committee on Faculty shall consider all matters having to do with faculty promotion, tenure, retention, and academic freedom within the CSGS. On or before the date required by the Faculty Personnel Policy, the Committee shall consider each member of the faculty eligible for promotion, tenure, reappointment or termination, and report its recommendation to the Dean of the Caspersen School.

The Committee shall consist of a chair (who will be tenured) appointed annually by the Dean of the CSGS and three additional tenured professors elected annually by the Faculty of the CSGS. Elected representatives and the appointed chair shall serve two years. Associate Professors with tenure who have begun their third year are eligible for election; no more than one associate faculty may serve on the committee. No current member shall be considered for promotion by the committee. The Dean of the CSGS is a non-voting, ex-officio member of the Committee who participates in the Committee's deliberations. In addition, the chair of the CSGS COF will ask the CLA Dean for a formal evaluation of a CSGS candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion whose full-time load also involves regular teaching in the CLA. The evaluation will come under advisement as part of the Committee’s deliberations.

2.B. Role of the CSGS Committee on Faculty
The Caspersen School of Graduate Studies Committee on Faculty’s review of the candidate is the first stage of the reappointment/promotion/tenure process. The Committee acknowledges the role of the President and Board of Trustees at a later stage in this process and therefore will consider it inappropriate for the Committee either to solicit materials or to receive unsolicited materials from the President and the Board of Trustees. If the administration and Board of Trustees subsequently differ with the Committee’s recommendation, however, the reasons for the disagreement shall be shared with the Committee in order for it to reconsider the case (Faculty Personnel Policy, Section VI).
2.1. CONTENTS OF THE DOSSIER FILE
The dossier file for a faculty member under review should include the following items:

- A current curriculum vitae (submitted by the faculty member)
- A reflective self-evaluation (see 2.1.1 below) (submitted by the faculty member)
- Portfolios for teaching, scholarship, and service, respectively (see 1.1.2, 1.2.2, 1.3.2 above) (submitted by the faculty member)
- Letters of evaluation of scholarship from external and internal reviewers (see 1.2.2 above and 2.1.2 below) (solicited by the dean or the chair of the Committee on Faculty)
- Student course evaluations (supplied by the dean’s office)
- Reports on class observations and teaching interviews (supplied by the area and/or the Committee on Faculty)
- Other letters of evaluation from students or colleagues documenting performance in teaching or service (solicited by the chair of the Committee on Faculty, where relevant) (see 1.2.2 above)
- Annual reports submitted during the review period (supplied by the dean’s office)
- Sabbatical reports from the review period (supplied by the dean’s office)
- Evaluation from the previous review (supplied by the dean’s office)

2.1.A. CSGS, scholarship, teaching, and service portfolios
While the scholarship portfolio submitted by faculty in the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies should be comprehensive (including all published materials, successful grant applications, record of creative activity, as well as material accepted for publication or creative exhibition/performance), portfolios for teaching and service should be representative, their items selected to clarify and amplify the narrative account provided in the reflective self-evaluation (described in more detail below in 2.1.1). Supporting materials in the teaching portfolio in particular should be judiciously selected to serve as illustrative examples of typical teaching materials.

2.1.B. CSGS, additional material
In exceptional circumstances, the CSGS Committee on Faculty in reviewing these documents may solicit additional materials they deem necessary and relevant to the faculty member’s evaluation and review. Should such additional materials be sought, the candidate will be made aware of the source of these materials and the Committee’s questions, and may respond in writing.

2.1.C. CSGS, unsolicited material
In reviewing the file, the CSGS Committee on Faculty will determine whether any unsolicited materials are relevant. Whether or not such materials are deemed to be relevant, the candidate has the right to see the material and to respond in writing.

2.1.D. CSGS faculty appointed to more than one area or program
In any case involving a CSGS faculty member appointed to teach in more than one area or
academic program, the CSGS Committee on Faculty will seek material for evaluation from all appropriate areas and/or programs.

2.1.1. Reflective self-evaluation

The faculty member undergoing review will present a coherent and reasonably concise account of the work he or she has done during the review period in each of the three criterion categories. This exercise provides, first, a formal occasion for self-reflection that enhances a faculty member’s ability to approach his or her work as a reflective scholar. Second, it fulfills the faculty member’s responsibility to present evidence making a persuasive case that he or she has satisfied the criteria and met the standards applicable in the review. To present evidence making a persuasive case, a self-evaluation should

- Enable colleagues and administrators who represent various disciplinary backgrounds to understand the nature of one’s teaching, scholarship, and service;
- Identify the distinctiveness of one’s workload profile during the period of the review—i.e., describe the specific work one has performed and the relations among the different aspects of one’s work load, as this has emerged both by personal decision and by the demands of context; Highlight one’s accomplishments in each of the three criterion categories;
- Report on professional development activities one has undertaken during the time covered by the review, particularly if these steps were taken in response to issues raised in a previous review;
- Identify challenges in one’s performance, place those challenges in the larger context of overall accomplishments, and show that one has made responsible plans to overcome them;
- Indicate the professional goals identified for the time until the next scheduled review and show how they are to be accomplished.

2.1.2. Letters of evaluation

The exact number and kinds of letters of evaluation required for the dossier will be determined by the Committee on Faculty conducting the review, in accordance with the guidelines established above.

Any letter of evaluation carries weight in a review in direct proportion to its cogency, the quality of its supporting evidence, and the care given to the analysis it contains. Authors of letters should indicate clearly the nature of the evidence on which they have based their judgments. Moreover, faculty members are advised to be judicious in requesting additional letters of evaluation for their dossiers. A dossier is strengthened much more by the inclusion of a limited number of letters from colleagues able to speak directly to one or more of the review criteria than by the inclusion of numerous letters, however laudatory they may be, that are less directly relevant.

To encourage candid, honest, and thorough letters of evaluation while at the same time protecting collegial working relationships, the university expects all evaluation letters to be treated as confidential (to the extent permitted under law), to be read only by the
relevant Committee on Faculty and Dean, the Provost, the President, and (very rarely) the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

2.1.2.A. CSGS, external letters
The CSGS Committee on Faculty will solicit three external letters for all tenure and promotion reviews, including promotion to full Professor. See Appendix II for specific guidelines and deadlines.

2.1.2.B. CSGS, internal letters
The CSGS Committee on Faculty will also solicit two internal letters for all tenure and promotion reviews, and four for promotion to full Professor. See Appendix II for specific guidelines and deadlines.

2.2. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Recommendation for reappointment as Assistant Professor or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor must be based on evidence documenting that the faculty member being reviewed

- has met the appropriate standards for strength in teaching, scholarship, and service (see 1.1.3, 1.2.3, and 1.3.3 above);
- has achieved overall excellence;
- has demonstrated improvement in any areas of performance identified as needing attention in a previous review (as applicable); and
- has exhibited conduct in accordance with professional standards (see Appendix below).

For the teaching faculty, normal practice is that tenure and promotion to Associate Professor occur at the same time.

Recommendation for tenure must be based on evidence documenting that the faculty member

- has met the standards for promotion to Associate Professor (if at the rank of Assistant or Associate) or Professor (if at the rank of Professor); and
- has established a pattern of excellence sufficient to justify the expectation of continued performance at a level satisfying those standards, with a promise of further growth, in a way that advances the long-term goals of the area, school, and university.

3. SENIOR REVIEW PROCESS
Full Professors will be reviewed at least every seven years. Tenured faculty members who have been at the rank of Associate Professor for seven years will also be reviewed, and reviewed at least every seven years thereafter. While the process for senior review should be similar to that for other faculty reviews, it does not involve external review and it does not result in any specific recommendation for change in status but rather provides the occasion for collegial peer assessment intended to foster the senior faculty member’s professional development and excellence in teaching.
3.A. CSGS Committee on Faculty review of professors
In order to serve the careers of long-term members of the Drew faculty the CSGS Committee on Faculty reviews all professors at least once every seven years. Prior to this review, the full professor will provide the Committee with a written self-evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and University service in addition to regular annual reports and updated vita. This review is meant to provide peer assessment and to allow the Committee to be of service to any professor who wants to bring concerns about his or her career at Drew to the Committee’s attention. The faculty member will meet with a member of the Committee on Faculty, who will report back to the Committee and write a brief summary of the conversation which is shared with the full professor and placed in the personnel file.

Every seven years following the last review, the Committee will send the faculty member a letter soliciting materials for the review including an updated vita and reflective self-evaluation.

4. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS
All faculty members must submit annual reports in a timely fashion and will be reviewed annually based on these reports. Their accomplishments will be assessed in accordance with the above described criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service, and the assessment will be communicated to the faculty member in question. The appropriate venue for annual review will be determined by the individual faculties, as will the format for the annual report.

4.1. CSGS Committee on Faculty review process for tenured professors (associate and full professors)

4.1.A. As a means of evaluating and reviewing tenured professors, annual reports must be turned in to conveners, who will then comment on those reports as appropriate before the reports are submitted to the Dean.

4.1.B. All tenured faculty are to be evaluated fully by their area conveners during the second year of each convener’s term (if a faculty member is on sabbatical one of these years, he or she will be fully evaluated the following year); in the subsequent years, the convener submits an evaluation for each member of their area, but may simply state "no significant change" or "performance up to standards" or some similar comment.

4.1.C. The convener reviews student evaluations of courses and discusses them with the faculty member.

4.2. CSGS Committee on Faculty review process for associate professors

4.2.A. During their first or second year in rank, associate professors are advised to meet with the Dean to discuss criteria for promotion to full professor.

4.2.B. During their fourth year in rank, each associate professor will meet with a member of the
CSGS Committee on Faculty. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss with the associate professor his or her teaching, scholarship, and University service since promotion to associate professor and tenure were granted. Prior to the meeting, the COF members read and discuss the associate professor's updated vita, annual reports and available teaching evaluations since promotion and tenure. The conversation allows the associate professor the opportunity to provide the Committee with a self-evaluation and to express concerns about his or her experience as a teacher, scholar, and member of the University community. Following the conversation, the Committee member reports back to the Committee, and then writes a letter to the associate professor summarizing the Committee's assessment of the associate professor's record. The letter also indicates any areas of teaching, scholarship, and University service which the Committee advises the associate professor to address in order to strengthen his or her candidacy for promotion to full professor. The letter becomes part of the associate professor's file.

The fourth-year conversation with associate professors is not a comprehensive review. It is rather intended to serve as an opportunity for associate professors to “check in” with a member of the Committee on Faculty to review progress towards promotion to full Professor and discuss related questions or concerns. In an attempt to address these questions or concerns, the designated member of the Committee on Faculty may consult with other members of the Committee, but it should be underscored that the fourth-year conversation is not a comprehensive review and it therefore can in no way be used to predict the outcome of the actual promotional review.

Candidate will be notified of the interview by September 1 of the year of the candidate’s fourth year at rank. The C.V. and annual reports will form the basis of the discussion, so no further submission of materials is required.

Appendix I
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE CASPERSEN SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

In affirming these standards for tenure and promotion, the faculty of the CSGS emphasizes the responsibility of the University to foster its faculty's ability to develop as teachers; to engage in professional activity--especially in research, writing, publication, presentation, exhibition, performance, creative work, and the like; and to serve the University community.

I.1. CSGS Committee on Faculty procedures in developing recommendations on faculty status

I.1.1. Files

I.1.1.A. Each faculty member’s file consists of two parts: an official personnel file containing non-confidential material including C.V., annual reports, and reappointment letters; and the Dean’s file which contains not only relevant confidential material from the personnel file, but
also confidential materials solicited for the tenure or promotional review and renewal, promotion and tenure summaries of the Committee on Faculty.

Individual faculty members have access to their official files upon request, but not to the Dean's file. The Dean of the Caspersen School and members of the Committee on Faculty when appropriate have access to letters of recommendation provided by internal or external reviewers and Committee on Faculty reports, contained in the Dean's file. Under extraordinary circumstances, the contents of letters in the Dean's file may be summarized for the individual by the Dean. The COF copies of candidates’ scholarship are returned to the candidate upon completion of the review.

I.1.1.B. When appropriate in regard to a candidate for tenure and promotion who is a member of both the Graduate Faculty and the College, the CSGS and CSGS Committees on Faculty both have access as appropriate to the candidate's official file and the Dean's file.

I.1.2. Voting, Decisions, and Notification

I.1.2.A. On all questions of faculty status, the Committee votes by secret ballot. When the faculty member under consideration is from the same area or program as a committee member the latter will recuse him- or herself from all deliberations and vote. Recused members of the COF shall not be present at any discussion until after the vote has been taken, or in discussions related to both written and oral communications with the Dean, President, and Trustees. Though the deliberation and vote can be conducted with only the remaining, non-recusing members of the COF, the chair of the COF in consultation with the Dean may request that a former member of the COF from the appropriate division replace a recused member. That individual shall have access to all materials in the candidate’s file and shall also have full voice and vote on that particular case. His or her responsibilities shall be fulfilled once the vote has been conducted.

I.1.2.B. After the Committee has acted on all promotion and/or tenure decisions, the Committee chair normally (but unofficially) informs the candidate of the decision noting that the final decision is made by the trustees.

I.1.2.C. As noted in the Faculty Personnel Policy, the COF makes its recommendations concerning tenure, promotion and reappointment to the Dean of the Caspersen School which the Dean will transmit along with his or her own recommendation (VI. 3.) to the President. The COF will summarize its reasoning in a formal statement which the chair of the COF will forward to both the Dean and the President.

I.1.2.D. The chair of the Committee and the Dean of the Caspersen School meet with the Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs when candidates for tenure, promotion and reappointment, are being presented.

I.1.2.E. Faculty members who are not recommended for reappointment or tenure shall be given an explanation; if the faculty member so requests, the Dean shall confirm the explanation for the decision in writing. The faculty member may request a reconsideration by the Committee, the Dean and/or the President. If the faculty member raises procedural issues, the question should be
reviewed by the Grievance Committee and may be remanded by the Grievance Committee back to the COF for reconsideration. If the faculty member produces new evidence that was overlooked in the original review, the Dean and/or the President may ask that the Committee reconsider the case.

I.1.2.F. Promotions become effective the semester following the official decision (p.11 B.5).

I.1.2.G. After the final decision has been made on reappointment, tenure and promotion, all official communication regarding a tenure decision will come from the Office of the Dean.

I.1.2.H. All actions of the Committee on Faculty are recorded in minutes made available to the Dean and the members of the Committee on Faculty and filed in the Dean’s office.

I.1.3. Procedures Pertaining to Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

I.1.3.A. The COF shall review all non-tenure-track full-time faculty who have served for longer than two consecutive years with full-time status. The COF recommendation shall address qualifications for further contract renewal of one or two years. The COF recommendation is contingent on available funding, and should be so noted in writing and in any oral communication with the candidate. As with other contract renewals, the area convener should submit a letter addressing the candidate’s performance and the area’s need for the candidate’s continuing service. That letter should reflect the views of the tenured faculty of the area (both pro and con). Such reviews ordinarily focus primarily on teaching, though service and scholarship may also be relevant in some cases if the contractual terms of employment clearly state these requirements. When appropriate, classroom evaluations should be conducted by the convener or by a designated member of the area.

I.1.3.B. Promotion procedure for full-time non-tenure-track faculty members shall follow the same guidelines as for tenure-track faculty members. Promotion for part-time non-tenure-track faculty members will also follow the same guidelines as for tenure-track faculty, but such recommendations should only be considered when the candidate has a well established record of teaching at Drew.

I.2. Individual Faculty Members’ Responsibilities (All Faculty)

I.2.1. All members of the CSGS faculty are expected to submit Annual Reports to their respective conveners, who will then comment on those reports in whatever way they deem appropriate before the reports are submitted to the Dean (see Convener’s Responsibilities below, esp. 6.1.B).

I.2.2. At the beginning of each semester, faculty members are expected to submit to the CSGS Dean’s office syllabi for all courses. These should be kept in the Dean’s office files.

I.2.3. All new and untenured full-time faculty can expect evaluative visits to their classes by the convener and/or tenured member(s) of their respective areas at least once a semester.
I.2.4. Faculty should submit updated vitae annually.

---

I.3. Area Convener's Responsibilities Regarding Faculty Development and Review

I.3.1. For Untenured Faculty
Convener should provide untenured tenure-track faculty members with regular assessment of their teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity and community service. This should be accomplished by the following:

I.3.1.A. The convener reviews student evaluations of courses and discusses them with the faculty member.

I.3.1.B. The convener receives the Annual Report from untenured Assistant and Associate Professors and each year comments on categories provided. Conveners’ responses to year-end reports should be as clear and thorough as possible to inform the candidate of his or her progress toward tenure. The Annual Report is then returned to the individual for his or her confidential response(s). The individual then turns the Annual Report in to the Dean of the Caspersen School.

I.3.1.C. The convener should attempt to clarify the issue of quality of scholarship so that the candidate realizes that it is not merely the quantity of work produced which is important.

I.3.1.D. The CSGS Dean’s office should maintain a file of course syllabi for all courses taught by each faculty member for the current and preceding year, the file to be updated at the beginning of each semester.

I.3.1.E. The convener (or designated, tenured faculty member from the area) should visit representative classes taught by each untenured faculty member at least once each semester for constructive purposes and first-hand knowledge to contribute to teaching evaluation. The area may wish to consider and use other means of evaluating the teaching of such faculty as well.

I.3.1.F. The convener must educate the tenure applicant as to the minimal standards and the fact that merely meeting these standards does not automatically ensure tenure.

I.3.1.G. Candidates' progress toward tenure should be communicated to the applicant. Special care should be taken to inform those candidates who are not making satisfactory progress as early as possible.
I.3.2. For Tenured Professors (Associate and Full Professors)

I.3.2.A. As a means of evaluating and reviewing tenured professors, annual reports must be turned in to conveners, who will then comment on those reports as appropriate before the reports are submitted to the Dean.

I.3.2.B. All tenured faculty are to be evaluated fully by their conveners during the second year of each convener's term (if a faculty member is on sabbatical one of these years, he or she will be fully evaluated the following year); in the subsequent years, the convener submits an evaluation for each member of their area, but may simply state "no significant change" or "performance up to standards" or some similar comment.

I.3.2.C. The Convener reviews student evaluations of courses and discusses them with the faculty member.

I.3.3. Letters for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

I.3.3.A. In cases of simple reappointment without promotion the convener, in consultation with the tenured members of the area, must provide a letter of recommendation (pro or con) for the candidate. For timing, see attached schedule (Appendix II).

I.3.3.B. At the time of tenure review, the Convener or another designated tenured member of the area, in consultation with the candidate submits the names of three external reviewers and two alternates able to evaluate aspects of the candidate’s scholarship, none of whom has a close professional relationship with the candidate. Both the Convener and the candidate submit the name of one internal reviewer and one alternate. The names of all proposed evaluators should be accompanied by contact information and a brief rationale identifying the reasons why he or she was selected, using the form provided. [See 2.1.2 and 2.1.2.A-B]. In addition, candidates may submit a list of reviewers who should not be asked by the area because of a possible conflict of interest. Proposed external reviewers may only be contacted about a possible evaluation by the Dean. For timing, see attached schedule (Appendix II).

I.3.3.C. At the time of review for promotion to full professor, the Convener or another designated tenured member of the area, in consultation with the candidate submits the names of three external reviewers and two alternates able to evaluate aspects of the candidate’s scholarship, none of whom has a close professional relationship with the candidate. Both the Convener and the candidate submit the names of two internal reviewers and one alternate. The names of all proposed evaluators should be accompanied by a brief rationale identifying the reasons why he or she was selected, using the form provided. [See 2.1.2 and 2.1.2.A-B]. For timing, see attached schedule (appendix ii). In addition, candidates may submit a list of reviewers who should not be asked by the area because of a possible conflict of interest. Proposed external reviewers may only be contacted about a possible evaluation by the Dean. For timing, see attached schedule (Appendix II).
I.3.3.D. For promotion to associate or full professor and/or the granting of tenure, either each tenured member of the area writes a letter of recommendation for the candidate, or the area may choose to submit a single area statement signed by all tenured members of the area. For timing, see attached schedule (Section 9)

I.3.3.E. For faculty serving interdisciplinary programs as a major part of their appointment, a letter will also be solicited from the program Director.

I.4. Statement on Tenured Faculty Holding Administrative Appointments

The Committee feels that there are a number of strong rationales for such appointments, and will normally encourage them as benefiting both the individual and the institution. The Committee's concern is, however, with the effect on areas of tenured faculty holding administrative appointments for more than two years. Uncertainty regarding a faculty member's return to the area can delay effective area staff planning. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that the area not be without a tenure-track replacement for more than two years. That is, after one year of employing a full- or part-time substitute, the area should be authorized to seek a tenure-track replacement for the tenured faculty member holding the administrative position for more than two years total. Should the tenured faculty member holding the administrative appointment return to the area, he or she would then be an additional member of the area.

I.5. EMERITI FACULTY

Recommendation for the conferral of the status of Professor Emeritus for retiring faculty, is made by the CSGS Committee on Faculty in the retiree's final semester. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean, the President and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Appendix II

Schedules and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews

II.1. Routine Contract Renewal Decisions

Routine contract renewal in the CSGS includes both pre-tenure reviews for tenure-track faculty (ordinarily in the second and fourth years of service) and contract renewals for full-time non-tenure-track faculty who have served longer than two years in the CSGS.
Candidates for reappointment typically are on a two-year contract cycle, though some non-tenure-track appointments are one-year appointments. When possible, contracts for tenure-track candidates are scheduled to ensure review two years prior to tenure consideration.

II.1.A. Schedule and required information for reappointment process when COF review is required

| Schedule and Required Information in Reappointment Process (p.5-7, III. C) |
| On or about: 04/15 | DEAN: Requests dossier materials from Candidate and recommendation from Convener (deadline for submission of candidate and convener materials is October 01) |
| 10/01 | CANDIDATE: Requests dossier materials from Candidate and recommendation from Convener (deadline for submission of candidate and convener materials is October 01) |
| AREA CONVENER: Provide a recommendation (pro or con) regarding reappointment and reports on all class observations and interviews from the review period. Reports of class observations by non-area Drew faculty may be included when the area and/or the candidate has requested a formal observation |
| DEAN: shall make available the cumulative record of student evaluations; annual reports and sabbatical reports from the review period; evaluations from previous reviews (if applicable); and candidate and area Convener’s materials for CSGS Committee on Faculty review |
| On or about: 12/01 | CSGS COMMITTEE ON FACULTY: deliberates and makes its recommendation(s) to the Dean. The COF will summarize its reasoning in a formal statement which the Convener of CoF will forward to both the Dean and the President. |
| DEAN: makes his or her recommendation and transmits the recommendations of the Committee on Faculty to the President. The President in turn makes his or her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. |
| On or about: 12/15 | CANDIDATE: is notified by the Dean of the Trustees’ decision regarding candidate’s reappointment or termination. The Dean will include in his or her letter of reappointment any concerns that have been noted by the committee which, if not addressed, could affect the faculty member’s future reappointment and tenure/promotion status. |
| Spring | CSGS COMMITTEE ON FACULTY: (Normally) in the subsequent spring semester, a member of the committee will meet together with the candidate and the candidate’s area convener to discuss strengths and weaknesses that emerged in the review process. |
II.2. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and/or Tenure

Ordinarily, assistant professors are considered for promotion during their sixth year in rank, though this may be modified by the total number of years of full-time service at Drew. A faculty member whose years in rank as Assistant Professor (either at Drew or at Drew and elsewhere) coincide with the probationary period can normally expect to be considered for tenure and promotion at the same time. On the other hand, a faculty member whose probationary period does not coincide with years in rank is not necessarily considered for promotion when considered for tenure. In such cases, consideration for promotion should not ordinarily be expected until the person has been in rank a minimum of four years. The anticipated year of consideration for tenure and promotion should be specified in the faculty member’s letter of appointment to the tenure track. The Committee on Faculty will consider a request by a candidate to extend tenure consideration by one year due to extraordinary circumstances (for example, a serious medical condition or a challenging family circumstance for which a leave might have been but was not granted).

II.2.A. Schedule and required information for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and/or tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule and Required Information in Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Process</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester</td>
<td>CANDIDATE: At the end of the spring semester preceding candidate’s tenure consideration year the Dean and the chair of the CSGS of Committee on Faculty will meet with each candidate to review the tenure review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or about: 04/15</td>
<td>DEAN: Requests dossier materials from Candidate (due by September 01) and a list of internal and external reviewers from Convener (deadline for submission of candidate and convener reviewers is Aug. 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15</td>
<td>Convener or another designated tenured member of the area, in consultation with the candidate, submits the names of three external reviewers and two alternates able to evaluate aspects of the candidate’s scholarship, none of whom has a close professional relationship with the candidate. In addition, the Convener submits the name of one internal reviewer able to evaluate aspects of the candidate’s performance with particular attention to the candidate’s record of service and [or] teaching if appropriate. The names of all proposed evaluators should be accompanied by contact information and a brief rationale identifying the reasons why he or she was selected, using the form provided. [See 2.1.2 and 2.1.2.A-B].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE: provides the name of one internal reviewer able to evaluate aspects of the candidate’s performance with particular attention to the candidate’s record of service and teaching if appropriate. Candidate should provide a suitable rationale explaining why the proposed evaluator was chosen, using the form provided. In addition, candidates may submit a list of reviewers who should not be asked by the area because of a possible conflict of interest. [See 2.1.2 and 2.1.2.A-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CSGS COMMITTEE ON FACULTY:** will use its discretion in evaluating the appropriateness of reviewers in each category, selecting reviewers with the necessary qualifications to evaluate the scholarship provided by the candidate. Where the scholarship falls into a less traditional category (see section 1.2.1. “A broad definition of scholarship”), reviewers whose professional status is comparable to traditional academic rank, may be considered.

No one other than the Dean may contact proposed external reviewers about a possible evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th><strong>CANDIDATE:</strong></th>
<th><strong>DEAN:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/01</td>
<td>provide the Dean’s office with seven copies of a current curriculum vitae and scholarship portfolio; two copies of the teaching and service portfolios; [See 1.1.2; 1.2.2; 1.3.2; 2.1; and 2.1.A] and two copies of the reflective self-evaluation [See 2.1.1]. Candidates may request that a copy of the scholarship section of the reflective self-evaluation be provided to external reviewers along with the scholarship portfolio. This request should be made in writing at the time that the scholarship portfolio is submitted.</td>
<td>Letters and vitae go out to all external referees asking them if they can evaluate the candidate’s work. The Committee asks them to respond by October 1 indicating their willingness to do so. The deadline for submission of the evaluation is January 15. Dean reviews the responses received and decides whether or not additional names are needed. If so, requests are sent out and additional evaluations sought by January 15. When necessary and in consultation with the Committee on Faculty, the Dean will request further names of alternate reviewers from the candidate and/or the area convener.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or about: 9/15</td>
<td><strong>DEAN:</strong> sends the scholarship portfolio along with copies of the scholarship section of this handbook and a copy of the candidate’s CV to the external evaluators. In addition, the section of the reflective self-evaluation specifically about scholarship will be included if the candidate has so requested.</td>
<td>sends letters to all internal (non-area program) referees asking them to evaluate the candidate’s performance with particular attention to the candidate’s record of teaching and/or service. (Deadline for submission is January 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or about: 10/01</td>
<td><strong>DEAN:</strong> requests letters of recommendation from tenured members of the area. If the area does not include two tenured members, the Committee appoints one or more tenured CSGS representatives closest to the area of the candidate to provide evaluations in addition to that of the area convener. If the candidate holds a joint appointment or serves multiple areas and/or programs, additional letters will be requested from those Conveners and from appropriate tenured faculty. (Deadline for submission: January 15).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or about: 12/01</td>
<td>Internal reviewers may consult the material submitted by the candidate along with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other non-confidential dossier materials available in the Dean's office.

01/15 CONVENER/AREA: submits letter(s) of recommendation. The tenured members of the area/program may choose to submit a joint statement instead of or in addition to individual letters. These faculty are asked to comment explicitly on how they assess the candidate with respect to integrity, teaching effectiveness, recognition as a scholar, and contributions to the life and task of the University and what role they see the candidate playing in meeting the present and future needs of the area and/or college.

INTERNAL REFEREES: submit letters of recommendation to the Dean’s Office.

On or about: 03/31 CSGS COMMITTEE ON FACULTY: deliberates and makes its recommendation(s) to the Dean. Candidate and Convener notified of the Committee’s recommendation. [see 1.2.B]

On or about: 04/15 DEAN: makes his or her recommendation and transmits the recommendations of the CSGS Committee on Faculty to the President. The President in turn makes his or her recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

On or about: 05/15 Candidate and Convener notified by the Dean of the Trustees’ decision regarding candidate’s promotion and/or tenure. The candidate is encouraged to meet with the Dean to discuss any issues raised during the decision process.

II.3. Fourth-Year Conversation with Associate Professors

During their first or second year in rank, associate professors are advised to meet with the Dean to discuss criteria for promotion to full professor.

A member of the COF will meet with each associate professor in his or her fourth year in rank. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss with the associate professor his or her teaching, scholarship, and University service since promotion to associate professor and tenure were granted. Prior to the meeting, the COF members read and discuss the associate professor’s updated vita, annual reports and available teaching evaluations since promotion and tenure. The conversation allows the associate professor the opportunity to provide the Committee with a self-evaluation and to express concerns about his or her experience as a teacher, scholar, and member of the University community. Following the conversation, the Committee member reports back to the Committee, and then writes a letter to the associate professor summarizing the Committee's assessment of the associate professor's record. The letter also indicates any areas of teaching, scholarship, and University service which the Committee advises the associate professor to address in order to strengthen his or her candidacy for promotion to full professor. The letter becomes part of the associate professor's file.
The fourth-year conversation with associate professors is not a comprehensive review. It is rather intended to serve as an opportunity for associate professors to “check in” with a member of the Committee on Faculty to review progress towards promotion to full Professor and discuss related questions or concerns. In an attempt to address these questions or concerns, the designated member of the Committee on Faculty may consult with other members of the Committee, but it should be underscored that the fourth-year conversation is not a comprehensive review and it therefore can in no way be used to predict the outcome of the actual promotional review.

Candidate will be notified of the interview by September 30 of the year of the candidate’s fourth year at rank. The CV and annual reports will form the basis of the discussion, so no further submission of materials is required. (See 4.2)

II.4. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor
Promotions to professor ordinarily are considered in the seventh year in rank as an associate professor. In cases of exceptional merit, promotion to full professor can occur earlier, but in no case earlier than in the sixth year of rank as associate professor. Exceptional merit is understood to be above and beyond what is normally expected for promotion in the seventh year of rank.

The Committee will consider requests from one or more tenured members of an area that a person in the area who is in at least his or her sixth year at rank of associate professor be considered for promotion to professor in the current academic year. Beginning in the seventh year in rank as associate professor, the committee will also consider requests from the candidate to initiate promotion procedures. In all cases, the Committee will consider the request along with information from the candidate's record and will make a recommendation to the candidate and/or convener concerning whether to initiate promotion procedures. If the Committee does not recommend initiating the promotion procedure, it will offer to review the situation with the candidate, who may be considered again in the following or a subsequent year. If the candidate and/or area disagree with the Committee's recommendation and wishes to initiate the full promotion procedure, the Committee will do so in the same manner it considers any other candidate for promotion. If a request for promotion consideration is not received, the Committee will review the associate professor seven years after the last review using the seven-year review procedures described below.

For those initially appointed as tenure-track Associate Professors, the anticipated date of the tenure review should be stated in the appointment letter. Service at rank of Associate Professor at other institutions can count towards total years of service at rank in determining eligibility for promotion to full professor. The same rules governing time in rank before consideration for full professor hold. When possible, letters of appointment for faculty hired with advanced standing should specify timelines for eligibility for promotion. In all cases, consideration will be given not only to eligibility for promotion based on years of service but also to the criteria for promotion outlined in this document and to the accumulated record available for review in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship.

Candidates may request that a copy of the scholarship section of the reflective self-evaluation be
provided to external reviewers along with the scholarship portfolio. This request should be made in writing at the time that the scholarship portfolio is submitted.

II.4.A. Schedule and required information for promotion from associate professor to full professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule and Required Information in Promotion to Full Professor Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convener or another designated tenured member of the area,</strong> in consultation with the candidate submits the names of three external reviewers and two alternates able to evaluate aspects of the candidate’s scholarship, none of whom has a close professional relationship with the candidate. Convener also submits the names of two internal reviewers and one alternate able to evaluate aspects of the candidate’s performance with particular attention to the candidate’s record of service and teaching if appropriate. The names of all proposed evaluators should be accompanied by a brief rationale identifying the reasons why he or she was selected, using the form provided. [See 2.1.2 and 2.1.2.A-B].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CANDIDATE:</strong> provides the name of two internal reviewers able to evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
aspects of the candidate’s performance with particular attention to the candidate’s record of service and teaching if appropriate. Candidate should provide a suitable rationale explaining why the proposed evaluator was chosen, using the form provided. In addition, candidates may submit a list of reviewers who should not be asked by the area because of a possible conflict of interest. See appendix I.IV.3.C

**CSGS COMMITTEE ON FACULTY:** will use its discretion in evaluating the appropriateness of reviewers in each category, selecting reviewers with the necessary qualifications to evaluate the scholarship provided by the candidate. Where the scholarship falls into a less traditional category (see section 1.2.1. “A broad definition of scholarship”), reviewers whose professional status is comparable to traditional academic rank, may be considered. No one other than the Dean may contact proposed external reviewers about a possible evaluation.

**DEAN:** Sends letters and vitae to all external referees asking them if they can evaluate the candidate's work. The Committee asks them to respond by October 15 indicating their willingness to do so. The deadline for submission of the evaluation is January 15. Dean reviews the responses received and decides whether or not additional names are needed. If so, requests are sent out and additional evaluations sought by January 15. When necessary and in consultation with the Committee on Faculty, the Dean will request further names of alternate reviewers from the candidate and/or the area convener.

**11/01 CANDIDATE:** provides the Dean’s Office with four copies of a current curriculum vitae and scholarship portfolio; two copies of the teaching and service portfolios [See 1.1.2; 1.2.2; 1.3.2; 2.1; and 2.1.A]; and two copies of the reflective self-evaluation [See 2.1.1]. Candidates may request that a copy of the scholarship section of the reflective self-evaluation be provided to external reviewers along with the scholarship portfolio. This request should be made in writing at the time that the scholarship portfolio is submitted.

Additions provided prior to December 1 will be shared with external reviewers, though it should be noted that some reviewers may complete their evaluations prior to that time; other additions may be added to the file as the review is ongoing, but these will not be sent to external evaluators.

**DEAN:** sends the scholarship portfolio along with copies of the scholarship section of this Handbook and a copy of the candidates’ CV to the external evaluators. In addition, the section of the reflective self-evaluation specifically about scholarship will be included if the candidate has so requested. Deadline for submission of external review letters: January 15

**12/01 DEAN:** Sends letters to all internal (non-area/program) referees asking them to evaluate the candidate’s performance with particular attention to the candidate’s record of teaching and/or service. These letters become part of the Dean's file on the candidate. They are not accessible to the candidate or any faculty not serving on
COF and actively reviewing the file. Letters of recommendation are requested from all tenured members of the area/program.

CONVENER/AREA: The tenured members of the area/program may choose to submit a joint statement instead of or in addition to individual letters. These faculty are asked to comment explicitly on how they assess the candidate with respect to integrity, teaching effectiveness, recognition as a scholar, and contributions to the life and task of the University and what role they see the candidate playing in meeting the present and future needs of the area and/or college.

CSGS COMMITTEE ON FACULTY: If the area does not include two tenured members, the Committee, in consultation with the area, appoints one or more tenured representatives closest to the area of the candidate to provide evaluations in addition to that of the area Convener. If the candidate holds a joint appointment or serves multiple areas and/or programs, additional letters will be requested from those Convener’s and / or program director’s and from appropriate tenured faculty; Internal reviewers may consult the material submitted by the candidate along with other non-confidential dossier materials available in the Dean's office.

Deadline for submission of internal review letters: January 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On or about:</th>
<th>CSGS COMMITTEE ON FACULTY: after deliberation makes its recommendation(s) to the Dean. The COF will summarize its reasoning in a formal statement which the Chair of COF will forward to both the Dean and the President. Candidate and Convener notified of the Committee’s recommendation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/31</td>
<td>On or about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15</td>
<td>DEAN: makes his or her recommendation and transmits the recommendations of the CSGS Committee on Faculty to the President. The President in turn makes his or her recommendation to the Board of Trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15</td>
<td>Candidate and Convener notified by the Dean of the Trustees’ decision regarding candidate’s promotion and/or tenure. The candidate is encouraged to meet with the Dean to discuss any issues raised during the decision process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.5. SENIOR REVIEW PROCESS (See 3.1)

In order to serve the careers of long-term members of the Drew faculty the Caspersen School of Graduate Studies Committee on Faculty reviews all professors at least once every seven years. Every seven years following the last review, the Committee will send the faculty member a letter soliciting materials for the review including an updated vita and reflective self-evaluation.

Prior to this review, the full professor will provide the Committee with a written self-evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and University service should be submitted in addition to regular annual
reports and updated vita. This review is meant to provide peer assessment and to allow the Committee to be of Service to any professor who wants to bring concerns about his or her career at Drew to the Committee’s attention. The faculty member will meet with a member of the Committee on Faculty, who will report back to the Committee and write a brief summary of the conversation which is shared with the full professor and placed in the personnel file.

II.6. EMERITI FACULTY

Recommendation for the conferral of the status of Professor Emeritus for retiring faculty, is made by the CSGS Committee on Faculty in the retirees final semester. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean, the President, and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

APPENDIX III:
AAUP 1987 STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

1. Professors,* guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and
scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

* In the “Statement of Professional Ethics,” the term professor is understood to refer to any member of the university faculty, regardless of rank.
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