2.6 Qualifications for Tenure and Promotion

2.6.1 Tenure

Exceptions to the following policies will have the concurrence of the Faculty Personnel Committee, the Dean of the College, and the President.

2.6.1.1 Qualifications for Tenure

Tenure is an honor that signifies that a faculty member has achieved a level of expertise and balance in all aspects of their career in a way that furthers the mission and purpose of Roanoke College. For the special employment rights of tenured faculty, see Section 2.2.3.

To be considered qualified for tenure an individual must:

1. hold a terminal degree unless specified otherwise in the initial letter of appointment;

2. have served at least six years at the rank of Assistant Professor or the equivalent;

3. demonstrate that they have offered a pattern of high-quality college courses which teach the content and skills of their discipline and of the liberal arts as described by the College's Liberal Learning Goals (1.2.4). To do so, an individual must demonstrate their teaching is characterized by the following hallmarks of high-quality college courses:

    a. The instructor designs and implements courses with a well-organized plan for learning and clear, appropriate goals;
    b. The instructor explores in their teaching the central knowledge and methodologies of their scholarly field;
    c. The instructor incorporates activities and assignments that will teach the skills central to their discipline and to a liberal arts education;
    d. The instructor creates a positive learning environment by being responsive to student questions and by challenging students to achieve at ever higher levels;
    e. The instructor has appropriately rigorous expectations for student learning and gives fair and clear assessment of student work;

4. demonstrate a pattern of engagement, activity, and productivity in professional life at the tenure level appropriate to the candidate's secondary emphasis (see Section 2.6.3.6);

5. demonstrate a pattern of active involvement in service that helps departments realize their goals and furthers the mission, purpose, and liberal learning goals of Roanoke College. To be so, an individual must demonstrate:
    a. Engagement in competent and conscientious advising of students;
    b. Reliable and effective work with others in the course of committee work and other service (which may include service to a professional organization or to the community);
    c. Adherence to the standard of professional ethics described in Section 2.9.3.1.

For candidates whose secondary emphasis is service, such service goes considerably beyond the committee service expected of all faculty (see 1.6.5 article vi and 1.6.5.1.3 Section 1), and should demonstrate initiative, and commitment to see projects through to completion (see Section 2.6.4).

6. demonstrate promise for growth in teaching, and in either professional life or service.

2.6.2   Promotion

Exceptions to the following policies will have the concurrence of the Faculty Personnel Committee, the Dean, and the President.

2.6.2.1   Qualifications for Promotion by Rank

Before receiving promotion between ranks, a full-time faculty member must meet the following professional qualifications:

2.6.2.1.1   Assistant Professor

To be considered qualified for promotion to Assistant Professor an individual must:

1. hold a terminal degree or have both an intermediate degree and at least three years of full-time teaching experience or other appropriate professional experience;

2. demonstrate potential for designing and implementing high quality college courses as defined by 2.6.1.1 Section 3;

3. demonstrate potential for engagement, activity, and productivity in professional life at the tenure level (see Section 2.6.3.6);

4. demonstrate a willingness to help departments realize their goals and further the mission, purpose, and liberal learning goals of Roanoke College as defined by 2.6.1.1 Section 5;

Immediate promotion from Instructor to the rank of Assistant Professor may be granted by the Academic Dean upon completion of the terminal degree.

2.6.2.1.2   Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are normally granted at the same time and thus have the same qualifications. Since in some cases tenure is granted separately, the criteria are repeated here.

The rank of Associate Professor signifies that a faculty member has achieved a level of expertise and balance in all aspects of their career in a way that furthers the mission and purpose of Roanoke College.

To be considered qualified for promotion to Associate Professor an individual must:

1. hold a terminal degree unless specified otherwise in the initial letter of appointment;

2. have served at least six years at the Assistant Professor rank or the equivalent;

3. demonstrate that they have offered a pattern of high-quality college courses as defined by 2.6.1.1 Section 3;

4. demonstrate a pattern of engagement, activity, and productivity in professional life at the tenure level appropriate to the candidate's secondary emphasis (see Section 2.6.3.6);

5. demonstrate a pattern of active involvement in service as defined by 2.6.1.1 Section 5;

6. demonstrate promise for growth in teaching and in either professional life or service.

2.6.2.1.3 Professor

The rank of Professor signifies that a faculty member, through teaching and a secondary area of emphasis (either professional life or service), has raised the academic quality of the College in a way that furthers the mission and purpose of Roanoke College. Sustained activity in the third area of evaluation is also a hallmark of the rank of Professor.

To be considered qualified for promotion to Professor an individual must:

1. hold a terminal degree;

2. have served at least five years at the Associate Professor rank or the equivalent;

3. have offered high quality college courses as defined by 2.6.1.1 Section 3 over a sustained period of time. In addition, an individual must demonstrate that their teaching is characterized by the following hallmarks of an excellent teacher:

    a. The instructor regularly incorporates into their teaching new knowledge and emerging methodologies of their scholarly field;
    b. The instructor creates new courses as necessary to reflect new areas of their scholarly interest and new subfields of their discipline;
    c. The instructor consciously and regularly reassesses and, as necessary, adapts their pedagogy (from course design to specific classroom activities) to communicate more effectively to each generation of students;

4. have maintained a pattern of engagement, activity, and productivity, in professional life at the Professor level appropriate to the candidate's secondary emphasis (see Section 2.6.3.7);

5. have maintained a pattern of active involvement in service as expected for the rank of Associate Professor. If the candidate's secondary emphasis is Service, the candidate must demonstrate a level of service that has improved the College's ability to fulfill its mission, purpose, and liberal learning goals in an evolving academic environment. Such service, which goes considerably beyond the committee service expected of all faculty (see 1.6.5 article vi and 1.6.5.1.3 Section 1), should demonstrate initiative and commitment to see projects through to completion (see Section 2.6.4).

2.6.3 Characteristics of Professional Life

Every faculty member belongs to both a professional community of scholars and to the community of scholars and students at Roanoke College. The ongoing development of an academic's professional life is integral to participation in and contribution to one's professional community; it is also essential to the intellectual vibrancy of Roanoke College as an academic community. Engagement in professional development activities and active involvement in professional organizations enhances the role of a faculty member as a teacher-scholar by infusing the faculty member's teaching with the latest developments in the field and with emerging pedagogies. Moreover, a faculty member's scholarly productivity models for students the habits of intellectual inquiry and the excitement of discovery.

A candidate's professional life may encompass pedagogical research as well as more traditional research questions. A candidate whose research agenda includes pedagogical issues should present this work in the Professional Life categories below.

The professional life of a faculty member is characterized by work in the following categories:

1. a sound <u>research agenda</u>;

2. <u>professional engagement</u> appropriate to one's research agenda, for example:
   a. attendance at professional meetings and conferences, including some national or international events;
   b. participation in short courses or workshops;
   c. visits to museums, exhibitions, and concerts;

3. <u>professional activity</u>, for example:

   a. as a referee or reviewer for publications or external grant proposals, including publication of book reviews;
   b. as a chair, panel member, discussant, respondent, or presenter at a poster session at a professional meeting or conference; as a presenter of a paper at a regional professional meeting or conference;
   c. as a recipient of an internal research grant;
   d. as a supervisor of students engaged in the faculty member's own research program;
   e. as a consultant on work that furthers one's research agenda;
   f. as the creator of a body of sustained artistic work;

4. <u>professional productivity</u> as attested by peers in the academic field. The pursuit of scholarship and the resulting productivity are typically demonstrated by:

   a. dissemination of results at national and international professional forums (for example, refereed paper presentations, refereed poster presentations);
   b. external grants that significantly contribute to the ability to pursue one's research agenda; Artist in Residency programs;
   c. professional exhibitions, performances, or recordings of artistic work; work in a permanent collection;
   d. refereed publications (for example, journal publications, book chapters, or books) or patents with significant participation by the candidate.

2.6.3.1 Disciplinary Differences in Professional Life

While expectations for teaching and service are not discipline-specific, the same is not the case for professional life. While some forms of dissemination, e.g., external peer-review, are indicative of the quality of a scholarly work, disciplines do not always share common terminology for describing their scholarly work, the mechanisms by which scholarly work is disseminated vary considerably, and disciplines measure achievement within that field according to their own standards.

2.6.3.2 Emphasis on Quality

While both the quality and quantity of a candidate's achievements are important, quality should be the primary consideration. The quality of a work should be defined largely in terms of the significance of the work's contribution to a discipline, or in terms of the creativity of the thoughts and methods behind it.

Consequently, the quality of a candidate's achievements can be judged best by those practicing in the discipline.

2.6.3.3 Flexibility of Achievement Levels

Accordingly, the achievement levels described in Sections 2.6.3.6 and 2.6.3.7 are meant to be a guide for the candidate and evaluators. Where the expectations for achievement described in these sections do not accurately reflect the standards and practices of the candidate's field, or where the quality of a candidate's achievements clearly compensates for lack of quantity, the candidate, the departmental committee, and the department chair should address the unique features of the candidate's field and indicate whether or not the candidate has demonstrated an equivalent level of achievement. For example, publication of a monograph by an academic press would normally be considered the equivalent of publishing multiple journal articles; attendance at several regional meetings may be the equivalent of attending one national meeting; one large refereed item may be the equivalent of two smaller refereed items; one item published in a very prestigious journal may be the equivalent of two items published in less prestigious journals.

2.6.3.4 Category 4: Submissions and Acceptances Counted

Submission (e.g., to a publisher or granting organization) of material in category 4 (Section 2.6.3) may count as an "item" in fulfilling the requirements outlined below, except where an "accepted" (for publication, exhibition, funding) item is specifically required. Resubmission of a nearly identical manuscript to another publisher or journal will not count as a distinct item. However, submission of a substantially revised manuscript will count as a distinct item. Some activities may be used to satisfy two different requirements (for example, if a candidate presents a refereed paper at a conference, the conference attendance could be one of the items used to satisfy the requirement of category 2, and the paper could be one of the items used to satisfy the requirement of category 4).

2.6.3.5 Years Counted in Achievement Levels

Many faculty members will be candidates for tenure during their sixth year of service at Roanoke College. Others may be candidates before their sixth year, as stated in their appointment letter. The review period for tenure will begin at the time of the initial appointment unless candidates have been granted credit for previous service as stated in their appointment letter. In such cases, candidates may choose to include these credit years within the review period, though the number of professional life achievements expected for tenure will increase accordingly (see Section 2.6.3.6).

Because of these different time frames, overall averages are used below. Since much of the work in professional engagement and professional activity are planned ahead of time, the review year is factored into the averages for categories 2 and 3; since work in professional productivity represents the highest levels of scholarly achievement and the responses to one's submissions (especially in category 4b-d) may not be available at the beginning of the academic year, the review year will not be factored into the averages for category 4. (For example, with Professional Life as a secondary area of emphasis, candidates for tenure who are reviewed during their sixth year at Roanoke College ought to have four items in category 2, three items in category 3, and two items in category 4.) Items accepted for presentation during the review year, however, will be counted, and candidates should update evaluators of any additional items achieved while the review is in process.

2.6.3.5.1 Review Period for Professor

Candidates for promotion to Professor can vary in the number of years of service since being granted tenure at Roanoke College. In the dossier cover letter, a candidate for promotion to Professor must specify the

review period to be used in evaluating the candidate's professional life; this period must be contiguous and include at least the four years leading up to the review year.

Candidates for promotion to Professor whose secondary area of emphasis has been split between Service and Professional Life will be expected to reach a level of achievement proportional to how their time has been allocated. Candidates should describe their situation in the dossier cover letter (see 2.7.3.1.1).

2.6.3.6   Achievement Levels: Tenure

1. Candidates whose secondary emphasis is Service must have a research agenda (category 1 in Section 2.6.3), and in the designated review period (see Section 2.6.3.5) should have, <u>on average</u>, at least:

    a. one item per two years in category 2 (Section 2.6.3);
    b. one item per three years in category 3 (Section 2.6.3);
    c. one item per three years in category 4 (Section 2.6.3).

In total, candidates should have at least one accepted item in either category 4c or d.

2. Candidates whose secondary emphasis is Professional Life must have a research agenda (category 1 in Section 2.6.3), and in the designated review period (see Section 2.6.3.5) should have, <u>on average</u>, at least:

    a. two items per three years in category 2 (Section 2.6.3);
    b. one item per two years in category 3 (Section 2.6.3);
    c. one item per two years in category 4 (Section 2.6.3).

In total, candidates should have at least one accepted item in either category 4c or d.

2.6.3.7   Achievement Levels: Professor

1. Candidates whose secondary emphasis is Service must have a research agenda (category 1 in Section 2.6.3), and in the designated review period (see Section 2.6.3.5.1) should have at least:

    a. three items in category 2 (Section 2.6.3);
    b. three items in category 3 (Section 2.6.3);
    c. three items in category 4 (Section 2.6.3).

In total, candidates should have at least one accepted item during the designated review period in either category 4c or d.

2. Candidates whose secondary emphasis is Professional Life must have a research agenda (category 1 in Section 2.6.3), and in the designated review period (see Section 2.6.3.5.1) should have at least:

    a. four items in category 2 (Section 2.6.3);
    b. four items in category 3 (Section 2.6.3);
    c. four items in category 4 (Section 2.6.3).

In total, candidates should have at least two accepted items during the designated review period in category 4b, c or d.

2.6.4   Characteristics of Service

Service to the College, which includes advising students, is a responsibility of every faculty member at Roanoke College. All the areas of service (detailed below) contribute to the College's ability to pursue and achieve its vision, mission, and purpose. As stated in Section 1.6, "the faculty has primary responsibility for the educational program including curriculum, academic standards, and requirements for graduation, methods of instruction, faculty status, admission policies, and other academic policies. Faculty also has a responsibility for monitoring the impact of all aspects of the College operations on the educational program."

All faculty are expected to meaningfully engage in service and will be evaluated on their contributions. Thus, any activity related to faculty governance, work on committees or taskforces, administrative responsibilities, departmental and programmatic service, student advising, and service to one's profession and service to the community that furthers the goals of the College, is considered Service for the purposes of faculty evaluation.

For tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, assessment will be based on all service contributions since the time of initial appointment. For those candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor, service will be assessed over the same period established by the candidate for the assessment of Professional Life, following 2.6.3.5.1.

2.6.4.1   Service as a Secondary Area

Service as a secondary area goes considerably beyond the responsibilities expected of all faculty, both in terms of time commitment and quality. The candidate's agency, ownership of responsibilities, leadership, and/or management in service should mark them as a leader of the Roanoke College community. While time commitments associated with such service are expected to be significant, quality should be the primary consideration. The quality of the work is defined largely in terms of the significance and impact of the work's contribution to the mission, vision, purpose, and goals of the College.

Rather than a collection of activity engagement, participation, or coordination efforts, hallmarks of such service at the secondary level include significant personal agency and/or ownership, meaningful leadership, and the successful development, management, and/or implementation of initiatives. Regardless of the specific nature of the work, candidates who declare service as a secondary emphasis must demonstrate a consistent record of initiative and seeing projects through to completion that have meaningfully supported or enhanced the College's ability to further its mission, vision, purpose, and goals.

The key to service at a secondary level is that it includes a pattern of such substantial activities. Every faculty member brings diverse skills, backgrounds, and talents; service opportunities and needs vary over time and by program. Accordingly, faculty will serve in different ways. A non-exhaustive list of such service could include the creation of new academic programs, successful direction of programs or departments, spearheading the organization and implementation of conferences or forums, overhauling systems of evaluation, or leading major structural reforms.

Note that a title does not automatically convey that a candidate has met service at the level of a secondary emphasis. Candidates should support their case through the service narrative.

2.6.4.2   Service as a Tertiary Area

Service as a tertiary area marks the candidate as an engaged member of the Roanoke College community. Accordingly, candidates who declare Service as their tertiary emphasis must demonstrate competent and conscientious advising of students along with regular ongoing service contributions to the College.

Such service may include attendance, participation, coordination, or facilitation of selected campus-wide or programmatic or departmental events, membership on committees/taskforces/councils/etc. as selected, sponsorship of student organizations, departmental/programmatic responsibilities that may not rise to the secondary level, or other non-enumerable hidden service obligations that nevertheless enhance the life of the College. Regular ongoing contributions to one's profession and to the wider community may also contribute to one's service obligations at the tertiary level, provided such service directly relates to furthering the mission, vision, purpose, and goals of Roanoke College.**... ....**

2.6.5 Evaluation and Materials for Tenure and Promotion

2.6.5.1 Teaching

Teaching is the heart of what we do as faculty members at Roanoke College. Service to the College—especially student advising—supports good teaching, and professional activity renews faculty knowledge and expertise. But teaching is our primary emphasis because the College's mission is "to engage students in their development as whole persons" and to prepare "our graduates for responsible lives of learning, service, and leadership in a diverse and changing world." Within an integrative approach that includes curricular and co-curricular learning, the faculty bears chief responsibility for leading students to meet the College's Liberal Learning Goals (1.2.4), preparing students for "lives of freedom with purpose." The Qualifications for Tenure (2.6.1.1 Section 3) offers a list of teaching characteristics expected of our faculty. Evaluators understand that outstanding teaching is not an achievement reached at a single point in a career, nor is it achieved once and for all; instead, it is an ability acquired and sustained through an ongoing process.

2.6.5.1.1 Evidence

1. Teaching Narrative

   a. A statement of the candidate's teaching goals and philosophy (e.g., reasons for teaching as one does, expectations of self and students);
   b. A review of what the candidate has learned about teaching during recent years, what pedagogical changes the candidate has made and what problems the candidate has encountered (solved and unsolved), and what actions the candidate has taken to attempt to resolve them;
   c. A statement of the candidate's teaching goals for the next several years and a plan for achieving those goals;
   d. A statement of how the candidate's teaching is tied to and shaped by Professional Life and Service.

2. Course Materials:

   a. List of all courses from the six most recent regular semesters in which the candidate taught, plus the most recent Intensive Learning course taught, if any. In addition, special topics courses, Intensive Learning courses, or other courses taught outside this time frame, which demonstrate the range and quality of the candidate's teaching may also be included;
   b. For each different course listed in 2.a. above, please include the following organized by course:
      i. Course syllabus/policy statement;
      ii. Final exams and selected tests/quizzes;
      iii. Selected assignments;
   c. Annotated list of independent studies including theses directed, honors in the major projects, summer scholars advised and URAP projects or internships supervised, or other instances in which you have facilitated student research or provided mentoring outside of regular class instruction or advising. Briefly (in one sentence or two) describe the nature of the project and your involvement;

3. Course Data:

   a. Grade distribution data for all courses from the six most recent regular semesters in which the candidate taught;
   b. Student evaluation numerical summary sheets for all courses from the six most recent regular semesters in which the candidate taught, and the most recent Intensive Learning course taught, if any;
   c. Student evaluation summative items for all courses from the six most recent regular semesters in which the candidate taught, and the most recent Intensive Learning course taught, if any.

4. Pedagogical Development:

   a. Annotated list of curricular innovations/contributions, emphasizing inclusion of recent developments in the field;
   b. Annotated list of pedagogical training, including on-campus workshops or seminars, off-campus training, seminars, workshops, or conferences attended. Please clarify your role (as participant or presenter) in these events;

5. Narrative Evaluations of Teaching:

   a. All supervisor's evaluation of teaching effectiveness within the years that include the six most recent regular semesters in which the candidate taught;
   b. An evaluation from the General Education Director (if one or more GST or INQ courses have been taught during the period of time for which evidence is being submitted);
   c. An evaluation from the Honors Program Director (if one or more HNRS courses have been taught during the period of time for which evidence is being submitted);

6. Other materials deemed appropriate may be submitted but are not required.

2.6.5.2 Professional Life

2.6.5.2.1 Evaluation Areas

Professional Life is an integral part of the job of any professor, as it defines us as researchers and educators. In considering a candidate for tenure or promotion, evaluators must examine the entire career of the candidate.   While the emphasis is on recent scholarly work, evaluators should consider the candidate's overall commitment to a scholarly life.

2.6.5.2.2 Evidence

1. Professional Life Narratives

   a. A statement of the significance the candidate attaches to professional life, and the challenges the candidate has encountered—solved and unsolved—and/or anticipates in conducting research, scholarship, and other forms of professional work;
   b. A statement of the candidate's professional life goals (i.e., research agenda) for the next several years and a plan to achieve those goals.

2. Professional Engagement

   a. List of professional meetings, short courses, workshops, and conferences attended;

b. Visits to museums, exhibitions, and concerts;
c. List of professional memberships;
d. Information on work towards an advanced degree.

3. Professional Activity

   a. List of workshops conducted;
   b. Information about service as a chair, panel member, discussant, or respondent at a professional meeting;
   c. Description of poster presentations;
   d. Description of paper presentations at regional professional meetings, including whether or not they were peer reviewed;
   e. List of invited reviews and services as referee for grants and manuscripts, including published book reviews;
   f. Information on internal grant proposals, including interim and final reports as appropriate;
   g. Information about student research or independent study projects supervised and how they contribute to the candidate's research program;
   h. Information on consulting, with a clear statement of how the work contributes to the candidate's research program;
   i. Description of body of sustained artistic work created
   j. List of professional awards.

4. Professional Productivity
   a. Descriptions of presentations at national and international professional forums, including whether or not they were peer reviewed;
   b. Description of refereed poster presentations;
   c. Descriptions of publications, including whether or not they were peer reviewed;
   d. Description of professional exhibitions, performances or recordings of artistic works or work in a permanent collection;
   e. Works in progress, including submissions under review, pending publications, invitations to exhibit, etc.;
   f. Information on external grant proposals or applications for Artist in Residency programs, including interim and final reports as appropriate;
   g. Professional service, which may encompass work as an officer in a professional organization, organizing a conference, chairing a conference panel, etc., including an explanation as to why these activities should be considered scholarly productivity rather than service (items included here may not be included under 2.6.4.3.2.5.a).

5. All supervisor's evaluations of Professional Life within the previous three years.

6. Other supporting materials deemed appropriate by the candidate or chair may be submitted but are not required.

2.6.5.3 Service

2.6.5.3.1 Evaluation Areas

1. Advising of students;

2. Service to the department;

3. Service to the College;

4. Service to the Profession (if appropriate);

5. Service to the Community (if appropriate).

2.6.5.3.2 Evidence

1. Service Narrative

The service narrative will demonstrate how the candidate's service supports the goals of the College. Faculty are inherently creative, and service needs across programs and communities can be very different. The narrative provides a place for candidates to highlight how they have served the College and explain the variety of their service obligations.

All faculty are expected to use the narrative to address how they have delivered competent and conscientious advising, the challenges encountered in advising (solved and unsolved), and what actions the candidate has taken to attempt to resolve them.

In addition:

Candidates who declare service as their secondary area will write a narrative explaining how their service represents a substantial enhancement beyond the responsibilities expected of all faculty, both in terms of time commitment and quality. This narrative will show the meaning in what they are doing, addressing their intentionality and how they have met the requirements for service at this level.

Candidates who declare service as their tertiary area will write a narrative illustrating how their regular or ongoing service contributions to the College show the candidate to be an engaged member of the Roanoke College community.

2. Advising:

    a. List of advising assignments including number of students advised and type of advising performed (e.g., majors, minors, interdisciplinary concentrations, first-years, transfers, and internationals);
    b. Both the numerical and the narrative portions of the College's survey of advisees for at least the three previous years.

3. Service to the department:

    a. Annotated list of leadership roles taken to further the goals of the department;
    b. Annotated list of departmental activities (e.g., work on changes to major/minor/concentrations, work on website, sponsoring departmental events, participation on departmental committees, etc.);
    c. List of departmental student organizations sponsored.

4. Service to the College:

    a. List of participation and leadership on college committees, groups and councils;
    b. Leadership in college professional activities (e.g., directing programs, administrative appointments, organizing campus-wide events, etc.);
    c. Participation in college professional activities (e.g., presenting at faculty forums and in the Elder Scholar program, orientation mentoring, etc.);

d. List of college-wide student organizations sponsored.
   e. Descriptions of other service activities that further the mission, purpose, or liberal learning goals of Roanoke College.

5. Service to the profession (if appropriate):

   a. Annotated list of appropriate professional service activities, including an explanation as to why these activities should be considered service rather than professional life (items included here may not be included under 2.6.4.2.2.4.g);
   b. List of leadership positions and offices held in professional organizations;
   c. External documentation of leadership positions and offices held.

6. Service to the Community (if appropriate):

   a. Annotated list of community service activities;
   b. External documentation of community service activities.

7. All supervisor's evaluations of Service within the previous three years.

8. An evaluation from the candidate's administrative supervisor (if the candidate receives release time for administrative duties.

9. Other supporting materials deemed appropriate by the candidate or chair may be submitted but are not required.

2.7 Tenure and Promotion Reviews

2.7.1 General Statements

Reviews at Roanoke College serve the purposes of ensuring that the faculty is fulfilling its responsibilities in seeking to pursue the mission, goals, and vision of the College, and that faculty ranks accurately reflect the accomplishments and contributions of each faculty member. Reviews are undertaken with appropriate seriousness and confidentiality, and are structured so that multiple evaluators contribute to the final outcome of any review.

2.7.2 Timing of Reviews

Deadlines for each step in the review process can be found below in the section entitled Review Timetables (Section 2.7.4).

2.7.2.1 Pre-Tenure Review

A pre-tenure review of faculty members will normally be performed in the third year; the purpose of the review is to advise candidates on their progress toward tenure. Faculty members who are granted academic credit for service at other institutions will be notified in the initial appointment letter of the academic years in which the pre-tenure and tenure reviews will occur.

In the spring prior to the deadline for submitting the dossier for review, candidates and their department chairs will be reminded by the Academic Dean of the upcoming review. At this time the candidate will be notified of the membership of the departmental review committee by its chair.

2.7.2.2   Tenure Review

The tenure review occurs when the faculty member is in the sixth year of service at the College and has attained the rank of at least Assistant Professor. Faculty members who are granted academic credit for service at other institutions will be notified in the initial appointment letter of the academic years in which the pre-tenure and tenure reviews will occur.

In the spring prior to the deadline for submitting the dossier for review, candidates and their department chairs will be reminded by the Academic Dean of the upcoming review. At this time the candidate will be notified of the membership of the departmental review committee by its chair.

2.7.2.3   Promotion Reviews

2.7.2.3.1   Promotion to Assistant Professor

Tenure-track faculty with a terminal degree normally enter Roanoke College at the rank of Assistant Professor. A person at the Instructor rank who completes the doctorate during the academic year may be considered immediately for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor. This promotion is not subject to the review procedures detailed below, but is granted by the Academic Dean, who will notify the faculty member in writing of this promotion and of the academic years in which the pre-tenure and tenure reviews will occur.

2.7.2.3.2   Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is usually conferred simultaneously with tenure. However, the Academic Dean may grant this rank to a new faculty member based on academic service and accomplishments at another institution.

2.7.2.3.3   Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is the highest faculty rank conferred by Roanoke College. Faculty members may apply for promotion to Professor no earlier than the fifth year since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Faculty members who are appointed to the rank of Associate Professor based on academic service at other institutions will be notified in the initial appointment letter of the academic year in which they will first be eligible to apply for promotion to Professor. In every case an individual must have served at least two years at Roanoke College.

In the spring prior to the deadline for submitting the dossier for review, candidates and their department chairs will be notified by the Academic Dean of their initial eligibility for promotion to Professor. Faculty members who wish to be reviewed in the following year must signal their intention in a letter addressed to the Academic Dean, the chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee, and their department chair. At this time the candidate will be notified of the membership of the departmental review committee by its chair by the date specified in 2.7.4.

Candidates for promotion to Professor may withdraw their application at any time prior to the dossier's submission to FPC.

2.7.2.4   Policies Affecting Timing of Reviews

A tenure-track faculty member may choose to delay the date of a pre-tenure or tenure review for one year any time during the probationary period. If a candidate chooses to delay the pre-tenure review, the tenure

review is also delayed to occur one year later than the date specified in the candidate's initial appointment letter. The candidate must inform the department chair and the Academic Dean in writing of the intention to delay the pre-tenure or tenure review. A candidate may do this at any time before the review in question, but no later than April 15 of the academic year prior to the scheduled time of review. If a candidate chooses to delay pre-tenure or tenure review, the candidate's eligibility for a sabbatical is delayed accordingly. This option to delay can only be exercised once by any candidate. Subsequent requests by a candidate for delays in the process would require the approval of the Academic Dean, in consultation with the department chair. In all cases, the additional year does not affect the professional life achievement levels required for tenure as defined in Section 2.6.3.6. That is, items included in the dossier as evidence in categories 2, 3 and 4 will be evaluated as if the tenure clock were "stopped" for one year. (For example, a candidate delaying a tenure review for one year, and being reviewed during their seventh year, would be evaluated as if only six years had transpired.)

2.7.3   Review Procedures

All reviews require the submission of a dossier by the candidate and its evaluation by the departmental committee, the department chair, and FPC. In the case of tenure and promotion reviews, the Academic Dean, the President, and the Board of Trustees are also included in the review process.

2.7.3.1   Dossier

2.7.3.1.1   Contents

Every candidate for review submits a dossier. The dossier should contain the following items:

1. a cover letter (on contents of the cover letter, see below);

2. a current curriculum vita;

3. letters of evaluation written by:

   a. the department chair (or Assistant Vice President if applicable);
   b. the departmental committee;
   c. the General Education Director (if one or more GST or INQ courses have been taught during the period of time for which evidence is being submitted);
   d. the Honors Program Director (if one or more HNRS courses have been taught during the period of time for which evidence is being submitted);
   e. the candidate's administrative supervisor (if the candidate receives release time for administrative duties);
   f. the chair of FPC documenting the results of the pre-tenure review (for tenure candidates only); candidates who have previously been denied promotion to full professor may include, at their discretion, the letter from FPC and/or the Academic Dean that resulted from that review.

4. all other materials required for evaluation in the areas of Teaching, Professional Life, and Service in reverse chronological order (see the items listed under Evaluation Areas and Materials in Section 2.6.4);

In the cover letter candidates should indicate:

1. the type of review (pre-tenure review, tenure, tenure with promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Professor);

2. the secondary area of emphasis (either professional life or service) under which the candidate for tenure or for promotion to Professor wishes to be evaluated. This declaration is necessary since a faculty member's secondary area of emphasis may have varied during the years under review. Candidates for promotion to Professor whose secondary area of emphasis since tenure has been split between Service and Professional Life should explain how their time has been allotted;

3. a request to meet with the departmental committee if desired. Any candidate who requests an interview must be granted one prior to the departmental committee's final voting on the candidate;

4. a request to meet with FPC if desired. Any candidate who requests an interview must be granted one prior to FPC's final voting on the candidate. All candidates have the right to appear before FPC without the presence of the department chair.

The dossier narratives allow candidates to interpret the various types of evidence contained in each section of the dossier and to present a holistic vision of their contributions as faculty members. While evaluators are free to interpret on their own the evidence presented, candidates are encouraged to contextualize and interpret any evidence they feel might present questions to evaluators (e.g., student or advising evaluation data). Candidates for promotion to Professor might wish to use the appropriate narrative to explain to evaluators that they have spent a number of years focused on the third area of evaluation rather than the declared secondary emphasis. The narratives also give candidates the opportunity to explain to evaluators outside their discipline the significance of their scholarly work (e.g., the types of publications completed, the contribution of work to the discipline overall).

Candidates should consult the document, "Guide to Assembling an FPC Dossier" for more detailed instructions on how to organize the dossier. FPC should reapprove this document every 5-7 years.

The candidate is also free to include any additional information deemed appropriate.

2.7.3.1.2 Submission

Candidates should contact the Dean's office for guidance in constructing an electronic dossier. Once prepared, the electronic dossier will be made available to the department chair, members of the departmental committee, and members of FPC. After the dossier has been reviewed within the candidate's department, the chair of the department and the chair of the departmental committee will provide their letters directly to the Academic Dean for incorporation into the dossier. A copy of the departmental committee's letter and the department chair's letter will be provided to the candidate. After a dossier has been submitted, the candidate may submit notification that a paper was published or accepted, a grant or fellowship awarded, a presentation accepted, or a performance invitation received. The candidate may not submit a revised narrative. FPC may request additional information if it conforms to the type of evidence allowed in the *Faculty Handbook*.

2.7.3.2 Evaluation of Evidence of Dossier

All evaluations of candidates' dossiers detailed below (by departmental committees, department chairs, FPC, the Academic Dean, and the President) must be done in light of the explicit criteria for tenure and promotion detailed in the *Faculty Handbook*. Multiple sources of evidence are included in the dossier, and evaluators are encouraged to give appropriate weight to each source in their deliberations.

Candidates for tenure should expect that evaluators will consider their dossier in light of the recommendations of their pre-tenure review. Candidates for promotion to Professor have the option of including in the dossier letters from FPC and/or Academic Dean that resulted from any previous reviews

for promotion to Professor. Such candidates can expect that evaluators will take these recommendations into account in their evaluation of the current dossier.

While recognizing the need for numerical evaluations (e.g., student course evaluations, advising evaluations, GPA-O/GPA-C), all evaluators are expected to interpret such numbers in the context of a candidate's overall profile of teaching responsibilities (e.g., general education courses, introductory courses, major courses, class size) and the limitations of the survey mechanism itself (e.g., the effect of outliers in small classes). Numerical evaluations, whether high, median, or low, are open to numerous interpretations, and given the importance of the decisions entrusted to them, evaluators ought not to rely too heavily on numerical evaluations.

Candidates for tenure and for promotion are required to declare a secondary area of emphasis since the secondary area of emphasis may have varied over the years under review. If evaluators deem that a candidate has not achieved the accomplishments required for tenure or promotion in that area, they may consider whether the candidate's accomplishments merit tenure or promotion based on the remaining area as a secondary area of emphasis. In brief, evaluators are not bound to a candidate's declaration of secondary emphasis.

The faculty and administration is aware that workload inequities exist at Roanoke College due to grants and various types of administrative appointments. It is not possible to create set rules that will adequately ameliorate these differences. All evaluators should, however, take these inequities into account in their evaluations.

2.7.3.2.1 Outcomes

As a result of the pre-tenure review, the candidate will receive evaluation letters that indicate one of the following: (a) that the candidate is making strong progress toward tenure, (b) that the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, or (c) that the candidate is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure. These letters are expected
to include sufficient detail to help candidates prepare for a successful tenure review.

As a result of the tenure review, the candidate will either (a) be awarded tenure and, if appropriate, promotion to Associate Professor or (b) be denied tenure and awarded a terminal one-year contract. In the latter case, evaluation letters should identify the areas in which the candidate did not meet the required criteria.

As a result of a review for promotion to Professor, the candidate will receive evaluation letters that indicate one of the following: (a) that promotion to Professor is recommended, (b) that the candidate is making progress toward promotion to Professor, or (c) that the candidate is not making satisfactory progress toward promotion to Professor. Letters not recommending promotion must include sufficient detail to help candidates prepare for a successful subsequent review.

2.7.3.3 Review of Dossier Within Department

All dossiers will be reviewed by both a departmental committee and the department chair.

2.7.3.3.1 Evaluation by Departmental Committee

2.7.3.3.1.1 Composition of Departmental Committee

Candidates will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, service, and professional life by a committee of no fewer than three members, usually consisting of all tenured members of their academic department excluding the candidate, the department chair, and any member of the department currently serving on the Faculty Personnel Committee. This committee will be convened by the department chair, but the committee chair will be chosen by the committee itself. All members of the committee are expected to participate in the committee's deliberations.

In the case of a conflict of interest, the Academic Dean may release a department member from service on a candidate's departmental committee. If there are not at least three tenured members of the department eligible to serve, the Academic Dean, in consultation with the department chair, tenured members of the department, and the candidate, will appoint one or more consenting, tenured Roanoke College faculty from other departments to the committee. In all cases, all members of the departmental committee must be tenured faculty members.

2.7.3.3.1.2 Procedures for Departmental Committee

Upon receiving access to the dossier, the committee chair will then arrange a meeting time that all members of the committee can attend.

Any candidate who requests an interview must be granted one prior to the departmental committee's final voting on the candidate. At its discretion, the departmental committee may request an interview with the candidate.

The departmental committee will evaluate the candidate's qualifications based on the criteria detailed in the *Faculty Handbook*. Since FPC will give serious weight to the recommendation of the departmental committee, especially in its evaluation of the candidate's level of professional life, the departmental committee should critically evaluate and interpret the candidate's achievements in light of that academic discipline. If the committee feels that a candidate does not meet some of the criteria, the committee should acknowledge this and, if it chooses, make a case for why the candidate nevertheless merits tenure and/or promotion. During voting on a candidate's review, any member of the committee may request a secret ballot.
Departmental Committees should consult the document, "Departmental Committee Guidelines" for more detailed instructions on how to evaluate the dossier. FPC should reapprove this document periodically to maintain consistency with the *Faculty Handbook*.

At the end of its deliberations, the chair of the departmental committee will draft a letter that communicates the majority opinion of the committee, but also gives voice to dissenting views. All members of the committee will be given opportunity to suggest revisions to the letter. The departmental committee's evaluation letter should follow the guidelines outlined in 2.7.3.2.

If the departmental committee wishes to meet with FPC, this request, along with the name of a representative of the committee, shall be made in the committee's evaluation letter. If FPC grants this request, the representative has the right to appear before FPC prior to its final voting on the candidate and without the presence of the department chair.

The departmental committee's recommendation letter will be added to the dossier and to the candidate's personnel file. Departmental committee chairs will also give one copy of the letter directly to the candidate.

2.7.3.3.2 Evaluation by Department Chair

If the candidate is currently the department chair, this step in the evaluation process will be skipped since the department chair is evaluated by the Academic Dean. In cases of a conflict of interest where an Assistant Vice President performs the evaluation of a faculty member, this step in the evaluation process will be completed by an Assistant Vice President rather than the department chair.

The department chair should evaluate candidates' dossiers in light of the same criteria and guidelines used by the departmental committee; in addition, this evaluation should be informed by the chair's interaction as chair with the candidate. If the department chair has not been chair during the entire period of time for which the candidate is being reviewed, the chair should consult with the previous department chair(s).

The department chair's evaluation should provide information about and/or address issues that would not necessarily be known by the departmental committee. Department chairs will usually be more aware of the candidate's service contributions to the department. Based on personal interaction with students and administrators, the chair may also be able to provide more insight into the candidate's teaching and advising. The department chair's evaluation letter should follow the guidelines outlined in 2.7.3.2.

If the chair wishes to meet with FPC, this request shall be made in the chair's evaluation letter. If FPC grants this request, the chair has the right to appear before FPC prior to its final voting on the candidate and without the presence of the candidate.

The department chair should also verify that the dossier contains all required materials and should notify the candidate of any omissions.

The chair's recommendation is sent to the Academic Dean, where it will be added to the candidate's dossier and entered in the candidate's personnel file. A copy of the letter will be provided to the candidate.

2.7.3.4   Review by Faculty Personnel Committee and the Academic Dean

At this stage candidates for the pre-tenure review are evaluated only by FPC. Their dossiers do not proceed to the President or the Board of Trustees. Candidates for all other reviews are at this point simultaneously reviewed by FPC and the Academic Dean, both of whom write independent letters evaluating the candidate's appropriateness for tenure and/or promotion. The following procedures are designed to help FPC and the Academic Dean come to a similar recommendation, but do not require their unanimity for the review to proceed to the President and the Board of Trustees.

2.7.3.4.1   Interviews

Any candidate who requests an interview must be granted one prior to FPC's final voting on the candidate. Departmental committees and department chairs may request an interview with FPC, but FPC is not required to grant an interview if it judges the evaluation letter sufficient. At its discretion, FPC may request interviews with candidates, representatives of departmental committees, or department chairs. FPC will attempt to meet with all candidates for tenure and for promotion; as time allows, it will seek to meet with other candidates. Candidates for review should not assume FPC's request for an interview indicates a problem with their review. FPC may interview other colleagues of the candidate only with the consent of the candidate.

No less than three days prior to a candidate's interview with FPC, the chair of the committee must submit to the candidate a list of questions raised by members of the committee. The questions asked by the committee during the interview, however, need not be limited to these questions.

All interviews must conform to appropriate ethical guidelines similar to those governing the interviewing of job candidates. Questions about a candidate's religion, political affiliation, disability, sexual orientation, family status and responsibilities, and reproductive choices, for example, may not be raised as they are not germane to the assessment of a candidate's qualifications for tenure or promotion.

2.7.3.4.2 Additional Sources of Evidence

In order to gain a more complete understanding of a candidate's teaching effectiveness, FPC may request from the Director of Institutional Research and Planning additional comparative data, which the committee can use to interpret the candidate's student evaluation reports.

2.7.3.4.3 Deliberation Guidelines

FPC and the Academic Dean will evaluate the candidate's qualifications based on the established criteria detailed in the *Faculty Handbook*. It is generally expected that FPC will give serious weight to the recommendations of the departmental committee and the department chair, especially in its evaluation of the candidate's level of professional life. Likewise, FPC will consider tenure dossiers in light of the recommendations of the candidate's pre-tenure review. If a candidate for promotion to Professor chooses to include letters from previous reviews for promotion to Professor, FPC will take these recommendations into account in its evaluation of the current dossier. In all these cases FPC nevertheless remains an independent body that has the responsibility of weighing each candidate's qualifications in light of the criteria approved by the Roanoke College faculty. During voting on a candidate's review, any member of the committee may request a secret ballot. FPC should attempt to achieve a majority vote for each candidate. If FPC is unable to do so, a tie vote will not be considered a negative or a positive recommendation.

While the Academic Dean is a member of FPC ex officio, FPC and the Academic Dean form independent evaluations of the candidate. The Academic Dean's role during FPC's meetings is therefore somewhat limited. The Academic Dean meets with the Committee during its deliberations and interviews, but does not participate in debate beyond acting as a resource for members of FPC to answer relevant questions about the candidate. In addition, the Academic Dean does not participate in, and should not be present during, the committee's final voting on the candidate or the committee's composition of its letter of recommendation.

2.7.3.4.4 Post Deliberation Procedures

In the case of pre-tenure reviews, FPC sends its letter of recommendation (see the guidelines outlined in 2.7.3.2.1) to the candidate, whose review is now complete.

In all other reviews for tenure and for promotion, FPC and the Academic Dean will inform each other of their recommendation for each candidate. The Academic Dean and FPC will meet to review their recommendations. If the recommendations differ, both the Academic Dean and FPC will articulate clearly the reasons for their recommendations. This will be followed by a discussion attempting to resolve this discrepancy. If consensus cannot be reached, at the very least both the Academic Dean and FPC will have a clear understanding of the reasons for their disagreement. After this discussion both the Academic Dean and FPC may choose to revise their original recommendation. The Academic Dean and FPC's evaluation letters should follow the guidelines outlined in 2.7.3.2.1.

The Academic Dean and the chair of FPC will submit their final letters of recommendation to the President of the College and to the candidate (with copies to each other). To protect the candidate's right to privacy the chair of FPC should destroy FPC's copy of the Academic Dean's letter at the end of that academic year.

Upon receipt of these letters of recommendation, the candidate may initiate an appeal (see Section 2.7.3.6). In light of the deadline for submitting an appeal, the recommendation letters of the Academic Dean and FPC should be sent via campus email by the date specified in 2.7.4.

2.7.3.5 Review by President

The President reviews the recommendations of the Academic Dean, the Faculty Personnel Committee, and, if applicable, the Faculty Grievance Committee. In cases where the recommendations of the Academic Dean and FPC diverge, the President should seek to understand the precise cause for this disagreement and may, at their discretion, meet with the Academic Dean, an appropriate representative of FPC or FGC, or the candidate. In any case, the President's recommendation must be made in light of the explicit criteria for tenure and promotion detailed in the *Faculty Handbook*.

The President sends notice of their recommendation to the candidate, the Academic Dean, and the Faculty Personnel Committee. In cases where the recommendations of FPC and the Academic Dean have diverged or in cases where the President's recommendation differs from the unanimous recommendation of the Academic Dean and FPC, the President must explain the reasons for this recommendation in that letter.

The President's favorable recommendations for tenure and for promotion are sent to the College Life Committee of the Board of Trustees. These recommendations become final only when they have been approved by the Executive Committee and by the Board of Trustees. Additionally, where the President's recommendation differs from the unanimous recommendation of the Academic Dean and FPC, the President sends copies of their recommendation to the College Life Committee of the Board of Trustees along with the recommendations of FPC and the Academic Dean for review.

2.7.3.6 Appeals

The faculty member may initiate an appeal to the chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) within 30 days of the date of receiving the letters from the Academic Dean, the chair of FPC, or the President.

Upon receipt of the faculty member's grievance, the FGC forms a Mediation Panel (see 2.16.3.2-3) which attempts to resolve the situation informally. If the Mediation Panel comes to an impasse, it will recommend that either (a) FGC hear the case on procedural grounds, or (b) the President consider it on substantive grounds. In cases containing both substantive and procedural grounds, the case will be sent to the President to review both claims. In the case of procedural grounds, the FGC will schedule a formal hearing and proceed with an FGC Review as outlined in Section 2.16.3.4.1.

2.7.4 Review Timetables

Timetable for Pre-Tenure Review

April 1	Academic Dean notifies candidate of review in following academic year
April 15	Candidate notifies Academic Dean of desire to delay pre-tenure review
April 25	In consultation with Academic Dean, Department Chair notifies pre-tenure candidate of membership of departmental committee and identity of committee chair
January 10	Submission of pre-tenure dossier for review
January 31	Submission of Department Chair's and Departmental Committee's Evaluation Letters to the Academic Dean, copies of Department Chair's and Departmental Committee's Evaluation Letters provided to the candidate
April 15	Candidate's receipt of evaluation by Faculty Personnel Committee

Timetable for Tenure and Promotion Review

April 1	Academic Dean notifies candidate of review in following academic year; in the case of candidates for promotion to Professor, Academic Dean notifies candidate of eligibility for review in the following year
April 15	Candidate notifies Academic Dean of desire to delay tenure review
April 20	Candidate for promotion to Professor notifies Academic Dean of intent to be reviewed in the following year
April 25	In consultation with Academic Dean, Department chair notifies candidate of membership of departmental committee and identity of committee chair
August 20	Submission of dossiers for review for tenure and promotion
September 24	Submission of Department Chair's and Departmental Committee's Evaluation Letters to the Academic Dean, copies of Department Chair's and Departmental Committee's Evaluation Letters provided to the candidate
December 15	Candidate's receipt of recommendations of Faculty Personnel Committee and the Academic Dean (for tenure, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and for promotion to Professor)
February 1	Candidate's receipt of President's recommendation (for tenure, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and for promotion to Professor)
May 1	Candidate's receipt of Board's response to President's recommendation