

PART I: BYLAWS AND IMPLEMENTING POLICIES

A. Bylaws of the Faculty

Preamble

We, the members of the faculty of Hobart and William Smith Colleges, hereby constitute ourselves a collegiate body under that title. We agree to conduct all proceedings appropriate to that collective character according to the following Bylaws. We define the scope of those proceedings as the exercise of all powers and duties conferred upon, delegated to, or inherent in the faculty. Moreover, we declare as our special responsibility the maintenance and improvement in the Colleges of their academic quality, in which we include the mastery and advancement of scholarly accomplishment in our various disciplines, the communication and exploration of this learning with our students by our teaching and example, and our common dedication to the life of the mind.

In establishing these Bylaws we recognize the overriding authority of the Board of Trustees of the Colleges, the Charter of Hobart and William Smith Colleges, and the applicable statutes of New York State and the Regents of the University of the State of New York. No provision of the Bylaws shall in any way conflict with, or be construed to conflict with, any provision of the Bylaws of the Board, of the Charter of these Colleges, or of the Statutes of the State or the Regents.

Article 1. The Faculty of the Colleges

Section a. Colleges Faculty

The faculty of Hobart and William Smith Colleges consists of the instructional faculty, including Full Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Instructors, faculty awarded Emeritus status, and Visiting Professors; the President; the Dean of Faculty and Provost; the Associate Provost; the Dean of Hobart College; the Dean of William Smith College; the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid and the Director of Admissions; the Chaplain; the Registrar; and the Librarian, the Visual Arts Curator, and the members of the Library Staff who have been accorded faculty status. [REVISED December 2013]

Any and all privileges and responsibilities granted by these Bylaws to the members of the administration shall in no way forfeit the faculty's ultimate control of its own affairs. Therefore, the faculty reserves the right to alter any portion of these Bylaws dealing with the privileges and responsibilities granted to the administration by these Bylaws by a simple majority vote. Privileges removed from an administrative position may not be claimed by the holder of that position by virtue of his or her simultaneous appointment as full-time teacher. "Administrator" and "administration" refer to individuals other than the instructional faculty cited above.

Section b. Appointment to the Faculty

A candidate for a position as Assistant Professor is interviewed by the departmental or program hiring committee and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. A written recommendation from the hiring committee to appoint is forwarded to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, along with any dissenting opinions of other members of the department/program. An appointment is made by the President, or in his or her absence by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, upon recommendation of the hiring committee.

A person who is a candidate for a position as Associate Professor or Full Professor shall be interviewed not only by the hiring committee, but also by the members of the Committee on the Faculty, and the views of each member of the Committee on the Faculty will be considered before a decision is reached on extending an offer of appointment. The appointment is made by the President, or in his or her absence, by the Dean of Faculty and

Provost, upon written recommendation of the hiring committee and after consultation with the Committee on the Faculty. The review schedule for such upper-level appointments will be agreed upon at the time of appointment but normally Review II will occur not earlier than during the fifth semester of teaching.[REVISED May 2009]

A familial relationship to another member of the Colleges' community (trustees, faculty, administration, staff, and students) is not a barrier to employment by the Colleges. Spouses, partners, and other relatives of Colleges' community members are considered for appointment, promotion, retention, tenure, and all other rights on the same basis as those who are not related to others in the Colleges' community. However, such community members will neither initiate nor participate in any decision involving direct benefit (initial appointment, retention, promotion, salary, leave, tenure, etc.) to members of their immediate families.

Each new tenure track faculty member will be given a copy of the Faculty Handbook which contains the bylaws describing the standards and procedures for contract renewal and all reviews and promotions and a copy of his/her departmental/program review Standards and Criteria (SAC). Before the eighth week of the faculty member's first semester, the Dean of Faculty and Provost will arrange a meeting with the faculty member and his/her department or program chair to discuss the appointment letter and the departmental/program SAC. After the end of classes in the faculty member's first semester on campus, the department/program chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss teaching during the first semester, examine all course evaluations and identify areas of strength and weakness. Typically, this will occur within one month. These meetings will continue to take place after each semester the faculty member teaches until the faculty member undergoes Review II. Typically, another colleague whom the candidate has given permission to read his/her evaluations will also attend that meeting. [REVISED November 2011]

Normal Appointment Schedules

Normally, an Assistant Professor with no previous full-time teaching experience is engaged for an initial period of two years. His or her contract is renewed in the second year for an additional two years upon the recommendation of his or her department/program. If the fourth year is not to be terminal, a third appointment is made which is for a period of four years beginning at the end of the third year of service (Table 1). A decision to make an appointment with tenure is made before the end of the sixth year of service.

Table 1:

| | Year 1 | | Year 2 | | Year 3 | | Year 4 | | Year 5 | | Year 6 | | Year 7 | |
|----------------------------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr |
| Initial Appointment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Renewal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Second Appointment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review I | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Third Appointment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review II | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

An Associate Professor or Full Professor is engaged for four years. A decision to renew the appointment with tenure is made before the end of the third year of service

Table 2:

| | Year 1 | | Year 2 | | Year 3 | | Year 4 | |
|----------------------------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr | Fall | Spr |
| Initial Appointment | | | | | | | | |
| Review II | | | | | | | | |

An Instructor is engaged on a one-year contract. The decision to engage an Instructor is normally made by a departmental or program hiring committee in consultation with the Dean of Faculty and Provost. No wider faculty approval is required. An Instructor's contract may be renewed three times, but ordinarily it will not be renewed a fourth time (for a fifth year), unless the Instructor has qualified for consideration for promotion to Assistant Professor by attaining the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree.

A candidate for a professorial position, whose professional degree has not been conferred at the time of appointment, may hold the appointment as an Instructor until the Colleges are notified formally that he or she has completed all of the requirements of his or her degree. His or her appointment at professorial rank is then effective the date on which the official notification is received. After that time, normal procedures for promotions apply.

Section c. Promotion of Faculty

Consideration for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor is given to a full-time Instructor immediately on attainment of the Ph.D., other appropriate terminal degree, or equivalent scholarly distinction. No assurance of promotion can be given to Instructors who do not hold the doctorate, other appropriate terminal degree, or equivalent scholarly distinction.

The doctorate, other appropriate terminal degree, or equivalent scholarly distinction is required for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Full Professor.

Assistant Professors normally serve six years in rank. Promotion to Associate Professor normally follows a successful Review II.

Associate Professors normally serve six years in rank before being considered for promotion. A Full Professorship is the highest rank the Colleges can confer on a member of the faculty. Promotion to Full Professor

normally follows a successful Review III.

Part-time faculty are eligible for promotion, as described in the following.

From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: The doctorate, other appropriate terminal degree, or equivalent scholarly distinction is prerequisite for promotion. Part-time faculty become eligible after teaching 30 semester or semester-equivalent courses.

From Associate Professor to Full Professor: Part-time faculty become eligible after teaching 30 semester or semester-equivalent courses.

Section d. Standards for Tenure and Reappointment

General Considerations

Hobart and William Smith Colleges seek to appoint and retain faculty members who will be talented and committed teachers, who will demonstrate quality in their professional work and who will provide valuable service to the Colleges and the community. Therefore, the Colleges' aim is to assist the growth of individual faculty members by encouraging programs of personal and professional development; by rigorously evaluating their teaching, scholarship, and community service; by providing detailed and constructive feedback on their development as educators, scholars, and members of the community; and by making informed and serious judgments regarding contractual renewal and tenure within a reasonably open process of consultation, discussion, and shared information.

An individual's qualifications must be judged as a whole and each person's contributions will be greater in some areas than in others. The weighing of a faculty member's several contributions to the Colleges' community cannot be accomplished entirely by formula, but certain guidelines should systematically be invoked. Because Hobart and William Smith Colleges are devoted chiefly to undergraduate education, demonstrable excellence in teaching is of paramount importance. Significant scholarly achievement is a second, but still essential, criterion. Meaningful and consistent service to the Colleges and the community is seen as a third measure and is an essential part of the normal and expected duties of faculty members.

1. Teaching

Teaching is a complex task which helps students to gain knowledge, understanding, and skill in academic areas of study (both disciplinary and interdisciplinary). It enables students to use ideas for themselves in creative, open-minded, and analytic ways, empowering them to function fully as individuals and citizens. The evaluation of teaching requires consideration of several qualities reflected in the faculty member's performance: commitment to teaching, effectiveness as a teacher, and mastery of an area of knowledge.

Hobart and William Smith Colleges consider a genuine professional commitment to teaching to be essential. Commitment to teaching may be as well demonstrated by a quiet and deliberative manner as by more dramatic approaches. It transcends the boundaries of the classroom, finding form in a wide range of activities: structure and organization of courses, the assessment of and response to student work, innovative curriculum development, formal advising and informal conversations, the encouragement of independent creative or scholarly work, the creation and supervision of internships, the incorporation of service learning into courses, directing off-campus programs, field work, and other related activities.

Faculty members must be effective teachers. Though difficult to measure, effectiveness should include an ability to present students with the subject matter in a way which generates intellectual enthusiasm, encourages

original scholarly or creative work, and results in student work that demonstrates critical thinking and an understanding of the central insights of the area of study. An effective teacher adheres to high intellectual standards, and responds to the work of students with fair, timely, and constructive methods of evaluation. Evidence that a faculty member is effective in fostering independent thinking and research and serves as a mentor may include, but is not limited to, the supervision of honors projects, independent studies, MAT theses, summer research projects, course equivalents and internships.

Teaching cannot be considered wholly apart from scholarship and the mastery of an area of knowledge. Faculty members must bring their commitment to their area of study and their own original research or creative work into their teaching through, for instance, the inclusion of recent developments in their area of study in course content and the modeling of intellectual engagement.

Faculty members should reflect in their teaching both depth and breadth, including the best and most rigorous work in their area of study, an attention to the broader outlines of the field, and commitment to the general curriculum. At these Colleges, teaching involves not only one's students but one's colleagues, and requires mutual respect and consideration. Its evaluation takes into account both what the teacher intends, what the teacher does, and what effects such activity has upon students and colleagues.

While faculty will be evaluated on the basis of the Colleges-wide standards and criteria expressed in these bylaws, we acknowledge that teaching takes diverse forms across the Colleges' disciplines and programs. For that reason, each department and program will articulate how it applies the general standards for teaching in its review of faculty. Each departmental/program Standards and Criteria (SAC) document will describe:

1. the nature of effective teaching in the given department/program;
2. how the department/program will evaluate teaching;
3. evidence of effective teaching expected by the time of each review;
4. any other factors relevant to reviews of teaching in this field.

2. Scholarship

Hobart and William Smith Colleges expect that this faculty will accomplish high levels of scholarship in all its forms. It is important not only in the advancement of human knowledge, but also in the improvement of teaching, as a means of refreshing and revitalizing the Colleges' community, and as an indicator of the Colleges' understanding of their larger social responsibilities.

Scholarship denotes original research in a field or discipline, inclusive of its equivalent expression in the creative arts. It seeks to advance the frontiers of knowledge, or to provide new insights into old problems, new interpretations, or continuing questions.

Scholarship may take the form of peer-approved public presentation of work, such as publication in scholarly journals, monographs or book-length studies, presentations of papers at scholarly conferences, or public performances and exhibition of creative work. Such demonstrations reflect a vital connection to one's peers in the field and make such work available to the criticism and insights of those best able to judge it. However, the form of scholarly work varies with both the discipline and the reference group for which it is intended. For example, it can include works which interpret one's field to a general rather than a professional audience, unpublished manuscripts, participation in the proceedings of learned societies, lectures to knowledgeable public groups, and participation in colloquia or panel discussions at one's own or other institutions.

The Colleges recognize that scholarship occurs both within and between traditional academic disciplines. Wherever such work is offered for evaluation it will be referred to its appropriate reference group for comment.

While faculty will be evaluated on the basis of the Colleges-wide standards and criteria expressed in these bylaws, we acknowledge that scholarship takes diverse forms across the Colleges' disciplines and programs. For that reason, each department and program will articulate how it applies the general standards for scholarship in its review of faculty. Each SAC document will describe:

1. the nature of scholarship in the given department/program;
2. how the department/program will evaluate diverse scholarly work;
3. record of achievement expected by the time of each review; and
4. any other factors relevant to reviews of scholarship in this field.

3. Community Service

Faculty at Hobart and William Smith Colleges are members of multiple, overlapping communities. These include the department or program into which the faculty member is appointed, other programs with which she/he is involved, the Colleges as a larger whole and professional organizations and projects external to the Colleges. Each of these spheres requires commitment of faculty time, yet it is unlikely that an individual faculty member will be equally active in all areas. For these reasons, the evaluative process in this category must be flexible and inclusive. Community service cannot be considered as a substitute for achievement in teaching and scholarly development, but it does constitute an important contribution to the Colleges. Moreover, when a faculty member has been asked to carry an abnormal load of such duties, that circumstance will be considered when evaluating the individual's scholarly development as part of an overall review.

While faculty will be evaluated on the basis of the Colleges-wide standards and criteria expressed in these bylaws, we acknowledge that various disciplines and programs may define community service very differently. For that reason, departments and programs are required to address this category in their SAC documents, by describing:

1. the nature of community service in the given department/program;
2. how the department/program will evaluate service in the several different communities to which the faculty member belongs;
3. record of community service expected by the time of each review;
4. any other factors relevant to the review of community service in this department/program.

Section e. Standards, criteria, and procedures for contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion

General considerations

Criteria used in the evaluation and decision-making process are to be made clear at the time the candidate is hired. These standards and criteria include the College-wide principles articulated in the bylaws for teaching, scholarship, and community service and the particular standards and criteria articulated in the departmental and/or program SAC document.

Decisions on contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be based on appropriate evidence carefully gathered in a manner consistent with maintaining the high intellectual and professional aspirations of the faculty and a sense of common purpose. Confidentiality shall be maintained at every stage of the process and concerning all matters of substance involved in the review by all members of the faculty who have the responsibility of reviewing a candidate. Confidentiality must be maintained even after a review has been completed, except when the review is being appealed under the provisions of the bylaws. In that case, individuals involved in the contract

renewal or review must respond to any questions of the Grievance Panel. The maintaining of confidentiality is a professional obligation to the members of the community and breaking it endangers the integrity of the whole community.

Specific procedures for evaluation should be governed by the overriding principle of providing a system for making informed, fair decisions which will at the same time protect colleagues from excessive scrutiny, abusive or arbitrary treatment, or disruption of their teaching, while assisting their intellectual and professional growth.

1. Contract renewal

a. Standards and criteria

The contract renewal evaluation allows the department/program and the candidate to take early stock of their relationship, with an eye to the future. If the original hiring process went well, there is no reason to expect that the candidate will be found wanting. On the other hand, it is far better for the candidate, the department/program, and the Colleges that a negative decision, if indicated, be made now rather than later.

Effective teaching is the primary consideration. At this stage, the candidate should be aware of his or her strengths and weaknesses as a teacher and actively seeking ways to ameliorate any difficulties encountered in the first year. Evidence to be considered will include student course evaluations and materials submitted by the candidate. The scholarly literature on student course evaluations shows that they reflect the implicit biases of students and are a flawed method for assessing teaching quality. Using student course evaluations to measure teacher quality confers differential advantages/disadvantages on faculty members along lines of gender, race and other axes of inequality. Additionally, a tenure process that uses numerical evaluation benchmarks can create a higher hurdle for some candidates and can negatively influence the tenure decision in an unfair and biased manner. All parties in the process of review (departmental/program committee, COTAP committee, Provost and President) will recognize that course topic and such factors as appearance, ableness, gender, gender expression, race, language, nationality, age, sexuality, religion, and other social positionalities affect how students evaluate the candidate. [Revised January 2016] Scholarly promise, as indicated by the candidate's curriculum vitae is a secondary consideration. There are no requirements for community service at this point.

b. Procedures

The department/program chair will meet with the candidate by the third week of the fall semester in the candidate's second year to discuss the contract renewal process. Deliberations on renewal will be completed by mid-November.

Participating in contract renewal deliberations will be all members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as 'on-going part-time' for at least one year. No spouses or partners of candidates are eligible to serve. Departmental/program faculty on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The department/program chair will assemble the materials to be considered in the contract renewal deliberations, including student course evaluations. The candidate will submit to the chair any materials he or she believes will be helpful to these deliberations. At the minimum, the candidate will submit a curriculum vitae and course syllabi, and any other materials the department/program chair, the faculty involved, or the Provost and Dean of Faculty request. The chair will draft a brief summary of the materials and convene a meeting of participating

faculty to determine their recommendation for or against renewal.

Based on this meeting, the chair will write a letter to the Dean of Faculty and Provost with the departmental/program recommendation for or against renewal. Recommendations need not be elaborately documented, but they should at least outline the procedures followed, and the department/program must be prepared to explain a negative finding. Negative recommendations are sent to Review I/III COTAP to be reviewed for procedural adequacy before administrative action. The Dean of Faculty and Provost makes the final decision concerning renewal, but normally follows the recommendation of the department/program. The Dean of Faculty and Provost will send to the candidate a letter of contract renewal or a letter stating that the contract is not renewed, with a copy sent to the department/program chair. A candidate will be provided reasons for non-renewal, in writing, if he or she so requests.

In case of a decision not to renew the contract, the candidate has the right to request a reconsideration of this decision. The unsuccessful candidate is also entitled to file a grievance, as outlined in the Faculty Bylaws, if he or she believes the decision was made with inadequate or improper consideration, or that it involved discrimination or a violation of academic freedom. Unsuccessful candidates who elect to grieve must understand that such proceedings may extend the case beyond December 15, the AAUP-recommended deadline for notification of non-reappointment in a faculty member's second year, and that, unless a proceeding has resulted in a reversal of the non-renewal decision, the candidate's employment contract ends with the academic year in which the decision was made.

2. Review I. For a Four-Year Reappointment [Revised January 2016]

a. Standards and criteria of the Colleges

Review I is both evaluative and diagnostic. It is designed to make a broad judgment of a faculty member's suitability for retention and to recommend any changes necessary to meet the standards for tenure by the time of Review II.

Substantial evidence of a high quality of teaching is of primary importance. Evidence of a degree of scholarly development, inclusive of its equivalent expression in the creative arts, sufficient to warrant the expectation of significant achievement by the time of the tenure review is also necessary. Contributions to department/program activities in particular and to the Colleges' community life in general are important but are given less weight than teaching or scholarship. The particular standards and criteria articulated for Review I in the candidate's departmental/program SAC document will be applied.

By the time of Review I, there should be evidence of a candidate's progress in achieving the characteristics of teaching excellence (not in rank order):

1. Inspires students to significant interest and accomplishment
2. Is a committed teacher
3. Upholds high intellectual standards
4. Encourages independent work
5. Instills critical habits of thought
6. Is innovative in course design, where appropriate
7. Conveys central insights of the discipline
8. Is knowledgeable and continually engaged in the subjects taught
9. Is fair in assessing student performance
10. Is effective in student advising.

In this review, the candidate's scholarship will be evaluated on the basis of the following aspects, ranked in order of importance:

1. The quality and originality of the candidate's published and other forms of scholarly work, including its advancement of knowledge, providing insights into problems, and offering new interpretations of ongoing questions;
2. Scholarly and professional reputation inside and outside the Colleges; and
3. Value as a resource to the department/program, and the intellectual community.

By the time of Review I, the candidate's scholarship will be characterized by:

1. Publication or clear evidence of substantial progress towards publication of work in an initial area of research, usually that of the dissertation or its equivalent; and
2. Initiation of work that moves beyond the focus of the dissertation or equivalent, or that explores this area more deeply; and
3. Clear articulation of a plan for continued scholarship which can reasonably be expected to lead to the level of scholarly achievement required at the time of Review II.

By the time of Review I, the candidate's community service may be characterized by, among other things:

1. Service within the department/program;
2. Participation in campus decision-making, through faculty meetings, etc.; and
3. Service in professional arenas in the wider community.

b. Roles, responsibilities, and procedures for Review I

General considerations

Review I is conducted by a departmental/program review committee, hereafter referred to as the Review I Committee. Review I normally occurs in the third year of full-time teaching, and is designed both to provide feedback to the faculty member in order to help her/him succeed at the Colleges, and to give that faculty member's colleagues an opportunity to make a judgment on his/her suitability for retention. The review will take into account and reflect a wide body of evidence, described below. [Revised November 2009]

1. Roles and responsibilities in Review I

a. Review I Committee

The main responsibility for this review lies with the Review I Committee of the department/program into which the candidate was hired. This body assembles the candidate's file and prepares the report which is both diagnostic and evaluative and which makes a recommendation for or against a four-year reappointment. Review I Committees can be constituted as either a committee of the whole, in which all voting members participate in all meetings, or as a sub-committee that meets on its own to discuss the case and prepare a report and recommendation, after which the sub-committee sends the report and recommendation to other departmental/program voting members, with whom it meets to discuss the report and take a final vote.

Those eligible to serve and to vote are all members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as 'on-going part-time' for at least one year. Spouses, partners, or relatives of candidates are not eligible to serve or to participate in any way in the review. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave may serve on the Review I Committee, but are not required to do so. Department/program members on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The Review I Committee will consist of at least four persons and its composition must be approved by Review I/III COTAP before the review commences. At least three persons will be members of the department/program who are eligible and able to serve (exceptions below), while one will be a tenured faculty member in a different division. This non-departmental/non-program faculty member is selected by the Review I Committee chair after consultation with the rest of the Committee, and is subject to approval by both the candidate and the chair of Review I/III COTAP.

In departments/programs with fewer than three eligible faculty members able to serve, the Review I Committee shall consist of as many eligible faculty members as are able to serve, plus other eligible faculty members selected from the faculty as a whole by the available eligible departmental/program members and the candidate, subject to approval by Review I/III COTAP and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The Review I Committee will be constituted when four eligible faculty members have been selected in this way and approved by Review I/III COTAP.

Each Review I Committee will have a sub-committee of three students, elected by majors and minors from among themselves, with representation of both Hobart and William Smith. (If this dual representation poses an undue burden, the department/program must receive an exemption from Review I/III COTAP.) The role of this sub-committee will be to summarize student input on the candidate's teaching in a short report to the Review I Committee. The students will present their findings to the Committee, and these findings will be reflected in the Review I Committee report. The students' signed report will become part of the candidate's file.

When the Dean of Faculty and Provost in consultation with a department/program and Review I/III COTAP agree that there is a well-founded basis, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may appoint a tenured member of the faculty to advise a department/program on procedure in conducting its faculty reviews. The consulting faculty member will attend all organizational and deliberative meetings, but will not read the files and will not be involved in substantive discussions.

b. Departmental/Program Faculty

Because colleagues within the candidate's department/program are likely to be most knowledgeable about the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, especially in teaching and scholarly work, their role in Review I is to submit letters which, like the report, are both evaluative and diagnostic. Letters should be based on the colleague's own observations and experiences, not on the contents of the file as assembled at the time of the review. All departmental/program faculty will be invited to write a letter. Each colleague participating in the review will have the opportunity to comment on all materials in the file during the discussion of the case and the Review I Committee report.

By the beginning of the second year of service, formal classroom observations for review purposes must commence. A completed classroom observation regimen consists of 2 visits to the same class in one semester by the same faculty member. At least two faculty members will have completed a classroom observation regimen for the candidate by the end of the first semester of the third year of service (in other words, the last semester before Review 1).

In general, these observations should be conducted by faculty members of the observed faculty member's department or program. In rare circumstances, observations for review purposes may be conducted by faculty outside of an observed faculty member's department or program; however, observations conducted by outside faculty must be approved by Review I/III CoTAP prior to the observation. All faculty who have completed a classroom observation regimen should include comments on those classroom visits in their departmental letters, or write a separate letter based on those classroom observations. (Rare circumstances include those in which there is no faculty member in the department or program who has the expertise required to evaluate the classroom performance

of the observed faculty member, e.g., in an area studies program where no one in the program is sufficiently fluent in the language in which the observed faculty member is teaching, or where there are not at least two colleagues additional to the candidate in the department/program.) In general, classroom observation procedures and documentation should follow the classroom observation guidelines set out in the Faculty Handbook, Section VIII.2 [REVISED May 2012]

If the faculty member undergoing Review I works with and has responsibilities in a program, but is chiefly connected to a department, program faculty are especially encouraged to write individual letters concerning the candidate. The program as a whole will prepare a recommendation only if it or the candidate specifically requests it. In these cases the program is not obligated to undertake a full review, but will have access to the candidate's file and will meet to discuss and draft a recommendation based on evidence.

c. The Candidate

The candidate's responsibility is to provide to the Review I Committee the majority of the materials necessary for an informed evaluation of his/her teaching, scholarship, and community service. A central piece will be a statement that presents, explains, and assesses the candidate's own record to date. The statement will include three sections:

1. teaching: a discussion of teaching philosophy and teaching performance, aims and accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses;
2. scholarship: description of the work pursued and accomplished since the completion of the dissertation or equivalent, plans for future work, and the candidate's own location in the discipline;
3. community service: a report on candidate's college-wide, departmental and/or program activities, as well as activity in the larger community.

To support this statement, the candidate will also provide a curriculum vitae, copies of all course syllabi and selected course materials (such as exams, assignments, paper topics, other miscellaneous communication with students), and copies of all scholarship completed to date, as well as unpublished work she/he wishes to be considered. The candidate may also provide miscellaneous material that speaks to the candidate's work, such as invitations to speak or present work in other classes or other schools. The candidate will also be asked to provide the names of Hobart & William Smith colleagues who should be contacted for comments on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and/or community service. Finally, the candidate will be asked to provide responses to the reports of the Review I Committee and Review I/III COTAP.

d. Review I/III COTAP

Review I/III COTAP's role in Review I is to examine the candidate's file, read the Review I Committee report, and prepare its own recommendation. Review I/III COTAP will assess teaching, scholarship, and community service from the perspective of the Colleges as a whole, according to general Colleges' standards as expressed in the Bylaws and articulated in the departmental/program SAC document. [Revised May 2013] Any member of Review I/III COTAP who is a member of the candidate's department/program will recuse himself/herself from Review I/III COTAP's deliberations and discussions of the case. The Review I/III COTAP member is eligible to serve on the candidate's Review I Committee.

e. The Dean of Faculty and Provost

The Dean of Faculty and Provost may be involved in determining the composition of departmental/program review committees. The Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, is responsible for determining when each candidate's file is complete and ready to be read by the members of Review I/III COTAP.

The Dean of Faculty and Provost reads the candidate's file, including the Review I Committee and Review I/III COTAP reports, and makes a final determination on the outcome of Review I, following any meetings with the Review I Committee or Review I/III COTAP she/he deems necessary.

2. Specific Procedures for Review I

a. Assembling the Candidate's File

The candidate will provide his/her required materials to the Review I Committee between December 15 and January 15 of the academic year in which Review I is occurring. The completed file is due in the Provost's Office by the third Monday of February.

In most cases, review of the candidate's scholarship and/or teaching materials by external reviewers is unnecessary. However, in exceptional cases in which the Review I Committee lacks the expertise to evaluate a candidate's materials, the Review I Committee and/or the candidate may appeal to the Provost and Dean of Faculty for permission to seek up to three external reviews. Such appeals should be submitted to the Provost and Dean of Faculty as soon as possible, but not later than three months before the review is due. If s/he decides to approve such a request, the Provost and Dean of Faculty will stipulate the details of the process in consultation with the department or program, the Chair of Review I/III COTAP, and the candidate. [REVISED September 2011]

The Review I Committee will solicit comments from students who have taken a course with the candidate, using a letter developed by Review I/III COTAP. This letter will be sent to all currently matriculated students and to alumni/ae who have taken one or more courses with the candidate. All comments from respondents must be signed unless transmitted through a secure electronic system provided by the IT department. [REVISED November 2009] The report will include the number of students contacted and the percentage responding, as well as copies of the letter(s) sent out to students and a record of the date(s) they were sent.

A summary of student course evaluation forms will be completed for each course either by the student subcommittee or by faculty members of the Review I Committee. For each course section, the number of evaluations in the file, the number of students in the course, and the percent of students completing evaluations will be indicated. For each course taught, there must be a systematic summary and assessment of the student evaluations. The department- or program-specific summary may be in prose or in a numerical format. The summary of College-wide questions will be in numerical format. The methods and procedures used in preparing these summaries should be explained in the Review I Committee report.

The scholarly literature on student course evaluations shows that they reflect the implicit biases of students and are a flawed method for assessing teaching quality. Using student course evaluations to measure teacher quality confers differential advantages/disadvantages on faculty members along lines of gender, race and other axes of inequality. Additionally, a tenure process that uses numerical evaluation benchmarks can create a higher hurdle for some candidates and can negatively influence the tenure decision in an unfair and biased manner. All parties in the process of review (departmental/program committee, Review I/III COTAP committee, Provost and President) will recognize that course topic and such factors as appearance, ableness, gender, gender expression, race, language, nationality, age, sexuality, religion, and other social positionalities affect how students evaluate the candidate.

The student report will reflect student opinion on the candidate's teaching. Specifically, the report will comment on the student course evaluation forms and student responses to the solicitation letter.

Using the list supplied by the candidate, the Review I Committee will contact faculty and staff from the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked, requesting signed letters that comment on the candidate in relation to

the standards for Review I. In addition, the Committee will receive signed letters written in response to a general solicitation sent out to all faculty and administrators by Review I/III COTAP, asking for letters that comment on each of the candidates undergoing Review I in a given year. The file will include a copy of all solicitation letters that were sent out.

b. Writing the Review I Committee Report

The Review I Committee will prepare a report that (1) describes the procedures used during the review; (2) summarizes and evaluates the materials in the file; and (3) makes a recommendation based on its evaluation of the materials in the file. Its central goal is to assess the candidate's teaching, scholarly potential, and community service. The report will summarize the file's evidence concerning the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, suggest areas for improvement and offer recommendations for improvement, and represent the tenor of the committee's discussions. It will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the SAC document given to the candidate at the time of her/his hire. Differing assessments of the evidence should be made clear in the report. In the end, the report makes a recommendation on whether the candidate should or should not pass Review I and is signed by all members of the Review I Committee who agree with the recommendation. Any dissenting opinions, together with reasons, must be spelled out in a separate written and signed statement.

The Review I Committee report, without signatures, along with any statement expressing dissenting opinions is given to the candidate. In the case of non-unanimous reports, the candidate does not receive a list of who voted which way. The candidate will submit to the Provost's Office a letter addressed to Review I/III COTAP, stating that the candidate has read the report and any statement written by dissenters, along with any comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications the candidate would like to make. [REVISED March 2016] This letter is required before the file is submitted to Review I/III COTAP.

c. The Completed File

The completed file will consist of the following materials, which will be the evidentiary basis of Review I:

1. Table of contents.
2. Copy of Colleges-wide standards and criteria for Review I and a copy of the departmental/program SAC document sections on Review I.
3. Candidate's curriculum vitae.
4. Candidate's letters of appointment and reappointment.
5. Written statement by candidate concerning teaching philosophy and assessment of own teaching performance; scholarly work, achievements, and aims; and record of community service.
6. Record of courses taught and enrollments, including Honors projects, independent studies, and MAT theses (supplied by Registrar's office).
7. Copies of all course syllabi and other selected teaching materials for the time period covered by Review I. Materials may include sample exams, assignments, quizzes, web-based resources, media projects, software packages and other digital work and resources supplied by the candidate. [REVISED September 2015]
8. Student course evaluations for all courses, with summaries of the departmental/program and Colleges-wide questions for each course.
9. Responses of all current and former students to a solicitation letter seeking comments on the candidate.
10. Scholarship: this may include any published and unpublished writing, paintings, compositions, slides, book reviews, digital work and other forms of professional engagement supplied by the candidate. [REVISED September 2015]
11. Miscellaneous materials related to professional engagement and community service, such as reviews and citations of candidate's work, records of participation in professional organizations

- and professional affairs.
12. Signed letters from departmental and/or program colleagues.
 - 12 a. Letters describing colleagues' classroom visit. [REVISED November 2009]
 13. Signed letters from non-departmental/program colleagues at the Colleges.
 14. Report of the student sub-committee.
 15. Review I Committee report and any letters expressing dissenting opinions together with reasons for them.
 16. Late-arriving materials.
 17. Signed letter from the candidate certifying that she/he has read the Review I Committee report (and, if present, letter of dissenting opinions), along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.
 18. Signed letters from members of Review I/III COTAP, describing their relationship to the candidate.
 19. Review I/III COTAP report.
 20. Signed letter from the candidate, addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, certifying that she/he has read the Review I/III COTAP report, along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.

d. Review of the file by Review I/III COTAP

The entire file is submitted to the Dean of Faculty and Provost's Office, and the Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, will check to see that all required materials (except for the last three items) are included. If the Associate Dean of Faculty determines that something is missing, she/he will ask the Review I Committee to remedy the problem. The file will be sent to Review I/III COTAP when it is complete.

Review I/III COTAP members will read the complete file, and then discuss the case as a group. In the course of its deliberations, it may convene a meeting with the Review I Committee for the purpose of better understanding its recommendation. It may also meet separately with the signers of any dissenting statement. Following its deliberations, Review I/III COTAP will write a signed report explaining its recommendation. In cases where Review I/III COTAP comes to a recommendation different from that in the Review I Committee report, its report must make clear why it disagrees. The Review I/III COTAP report is sent to the candidate, the chair of the Review I Committee, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The candidate will confirm, in a letter sent to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with copies to Review I/III COTAP and the Chair of the Review I Committee, that she/he has read Review I/III COTAP's report. The candidate may make comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications in this letter. The deadline for receipt of this confirmation letter will be set by Review I/III COTAP, generally allowing seven days.[REVISED May 2009] Once the candidate has sent this letter, Review I/III COTAP will meet with the Dean of Faculty and Provost to discuss the case.

e. Final decision regarding Review I

The Dean of Faculty and Provost will make a final determination, following any meetings with the Review I Committee or Review I/III COTAP she/he deems necessary. The Dean of Faculty and Provost will convey the outcome of the Review I in a letter to the candidate, with a copy sent to the chair of the Review I Committee. Following a negative Review I decision, the candidate may request from the Dean of Faculty and Provost a written explanation of the negative decision. Following a positive Review I decision, the letter from the Dean of Faculty and Provost will outline the diagnostic recommendations that emerged from the review. These recommendations will address actions that both the candidate and the department/program should take to continue the candidate's development as a member of the faculty, with an eye toward preparing the candidate for Review II. Within four months of a positive decision, the Dean of Faculty and Provost will meet with the candidate to discuss these

recommendations.

3. Review II. For Promotion to Associate Professor, and the Awarding of Tenure [Revised January 2016]

a. Standards and criteria of the Colleges

Review II is designed to evaluate a faculty member's ability and continuing promise as an academic scholar who can make a significant contribution to the intellectual and educational climate of these Colleges. Specifically, the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are (in rank order of importance):

1. a record of excellence in teaching which appears to assure long-term excellence;
2. significant accomplishment in scholarship, inclusive of its equivalent expression in the creative arts, that has earned the esteem of departmental/program colleagues and experts outside the Colleges; and
3. effective service to the department and/or program, and the Colleges' community.

Teaching is the most important factor in Review II. Meeting the teaching standards for Review II is required; extraordinary scholarly accomplishments cannot compensate for records of teaching judged unsatisfactory. While service to the Colleges' community is important, that service, however great, will not compensate for teaching and scholarship that fall short of the standards for Review II. Every decision on tenure inevitably necessitates prospective judgment concerning the promise for further development.

By the time of Review II, there should be evidence that the candidate exhibits the following characteristics of teaching excellence (not in rank order):

1. Inspires students to significant interest and accomplishment
2. Is a committed teacher
3. Upholds high intellectual standards
4. Encourages independent work
5. Instills critical habits of thought
6. Is innovative in course design, where appropriate
7. Conveys central insights of the discipline
8. Is knowledgeable and continually engaged in the subjects taught
9. Is fair in assessing student performance.
10. Is effective in student advising.

As indicated at the beginning of this section of the bylaws, by the time of Review II the candidate will have accomplished significant scholarship which has earned the esteem of departmental/program colleagues and experts outside the Colleges.

By the time of Review II, it is expected that the candidate will have a demonstrable record of scholarly achievement based on a pattern of related professional activities.

In this review, the candidate's scholarship will be evaluated on the basis of the following aspects, ranked in order of importance:

1. The quality and originality of published work or its equivalent in the creative arts, including its advancement of knowledge, providing insights into problems, and offering new interpretations of ongoing questions;
2. Scholarly and professional reputation inside and outside the Colleges;
3. The quality and originality of other forms of scholarly work, as defined in the relevant SAC

- document;
4. Value as a resource to the department/program, and the intellectual community.

By the time of Review II, candidates will have a demonstrable record of community service. Since one hallmark of community service is the ability to perceive unmet needs and respond to them, faculty will often serve in ways not previously seen. However, some familiar types of effective service that may have been undertaken by the time of Review II include:

1. Service on faculty committees and participation in campus decision-making;
2. Service that enriches the community, such as planning symposia, arranging speakers, films, concerts, exhibitions;
3. Service that connects the campus to the world beyond in projects of mutual benefit;
4. Service that promotes the interests of the Colleges such as working with admissions and alumni/ae affairs.

The particular standards and criteria articulated for Review II in the candidate's departmental/program SAC document will be applied.

b. Roles, responsibilities, and procedures for Review II

General Considerations

Review II is conducted by a departmental/program review committee, hereafter referred to as the Review II Committee. Review II normally occurs in the sixth year of full-time teaching at this institution; or in the third year of a senior appointment; or at a time agreed upon appointment to tenurable status when credit is given for prior service. Its aim is to allow the faculty member's colleagues an opportunity to formulate a recommendation on whether the candidate should be awarded tenure, as well as to provide information to the candidate that will allow her/him to continue developing as a scholar, teacher, and colleague. The review will take into account and reflect a wide body of evidence, described below. [REVISED November 2009]

1. Roles and responsibilities in Review II

a. Review II Committee

The main responsibility for this review lies with the Review II Committee of the department/program into which the candidate was hired. This body assembles the candidate's file and prepares the report which makes a recommendation for or against the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Review II Committees can be constituted as either a committee of the whole, in which all voting members participate in all meetings, or as a sub-committee that meets on its own to discuss the case and prepare a report and recommendation, after which the sub-committee sends the report and recommendation to other departmental/program voting members, with whom it meets to discuss the report and take a final vote.

Those eligible to serve and to vote are all members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as 'on-going part-time' for at least one year. Spouses, partners, or relatives of candidates are not eligible to serve or to participate in any way in the review. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave may serve on the Review II Committee, but are not required to do so. Departmental/program members on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The Review II Committee will consist of at least four persons and its composition must be approved by Review II COTAP before the review commences. At least three persons will be members of the department/program

who are eligible and able to serve (exceptions below), while one will be a tenured faculty member in a different division. This non-departmental/non-program faculty member is selected by the Review II Committee chair after consultation with the rest of the review committee, and is subject to approval by both the candidate and the chair of Review II COTAP.

In departments/programs with fewer than three eligible faculty members able to serve, the Review II Committee shall consist of as many eligible faculty members as are able to serve, plus other eligible faculty members selected from the faculty as a whole by the available eligible departmental/program members and the candidate, subject to approval by Review II COTAP and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The Review II Committee will be constituted when four eligible faculty members have been selected in this way.

Each Review II Committee will have a sub-committee of three students, elected by majors and minors from among themselves, with representation of both Hobart and William Smith. (If this dual representation poses an undue burden, the department/program must receive an exemption from Review II COTAP.) The role of this sub-committee will be to summarize student input on the candidate's teaching in a short report to the Review II Committee. The students will present their findings to the Committee, and these findings will be reflected in the Review II Committee report. The students' signed report will become part of the candidate's file.

When the Dean of Faculty and Provost in consultation with a department/program and Review II COTAP agree that there is a well-founded basis, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may appoint a tenured member of the faculty to advise a department/program on procedure in conducting its faculty reviews. The consulting faculty member will attend all organizational and deliberative meetings, but will not read the files and will not be involved in substantive discussions.

b. Departmental/Program Faculty

Because colleagues within the candidate's department/program are likely to be most knowledgeable about the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, especially in teaching and scholarly or artistic work, their role in Review II is to submit letters which, like the report, are both evaluative and diagnostic. Letters should be based on the colleague's own observations and experiences, not on the contents of the file as assembled at the time of the review. All departmental/program faculty will be invited to write a letter. Each colleague participating in the review will have the opportunity to comment on all materials in the file during the discussion of the case and the Review II Committee report.

Classroom observations will commence for Review II by the first semester of teaching following a successful Review I. By the time of Review II, at least two departmental/program faculty members will have completed a classroom observation regimen, as described in section e.2.1.b. All faculty who have completed a classroom observation regimen should include comments on those classroom visits in their departmental letters for Review II, or write a separate letter based on those classroom observations.

In general, these observations should be conducted by faculty members of the observed faculty member's department or program. In rare circumstances, observations for review purposes may be conducted by faculty outside of an observed faculty member's department or program; however, observations conducted by outside faculty must be approved by Review II COTAP prior to the observation. All faculty who have completed a classroom observation regimen should include comments on those classroom visits in their departmental letters, or write a separate letter based on those classroom observations. (Rare circumstances include those in which there is no faculty member in the department or program who has the expertise required to evaluate the classroom performance of the observed faculty member, e.g., in an area studies program where no one in the program is sufficiently fluent in the language in which the observed faculty member is teaching, or where there are not at least two colleagues

additional to the candidate in the department/program.) In general, classroom observation procedures and documentation should follow the classroom observation guidelines set out in the Faculty Handbook, Section VIII.2 (p77) [REVISED May 2012]

If the faculty member undergoing Review II works with and has responsibilities in a program, but is chiefly connected to a department, program faculty are especially encouraged to write individual letters concerning the candidate. The program as a whole will prepare a recommendation only if it or the candidate specifically requests it. In these cases the program is not obligated to undertake a full review, but will have access to the candidate's file and will meet to discuss and draft a recommendation based on evidence.

c. The Candidate

The candidate's responsibility is to provide to the Review II Committee the majority of the materials necessary for an informed evaluation of his/her teaching, scholarship, and community service. A central piece will be a statement that presents, explains, and assesses the candidate's own record to date. The statement will include three sections:

1. teaching: a discussion of teaching philosophy and teaching performance, aims and accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses;
2. scholarship: description of the work pursued and accomplished since the candidate's last review, plans for future work, and own location in the discipline;
3. community service: a report on candidate's college-wide, departmental and/or program activities, as well as activity in the larger community.

To support this statement, the candidate will also provide a curriculum vitae, copies of all course syllabi and selected course materials (such as exams, assignments, paper topics, other miscellaneous communication with students), and copies of all scholarship completed to date, as well as unpublished work she/he wishes to be considered. The candidate and Review II Committee chair jointly decide which work will be sent out for outside review. The candidate may also provide miscellaneous material that speaks to the candidate's work, such as invitations to speak or present work in other classes or other schools. The candidate will be asked to provide the names of potential outside reviewers of his/her scholarship and the names of people who should be contacted for comments on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and/or community service. Finally, the candidate will be asked to provide responses to the reports of the Review II Committee and Review II COTAP.

d. Review II COTAP

Review II COTAP's role in Review II is to examine the candidate's file, read the Review II Committee report, and prepare its own recommendation. Review II COTAP will assess teaching, scholarship, and community service from the perspective of the Colleges as a whole, according to general Colleges' standards as expressed in the Bylaws and articulated in the departmental/program SAC document. [Revised May 2013] Any member of Review II COTAP who is a member of the candidate's department/ program will recuse himself/herself from Review II COTAP's deliberations and discussions of the case. The Review II COTAP member is eligible to serve on the candidate's Review II Committee.

e. The Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President

The Dean of Faculty and Provost may be involved in determining the composition of departmental/program review committees. The Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, is responsible for determining when each candidate's file is complete and ready to be read by the members of Review II COTAP.

Having received the reports of Review II COTAP and the Review II Committee, the Dean of Faculty and Provost make a recommendation to the President. The President attends the meetings at which Review II COTAP meets with the Dean of Faculty and Provost to discuss each Review II case. Having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the President makes his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, to inform him/her of the outcome of Review II.

2. Specific Procedures for Review II

a. Assembling the Candidate's File

The candidate will provide his/her required materials to the Review II Committee between May 1 and July 1. The completed file is due in the Provost's Office by the third Monday of October.

1. Outside Review of Scholarship

The candidate and the Review II Committee chair jointly decide which work the candidate will send out for outside review. The candidate is obliged to submit a representative sample (at least) of her/his scholarship for review by scholars in the discipline. Typically this will include both published and unpublished work. All of the selected work shall be sent out for review to allow an outside scholar the chance to see the range of a candidate's work. The Review II Committee report should describe the refereeing practice in each case. [Revised May 2014]

Work will be sent to three to five outside reviewers, who are deemed able to speak from an informed position explicitly to the candidate's accomplishments in and further potential for scholarly work. The candidate will submit a list of possible reviewers, specifying her/his relationship to each individual, and the Review II Committee will independently draw up a list of possible reviewers. The Committee's list will be shown to the candidate, and the latter will specify her/his relationship to each individual, and can insist on the removal of one or more names on grounds that the individual is likely to be prejudiced against the candidate. In no circumstances should any reviewer be a former colleague, collaborator, or close friend of the candidate. Neither should a reviewer have a significant formal or informal connection to the Colleges. The Review II report will explain how and why it chose the outside reviewers it did. Typically it is best to have a mix of outside reviewers: people of different levels (although all will usually be tenured), from different types of institutions, including people who work in a candidate's specific subfield as well as those who simply work in the candidate's discipline. At least two of the outside reviewers should not be personally acquainted with the candidate. If it is not practical to engage at least two such reviewers, the Review II Committee report will explain why. A curriculum vitae will be obtained from each reviewer. Interdisciplinary work should be sent to appropriate reviewers. The Review II Committee will treat the outside letters as constituting significant, but not all-determining, input on the candidate's scholarship.

Since this is one of the few times a candidate is likely to hear a group of academic colleagues assessing her/his work, the Review II Committee report should accurately reflect the letters' assessment of strengths and weaknesses of that work. Representative quotations from the letters should be included in the Review II Committee report. At the Committee's discretion, an appendix can be included with more extensive quotations so as to provide the candidate with more specific comments, suggestions, praises, or criticisms that the Committee deems will be beneficial for the candidate, provided the quotations do not give away the reviewer's identity.

2. Assessing student perceptions of the candidate

The Review II Committee will solicit comments from students who have taken a course with the candidate since the candidate's last review, using a letter developed by Review II COTAP. This letter will be sent to all currently matriculated students and to alumni/ae who have taken one or more courses with the candidate. All comments from respondents must be signed unless transmitted through a secure electronic system provided by the IT

department. [REVISED November 2009] The report will include the number of students contacted and the percentage responding, as well as copies of the letter(s) sent out to students and a record of the date(s) they were sent.

A summary of student course evaluation forms will be completed for each course taught since the last review either by the student sub-committee or by faculty members of the Review II Committee. For each course section, the number of evaluations in the file, the number of students in the course, and the percent of students completing evaluations will be indicated. For each course taught, there must be a systematic summary and assessment of the student evaluations. The department- or program-specific summary may be in prose or in a numerical format. The summary of College-wide questions will be in numerical format. The methods and procedures used in preparing these summaries should be explained in the Review II Committee report.

The scholarly literature on student course evaluations shows that they reflect the implicit biases of students and are a flawed method for assessing teaching quality. Using student course evaluations to measure teacher quality confers differential advantages/disadvantages on faculty members along lines of gender, race and other axes of inequality. Additionally, a tenure process that uses numerical evaluation benchmarks can create a higher hurdle for some candidates and can negatively influence the tenure decision in an unfair and biased manner. All parties in the process of review (departmental/program committee, Review II COTAP committee, Provost and President) will recognize that course topic and such factors as appearance, ableness, gender, gender expression, race, language, nationality, age, sexuality, religion, and other social positionalities affect how students evaluate the candidate.

The student report will reflect student opinion on the candidate's teaching. Specifically, the report will comment on the student course evaluation forms and student responses to the solicitation letter.

3. Soliciting comments from colleagues

Using the list supplied by the candidate, the Review II Committee will contact faculty and staff from the Colleges and individuals from outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked, requesting signed letters that comment on the candidate in relation to the standards for Review II. In addition, the Review II Committee will receive signed letters written in response to a general solicitation sent out to all faculty and administrators by Review II COTAP, asking for letters that comment on each of the candidates undergoing Review II in a given year. The file will include a copy of all solicitation letters that were sent out.

b. Writing the Review II Committee Report

The Review II Committee will prepare a report that (1) describes the procedures used during the review; (2) summarizes and evaluates the materials in the file; and (3) makes a recommendation based on its evaluation of the materials in the file. Its central goal is to assess the candidate's teaching, scholarly accomplishments and potential, and community service. The report will summarize the file's evidence concerning the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, suggest areas for improvement and offer recommendations for improvement, and represent the tenor of the Committee's discussions. The report will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the SAC document that was given to the candidate at the time of her/his hire. Differing assessments of the evidence should be made clear in the report. In the end, the report makes a recommendation on whether the candidate should or should not pass Review II and be awarded tenure. This report will be signed by all members of the Review II Committee who agree with the recommendation. Any dissenting opinions, together with reasons, must be spelled out in a separate written and signed statement.

The Review II Committee report, without signatures, along with any letters expressing dissenting opinions, is given to the candidate. In the case of non-unanimous reports, the candidate does not receive a list of who voted which way. The candidate will submit to the Provost's Office a letter addressed to Review II COTAP, stating that

the candidate has read the report and any statement written by dissenters, along with any comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications the candidate would like to make. [REVISED March 2016] This letter is required before the file is submitted to Review II COTAP.

c. The Completed File

The completed file will consist of the following materials, which will be the evidentiary basis of Review II:

1. Table of contents.
2. Copy of Colleges-wide standards for Review II and relevant SAC document.
3. Candidate's letters of appointment and reappointment.
4. Candidate's curriculum vitae.
5. Candidate's Review I reports (Review I Committee report, COTAP report, and candidate's responses [REVISED November 2009]) and letter from the Dean of Faculty and Provost following Review I (unless the candidate did not undergo Review I at the Colleges).
6. Written statement by candidate concerning her/his scholarly work, achievements, and aims; teaching philosophy and assessment of own teaching performance; and record of community service.
7. Record of courses taught and enrollments, including Honors projects, independent studies, and MAT theses, since Review I (supplied by Registrar's office).
8. Copies of all course syllabi and other selected teaching materials for the time period covered by Review II. Materials may include sample exams, assignments, quizzes, web-based resources, media projects, software packages and other digital work and resources supplied by the candidate. [REVISED September 2015]
9. Student course evaluations for all courses taught since Review I, with summaries of the departmental/program and Colleges-wide questions for each course.
10. Responses of all current and former students to a solicitation letter, seeking comments on the candidate. Responses must be signed.
11. Scholarship: this may include any published and unpublished writing, paintings, compositions, slides, book reviews, digital work and other forms of professional engagement supplied by the candidate. [REVISED September 2015]
12. Miscellaneous material related to professional engagement and community service, such as reviews and citations of candidate's work, records of participation in professional organizations and professional affairs.
13. Signed letters from departmental and/or program colleagues.
 - 13a. Letters describing colleagues' classroom visit. [REVISED November 2009]
14. Signed letters from non-departmental/program colleagues at the Colleges.
15. Signed letters from people outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked. A copy of the letter sent out will also be included.
16. Letters from outside reviewers of scholarship. Letters must be signed or received by Review II COTAP-approved electronic means. Also included will be a curriculum vitae from each outside reviewer, a list of the materials sent out to reviewers, and a copy of the letter sent with these materials.
17. Report of the student sub-committee.
18. Review II Committee report and any letters expressing dissenting opinions with reasons for them. [REVISED November 2009]
19. Late-arriving materials.
20. Signed letter from candidate certifying that she/he has read the Review II Committee report (and, if

present, statement written by any dissenters), along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.

21. Signed letters from members of Review II COTAP, describing their relationship to the candidate.
22. Review II COTAP report.
23. Signed letter from candidate, addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, certifying that she/he has read the Review II COTAP report, along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.

d. Review of the file by Review II COTAP

The entire file is submitted to the Dean of Faculty and Provost's Office, and the Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, will check to see that all required materials (except for the last three items) are included. If the Associate Dean of Faculty determines that something is missing, she/he will ask the Review II Committee to remedy the problem. The file will be sent to Review II COTAP when it is complete.

Review II COTAP members will read the complete file, and then discuss the case as a group. In the course of its deliberations, it may convene a meeting with the Review II Committee for the purpose of better understanding its recommendation. It may also meet separately with the signers of any dissenting statement. Following its deliberations, Review II COTAP will write a signed report explaining its recommendation. In cases where Review II COTAP comes to a recommendation different from that in the Review II Committee report, its report must make clear why it disagrees. This report is sent to the candidate, the chair of the departmental/program review committee, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The candidate will confirm, in a letter addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with copies to Review II COTAP and the chair of the Review II Committee, that she/he read Review II COTAP's report. The candidate may make comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications in this letter. The deadline for receipt of this confirmation letter will be set by Review II COTAP, generally allowing seven days. Once the candidate has sent this letter, Review II COTAP will meet with the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President to discuss the case.

e. Final decision regarding Review II

Following the meeting of Review II COTAP with the President and the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes his/her own recommendation to the President. Prior to making this recommendation, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may meet with the Review II Committee or Review II COTAP if she/he thinks it necessary. The President, having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, may meet with Review II COTAP or the Review II Committee prior to making his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, with copies to the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the Review II Committee chair, to inform the candidate of the outcome of Review II. Following a negative decision, the candidate may request from the Dean of Faculty and Provost a written explanation of that decision.

4. Review III. For Promotion to Full Professor [Revised January 2016]

a. Standards and criteria of the Colleges

For promotion to Full Professor, continued demonstration of significant scholarly activity and excellence in teaching are required. At the Review III level, however, scholarship, inclusive of its equivalent expression in the creative arts, is the most important criterion. In all cases, although tenured faculty have a particular obligation to assume their fair share of the responsibility for the governance and intellectual and artistic life of the Colleges, such contributions do not substitute for the primary criteria for promotion – continued and high achievement in scholarly work. Time in rank alone is not a sufficient qualification.

By the time of Review III, there should be evidence that the candidate exhibits the following characteristics of teaching excellence (not in rank order):

1. Inspires students to significant interest and accomplishment
2. Is a committed teacher
3. Upholds high intellectual standards
4. Encourages independent work
5. Instills critical habits of thought
6. Is innovative in course design, where appropriate
7. Conveys central insights of the discipline
8. Is knowledgeable and continually engaged in the subjects taught
9. Is fair in assessing student performance
10. Is effective in student advising

In this review, the candidate's scholarship will be evaluated on the basis of the following aspects, ranked in order of importance:

1. The quality and originality of published work or its equivalent in the creative arts, including its advancement of knowledge, providing insights into problems, and offering new interpretations of ongoing questions;
2. Scholarly and professional reputation inside and outside the Colleges;
3. The quality and originality of other forms of scholarly work, as defined in the relevant SAC document;
4. Value as a resource to the department/program, and the intellectual community.

By the time of Review III, it is expected that candidates will have a record of successful publishing and public presentation of their scholarship in the years since Review II, and will have a recognizable national or international reputation.

By the time of Review III, candidates will have a demonstrable record of community service since Review II. Since one hallmark of community service is the ability to perceive unmet needs and respond to them, faculty will often serve in ways not previously seen. However, some familiar types of effective service that may have been undertaken by the time of Review III include:

1. Service on faculty committees and participation in campus decision- making;
2. Service that enriches the community, such as planning symposia, arranging speakers, films, concerts, exhibitions;
3. Service that connects the campus to the world beyond in projects of mutual benefit;
4. Service that promotes the interests of the Colleges such as working with admissions and alumni/ae affairs.

The particular standards and criteria articulated for Review III in the relevant SAC document will be applied. Generally, this will be the SAC document in effect when the candidate passed Review II, or the one in effect six years before Review III, whichever is more recent.

b. Roles, responsibilities, and procedures for Review III

General Considerations

Members of the faculty are normally considered for promotion to Full Professor in their sixth year as Associate Professor, having demonstrated significant scholarly accomplishment beyond that presented at the time of

Review II. Each departmental/program SAC document is crucial for determining the kind of work that is required for promotion to Full Professor. To initiate a Review III, the candidate will write a letter to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with a copy to the department/program chair, by May 1 of the academic year preceding the review. Associate professors who feel their case is not sufficiently strong may delay consideration. If promotion is not made following consideration in the sixth year, that faculty member should not normally be considered again for several years or until substantial new evidence is available.

1. Roles and responsibilities in Review III

a. Review III Committee

The main responsibility for this review lies with a departmental/program review committee, hereafter referred to as the Review III Committee. This body assembles the candidate's file and prepares the report which is primarily evaluative, making a recommendation for or against promotion to Full Professor but also providing information to the candidate that will assist her/him in continuing to develop as a scholar, teacher, and colleague. Review III Committees can be constituted as either a committee of the whole, in which all voting members participate in all meetings, or as a sub-committee that meets on its own to discuss the case and prepare a report and recommendation, after which the sub-committee sends the report and recommendation to other departmental/program voting members, with whom it meets to discuss the report and take a final vote.

Those eligible to serve and to vote are all members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as 'on-going part-time' for at least one year. Spouses, partners, or relatives of candidates are not eligible to serve or to participate in any way in the review. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave may serve on the Review III Committee, but are not required to do so. Departmental/program members on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The Review III Committee will consist of at least four persons and its composition must be approved by Review I/III COTAP before the review commences. At least three persons will be members of the department/program who are eligible and able to serve (exceptions below), while one will be a tenured faculty member in a different division. This non-departmental/non-program faculty member is selected by the Review III Committee chair after consultation with the rest of the review committee, and is subject to approval by both the candidate and the chair of Review I/III COTAP.

In departments/programs with fewer than three eligible faculty members able to serve, the Review III Committee shall consist of as many eligible faculty members as are able to serve, plus other eligible faculty members selected from the faculty as a whole by the available eligible departmental/program members and the candidate, subject to approval by Review I/III COTAP and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The Review III Committee will be constituted when four eligible faculty members have been selected in this way.

Each Review III Committee will have a sub-committee of three students, elected by majors and minors from among themselves, with representation of both Hobart and William Smith. (If this dual representation poses an undue burden, the department/program must receive an exemption from Review I/III COTAP.) The role of this sub-committee will be to summarize student input on the candidate's teaching in a short report to the Review III Committee. The students will present their findings to the Committee, and these findings will be reflected in the Review III Committee report. The students' signed report will become part of the candidate's file.

When the Dean of Faculty and Provost in consultation with a department/program and Review I/III COTAP agree that there is a well-founded basis, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may appoint a tenured member of the

faculty to advise a department/program on procedure in conducting its faculty reviews. The consulting faculty member will attend all organizational and deliberative meetings, but will not read the files and will not be involved in substantive discussions.

b. Departmental/Program Faculty

Because colleagues within the candidate's department/program are likely to be most knowledgeable about the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, especially in teaching and scholarly work, their role in Review III is to submit letters which, like the report, are primarily evaluative but also diagnostic. Letters should be based on the colleague's own observations and experiences, not on the contents of the file as assembled at the time of the review. All departmental/program faculty will be invited to write a letter. Each colleague participating in the review will have the opportunity to comment on all materials in the file during the discussion of the case and the Review III Committee report.

Classroom observations will commence for Review III by the second year of teaching following a successful Review II. By the time of Review III, at least two departmental/program faculty members will have completed a classroom observation regimen, as described in section e.2.1.b. All faculty who have completed a classroom observation regimen should include comments on those classroom visits in their departmental letters for Review III, or write a separate letter based on those classroom observations.

In general, these observations should be conducted by faculty members of the observed faculty member's department or program. In rare circumstances, observations for review purposes may be conducted by faculty outside of an observed faculty member's department or program; however, observations conducted by outside faculty must be approved by Review I/III COTAP prior to the observation. All faculty who have completed a classroom observation regimen should include comments on those classroom visits in their departmental letters, or write a separate letter based on those classroom observations. (Rare circumstances include those in which there is no faculty member in the department or program who has the expertise required to evaluate the classroom performance of the observed faculty member, e.g., in an area studies program where no one in the program is sufficiently fluent in the language in which the observed faculty member is teaching, or where there are not at least two colleagues additional to the candidate in the department/program.) In general, classroom observation procedures and documentation should follow the classroom observation guidelines set out in the Faculty Handbook, section >>>[REVISED May 2012]

If the faculty member undergoing Review III works with and has responsibilities in a program, but is chiefly connected to a department, program faculty are especially encouraged to write individual letters concerning the candidate. The program as a whole will prepare a recommendation only if it or the candidate specifically requests it. In these cases the program is not obligated to undertake a full review, but will have access to the candidate's file and will meet to discuss and draft a recommendation based on evidence.

c. The Candidate

The candidate's responsibility is to provide to the Review III Committee the majority of the materials necessary for an informed evaluation of his/her teaching, scholarship, and community service. A central piece will be a statement that presents, explains, and assesses the candidate's own record to date. The statement will include three sections:

1. teaching: a discussion of teaching philosophy and teaching performance, aims and accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses;
2. scholarship: description of the work pursued and accomplished since the candidate's last review, plans for future work, and own location in the discipline;

3. community service: a report on candidate's college-wide, departmental and/or program activities, as well as activity in the larger community.

To support this statement, the candidate will also provide a curriculum vitae, copies of all course syllabi and selected course materials (such as exams, assignments, paper topics, other miscellaneous communication with students), and copies of all scholarship completed since Review II, as well as unpublished work she/he wishes to be considered. The candidate and the Review III Committee chair jointly decide which work will be sent out for outside review. The candidate may also provide miscellaneous material that speaks to the candidate's work, such as invitations to speak or present work in other classes or other schools. The candidate will be asked to provide the names of potential outside reviewers of his/her scholarship and the names of people who should be contacted for comments on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and/or community service.

d. Review I/III COTAP

Review I/III COTAP's role in Review III is to examine the candidate's file, read the Review III Committee report, and prepare its own recommendation. Review I/III COTAP will assess teaching, scholarship, and community service from the perspective of the Colleges as a whole, according to general Colleges' standards as expressed in the Bylaws and articulated in the departmental/program SAC document. [Revised May 2013] Any member of Review I/III COTAP who is a member of the candidate's department/program will recuse himself/herself from Review I/III COTAP's deliberations and discussions of the case. The Review I/III COTAP member is eligible to serve on the candidate's Review III Committee.

e. The Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President

The Dean of Faculty and Provost may be involved in determining the composition of departmental/program review committees. The Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, is responsible for determining when each candidate's file is complete and ready to be read by the members of Review I/III COTAP.

Having received the reports of Review I/III COTAP and the Review III Committee, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes a recommendation to the President. The President attends the meetings at which Review I/III COTAP meets with the Dean of Faculty and Provost to discuss each Review III case. Having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the President makes his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, to inform him/her of the outcome of Review III.

2. Specific Procedures

a. Assembling the Candidate's File

The candidate will provide his/her required materials to the Review III Committee between September 1 and October 1. The completed file is due in the Provost's Office by the fourth Monday of January.

1. Outside Review of Scholarship

The candidate and the Review III Committee chair jointly decide which work the candidate will send out for outside review. The candidate is obliged to submit a representative sample (at least) of her/his scholarship for review by scholars in the discipline. Typically this will include both published and unpublished work. Work published in refereed publications should be considered by the Review III Committee as evidence of quality and originality, but at least some of it should still be sent out for review to allow an outside scholar the chance to see the range of a candidate's work. The Review III

Committee report should describe the refereeing practice in each case.

Work will be sent to three to five outside reviewers, who are deemed able to speak from an informed position explicitly to the candidate's accomplishments in and further potential for scholarly work. The candidate will submit a list of possible reviewers, specifying her/his relationship to each individual, and the Review III Committee will independently draw up a list of possible reviewers. The Committee's list will be shown to the candidate, and the latter will specify her/his relationship to each individual, and can insist on the removal of one or more names on grounds that the individual is likely to be prejudiced against the candidate. In no circumstances should any reviewer be a former colleague, collaborator, or close friend of the candidate. Neither should a reviewer have a significant formal or informal connection to the Colleges. The Review III Committee report will explain how and why it chose the outside reviewers it did. Typically it is best to have a mix of outside reviewers: people of different levels (although all will usually be tenured), from different types of institutions, including people who work in a candidate's specific subfield as well as those who simply work in the candidate's discipline. At least two of the outside reviewers should not be personally acquainted with the candidate. If it is not practical to engage at least two such reviewers, the Review III Committee report will explain why. A curriculum vitae will be obtained from each reviewer. Interdisciplinary work should be sent to appropriate reviewers. The Review III Committee will treat the outside letters as constituting significant, but not all-determining, input on the candidate's scholarship.

Since this is one of the few times a candidate is likely to hear a group of academic colleagues assessing her/his work, the Review III Committee report should accurately reflect the letters' assessment of strengths and weaknesses of that work. Representative quotations from the letters should be included in the Review III Committee report. At the Committee's discretion, an appendix can be included with more extensive quotations so as to provide the candidate with more specific comments, suggestions, praises, or criticisms that the Committee deems will be beneficial for the candidate, provided the quotations do not give away the reviewer's identity.

2. Assessing student perceptions of the candidate

The Review III Committee will solicit comments from students who have taken a course with the candidate since the candidate's last review and to all current advisees, using a letter developed by Review I/III COTAP. This letter will be sent to all currently matriculated students and to alumni/ae who have taken one or more courses with the candidate since the last review. [REVISED November 2009] All comments from respondents must be signed unless transmitted through a secure electronic system provided by the IT department. [REVISED November 2009] The report will include the number of students contacted and the percentage responding, as well as copies of the materials sent out to students and a record of the date(s) they were sent.

A summary of student course evaluation forms will be completed for each course taught since the last review either by the student sub-committee or by faculty members of the Review III Committee. For each course section, the number of evaluations in the file, the number of students in the course, and the percent of students completing evaluations will be indicated. For each course taught, there must be a systematic summary and assessment of the student evaluations. The department- or program-specific summary may be in prose or in a numerical format. The summary of College-wide questions will be in numerical format. The methods and procedures used in preparing these summaries should be explained in the Review III Committee report.

The scholarly literature on student course evaluations shows that they reflect the implicit biases of

students and are a flawed method for assessing teaching quality. Using student course evaluations to measure teacher quality confers differential advantages/disadvantages on faculty members along lines of gender, race and other axes of inequality. Additionally, a tenure process that uses numerical evaluation benchmarks can create a higher hurdle for some candidates and can negatively influence the tenure decision in an unfair and biased manner. All parties in the process of review (departmental/program committee, Review I/III COTAP committee, Provost and President) will recognize that course topic and such factors as appearance, ableness, gender, gender expression, race, language, nationality, age, sexuality, religion, and other social positionalities affect how students evaluate the candidate.

The student report will reflect student opinion on the candidate's teaching. Specifically, the report will comment on the student course evaluation forms and student responses to the solicitation letter.

3. Soliciting comments from colleagues

Using the list supplied by the candidate, the Review III Committee will contact faculty and staff from the Colleges and individuals from outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked, requesting signed letters that comment on the candidate in relation to the standards for Review III. In addition, the Committee will receive signed letters written in response to a general solicitation sent out to all faculty and administrators by Review I/III COTAP, asking for letters that comment on each of the candidates undergoing Review III in a given year. The file will include a copy of all solicitation letters that were sent out.

b. Writing the Review III Committee Report

The Review III Committee will prepare a report that (1) describes the procedures used during the review; (2) summarizes and evaluates the materials in the file; and (3) makes a recommendation based on its evaluation of the materials in the file. Its central goal is to assess the candidate's teaching, scholarly accomplishments and potential, and community service. The report will summarize the file's evidence concerning the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, suggest areas for improvement and offer recommendations for improvement, and represent the tenor of the committee's discussions. The report will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the relevant SAC document. Differing assessments of the evidence should be made clear in the report. In the end, the report makes a recommendation on whether the candidate should or should not pass Review III and be promoted to Full Professor and is signed by all members of the Review III Committee who agree with the recommendation. Any dissenting opinions, together with reasons, must be spelled out in a separate written and signed statement.

The Review III Committee report, without signatures, along with any letters expressing dissenting opinions, is given to the candidate. In the case of non-unanimous reports, the candidate does not receive a list of who voted which way. The candidate will submit to the Provost's Office a letter addressed to Review I/III COTAP, stating that the candidate has read the report and any statement written by dissenters, along with any comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications the candidate would like to make. [REVISED March 2016] This letter is required before the file is submitted to Review I/III COTAP.

c. The Completed File

The completed file will consist of the following materials, which will be the evidentiary basis of Review III:

1. Table of contents.
2. Copy of Colleges-wide standards for Review III and relevant SAC document.
3. Candidate's curriculum vitae.

4. Candidate's Review II reports (Review II Committee report, Review I/III COTAP report and candidate's responses [REVISED November 2009]) plus any previous Review III reports.
5. Written statement by candidate concerning her/his scholarly work, achievements, and aims; teaching philosophy and assessment of own teaching performance; and record of community service.
6. Record of courses taught and enrollments, including Honors projects, independent studies, and MAT theses, since Review II (supplied by Registrar's office).
7. Copies of all course syllabi and other selected teaching materials for the time period covered by Review III. Materials may include samples exams, assignments, quizzes, web-based resources, media projects, software packages and other digital work and resources supplied by the candidate. [REVISED September 2015]
8. Student course evaluations for all courses taught since Review II, with summaries of the departmental/program and Colleges-wide questions for each course.
9. Responses of all current and former students to a solicitation letter, seeking comments on the candidate. Responses must be signed.
10. Scholarship: this may include any published and unpublished writing, paintings, compositions, slides, book reviews, digital work and other forms of professional engagement supplied by the candidate. [REVISED September 2015]
11. Miscellaneous material related to professional engagement and community service, such as reviews and citations of candidate's work, records of participation in professional organizations and professional affairs.
12. Signed letters from departmental and/or program colleagues.
 - 12a. Letters describing colleagues' classroom visit [REVISED November 2009]
13. Signed letters from non-departmental/program colleagues at the Colleges, commenting on the teaching, scholarship, and community service of the candidate.
14. Signed letters from people outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked. A copy of the letter sent out will also be included.
15. Letters from outside reviewers of scholarly work. Letters must be signed or received by REVIEW I/III COTAP-approved electronic means. Also included will be a curriculum vitae from each outside reviewer, a list of the materials sent out to reviewers, and a copy of the letter sent with these materials.
16. Report of the student sub-committee.
17. Review III Committee report and any letters expressing dissenting opinions, together with reasons for them [REVISED November 2009].
18. Late-arriving materials.
19. Signed letter from candidate certifying that she/he has read the Review III Committee report (and, if present, statement written by any dissenters), along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.
20. Signed letters from members of Review I/III COTAP, describing their relationship to the candidate.
21. Review I/III COTAP report.
22. Signed letter from Candidate, addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, certifying that she/he has read the Review I/III COTAP report, along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.

d. Review of the file by Review I/III COTAP

The entire file is submitted to the Dean of Faculty and Provost's Office, and the Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, will check to see that all

required materials (except for the last three items) are included. If the Associate Dean of Faculty determines that something is missing, she/he will ask the Review III Committee to remedy the problem. The file will be sent to Review I/III COTAP when it is complete.

Review I/III COTAP members will read the complete file, and then discuss the case as a group. In the course of its deliberations, it may convene a meeting with the Review III Committee for the purpose of better understanding its recommendation. It may also meet separately with the signers of any dissenting statement. Following its deliberations, Review I/III COTAP will write a signed report explaining its recommendation. In cases where Review I/III COTAP comes to a recommendation different from that in Review III Committee report, its report must make clear why it disagrees. This report is sent to the candidate, the chair of the Review III Committee, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The candidate will confirm, in a letter addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with copies to Review I/III COTAP and the chair of the Review III Committee, that she/he has read Review I/III COTAP's statement. The candidate may make comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications in this letter. The deadline for receipt of this confirmation letter will be set by Review I/III COTAP, generally allowing seven days for a response. [REVISED May 2009] Once the candidate has sent this letter, Review I/III COTAP will meet with the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President to discuss the case.

e. Final decision regarding Review III

Following the meeting of Review I/III COTAP with the President and the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes his/her own recommendation to the President. Prior to making this recommendation, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may meet with the Review III Committee or Review I/III COTAP if she/he thinks it necessary. The President, having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, may meet with Review I/III COTAP or the Review III Committee prior to making his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, with copies to the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the Review III Committee chair, to inform the candidate of the outcome of Review III. Following a negative decision, the candidate may request from the Dean of Faculty and Provost a written explanation of that decision.

5. Review of Faculty in Non Tenure-track Lines

All faculty not appointed in tenure-track lines must undergo a review in their third year of service teaching half-time or more unless the faculty member is in his/her final year of teaching at the Colleges. Under such circumstances, by mutual consent of the department/program and faculty member, the requirement may be eliminated. In such cases, the department/program chair and faculty member must submit a letter to the Dean of Faculty and Provost stating that they have agreed to forego any review. After the first review takes place, the second review shall take place three years after the first. Subsequent reviews shall take place at six year intervals.

Each review of faculty in a non tenure-track line must include a full review of the candidate's record of teaching, and may, but need not, take into consideration evaluation of scholarship and community service. Faculty who pass this review may be reappointed, when continuation of an ongoing line or curricular need permit. Failure to pass this review will result in the termination of the faculty member's employment at the end of the contract period. The positive or negative outcome of a review of faculty in a non tenure-track line has no implications for the continuation, discontinuation, or conversion of an individual line.

The candidate for this review will submit a short teaching statement and representative course materials to the department/program chair. The chair will request letters from all members of the department/program, commenting on the candidate's teaching, as well as scholarship and community service, if these are to be considered. The chair and the Dean of Faculty and Provost will read through the candidate's student course evaluations as well as letters submitted by colleagues. The chair and the Dean of Faculty and Provost will meet to discuss the case and to determine the review's outcome. The Dean of Faculty and Provost will write a letter to the candidate, explaining

the outcome of the review. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate may request a written explanation of the negative decision.

Section f. Faculty Retention

Retention of an Instructor for a fifth year or longer requires the approval of the President, following discussion with the Committee on the Faculty. At this time, a formal statement in writing from the Department Chair justifying the recommendation for retention is required.

A decision not to renew the contract of a faculty member of professorial rank at the end of the initial contract period in an ongoing position may be taken only following discussion in the Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

The national American Association of University Professors standards are followed for de facto tenure for Assistant Professors and Instructors in these general respects:

- a. The probationary period at these Colleges is not to exceed seven years of full-time appointment at these Colleges.
- b. In the first year of service at the Colleges, at least three months' notice is given if a contract is not to be renewed. In the second year, at least six months' notice is given. During the remainder of the probationary period, one full year's notice is required if a contract is to be terminal or tenure not granted.
- c. At the time of appointment to tenurable status, Instructors and Assistant Professors may claim up to 5 years credit, no more than three of which may be at an institution other than these Colleges, toward the normal probationary period for their full-time service in accredited institutions elsewhere and at these Colleges. Exceptions to this policy may be considered, in consultation with the Committee on the Faculty, the Dean of Faculty and Provost, and the faculty member, on a case-by-case basis. When a faculty member considers it to be in her or his interest, she or he may be permitted to waive a claim to prior service or *de facto* tenure. [REVISED 4/2/01]
- d. All persons hired as administrators, even those holding faculty rank, who immediately or subsequently teach courses up to but not more than three courses per academic year, do not thereby acquire credit toward tenure. For purposes of this restriction, the coaching of athletic teams is to be classified as administrative duty.
- e. Persons whose duties consist only in teaching acquire credit toward tenure only for academic years in which their teaching amounts to more than three courses per academic year. For purposes of this restriction, non-obligatory committee work and other quasi-administrative duties, and also the supervision of honors work and independent study, will not affect the calculation of teaching load.

Late Notice of Non-Reappointment

In cases where a non-tenured faculty member is given late notice of non-reappointment, the following procedures will become operative:

1. Preliminary proceedings:

- a. There should be consultation between the faculty member and the President and Dean of Faculty and Provost. The matter may be terminated at this point by mutual consent.

- b. If the question is not terminated at this point, the faculty member may request that formal proceedings be instituted, which may result in a written record.

2. Commencement of formal proceedings:

- a. If, after consulting the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, the President decides to continue proceedings, he or she shall inform the faculty member in writing of the grounds proposed for dismissal and shall inform him or her that, if the faculty member so requests, a hearing to determine whether he or she should be removed from his or her faculty position on the grounds stated will be conducted by a faculty hearing committee at a specified time and place. The faculty member should be informed in detail of his or her procedural rights. The date of the hearing should permit sufficient time for the faculty member to prepare his or her defense.
- b. The faculty member should respond in writing whether he or she wishes a hearing or not, at least one week prior to the date set for the hearing.

3. Hearing Committee:

- a. As soon as possible after the President has been notified of the faculty member's intention to request a hearing, the President shall call a special faculty meeting in order to constitute a Hearing Committee.
- b. A separate Hearing Committee will be constituted for each individual case arising under these procedures.
- c. Each Hearing Committee will be composed of five members and will elect its own Chair.
- d. Election of the individual committees will be according to secret paper ballot. The Committee on the Faculty will nominate at least five candidates and a notice of those nominated by the Committee on the Faculty will be given on the day before the special faculty meeting. Each faculty member will have three votes, which must be cast for three separate individuals. The five nominees with the highest number of votes will constitute the members of the Hearing Committee. Nominations may be made from the floor.
- e. Members of the Committee on the Faculty are ineligible to serve, as are administrative officers.
- f. Those with absolute right to attend Hearing Committee proceedings shall be: The Hearing Committee, the faculty member in question and his or her counsel, and the President and his or her representative.

4. Hearing Committee proceedings:

- a. The Hearing Committee, in consultation with the President and faculty member, will decide whether the hearing should be public or private.
- b. If the facts are in dispute, the Hearing Committee shall receive the testimony of the witnesses and other evidence concerning the matter set forth in the President's letter to the faculty member. The faculty member shall have the right to assistance by counsel of his or her choosing to argue his or her case, and to the aid of the Hearing Committee in

securing witnesses. The faculty member or his or her counsel and the representative designated by the President shall have the right, within reasonable limits, to question all witnesses who testify orally. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to confront all witnesses adverse to him or her. Where unusual and urgent reasons move the Hearing Committee to withhold this right, or where the witness cannot appear, the identity of the witness, as well as his or her statements, shall nevertheless be disclosed to the faculty member. Subject to these safeguards, statements may, when necessary, be taken outside the hearing and reported to it. All of the evidence should be duly recorded. Unless special circumstances warrant, it should not be necessary to follow formal rules of court procedure.

5. Consideration by Hearing Committee:

The Committee shall reach its recommendation in conference, on the basis of the hearing. The President and the faculty member should be notified of the recommendation in writing. Minority statements may be filed if desired.

Section g. Termination of Faculty

The appointment of any member of the faculty, including that of a member on permanent tenure, shall be terminated (as distinguished from failure to reappoint) only for adequate cause. Adequate cause for termination of the services of a faculty member shall include: incompetence, moral turpitude, bona fide financial exigency (see AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 1990 Edition, pp. 23-24), and discontinuance of a program or a department of instruction not mandated by financial exigency.

Standards and procedures applying to the discontinuance of a program or department not mandated by financial exigency are described in the AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 1990 Edition, p. 25, as follows:

1. The decision to discontinue formally a program or department of instruction will be based essentially upon educational considerations, as determined primarily by the faculty as a whole or an appropriate committee thereof.
 - a. "[NOTE: 'Educational considerations' do not include cyclical or temporary variations in enrollment. They must reflect long-range judgments that the educational mission of the institution as a whole will be enhanced by the discontinuance.]"
2. Before the administration issues notice to a faculty member of its intention to terminate an appointment because of formal discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, the institution will make every effort to place the faculty member concerned in another suitable position. If placement in another position would be facilitated by a reasonable period of training, financial and other support for such training will be proffered. If no position is available within the institution, with or without retraining, the faculty member's appointment then may be terminated, but only with provision for severance salary equitably adjusted to the faculty member's length of past and potential service.
 - a. "[NOTE: When an institution proposes to discontinue a program or department of instruction, it should plan to bear the costs of relocating, training, or otherwise compensating faculty members adversely affected.]"
 - b. Termination of the services of a faculty member for adequate cause shall be upon written

notice to the individual of such cause, in conformance with the following procedures:

- c. an untenured member of the faculty If the faculty member denies that such cause exists and demands a hearing, he or she is advised to pursue grievance through the Grievance Committee, following the established rules and procedures of that committee.
- d. a member of the faculty under tenure If the faculty member denies that such cause exists and demands a hearing, he or she shall be entitled to be heard by a joint committee of three tenured professors and three Trustees, and given the opportunity to be heard in his or her defense before such committee, which shall report its recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The chair of the standing faculty grievance panel will randomly select by drawing lots seven tenured members of the faculty for service on the hearing committee. Of these, the Dean of Faculty and Provost will first excuse two, and the faculty member subject to termination will then excuse two more. Board members will be appointed by the Chair of the Board of Trustees. The committee will be convened by the President as ex officio member without vote. If this committee recommends the termination of services of the faculty member, the Board of Trustees may act upon this recommendation without a further hearing by a majority vote of the Board, which shall be final and binding on both parties. If the committee does not recommend termination, the Board of Trustees may terminate the services of the individual only after a further hearing before the Board, in which case a three-quarters vote of the full Board shall be final and binding upon both parties.

Termination of the services of a member of the faculty with tenure for cause shall be by notice given one year before the time set in the notice for termination.

These Bylaws incorporate by reference the following principles adopted by the American Association of University Professors, as found in the 1990 edition of the AAUP Policy Documents and Reports (p. 7):

"The 1958 Statement provides: 'Suspension of the faculty member during the proceedings is justified only if immediate harm to the faculty member or others is threatened by the faculty member's continuance. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension should be with pay.' A suspension which is not followed by either reinstatement or the opportunity for a hearing is in effect a summary dismissal in violation of academic due process.

"The concept of 'moral turpitude' identifies the exceptional case in which the professor may be denied a year's teaching or pay in whole or in part. The statement applies to that kind of behavior which goes beyond simply warranting discharge and is so utterly blameworthy as to make it inappropriate to require the offering of a year's teaching or pay. The standard is not that the moral sensibilities of persons in the particular community have been affronted. The standard is behavior that would evoke condemnation by the academic community generally."

Section h. Appointment of outside faculty member to advise on Reviews.

When the provost and dean of the faculty in consultation with a department or program and COTAP agree that there is a well-founded basis, the provost may appoint a tenured member of the faculty to advise a department or program on procedure in conducting its faculty reviews. The consulting faculty member will not read the files and will not be involved in substantive discussions.

Section i. Guidelines for Eligibility for Faculty Emeritus/a Status at the Colleges.

Members of the faculty in good standing with 15 years of service are eligible for emeritus/a status on

retirement from the Colleges. This is in recognition of their contribution to teaching, scholarship and community service over the course of their time at the institution. In unusual circumstances when a member of the faculty who has served for fewer than 15 years is recommended for emeritus/a status, consideration of contributions might include: leadership positions such as chair of a department, program and/or faculty committee, significant contributions as teacher and/or a scholar, or unique contributions to the curriculum. The Provost and Dean of Faculty will initiate recommendations for emeritus/emeriti status within six months of the effective date of retirement by bringing forward to COFAC a curriculum vitae and a summary of the candidate's achievements. COFAC will discuss the matter with the dean of the faculty and (assuming the retiree is in good standing) the president will bring their name forward to the Board of Trustees.

Article 2. Officers of the Faculty

Officers of the faculty include the Presiding Officer, the chairs of the standing committees, the Secretary of the Faculty, the Parliamentarian, and the faculty Ombudspersons. Unless otherwise provided in these bylaws, members of the faculty regularly appointed in tenure-track and ongoing positions are eligible for service as officers of the faculty. [REVISED 6/00]

The Presiding Officer of meetings of the faculty is a faculty member elected by the faculty from among the ranks of the teaching faculty, by a majority vote of the teaching faculty in attendance at the election meeting. The Presiding Officer serves a two-year term beginning on 1 July. In the absence of the Presiding Officer, the Chair of the Committee on the Faculty will preside; in the latter's absence, the Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs will preside.

The Secretary of the Faculty is responsible for the following: (1) assembling and distributing to the faculty an agenda and supporting materials in advance of all faculty meetings, (2) maintaining full and accurate minutes for all faculty meetings, (3) maintaining for each semester a list of voting faculty and those counting toward quorum, and announcing the number in each category at the first faculty meeting of each semester, and at any faculty meeting at which those numbers have changed since the previous meeting, [REVISED 6/00] (4) keeping track of quorum within each faculty meeting, and (5) initiating revision of the Faculty Handbook when approved Minutes record a necessary change (see Part III, E). [REVISED 5/12/97] The Secretary is elected by the Faculty as a whole for a one-year term.

The Parliamentarian (or in special cases the Parliamentarian's designate) will be present at all meetings of the faculty and will act as the faculty's authority in matters of parliamentary procedure. He or she will be appointed by the Committee on the Faculty.

Four Ombudspersons are elected by the Faculty from among its tenured members to five-year terms each, upon nomination by the Committee on the Faculty acting in consultation with the Dean of Faculty and Provost. Typically two will be female and two will be male. Terms are to be staggered to insure continuity. The role of ombudsperson is that of informal mediator, and the primary service provided by an ombudsperson is to promote the resolution of complaints by facilitating communication. He or she is available to faculty seeking to resolve interpersonal conflicts of an institutional nature, or seeking to resolve complaints against institutional practices that may be infringing upon the rights of the individual. In responding to complaints, an ombudsperson might (1) advise the individual of existing procedures for raising such complaints, (2) offer to facilitate an informal resolution, or (3) advise the institution that its policies do not effectively respond to recurrent problems. Ombudspersons shall take as their ethical standard independence, impartiality, and confidentiality, and will seek to promote a community ethic of freedom of expression as well as freedom from repression. Use of the services of an ombudsperson does not preclude or jeopardize an individual's right additionally to use grievance procedures available to him or her.

Article 3. Committees of the Faculty

Section a. The Executive Committee of the Faculty

The Executive Committee of the Faculty is composed of the Presiding Officer (who acts as chair of the Executive Committee), the Chairs of the Standing Committees of the Faculty, and one untenured faculty member to be elected as described in the following paragraph. The Secretary of the Faculty is also a member of the Executive Committee with voice but no vote in meetings and deliberations of the Committee. [REVISED 6/00]

As indicated above, one seat on the Executive Committee is reserved for an untenured faculty member. This position has a two-year term of office, to begin on January 1, and with elections held the semester preceding the beginning of the term of office. The Committee on Committees shall organize and conduct this election. All untenured members of the faculty in tenure-track or ongoing appointments are eligible to vote for and to serve in this position. [REVISED 6/00]

The Executive Committee is charged with the following [REVISED 9/11/95]:

1. Identifying issues that require faculty consideration and bringing them before the faculty as a whole. The faculty Executive Committee does not formulate policies or statements on behalf of the faculty, but rather helps coordinate the work of other standing committees.
2. Insuring communication between committees and the faculty as a whole and the efficient discharge of committee responsibilities.
3. Creating the agenda for faculty meetings.

Section b. Standing Committees and Subcommittees

There are five standing faculty committees. These and their subcommittees are designated as follows. Other subcommittees may be created as the occasion arises. Subcommittees designated as "advisory" serve in a consultative capacity to an administrative officer and report periodically to their parent committee. [REVISED November 2002]

Standing Committees

Committee on the Faculty

Committee on Academic Affairs

Committee on Tenure and Promotion

Subcommittees

Committee on Faculty Research and Honors
Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice
Committee on Faculty Salary and Compensation
Committee on the Library (advisory)

Committee on Honors
Committee on Individual Majors
Committee on Global Education (advisory)
Committee on Athletics
Committee on Admissions and Retention

Committee on Standards

Committee on Committees

Section c. Additional Committees

There are two additional faculty committees. These meet as appropriate to their function. They are designated as:

1. The Grievance Committee
2. The Sub-Committee on Technology

Section d. General Considerations

1. Meeting times Under normal circumstances, all standing committees are expected to meet Mondays at 4:00 p.m.
2. Chairs Unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws, committees will elect their Chair before the close of the academic year, and any member who has served on a particular committee for at least one year is eligible to be Chair.
3. Student participation Unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws, the Chair of each faculty committee, with the consent of all members of the committee, may invite students to committee meetings whenever she or he considers it appropriate. The degree of participation afforded such students present at any meeting is left to the discretion of each committee.
4. Voting privileges All faculty committee members have full voting privileges. An ex officio member of a faculty committee or subcommittee is a non-voting member. Voting privilege may be extended to an ex officio member by majority vote of the elected members of the committee at the beginning of each academic year.

Section e. Nominations and Elections

1. General comments The faculty expects its members to accept nominations to standing committees and to serve on those committees if elected. However, no person may be nominated for a faculty committee without his or her first having been consulted and it is understood that no faculty member is under obligation to serve on more than one standing committee at any given time. Membership on standing committees will generally be for three years, except for the Committee on Standards, for which the term is two years. Retiring committee members are not expected to serve on any committee during the year after their retirement, unless they are nominated and elected in the new academic year to fill a vacancy.

With respect to advisory and subcommittees of standing committees, normally all service will be for three years, with a maximum of five years of continuous service.

Unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws, all members of the faculty regularly appointed in tenure-track and ongoing positions are eligible for service. In addition, the library staff with faculty status are available for service on all committees of the faculty except the Committee on the Faculty and the Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

2. Procedures Nominations for all standing committees of the faculty and the Grievance Committee, will be administered by the Committee on Committees as follows: Each January, the Chair of the Committee on Committees will contact the chairs of other standing committees and the two grievance committees to ascertain their staffing needs for the coming year.

Members of the administration will consult with the Committee on Committees when seeking faculty to serve on ad hoc and institutional committees, including search committees, planning committees, and advisory committees. If, in the judgment of the Committee on Committees, certain ad hoc and institutional committees are of such a nature as possibly to justify the election, as opposed to appointment, of faculty members to them, it will so advise the Committee on the Faculty. The Committee on Faculty will consult with the Committee on Committees and with the administration in order to resolve the issue. Failing a resolution, the Committee on the Faculty may bring the matter to the attention of the faculty for a determination of its position on the issue.

In February, the Committee on Committees will announce positions that will be open in the following year, including officers of the faculty. The Committee will circulate a list of all faculty members eligible for committee and officer positions and a summary of their current and past service for the previous three years. The Committee will solicit nominations for positions from the faculty for officers of the faculty and for standing committee and subcommittee assignments. The Committee on Committees will maintain, where possible, divisional balance with the slate of nominations it presents to the faculty.

The names of nominees will be formally announced at the March faculty meeting, and other nominations solicited from the faculty at large at that time. Nominations will be considered officially closed one week before the April faculty meeting, at which time all nominations must be circulated to the faculty at large. Elections will be held on-line, following the voting procedures as set for in Article 4, section d.

Except where otherwise stated in the Bylaws, standing committees are responsible for staffing their own subcommittees. All appointments to subcommittees must be communicated, at the time of appointment, to the Committee on Committees. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Committees to keep an up-to-date list of membership on all faculty standing committees, subcommittees, and ad hoc and advisory committees. This list will be published in the Faculty Handbook.

Section f. Committee Membership and Function

1. Committee on the Faculty

Membership

The committee consists of 5 faculty members, preferably with at least one from each division, when an eligible faculty member from the division is willing and able to stand for election to an open position. Members of the committee must not all identify as the same gender. At least three members of the committee must be tenured, including the Chair (and Chair-elect). The term of service on the committee is generally three years. Untenured members elected for a full term of service (not the one year term defined below) may opt to serve for two rather than three years. Members of this committee should serve full years in order to eliminate the need for short-term replacements.

The Chair is usually elected into the position of Chair-elect for his or her first year of service on the committee. The Chair-elect will be elected from the tenured faculty

members of any division in elections held during the year just prior to the current Chair's final year of service. The Chair-elect then serves as the fifth faculty member on the committee (along with the Chair and three other members) in her or his first year of service on the committee. For the first year of a Chair's term, a fifth member of the committee will be elected for a one-year term, in elections held during the year just prior to the Chair's first year of service. The position is open to any faculty member eligible to serve on the committee on Faculty, but preferably will be an untenured faculty member (assuming there are 3 tenured people on the committee. [Revised December 2013]

The Chair carries a three-fifths teaching load, service as Chair of this committee being deemed to constitute two-fifths of full-time service as a member of the faculty. The Chair is responsible, with the Dean of Faculty and Provost, for determining and expediting the agenda of the Committee. For an unscheduled replacement of the Chair, any tenured member of the faculty with one year of prior experience on the committee may be elected as a replacement until the next Chair-elect is eligible to take over the position.

Ex Officio The President and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

Meetings On a regular schedule and at least once a month; extraordinary meetings called either by the Chair or on the request of the President.

Minutes Confidential when so called by the Chair; otherwise, open to faculty. Recent minutes are available in the office of the Dean of the Faculty; less recent minutes are available in the Colleges' archive.

Reports To the faculty on all policy questions.

Responsibilities

1. Acts as a consultant committee to the Dean of Faculty and Provost on policy and matters of academic freedom, faculty research, faculty workload, faculty working conditions, faculty compensation, and overall faculty and Colleges goals, including the following:
 - a. The presentation and administration of the instructional budget,
 - b. Faculty recruitment,
 - c. Guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews,
2. With respect to the Dean of Faculty and Provost's supervision of the instructional activities of the faculty, CoFac:
 - a. Acts as advocate of faculty interest in the allocation of instructional resources among instructional and non-instructional activities, in the determination of teaching loads and conditions, and in the maintenance of fair and adequate faculty compensation.
 - b. Acts as the President's Advisory Council to discuss, from the point of view of the faculty, the Colleges' administrative problems. The Council shall meet at the request of the President or Chair of the Committee on the Faculty. The Chair of the Committee on the Faculty may at his or her discretion excuse from a meeting of the Council any member of

the Committee who might have a personal or vested interest in a matter to be discussed at that meeting. In the event of an unresolved difference of opinion within the Council, a statement of such differences may be forwarded in writing by any member to the Executive Council of the Board of Trustees. At the discretion of the Executive Council, or of the Board, any members of the Advisory Council may be invited to attend a meeting of the Executive Council or the Board.

- c. Acts as the Committee on Conference with the Trustees to confer, from time to time and as occasion arises, with the Trustee Committee on Education and Appointments. Its purpose is to bring the faculty and Trustees, through chosen representatives, into closer contact with each other, and to provide for the exchange of information and recommendations for the protection of the personal and professional interests of the faculty by means of a direct and immediate contact between that body and the Trustees.
- d. Consults with the President on selection of faculty members to sit with standing committees of the Board of Trustees.
- e. Staffs, administers, and oversees the following subcommittees:
 - i. Committee on Faculty Research and Honors
Membership consists of three faculty, preferably one from each division. One member shall be a member of the Committee on the Faculty. The Dean of Faculty serves *ex officio*. The committee is convened by its faculty Chair, who is elected by the members of the subcommittee. [REVISED November 2002]

Responsibilities: Establishes in consultation with the Committee on the Faculty policy for the award of funds allocated annually in support of the faculty research and professional development, and awards these funds. This includes publishing a statement of annual guidelines and procedures, establishing and publicizing a schedule for the solicitation and review of applications, and reviewing and awarding these funds accordingly.

Solicits annually nominations for faculty recognition of teaching, scholarship, and service, and reviews and selects awardees from among nominees.

- ii. Committee on Diversity, Equity and Social Justice
Membership consists of three faculty, including at least one man and at least one woman. One member shall be a member of the Committee on the Faculty. The Director of Human Resources, the Director of Intercultural Affairs will serve as *ex officio* members of the sub-committee. The committee is convened by its faculty Chair, who is elected by the members of the subcommittee. [REVISED April 2006]

Responsibilities: Responsibility for insuring compliance with the faculty's Affirmative Action Plan is assigned the Committee and Dean of Faculty. This includes monitoring the performance of each division and its constituent departments, reviewing position requests and search plans for compliance with approved policies and procedures, submitting written recommendations to the Dean of Faculty and the Committee on the Faculty, advising departments on

search plans and strategies, facilitating training of Diversity Liaisons and organizing Diversity Liaisons to serve on search committees. The Committee and the Dean of Faculty will annually review the impact of hiring and retention on the Colleges' progress in meeting the faculty's diversity objectives, and report their findings to the faculty. The Committee will also work with other organizations and committees on campus as needed to contribute to building and sustaining an inclusive campus climate. [Revised December 2013]

iii. Committee on Faculty Salary and Compensation

Membership consists of three faculty. One member shall be a member of the Committee on the Faculty. The committee is convened by its faculty Chair, who is elected by the members of the subcommittee. [REVISED November 2002]

Responsibilities:

- a. Advising on matters that bear on faculty salaries, matters that might include protection of the step system, keeping an eye on over-all budget considerations at the Colleges, and improving the faculty's position with respect to the eighteen colleges with which we compare ourselves.
- b. Keeping the faculty informed of material impinging on salary and compensation considerations.
- c. Submitting a salary proposal to the Committee on the Faculty for timely action.

iv. Committee on the Library (advisory to the Colleges' Librarian)

Membership consists of the Colleges Librarian and three faculty, two appointed by the Librarian and the third appointed by the Committee on the Faculty. The committee is convened by the Librarian, who serves as its chair. Additional members may be appointed by the Librarian.

Responsibilities: Represents faculty interests to the Librarian and provides consultation to the Librarian on matters of library policy. In particular, provides consultation to the Librarian on the appointment, reappointment, and non-renewal of contracts of professional library staff, on collection policy acquisitions and withdrawals), on allocation of resources, and on development of the physical plant of the library.

v. The Faculty Information Technology Committee

Membership consists of four faculty, with representation from every division preferred, but at least two divisions required. All four members may not identify as the same gender. One member shall be a member of the Committee on the Faculty. The Vice President of Strategic Initiatives and CIO, Director of Digital Learning, and a representative from the Provost's Office will serve as ex officio members. The committee is convened by the CoFac representative. The committee is facilitated by its faculty chair, who is elected by members of the committee.

Charge: The Faculty Information Technology Committee (FacIT) is established to ensure a faculty voice in decisions on technology use at HWS. The committee will provide oversight on decisions that impact faculty working conditions, including technology resources for both teaching and research. The committee shall work with the President, Provost, and Vice President of Strategic Initiatives and CIO to ensure the sustainability of technology resources required for the institution's academic mission.

Responsibilities:

1. Providing guidance to administrative decisions on technology which affect faculty, as well as promoting new technologies in response to changing needs.
2. Establishing and reviewing policy for faculty use of informational technologies.
3. Identifying, reviewing, and assessing IT technologies and resources.
4. Soliciting and prioritizing proposals for adopting software and hardware technologies and recommending appropriate resources for inclusion in the IT budget.
5. Advocating IT policies and practices which enable access to a multiplicity of hardware and software platforms, including open-source and non-proprietary standards. [REVISED April 2017]

3. Engages in review of the department/program SAC documents. [Revised May 2013]

2. Committee on Academic Affairs

Membership

Four faculty members, including at least three tenured faculty and at least one member from each division. Members of the committee must not all identify as the same gender. One student from Hobart College and one student from William Smith College shall each have one half a vote. The term of service is generally three years. Untenured members may opt to serve for two rather than three years. Members of this committee should serve full years in order to eliminate the need for short-term replacements. [REVISED March 2017]

Ex Officio

The Dean of Faculty and Provost, the Dean of Hobart College, and the Dean of William Smith College, and the Registrar.

Chair

Elected by the faculty, to serve as one of the four faculty members of the Committee. Shall serve as Chair-elect in the first year, followed by two years as Chair. The chair carries a three-fifths teaching load, service as chair of this committee being deemed to constitute two-fifths of full-time service as a member of the faculty. The Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs will represent the Committee to confer with the Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs, as needed. The Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs will work with the Chair of the Committee on the Faculty to coordinate presentations to the Trustee committee as appropriate. The purpose is to provide for the exchange of information between the faculty and the Trustees. [REVISED March 2017]

Meetings

On a regular schedule and at least once a month; extraordinary meetings may be called by the Chair.

Minutes

Confidential when so called by the Chair; otherwise, open to the faculty. Recent minutes are available in the office of the Dean of Faculty and Provost; less recent minutes are available in the Colleges' archive.

Reports

To the faculty.

Responsibilities

- a. Establishes academic goals, curricula, and standards of student scholarship.
- b. Reviews and approves all new course and program proposals and changes to any current curricula in majors and minors.
- c. Oversees the general curriculum, including the Colleges' off-campus programs.
- d. Reviews and advises on the relation of the athletic, co-curricular, and minority support programs, to the academic program.
- e. Acts as the advisory council to the Dean of Faculty and Provost to discuss from the point of view of the faculty the Colleges' academic issues and concerns.
- f. Staffs, administers, and oversees the following subcommittees:

i. Committee on Honors

Membership consists of four faculty, including a representative from the Committee on Academic Affairs, with representation from every division preferred but at least two divisions required. Preferably, members of the committee should not all identify as the same gender. One student from Hobart College and one student from William Smith College shall each have one half a vote. The committee is convened by the COAA representative or the faculty Chair, who is elected by its members. [REVISED March 2017]

Responsibilities:

6. Establishes in consultation with the Committee on Academic Affairs policy governing the administration of the Colleges' Honors Program and oversees its operation.
7. Provides prospective students and their advisors information about the Honors Program (its goals, procedures, and requirements).
8. Holds informational meetings to acquaint those considering Honors with general guidelines and due dates. The Committee generally holds three honors information meetings for prospective honors students – one in the fall for juniors, one in February for sophomores and juniors, and one in April for first year students.
9. Consults, when needed, with individuals doing Honors (particularly

- faculty advisors who have not mentored an Honors student before).
10. Issues a summary of Honors at the Colleges at the end of each academic year. [REVISED March 2017]

ii. Committee on Individual Majors

Membership consists of four faculty, including a representative from the Committee on Academic Affairs, and at least one faculty member from each division. Preferably, members of the committee should not all identify as the same gender. A Dean from Hobart College, a Dean from William Smith College, and a member of the Registrar's office serve as ex officio members. The committee is convened by the CoAA representative or the faculty Chair, who is elected by members of the subcommittee. [REVISED March 2017]

Responsibilities:

- a. Oversees the requirements of all non-departmental/program majors, ensures specific Individual Majors are substantially different from existing department/program majors, and ensures that majors proposed out of existing minor areas are consistent with the academic goals of the minor area.
- b. Reviews proposals by students for Individual Majors, including the narrative of the proposed major, the course list, the advisor's comments and signature, and the feasibility of completing such a major at the Colleges.
- c. Reviews every proposed change to each student's Individual Major (alternative courses, change in title, additions or deletions to the course list).
- d. Acts as an advisory group for faculty and students who wish to devise a unique major combining work from several departments and/or programs.
- e. Monitors and reports on the topics or disciplines of all individual majors annually. The committee also reports to the Committee on Academic Affairs regarding any concerning issues for the Individual Majors program (e.g. large numbers of particular Individual Majors, consistent registration issues related to popular courses in Individual Majors, etc.).

The Individual Majors Committee chair responds in writing to each student and advisor, communicating the committee's decision on the proposal or proposed changes to the major, either approving, not approving, and/or suggesting specific revisions to the proposed program of study, course list, title and direction. The chair is responsible for signing all senior audit forms for individual majors. [REVISED March 2017]

iii. Committee on Global Education (Advisory to the Dean of Faculty and Provost)

Membership consists of five faculty members, including a representative from the Committee on Academic Affairs, with representation from each division preferred but at least two divisions required.. One faculty member must be a

language professor. A minimum of three of the five faculty must each have directed one or more off-campus programs. Preferably, members of the committee should not all identify as the same gender. The Director of the Center for Global Education, A Dean from Hobart College and a Dean from William Smith College serve as ex officio members. The Committee is convened by the CoAA representative or the faculty Chair, who is elected by the members of the committee. [REVISED March 2017]

Responsibilities:

- a. Advises the Center for Global Education's Director on overall academic goals, curricular integration, standards of scholarship, faculty qualifications, and student preparation as they affect the Colleges' domestic and international off-campus programs.
- b. Works with the Center Director to develop new off-campus programs and design faculty development initiatives, to create additional partnerships and consortia, and, as needed, assists in recruiting faculty to serve as program directors.
- c. Reviews proposals from faculty seeking to direct Center for Global Education programs, recommends proposals to the Committee on Academic Affairs and the Provost, and ensures that the process of soliciting and reviewing faculty proposals is carried out in an open and transparent manner.
- d. Advises the Center Director and the Committee on Academic Affairs on the educational content, consistency and curricular coherence of off-campus programs, and the faculty standards regarding student participation and conduct in off-campus programs.
- e. Works with the Center Director to ensure that all domestic and international off-campus programs are evaluated on a regular basis and that student evaluations are administered after each program, and advises the Center Director and the Committee on Academic Affairs on the viability of off-campus programs.
- f. Works with the Center Director to ensure a transparent budgeting system is maintained and assists in reviewing budgetary priorities.
[REVISED March 2017]

iv. Committee on Athletics

Membership consists of four faculty members (two appointed by the Committee on Academic Affairs, one member of the Committee on Academic Affairs, and the Hobart and William Smith NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR)). Preferably, members of the committee should not all identify as the same gender

One Hobart student selected by the Hobart athletic director from the Student-Athlete Advisory Council, and one William Smith student selected by the William Smith athletic director from the Student-Athlete Advisory Council shall each have a half a vote. The Vice President of Student Affairs, a Dean from Hobart College, a Dean from William Smith College, the Director of Athletics of Hobart College, the Director of Athletics of William Smith College, the Colleges' NCAA Compliance Coordinator, and two coaches (one designated by the Hobart College coaching staff and one designated by the William Smith College coaching staff) will also serve on the committee ex officio. The NCAA FAR shall be responsible for convening the first meeting of each year. The faculty chair of the Committee on Athletics will be elected by its voting members. [REVISED March 2017]

Responsibilities:

- a. Works to insure effective communication between the athletic staff and the faculty;
- b. Reviews, revises, and refers to the Committee on Academic Affairs for approval all policies pertaining to academic requirements, programs, and performance as they apply specifically to student athletes;
- c. Undertakes as an institutional obligation the reduction of conflict between academic work and the athletic participation. Reaffirms and publishes the policies regarding the relationship of academics and athletics, including policies specifically related to scheduling conflicts;
- d. Monitors the impact of the athletic programs and athletic participation on admissions and the academic progress of student athletes;
- e. Assesses when appropriate the divisional status of athletic programs;
- f. Monitors and maintains the Faculty Athletic Fellows (FAF) program;
- g. Monitors issues of gender equity among the athletic programs.

The Committee on Athletics will present an annual written report to the faculty explaining its deliberations and actions.

- v. Committee on Admissions and Retention
Membership consists of four faculty members (two appointed by the Committee on Academic Affairs, one member of the Committee on the Faculty, and one member of the Committee on Academic Affairs who will serve as Chair). Preferably, members of the committee should not all identify as the same gender. One student from Hobart College and one student from William Smith College shall each have one half a vote. The Dean of Admissions, the Director of Admissions, a Dean from Hobart College, a Dean from William Smith College,

the Provost and Dean of Faculty, and the Vice President of Student Affairs serve as ex officio members. The committee is convened by its faculty Chair. [REVISED March 2017]

Responsibilities:

- a. Works to insure effective communication between the faculty and the Admissions office through regular reports, at least one per semester, at faculty meetings (and included in the CoAA report to the faculty).
- b. Monitors enrollment management statistics and recruitment and admissions procedures mainly pertaining but not limited to academic standards and student success and retention.
- c. Facilitates communication with faculty to promote participation in the recruitment and admissions process and student retention efforts as appropriate.
- d. Will be available to meet with the Trustee Committee on Admissions and Retention to confer as occasions arise. [REVISED March 2017]

3. Committee on Tenure and Promotion

Membership Six tenured faculty members, including at least two Full Professors, at least one woman and at least one man, and at least one member from each division but no more than three members from any one division. Members are expected to serve full academic years and no more than three years out of five.

Chair Elected from within the Committee by its members. The Chair normally carries a four-fifths teaching load, with service as chair of this committee being deemed to constitute one-fifth of full-time service as a member of the faculty. [REVISED November 2008]

Meetings As appropriate.

Minutes Closed.

Reports To the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President.

Responsibilities Advises the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President in matters of faculty reviews, promotions, tenure decisions, and termination of appointments, according to procedures described in Article I, Section e of the Bylaws. In Review I, II, and III will make its own written report and recommendations to the Provost and President. Its role in Administrative Reviews is described in Faculty Handbook, Part III, Institutional Policies and Procedures, Section C.

In consultation with the Committee on the Faculty, establishes, updates, and publishes procedures to be followed in all faculty reviews and contract renewals. Advises CoFac when departmental/program Standards and Criteria (SAC) documents are reviewed.

Is responsible for educating faculty members generally, and each candidate for review and

his/her department or program specifically, about review procedures.

Is responsible for generating a common letter to be used by all Review I, II, and III Committees when soliciting comments from students.

The following describes the Committee on Tenure and Promotion for the 2016-17 and 2017-18 academic years:

- Membership There will be two COTAP committees (Review II COTAP and Review I/III COTAP) each with six tenured members, including at least two Full Professors, at least one woman and at least one man, and at least one member from each division but no more than three members from any one division.
- The Review II COTAP members are expected to serve full academic years. Members elected to COTAP in prior years but still serving in 2016-17 and/or 2017-18 will serve on the Review II COTAP.
- The Review I/III COTAP members serve during Spring semester only. Members, will be elected in Spring 2016 and be expected to serve a two-year term.
- Chairs One chair for each committee. The Review II COTAP chair will be elected and serve in the position of Chair-elect the year before becoming Chair. The Chair of the Review II COTAP receives a two-course release. The Chair of the Review I/III COTAP will be elected in the year before serving as Chair and will receive a one-course release during the semester he or she serves as Chair.
- Meetings As appropriate
- Minutes Closed
- Reports To the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President.
- Responsibilities The Review II COTAP advises the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President on matters of faculty reviews, promotions, tenure decisions, and termination of appointments, according to procedures described in Article I, Section e3 of the Bylaws. It makes its own written report and recommendations to the Provost and President on Review II cases. Its role in Administrative Reviews is described in Faculty Handbook, Part III, Institutional Policies and Procedures, Section C.
- The Review I/III COTAP advises the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President on matters of Review I and Review III, writing its own report and making recommendations to the Provost on Review I cases and to the Provost and President on Review III cases.

4. Committee on Standards

- Membership The committee will consist of three faculty members, each with at least three years of experience at these Colleges. At least two divisions must be represented, and faculty membership must have gender diversity. The term of service for faculty representatives is three years. Untenured members may opt to serve for two rather than three years. Student representatives, one each from Hobart and from William Smith, will be selected

by their respective student governments. [REVISED March 2017]

Ex Officio Representatives from the Hobart and William Smith Deans Offices, from the Provost's Office and from the Registrar's Office will be ex officio members of the committee. [REVISED March 2017]

Chair The faculty on the committee will elect a Chair from their members who have at least one prior year of experience on the committee. [REVISED March 2017]

Decision making The committee will strive to reach consensus. When consensus cannot be achieved, the committee will resort to majority voting with each faculty member receiving one vote and the student representatives each receiving half a vote. [REVISED March 2017]

Meetings The committee will meet on a regular schedule, preferably once per week, with extraordinary meetings called by the chair. [REVISED March 2017]

Minutes Minutes recorded during adjudication on standards are confidential. These minutes will be stored in a secure location and will be accessible only by the Committee and the Dean's Offices. Minutes will be kept during the committee's policy discussions and will be made available to the faculty. [REVISED March 2017]

Reports The Chair will make a report to the faculty on the Committee's work at least once per semester. The report will include summary information regarding the number and typed of cases. This summary must include no personal identifying information. [REVISED March 2017]

Unique and Binding Definition This definition of the responsibilities and practices of the Committee on Standards is the sole and binding definition of the Committee. It shall not be expanded, amended, or superseded by any other document. [REVISED March 2017]

Responsibilities

- a. The Committee insures the integrity and fair application of the Colleges' academic rules, policies, and standards.
- b. The Committee adjudicates violations of the Colleges' academic integrity standards, including, but not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, or falsification of data. The Committee is also charged with granting exceptions to the deadlines for course withdrawal or for implementing the credit/no-credit grading option.
- c. The Committee establishes the procedures for academic review and for implementing academic probation and suspension at the Colleges.
- d. The Committee and representatives of the Deans' Offices, the Registrar, and the Provost's Office conduct an academic review after each semester. The academic performance of all students is reviewed, and the Committee decides which students will receive academic probation, suspension, and separation.
- e. The Committee Chair will have access to and regularly review the list of social conduct violations, currently kept by the Office of Student Affairs.
- f. The Committee will adjudicate cases involving social conduct violations that are deemed as possibly involving at least one of the following conditions:

- a. a serious breach of the Colleges' Community Standards (such as discrimination, interpersonal violence, the threat of violence, harassment, or bullying), including such cases where the violation may be ambiguous,
 - b. an incident involving a staff and/or faculty member(s)
 - c. the accused student is a repeat offender of College's policies.
- g. The determination as to which social conduct cases are adjudicated by the Committee will be made by the Committee Chair and the Office of Student Affairs. Cases not heard by the Committee will be adjudicated by the Office of Student Affairs.
- h. The Committee will work in cooperation with the Title IX Office on cases that require partial adjudication by that office. The Committee will abide by the Title IX office's direction in protecting the privacy and safety of students involved in these cases. [REVISED March 2017]

5. Committee on Committees

Membership

The Committee on Committees consists of three elected faculty with a minimum of four years' experience at the Colleges, one from each division. The term of service is three years. The Committee on Committees is convened at the beginning of the Fall semester by the Presiding Officer of the Executive Committee for the purpose of the Committee's electing its Chair from among its three members.

Responsibilities

The Committee is charged with the following responsibilities:

- a. Keeping an up-to-date list of all faculty and their current and past committee assignments, including standing committees, subcommittees, advisory committees, and ad hoc committees;
- b. Activating the nomination process;
- c. Presenting to the faculty nominations for all standing committees;
- d. Consulting with administrators in the appointment of faculty to ad hoc and institutional committees;
- e. Reviewing committee structures for preparing and presenting to the faculty necessary changes in charges of faculty committees.

6. The Grievance Committee

Membership

The Grievance Committee consists of seven faculty members, each having taught at least two years at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, including at least two members from each division, but no more than three from any one division. Members are elected each spring for a one-year term, beginning the first day of following spring semester. Members will remove themselves from consideration for an individual panel if they perceive a conflict of interest.

Whenever possible, when the removal of members so requires, an alternate will be

designated from a pool of faculty who have previously served on the grievance committee. The pool will be formed by asking all faculty members prior to the end of their term of service whether they would be willing to serve as alternate for the next year. The Chair of the Committee on the Faculty will convene the Grievance Committee in the fall semester preceding the committee's term of service for the purpose of the committee electing its chair.

Grounds for Grievance

Individual faculty members may request an examination of any Grievance decision adversely affecting their faculty status if they believe the decision to have been made with inadequate or improper consideration, or if they believe the decision involved a violation of their academic freedom. Faculty alleging discrimination have recourse through the Colleges' Grievance Committee on Nondiscrimination.

Initiation of Grievance

Within ten academic days of the time the faculty member receives official notice of the decision in question, the Chair of the Grievance Committee must be informed in writing of the faculty member's intention to file a grievance. As soon as notification of the intent to file a grievance has been received, the Chair of the Grievance Committee will notify the committee members of such intent and remind them that no communication with either griever or grievée(s) should take place, except as provided for by the grievance procedure.

A statement of grievance must normally be submitted to the Grievance Committee Chair at a time mutually agreed upon by the griever and the Grievance Committee. That statement shall name both the action and the person or body by which the petitioner was allegedly aggrieved and shall state the grounds for the grievance (e.g., improper consideration, violation of academic freedom, etc.). However, the statement need not contain the evidence in support of the petitioner's allegations. Upon receipt of the grievance statement, the Chair of the Grievance Committee shall notify the grievée(s) in writing that such grievance has been submitted and that the statement is available in the Dean of Faculty and Provost's office. The Chair of the Grievance Committee will make sure that those grieved against have received the notice and have an opportunity to examine the grievance statement.

A panel of three will be chosen to examine the case and to make recommendations. The Panel will be selected from among committee members by the elimination of two members by the griever and two by the grievée(s). In the case that both the griever and grievée(s) name the same person(s), the Panel will be chosen by lot from the four or five remaining members. The Panel will designate one of its members as convener.

Procedures

The Grievance Panel, on the basis of both the evidence presented by the Petitioner and any inquiry that it (the panel) deems appropriate, will determine whether the statement of grievance presented warrants further investigation. If it determines that it does not, the panel will so notify the griever and grievée(s) of its decision and reasons for the decision, and the grievance process with respect to this matter is terminated. If it determines that the statement of grievance does warrant further investigation, the panel will seek to

resolve the matter by informal methods with the understanding that, if the matter is not resolved informally, the conversations and communications with both parties* may later become part of a more formal investigation.

If informal methods fail, the Grievance Panel shall devise and adopt general rules to govern its procedures in a more formal investigation. These rules shall protect the rights of the grievor and grievor(s) and shall not be of such a nature that a professional knowledge of law would be required to operate within them. These rules shall be consistent with AAUP guidelines. The panel may have access to all documents that in its judgment bear upon the case. The panel will be bound by the same standards of confidentiality that surrounded the original judgments.

The Grievance Panel will determine on the basis of its investigation if the decision in question was made with inadequate or improper consideration or if a violation of academic freedom occurred. If the panel determines that such a violation has not occurred, the panel will so notify the grievor and grievor(s) of its decision, and the grievance process with respect to this matter is terminated. If the panel determines that such a violation has occurred, the panel may recommend reconsideration of the case by the appropriate body** and will make a report of its findings to the grievor, the grievor(s), and the President.

In no case will the Grievance Panel substitute its judgment in the case for the judgment of the person(s) involved in the original decision.

In cases in which a recommendation to reconsider is not followed, the panel will so inform the faculty.

* The grievor and the persons involved in the original judgment.

** The elected representatives presently in office.

Article 4. Meetings of the Faculty

Section a. Procedures

The faculty meets regularly when the Colleges are in session. The Presiding Officer establishes the regular meeting time, typically the first Monday of each month when the Colleges are in session. He or she calls additional meetings when necessary. A special meeting of the faculty may be called by the chair of a standing committee for consideration of an appropriate issue. Binding action can be taken only if a quorum is present and the faculty has been duly informed in writing of the specific issues at least three days in advance.

The Secretary of the Faculty sends a note to each faculty member by Thursday noon of the week before the meeting. The notice includes an agenda. The deadline, therefore, for any material which should be included on the agenda is 12:00 noon on the Tuesday before the meeting. Such material is given to the Secretary.

Except on occasions when the President addresses the faculty in "privileged conversation," or when a particular meeting or part of a meeting is closed by the majority vote of the faculty, all faculty meetings are open to other members of the Colleges community, who shall have neither voice nor vote. The denial of a voice shall not apply to official student members of the Committee on Academic Affairs or the Committee on Students, nor to the Presidents of the two Student Associations. These students shall be granted a voice, but not a vote, upon recognition by the Chair, when matters emanating from these bodies are before the faculty.

Section b. Quorum

A quorum is determined on a semester-by-semester basis. A quorum is defined as 30% (number rounded up) of all faculty and administrators to whom voting privilege is extended (Article 4, Section d. Voting.) The Secretary is responsible for maintaining a current list of individuals to be counted toward quorum. [REVISED March 2011]

Section c. Order of Business

The usual order of business is as follows:

1. Minutes read, corrected, and approved by faculty
2. Announcements (non-debatable) and points of information by the
3. President, Dean of Faculty and Provost, the Deans, and others
4. Reports of committees
5. Old business
6. New business
7. Adjournment

Section d. Voting

Voting privilege is extended to: (a) all full-time faculty and those in half-time or greater ongoing appointment, including those on leave; (b) all administrators who hold faculty rank enumerated in Article 1, Section a; and (c) all other faculty teaching more than three courses in the academic year and having more than one year of such instructional service at the Colleges.

Votes may be conducted in the following ways:

Within the context of a regularly-scheduled or special meeting of the faculty

1. Voice vote of eligible faculty who are in attendance.
2. A show of hands of eligible faculty who are in attendance. The Secretary acts as teller.
3. A secret ballot (paper, on-line or electronic) of eligible faculty who are in attendance.

Elections for Officers and to Committees

4. Secret on-line or electronic ballot for all elections to committees and for officers of the faculty Voting will open at the time the final slate of nominees is announced, and close at midnight on the night of the April faculty meeting. Results will be announced electronically on the day following the faculty meeting. The online voting system will be chosen by the committee on committees in consultation with CoFac and the Colleges' Information Technology services. Any such system will guarantee that: (1) only eligible faculty may vote; (2) eligible faculty may cast only one ballot a piece; (3) ballots are anonymous. The system will be accessible to all eligible voting members of the faculty.

For matters of great consequence to the entire faculty

5. A secret ballot (paper, on-line or electronic) of all faculty who are eligible to vote. These secret ballot votes are intended for issues of great consequence to the entire faculty, and require passage of a special motion at a regular faculty meeting, by a majority numbering at least half the quorum.
 - The special motion to adopt a secret ballot vote of all eligible faculty can be moved by a standing faculty committee without a second, or by any voting faculty member with 10 additional voting faculty who will second the motion.
 - The motion is then debated and must pass by a majority numbering at least half of the quorum. The special motion to adopt a secret ballot vote is subsidiary to a main motion and takes precedence over a motion of previous question, but yields to a motion to lay on the table. A special motion for a secret ballot vote of all eligible faculty is out of order while a motion to amend is pending. If the special motion is passed, the presiding officer and the faculty secretary will conduct the balloting with a reasonable closing date and results to be reported as soon as possible after the closing date. (The balloting may be conducted by any method that is intended to allow all eligible faculty to vote, ensures individual votes are secret, permits only eligible faculty to vote, and allows each eligible voter to cast only one vote.) [REVISED March 2015]

No proxy votes are allowed.

Ordinarily, elections to committees and for officers of the faculty will be conducted by secret on-line or electronic balloting, as described in Article 4, section d.3. In extraordinary circumstances, as when a late resignation occurs from a committee seat which must be filled in as timely a manner as possible, the Committee on Committees may recommend to the Committee on the Faculty that election occur in an expedited manner. In such case, with the concurrence of the Committee on the Faculty, nominations and balloting may proceed as follows:

- a. The Committee on Committees will advise faculty of the vacancy as soon as it learns about it.
- b. After 7 days (or more, if the Committee on Committees cannot in that time find at least one nominee) the Committee on Committees will advise faculty of the nominee(s).
- c. Nominations will close 7 days after faculty have been advised of the nominee(s).
- d. Elections will be held on-line. Voting will open at the time the final slate of nominees is announced, and close one week later. Results will be announced electronically on the day following the close of voting.

Section e. Attendance

All members of the faculty are required to attend faculty meetings.

Attendance at Commencement and other academic processions is strongly encouraged. The Registrar marshals the faculty at Commencement, and any member who must be absent should inform the Dean of Faculty and Provost. Position in the procession is determined by rank and seniority.

Article 5. Parliamentary Authority

The Faculty has adopted Robert's Rules of Order, with the provision that any rule may be amended by majority vote of the Faculty.

Article 6. Amendment of Bylaws

These Bylaws may be amended by presenting the proposed Bylaw change in writing to the faculty for first discussion at a regularly scheduled meeting and having such change approved by two-thirds of the faculty present and voting at a subsequent regularly scheduled meeting. A copy of such proposed change is to be sent to all members prior to the first meeting, and at least three weeks before the meeting at which a vote for approval will be taken, if the proposed change has been amended. Substantive amendment of a proposed Bylaw change at the second meeting will constitute a first reading and require a vote at a subsequent faculty meeting.

Amendments to the Bylaws will take effect December 31 for amendments approved in a fall semester and May 31 for amendments approved during a spring semester, with the exception of amendments dealing with faculty reviews, as reflected in Section d. Standards for Tenure and Reappointment and Section e. Standards, criteria, and procedures for contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Application of amendments to the review process will take effect on the first day of July, immediately following the academic year in which the amendment was approved. The change to the review process will immediately apply to all faculty hired on or after the July 1 in which the amendment takes effect, and to all other faculty unless the faculty member applied for relief from the application of the changed review process, in accordance with the rules set out in Section II, item 6 in the Faculty Handbook, Part II.