I.PERSONNEL POLICIES: A. FULL-TIME FACULTY

(Revised per proposal 25-84.)

1. Objectives and Categories of Contracts

a. The essential objective of the faculty personnel policy at Denison is to secure the highest quality faculty possible for a liberal arts college. Quality is measured by the criteria set forth in this statement in those sections dealing with reappointment, tenure and promotion.

b. There are three basic types of teaching faculty appointments at Denison:

i. Tenure-Track Appointments

These are appointments that will lead to tenure, provided the candidate performs at the level specified by the criteria described below in sections dealing with tenure and promotion [section I.A.3]. Tenure-track appointments form the core of Denison's faculty and Denison endeavors to staff the curriculum with long-term faculty.

ii. Visiting Appointments

These are short-term, non-tenure track appointments to manage acute staffing needs (e.g. those caused by leave replacements, unexpected short-term enrollment pressures). They may be at either a junior or senior level, i.e. as Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor. Based on departmental need, these appointments will typically be for 1-2 years, but generally for no more than three years. (Occasionally, such appointments may be renewed for up to, but no more than six years. For further discussion of visiting appointments, see [I.B.].)

iii. Continuing Appointments

These are long-term, non-tenure track appointments to address a variety of persistent staffing needs that may not be readily addressed via tenure-track appointments. They may be provided to faculty in certain situations who have served in visiting appointments and who are being reappointed past six years. Such reappointments must be based on a determination of continued need as well as successful reviews. They come with expectations and professional development opportunities that are additional to those of visiting appointments, as described in section I.B.3.

2. Appointments and Promotions

Denison University commits itself to an open application system where all interested and qualified individuals are given an equal opportunity to apply for continuing appointments. Denison employs full-time, tenure-track faculty members insofar as possible to teach its curriculum and perform the other educational tasks of the institution. The University may employ part-time faculty in situations where the institution may want to offer special courses or take advantage of special skills for which there is not a full-time need or where temporary replacement staffing is needed.

Tenure-track positions are filled through national searches conducted expressly for the position in question. These searches must comply with Denison's hiring procedures and the relevant provisions of the Faculty Handbook. Internal candidates may apply for tenure-track positions, in which case they will be considered on the same basis as all other candidates.

This section outlines the normal process by which faculty appointments are made. However, circumstances may require the length of appointments and designation of faculty rank to vary in certain cases. The contract letter will specify any exceptions to the normal practice.

a. Instructor. If an individual who is appointed to the faculty has not received a Ph.D. (or an equivalent advanced degree), the appointment ordinarily shall be at the rank of Instructor. If that appointment is to a tenure-track position, it will be for two years. Reappointment beyond two years will normally not occur unless all requirements for the appropriate advanced degree are completed prior to the beginning of the second year of the contract. If the requirements are completed, the faculty member will be promoted to Assistant Professor and the faculty member's contract will be extended through a fourth year.

Faculty at the rank of Instructor who complete all the requirements for the appropriate advanced degree by December 15 of their first year will be retroactively promoted to Assistant Professor and their salary adjusted accordingly.

b. Assistant Professor. If an individual who is appointed to the faculty has received a Ph.D. (or equivalent advanced degree), the initial appointment is at the rank of Assistant Professor. Normally, the initial appointment to a tenure-track position is four years with a maximum reappointment of one three-year contract, or a total of seven years.

An Assistant Professor holding a tenure-track position shall be considered for tenure during the sixth year of full-time service as a member of the faculty at Denison. (See paragraph "e" regarding credit for prior experience.) If tenure is granted, the individual is promoted to Associate Professor with tenure, effective at the beginning of the subsequent academic year.

c. Appointment of Associate Professors and Professors. Denison normally does not make initial appointments at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and normally does not make initial appointments with tenure. When extraordinary circumstances make such an appointment desirable, the Provost seeks the advice both of the department affected and the President's Advisory Board prior to making the appointment. For more information on the process to make an appointment with tenure, please refer to this (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1S2WPZXTNGNllmTvmWBWG0ygnFqOCsHBxsL_PPxKRhtU/edit/?usp=sharing) document.

d. Notification of Non-renewal. Normally, faculty with tenure-track and continuing appointments will be notified at least one year in advance if their contracts will not be renewed.

e. Prior Experience. Denison normally does not accept more than two years of prior experience either from other institutions or from Denison experience when making tenure-track appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor. The number of years of prior experience to be claimed by a candidate will be negotiated between the candidate and the Provost in consultation with the members

of the department at the time of hire. The years of prior credit may be changed during the first nine months of the initial appointment with the concurrence of the new faculty member, the appropriate department chair, and the Provost. Tenure decisions are based primarily upon work done at Denison, particularly with respect to teaching and contributions to the other purposes of the University. Faculty should be aware that sabbatical leaves are awarded only after six years of service at Denison, whether or not prior experience has been claimed.

Faculty Affiliation with Interdisciplinary Programs

(Proposal #21-45, adopted 5 November 2020)

Unlike divisional departments, Interdisciplinary (ID) Programs rely heavily, and in some cases solely, on the voluntary contributions of faculty from divisional departments. An "affiliated status" has been established to both facilitate the work of ID Programs and to recognize the contributions of faculty who participate in IDs. There are three types of faculty associated with IDs: 1) those with full-time appointments; 2) those with joint appointments; and, 3) faculty with a full-time appointment in a divisional department who voluntarily associate with one or more ID Program. This policy addresses those in the third category, as well as faculty members with appointments in programs who seek affiliation with an ID Program outside of their contractual home.

A faculty member may become "affiliated" with an ID Program if the colleague shows sustained involvement in two of the three major areas of contributions to the ID (i.e., teaching, service, and research). A faculty member requests affiliated status from the ID Director, who, in consultation with members of the program, then sends notification to the Provost. From the outset, faculty members are encouraged to be in communication with their home department/program chairs regarding the affiliation process.

While there is no formal metric for "sustained involvement," Denison expects affiliates of IDs in the area of Service to attend regularly committee meetings and be active participants in the business of the program. Those claiming affiliation owing to contributions to teaching should make regular contributions to the ID curriculum and advise an equitable share of the Program's advisees. To qualify for affiliate status on the basis of scholarship, the faculty members should conduct research accessible to the ID and/or make substantial contributions to the intellectual identity of the ID through lecture series, symposia, and the like.

Each ID will maintain a list of its affiliated faculty and display it when detailing faculty members on web pages and the like.

To ensure active participation, affiliation must be reaffirmed by the faculty member and ID at each renewal, promotion, and senior review.

Under most circumstances, senior faculty who are affiliated with the ID may be considered eligible to serve as Program Director, and to serve on review, tenure, and promotion committees for program faculty.

3. Performance Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion to Associate Professor

a. Principles.

The statement of criteria set forth below makes clear what the university expects of its faculty in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Consistent with its mission, the university requires that its faculty demonstrate excellence in teaching. Scholarship has an intrinsic value, and it informs the best teaching. As a diverse community with many needs, the university relies on all of its members to contribute service according to their various talents and also with consistency over time. In sum, a member of the Denison faculty is expected to meet the standards described below in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, since in reality the three areas are linked in many ways. It is only when the faculty member meets the standards of the university across the range of these pursuits that the person is likely to make those contributions, upon which the university depends to excel as an intellectual and social community.

b. Teaching.

1. Successful teaching is based on expertise in a particular subject matter and on a commitment to the craft of teaching. An individual matures into an effective teacher with experience and reflection. An effective teacher is also a scholar, who is well-versed in a field of knowledge and current with the latest inquiry in that field.
2. Effective teachers are able to engage a broad range of students, from the novice to the advanced learner. They are able to articulate pedagogical goals, adopt classroom practices designed to achieve those goals, and demonstrate success in achieving those goals. They convey excitement about their discipline and about learning in general, and they foster respect for the liberal arts. They introduce students to the role of scholarship in their discipline in ways that are appropriate to the developmental level of the student.
3. Effective teachers create a respectful environment that encourages the open exchange of ideas, and in which the interest of students increases and their engagement with the material deepens. Such teachers provide careful, honest and constructive feedback, and they encourage students to develop the habits of critical thinking. They aspire to help students to think independently, and to hold themselves to a standard of intellectual rigor and ethical reflection while learning to see the world in new ways.
4. As faculty advisors, effective teachers encourage students to develop a deliberative approach to their academic endeavors: to design a course of study, to reflect on career and life choices, and to pursue opportunities for independent scholarship.
5. Successful candidates for tenure will be expected to be effective teachers.
6. Candidates for reappointment at the third year must demonstrate progress toward meeting the above standards for tenure at the sixth year. Merit pay at the third year will be evaluated based on criteria in section I.E.2.f.
7. Teaching can be assessed by drawing upon a variety of materials, including:

    - a professional statement including analysis, evaluation and reflection on teaching philosophy, goals, methods, and outcomes;
    - samples of syllabi, examinations, assignments and other course materials;

- results of the common university summative evaluations, comments and quantitative results;
- peer observation of teaching;
- reflections on the supervision of student research;
- reflections on student advising and (pending the development of guidelines by AAC) evidence of its effectiveness.

c. Scholarship.

1. Scholarship and creative achievements are both valuable in their own right and instrumental to good teaching. Scholarly achievements are not only measures of a faculty member's continuing involvement in a field of study or artistic endeavor, but are also sources of curricular strength and renewal for the institution. Engaging in scholarship is vital to the continued intellectual and professional growth of a faculty member. Scholarship is also vital to teaching because it informs the subject matter of courses and establishes the faculty member as a model from whom students learn.
2. The candidate's body of scholarship should flow from a vision of scholarly growth, which should be discussed in the professional statement. This body of scholarship should reflect a degree of originality in the generation, application, or reinterpretation of concepts, methods, or creative works. The body of scholarship should reflect the activity of an informed and lively intellect and talent that may be read with interest by the candidate's peers beyond Denison and possibly employed in their own work. The issues addressed should be important ones, and the contributions candidates make to their field should be significant and intellectually sound.
3. A successful candidate for tenure will be expected to have demonstrated a sustained scholarly effort, as well as scholarly ability, by producing a professionally reviewed body of scholarship in the form of publication, performance, exhibition, or other final form usual to the discipline. Evidence may include the continuation or completion of scholarly activity that was begun prior to the candidate's employment at Denison; however, there must be a clear demonstration of continued scholarly activity, growth, and productivity while a faculty member at Denison. The tenure review process includes an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship or creative work done by persons not associated either with the candidate or with Denison.
4. Candidates for reappointment at the third year must demonstrate progress toward meeting the above standard for tenure at the sixth year. Works in progress beyond the dissertation may be sufficient to demonstrate progress toward tenure at the time of the third year review, but are not in themselves adequate for tenure. Merit pay at the third year will be evaluated based on criteria in section I.E.2.f.
5. Professionally reviewed scholarship and creative works are the most important indicators of scholarly achievement and are essential for tenure. Examples of these may include: scholarly articles, monographs, book chapters; published short stories, poetry, and novels; translations, critical editions, and interpretive anthologies and textbooks; published or recorded music; performances and exhibitions; original work in performing, dramatic, or visual arts; original computer software; and peer reviewed grant proposals.
6. Other forms of scholarship and creative works may be reported as additional evidence of scholarly activity, for example: book reviews; technical reports from consulting projects; papers presented at professional meetings; and non-peer reviewed grant proposals.
7. These examples are neither all-inclusive nor exclusive. In every instance, the quality and extent of the scholarship or creative works are most important.

d. Contributions to the Other Purposes of the University.

1. As a residential liberal arts college dedicated to educating the whole person, Denison depends upon its faculty to contribute to the life of the University not only as teacher/scholars but also as members of the community. In the extent and quality of their contributions to the University, faculty serve as models for colleagues and students of civic engagement, promote participation in thoughtful public discourse, and exemplify the ability to see individual and departmental interests through the lens of institutional needs. These other contributions to the University have the effect of increasing the overall sense of connectedness within the community, connecting students to the University, colleagues to one another, and the University to the larger world of academe. In doing so, they strengthen the community and promote both unity and diversity. For these reasons, other contributions to the University constitute a third and important criterion for contract reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
2. Faculty members are expected to engage in ongoing service to the University, which may include service to the discipline or the profession. This service should expand in breadth and depth throughout an individual's career in ways that complement the unique talents of the faculty member. Thus, while the beginnings of a record of service would suffice for reappointment, a more significant record of service would be expected for tenure, and an even more significant record of service would be expected for promotion to professor. Merit pay at the third year will be evaluated based on criteria in section I.E.2.f.
3. These contributions may take many forms. Active engagement with the department and the University are expected of all colleagues. For this reason, all faculty members are expected to attend department meetings and meetings of the University faculty. Faculty serve their departments in such ways as participating on departmental committees, participating in faculty searches, serving as department chair, advising departmental student groups, and attending and participating in other departmental events. Faculty are expected to contribute to the University in such ways as serving on committees in the governance system, serving on ad hoc committees and task forces, serving on interdisciplinary program committees, attending and participating in admissions events, advising student organizations, and representing the University in various consortial roles. Faculty members also serve their

disciplines and the profession in such ways as serving on editorial boards, prize committees, and review boards and serving in leadership roles in professional organizations. Faculty also serve their communities in such ways as holding elected office and serving on the boards of community agencies and non-profits. Such community service is particularly valued when colleagues lend their professional expertise to help meet civic needs.

e. Criteria Unrelated to the Performance of the Candidate. In exceptional circumstances, the president may take into consideration factors unrelated to the performance of a candidate when making recommendations on reappointment, tenure, or promotion, as discussed under the "Responsibilities of the President" below.

4. Performance Criteria for Promotion to Professor

(Proposal #17-02, 17-05, adopted 2 February 2017)

Promotion to full professor is not based primarily on the number of years served at the rank of associate professor. Many faculty members may be ready to stand for full professor following their second sabbatical as an associate professor. Some faculty may choose to stand for promotion earlier. Although a candidate can be considered for promotion at any time, a full professor review is recommended by the 14th year after earning tenure for all faculty members who have not yet come up for promotion. The provost will discuss with the faculty member the possibility of submitting a dossier for promotion at the time of the second senior review after tenure.

a. Teaching. Successful candidates for promotion to full professor will demonstrate that they have matured as teachers by providing evidence of effective teaching and growth beyond the point of tenure according to the criteria set forth in section I.A.3.a-d. Such teachers will be current with their field as shown by continuing scholarly and creative activity. They will be able to articulate fully-developed pedagogical goals, will adopt classroom practices designed to achieve those goals, and will present a record of success in achieving those goals. They will be consistently successful in engaging with learners at all levels and will be constructive in their feedback to students and rigorous in evaluating them. They will be conscientious advisors and mentors. They will challenge students to become critical thinkers, independent learners, and self-conscious participants in the process of a liberal arts education.

b. Scholarship. Successful candidates for promotion to full professor will have remained actively involved in producing work in their area of study through the regular and disciplined pursuit of knowledge and development of disciplinary skills. After tenure one's scholarly and creative interests may broaden to include alternative paradigms, different methods, and new lines of inquiry. Such scholarly growth and exploration is central to the liberal arts tradition and is encouraged. The space for scholarly exploration and the drive for distinction in one's field need not be mutually exclusive, and we wish to encourage intellectual growth in all its manifestations.

In considering scholarly and creative work for promotion to the rank of full professor, those reviewing the dossier will consider the body of work produced over the arc of the candidate's career since tenure. In all cases, emphasis is on the quality of the work.

Evidence for a successful promotion must include peer-reviewed or professionally adjudicated materials. Examples include, but are not limited to, research papers; essays and review articles published in professional journals; published research on methods and outcomes of teaching and learning; published poetry, short stories, novels; films, compositions, and works of art presented or published; books written or edited; chapters in books and articles in anthologies; published translations; published or performed music; programs of concerts or dramatic productions; exhibits or commissions of works of art; grant requests funded.

Other types of scholarly and creative work, while not required, form an important context for professional work and are secondary evidence of scholarly activity for the purposes of promotion to the rank of full professor. These include, but are not limited to: technical reports from consulting projects; articles published in the national press; professional blogs; book reviews; unfunded grant proposals; publicly disseminated reports from action research and/or experiential-learning projects; public lectures; descriptions of radio and television interviews and presentations. The review for promotion to full professor includes an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship or and creative work done by persons not associated either with the candidate or with Denison.

c. Service to the University and the Profession. Successful candidates for promotion to full professor will be campus and departmental leaders by virtue of their sustained record of active participation in the life of the campus community. They will be known for their role as mentors to their colleagues and for their service to the University. Their influence will extend beyond their own concerns to important departmental and University issues, to which they will have made a series of important contributions over time. Additional evidence of distinguished service to the profession to support promotion to the rank of full professor includes, but is not limited to: leadership in professional societies at the regional, national, or international levels; membership on the editorial boards of scholarly journals; external reviews of tenure and promotion cases; external accreditation reviews; civic engagement in which faculty use their professional expertise.

5. Procedures Pertaining to Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

a. Principles.

1. Several principles should inform all aspects of personnel reviews. The principle of fairness should apply to all evaluations. The process of evaluation and review should be transparent to all parties and, to the extent permitted by the need for confidentiality, there should be openness as well. The process of evaluation should be participatory, including all the tenured members of a department as well as the candidate. Tenured faculty and department chairs should provide colleagues with formative and summative feedback consistent with the university's expectations (see Faculty Handbook section III.A.4 (https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/faculty-responsibilities/iii-a-teaching-related-responsibilities/)). Above all, our communications and evaluations should be marked by candor, our criticisms tempered by respect, and

our commitment should be to the good of the university and its future generations of students.

2. Evaluation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion is a peer review process. Advisory Board recommendations must rest ultimately on the judgment of the faculty on the Board, based on evidence, and made in accordance with the criteria. In the same manner the President should make recommendations to the Board of Trustees about reappointment, tenure, and promotion based on the recommendation of Advisory and the candidate's record, and should be in accord with the criteria.
3. In some cases the initial evaluation of candidates will be made by a committee of persons from different departments. Procedures governing the creation of such committees are set out below. Such bodies shall be considered “departments” in these procedures.

b. Responsibilities of the Candidate.

1. The candidate bears the responsibility for making the case to the department and the University that a positive decision on reappointment, tenure or promotion is merited. Candidates are responsible for knowing the review process as outlined in the Faculty Handbook and for meeting the deadlines associated with the process.
2. Personnel reviews begin with the candidate, who is to provide the tenured members of the department and Advisory with complete data on which to base their evaluation. Specifically, candidates are responsible for assembling relevant materials, writing a professional statement, and providing that material and statement to their colleagues in a timely fashion.
3. Candidates for tenure and promotion shall provide a list of individuals who can recommend external reviewers qualified to make expert and objective evaluations of the candidate’s scholarship.
4. Candidates' contributions to their own dossier must include:

    - a professional statement
    - a copy of the candidate's current vita
    - samples of syllabi, assignments, examinations and other course materials
    - a list of courses taught including enrollments and course grade point averages
    - results of the common summative evaluation form, comments and quantitative results, for all courses taught
    - a copy of each scholarly work (as described in the criteria) to be considered for the review;
    - records of contributions to the other purposes of the University
    - a leave proposal from candidates for tenure who would be eligible for an immediate sabbatical if tenured.

A checklist for the elements of the candidate's dossier (https://my.denison.edu/campus-resources/office-of-the-provost/faculty-reviews/) is available to assist candidates in compiling materials.

5. The professional statement invites candidates to reflect on their philosophy, goals, and experience in teaching, conducting scholarship or creative work, and contributing to the other purposes of the University. The professional statement should serve as an interpretive guide to the materials in the dossier by providing a context that both reflects analytically on the data in the dossier and places that data in a narrative showing the development of the candidate as a faculty member at Denison. The statement should explain significant achievements as well as discuss frankly challenges the candidate needs to address. The professional statement should also articulate candidates' visions of their roles as a teacher, scholar, and member of the community in the future.

6. Candidates must make their dossiers available to the tenured members of their department, through the department chair, at a date early enough for their tenured colleagues to review the materials and prepare their letters, and for the chair to prepare a departmental letter and share it with the candidate (as described below) before the dossier must be delivered to the Provost's office.

7. Candidates shall also have the opportunity to write a response to the departmental letter once that is completed as is described below.

8. After the candidate's dossier is submitted to the Provost's office a candidate may request a meeting with the Advisory Board. (The Advisory Board may also request a meeting with the candidate.)

c. Responsibilities of the Tenured Members of a Department.

1. Tenured members of a department have the important responsibilities of evaluating a candidate's performance and making recommendations for the good of the university and future generations of students. Untenured colleagues do not participate in the review process.
2. Tenured members of the department are expected to know the procedures and criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and to provide their input in ways consistent with these guidelines. Tenured colleagues are expected to review thoroughly all the materials a candidate submits as part of the dossier.
3. Classroom observation is a required component of summative evaluation. Faculty in a department or program have the responsibility of determining the number and choice of colleagues who will act as observers and the timing of these observations. There will be a minimum of two observers from a department. In addition, any colleague who participates in this process should make at least two observations within a specific course. Colleagues' multiple observations should occur closely together in time or sequentially in order to provide a view of how the instructor develops and coordinates teaching activities on a given topic. The instructor's teaching will be observed in different courses and at different periods of time within a semester. Preparation and discussion should be part of the classroom observation process. The instructor and the classroom observer(s) should agree upon a minimum of two specific days of classes. In advance of the observations, the instructor should

provide the observer(s) with course syllabi, handouts, assignments or other relevant teaching materials. In addition, a brief discussion before the observation should identify the instructor's objectives and planned class activities, materials, and any other concerns or issues identified as important for the observation. A brief discussion should be held immediately or shortly after a class observation in order to get clarification or additional information about the events and activities observed.

4. After the tenured members of the department have had time to evaluate the candidate's dossier, they shall meet without the candidate to discuss the dossier and their evaluation of the candidate's performance before they submit their individual letters to the chair.
5. Each tenured colleague (including the chair) must prepare an honest and informative letter of evaluation that discusses the candidate's performance, based on the dossier and on observations of the candidate, and that addresses the criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The letter should provide objective evaluation of the specific strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, and must include a clear positive or negative recommendation for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. These letters must be sent to the chair at a date early enough so that the chair may prepare a departmental letter and share it with the candidate (as described below) before the dossier must be delivered to the Provost's office.
6. Once the chair has written the first draft of the departmental letter and has shared it with all tenured members of the department, each member should respond in a timely fashion to the chair with comments, suggestions, or other feedback.
7. In cases of tenure and promotion where outside reviewers submit evaluations of scholarship or creative works, tenured members of the department may read those reviews, and department chairs must read those reviews, but only after the department letter is completed. Colleagues who, after reading these reviews, wish to write an amendment to their letters addressing issues raised by the external reviews may do so. However, these amendments must be submitted to the chair who must then write an amendment to the departmental letter, following the procedures for approval of the draft departmental letter and sharing the completed amendment with the candidate as described below. Candidates in turn may submit a response to the amendment through the chair. In other words, all amendments to individual and departmental letters must follow the same procedures as those for departmental letters.

d. Responsibilities of Department Chairs.

1. Department chairs have the responsibility of seeing that all the steps of summative evaluation up to and including delivery of the dossier to the Provost's office are taken in ways consistent with these procedures, and that the results of summative, peer evaluation of teaching are included in the dossier (see III.A.4 (https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/faculty-responsibilities/iii-a-teaching-related-responsibilities/)).
2. Chairs are responsible for providing guidance to candidates as they prepare their dossiers and to colleagues as they prepare their letters of evaluation.
3. The department chair should begin the evaluative process by convening a meeting of the tenured members of the department and the candidate well in advance of the deadline for the delivery of the completed dossier to the Provost's office to discuss the procedures for evaluation and to establish departmental deadlines for the submission of the dossier and letters from tenured colleagues. The timing of peer review of teaching, who will participate in peer review, and how the evaluation of peer review will be shared should also be determined at this meeting.
4. After the tenured members of the department have had time to evaluate the candidate's dossier, they shall meet without the candidate to discuss the dossier and their evaluation of the candidate's performance before they submit their individual letters to the chair.
5. All the letters from tenured colleagues (and others, if any, except external review letters) shall be added to the dossier. At this stage the dossier is confidential. Only the department chair and Advisory may see all the information in the dossier.
6. The department chair shall prepare a departmental letter that shall be separate from the chair's own letter as a tenured colleague. Chairs shall draw upon the evaluations in the letters from their tenured colleagues in constructing the departmental letter. That letter shall summarize the department's evaluation of the candidate's performance and make a clear recommendation, either for or against, reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
7. The chair's draft of the departmental letter shall be shared with all tenured members of the department for comments, suggestions, and feedback. The chair shall rewrite the departmental letter in light of this feedback as appropriate.
8. The completed departmental letter shall by shared, in writing, with the candidate at a date early enough so that the candidate, if the candidate should choose to do so, may write a response to the departmental letter that will be included in the dossier when it is delivered to the Provost's Office.
9. Department chairs are responsible for asking candidates for tenure and promotion to provide a list of individuals who can recommend external reviewers qualified to make expert and objective evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. The department chair and the candidate shall forward the list of individuals to the Provost. The candidate should also submit a list of people who are disqualified from serving as external reviewers because of their familiarity with the candidate. Reviewers should not include anyone whom the candidate knows personally or professionally in such a way that the reviewer's opinion of the candidate's work might be predicted on the basis of their relationship.
10. In cases of tenure and promotion where outside reviewers submit evaluations of scholarship or creative works, tenured members of the department may read those reviews, and chairs of departments must read those

reviews, but only after they have completed their individual letters. If, after having read these reviews, colleagues wish to write an amendment to their individual letters addressing issues raised by the external reviews, they may do so. However, these amendments must be submitted to the chair, who must then write an amendment to the departmental letter, following the procedures for approval of the draft departmental letter and sharing the completed amendment with the candidate as described above. Candidates in turn may submit a response to the amendment through the chair. In other words, all amendments to individual and departmental letters must follow the same procedures as those for departmental letters.

11. All letters and amendments must be submitted through the department chair so that the candidate sees the summaries of all materials submitted from colleagues to Advisory.
12. The chair is responsible for seeing that no additional information about a faculty member is gathered without carefully informing both the department and the candidate about the kind of information and the reason for gathering it.

e. Responsibilities of the Provost.

1. The Provost presides over the process by which information is gathered regarding each individual who is to be considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
2. The Provost is responsible for providing newly-hired tenure-track faculty with information regarding the criteria and procedures for contract renewal and tenure, and for seeing that detailed procedures and timetables for the submission of candidates' dossiers are available to individuals and departments.
3. The Provost will generate a list of external reviewers after contacting the individuals on the list forwarded by the candidate and the chair. The Provost is expected to evaluate the external reviewers to ensure an appropriate distribution of institutions, levels of expertise, and objectivity among the potential reviewers.
4. The Provost is responsible for assuring that all participants in the review process follow the procedures for review. In the event that procedural concerns arise during the process, the Provost is responsible for alerting all parties involved of the existence of the concern and working with those parties to address the concern in such a way that the review procedures are properly followed.
5. The Provost should be available throughout the review process to answer questions and respond to concerns by any of the parties involved, consistent with the standards of professional confidentiality under which the information was gathered.
6. The Provost presides over meetings of the President's Advisory Board and is responsible for providing members of the Board with the appropriate materials for review in a timely manner. The Provost communicates with departments and candidates on behalf of the Advisory Board during the review process.

f. Responsibilities of the President's Advisory Board.

1. It is the Advisory Board's responsibility to read the candidate's dossier, the letters of evaluation by colleagues, the external reviewers' comments (if any), and the Provost's letter to the candidate summarizing the outcome of previous review(s), and to make a recommendation to the President on reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
2. The members of Advisory individually review the dossier and then meet to discuss the case. The dossier includes the material sent by the department and the letters written by external reviewers. Materials may be added to the dossier after it has been submitted to the Provost's office only when they provide additional information about materials already included in the dossier (such as notice that a work has been accepted for publication). Furthermore, all additional submissions must come through the chair of the department.
3. No other information (e.g., a formal determination of misconduct) may be taken into account in Advisory's deliberation of the candidate's performance.
4. If the Advisory Board believes there is a discrepancy between the evidence presented and the departmental statement, or if they believe the dossier is incomplete, it shall direct the Provost to consult with the department chair and candidate in an effort to clear up the discrepancy or obtain the missing information. In neither case does the process of informing the chair and the candidate mean that Advisory agrees or disagrees with the interpretation of the evidence or with the departmental recommendation.
5. At any point in their deliberations the Advisory Board may request a joint meeting with the candidate and the department chair.
6. When it is agreed by the Advisory Board that there has been sufficient discussion on a candidate, the discussion ceases and the faculty members on the Board vote. The recommendation and the vote shall be reported to the President. After the President deliberates on the advice and recommendation received from the Advisory Board, the President reports their disposition on the candidate to the Board. At that point members of the Board may offer additional advice.
7. If the President's recommendation differs from that of the Advisory Board, the Advisory Board shall provide a written explanation for its recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. In addition, the Committee may ask faculty representatives from the Advisory Board to attend a meeting of the Committee to explain their recommendation.

g. Responsibilities of the President.

1. It is the responsibility of the President to make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President's recommendation should be informed by all the materials considered by Advisory and by Advisory's recommendation. If the President's decision differs from the recommendation of the Board, the President

must inform the Advisory Board of the reasons for their decision.

2. It is understood that the President may make a recommendation either for or against reappointment, tenure, or promotion for reasons other than those related to the performance of a candidate, while taking care to preserve academic freedom. Bringing these reasons to bear on a recommendation should happen only in the most unusual of circumstances. Furthermore, as soon as it becomes clear that such considerations may be important to a candidate's employment at Denison, the candidate and chair shall be notified by the Provost.
3. Once the President has decided on their recommendation, the President or the Provost will meet with the candidate, chair, and a tenured faculty member (optional) of the candidate's choice to provide a full explanation as to the basis for the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees. This meeting shall be followed within five days by a written report containing, if that recommendation is negative, the vote of the Advisory Board and its rationale. If the recommendation is negative, the candidate shall be given opportunity to read and copy (or have copies made) of all materials used to make the recommendation, with suitable steps taken to ensure confidentiality. In addition, the candidate shall be provided a written statement explaining the basis for the President's recommendation and the procedures to be followed in case the candidate wishes to appeal it. Copies of this letter shall be shared with the members of the Advisory Board.
4. In cases of appeals, the President shall wait until the appeal process is complete before making their recommendation to the Board of Trustees.
5. The Board of Trustees has the exclusive power to grant reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

h. Procedures Governing the Appointment of Review Committees.

1. In cases where there are fewer than three tenured members of a department or program (not including the candidate in cases of promotion to professor), a review committee shall be created to act as the candidate's department.
2. This committee shall consist of at least three tenured members of the faculty, including all tenured members of the department or program and the program director if the director is not tenured in the program itself.
3. When a candidate is from a department or program where there are fewer than three tenured members, the chair of that department or program (if tenured) shall serve as the chair of the committee. When the department chair or program director is not tenured, the Provost shall appoint a chair of the committee from among their members, and the chair shall assume all the responsibilities of a department chair for the review process.
4. To constitute a review committee, the chair (or when the department chair or program director is not tenured, the Provost) shall ask the candidate to identify several tenured faculty members on campus whose work is most similar to the candidate's work. These names will then be discussed by the tenured members of the department and the Provost. Members of the committee should be selected on the basis of their familiarity with (1) the program or department, or (2) the candidate's substantive area of knowledge. The Provost shall then appoint the remaining member(s) of the group to constitute the department for this review.

i. Guidelines for Interdisciplinary Participation in Reviews.

(Proposal #21-57, adopted 4 February 2021)

1. For purposes of review, faculty members with an affiliation in an Interdisciplinary Program (ID) may designate the participation of the ID in renewal, tenure, and promotion reviews. Regardless of how many Interdisciplinary Programs in which a faculty member may be affiliated, typically only one ID can be invited to contribute to the review process. Though some faculty do contribute to more than one ID, and it may be in the interests of both faculty member and each of these IDs to participate in any review, limiting participation to one ID best preserves the efficiency and focus of the review process.
2. Faculty members desiring ID involvement in their review must have “affiliate” designation at least two years prior to a scheduled review.
3. Faculty members must coordinate participation of the ID through the Provost’s Office. Affiliated faculty members must declare their desire to have ID participation in their review two years prior to a scheduled review. The Provost will consult with the contractual department and then proceed to appoint an ID review committee consisting of at least two members. The Provost, in consultation with the ID review committee, will appoint the Chair. The Chair of the ID review committee will not necessarily be the Director of the ID program.
4. The ID review committee will limit its review to only those areas of affiliation declared by the faculty member (some combination of at least two of the standard areas of teaching, scholarship and/or service). The ID review committee will not be offering a recommendation for renewal, tenure, or promotion. Rather, as with the external review letters provided to evaluate scholarship for tenure and promotion reviews, the Interdisciplinary Review Letter will provide important feedback in the review process from a unique area of expertise. ID faculty members selected to serve on the ID review committee will be able to offer insight on relevant issues regarding: interdisciplinary teaching and fulfillment of ID curricular needs; participation in service to ensure the functioning of the ID and fulfillment of its mission; and/or the degree to which scholarship reflects the norms of the interdisciplinary program.
5. As the contracting department completes its composite letter, the ID review committee members will provide individual letters to the Chair of the ID review committee following the guidelines laid out in the Faculty Handbook regarding the responsibilities of academic departments in cases of contract renewal, tenure, or promotion. The Chair of the ID review committee will then draft the composite Interdisciplinary Review Letter, providing the members’ unique expertise on the candidate’s performance in the

areas of selected interdisciplinary affiliation. This letter must be approved by the members of the ID Program review committee, and then forwarded to the Chair of the candidate's contracting department and shared with the candidate simultaneously with the contracting departmental letter. These individual letters and the ID review committee composite letter will be included in the review dossier sent to the Provost's Office. The candidate will have the opportunity to respond to the composite ID review committee letter if desired, to be included in the review materials. Revised 5/2019

6. In some limited circumstances, with the support of the contractual department, faculty without a formal joint appointment may request a special arrangement and have a representative of an ID Program serve as a full-fledged voting member of their review committee.

6. Reconsideration of a Decision

a. Principles

A faculty member about whom a negative decision is made regarding reappointment, tenure or promotion may appeal the decision on the basis of (1) discrimination, (2) violation of academic freedom, or (3) inadequate consideration.

1. **Non-Discrimination**. Faculty are entitled to protection against discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, ethnic or national origin, age, disability, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status.
2. **Academic Freedom.** Faculty are entitled to academic freedom.
3. **Inadequate Consideration.** Inadequate consideration occurs when a decision is reached as a result of any of the following: a failure to gather and consider evidence bearing on the relevant performance of the candidate, inadequate deliberation over the import of evidence in light of the relevant standards, reliance on irrelevant and/or improper standards, or a failure to exercise professional academic judgment. In determining whether there was inadequate consideration, the Faculty Investigative Committee (see below) will not substitute its own judgment on the merits of the case for that of the members of the department, the President's Advisory Board, or the administration.

b. Procedures

1. Prior to lodging an appeal, the faculty member shall be allowed to read and make copies of (or have copies made of) all information that has been made available to Advisory and is related to the candidate's case. Before the faculty member is allowed access to this information, the Provost's office will remove such obvious identifying information as the name, rank, or institution of the evaluators. The faculty member has thirty calendar days after receipt of the written report specified in Section I.A.5.g.3 and of the written rationale for the decision to lodge an appeal and to compile and submit the materials relevant to the appeal. When the Provost receives such a request, they shall promptly inform the Advisory Board that the decision is under appeal. No report shall be made to the Board of Trustees about the candidate until the appeal process is completed. Normally, candidates for tenure will be considered by Advisory in such a manner as to ensure that the initial decision about their case can be completed by the January meeting of the Board of Trustees. This allows ample time for an appeal prior to the April meeting of the Board.
2. During the appeal process the decision is presumptively valid; that is, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion, and the faculty member must present a basis for changing the decision. The faculty member may submit additional information during the appeal process, but this information must relate to the same time frame on which the original decision was based.
3. Appeals of personnel decisions will be heard by a Faculty Investigative Committee constituted from among members of the Standing Faculty Appeals Committee (hereafter the Appeals Committee), consisting of six tenured members of the teaching faculty elected by ballot of the faculty and serving staggered three-year terms. There shall not be more than one member from any department. No one shall serve concurrently on the Appeals Committee and on Advisory. The chair shall be chosen by and from among the elected members of the Committee, who shall be convened at the beginning of each academic year by the Provost or a representative of the Provost.
4. In the event of an appeal, a three-member Faculty Investigative Committee shall be chosen by lot from among the eligible members of the Appeals Committee to investigate the case. A member of the Committee who is the appellant, who is a member of the appellant's department, or who participated directly in the decision under appeal shall be disqualified from appointment to the Investigative Committee. A member of the Appeals Committee may ask the Chair to be excused from service on an Investigative Committee based upon a conflict of interest. For an appeal alleging inadequate consideration, the procedures followed by the Investigative Committee in carrying out its responsibility will be designed to be responsive to the particular allegation it is investigating, and it shall have access to whatever individuals and information it deems appropriate, subject only, but always, to the qualification that it is inquiring into the process by which the decision was made rather than into the substance of the decision. The procedures are fact-finding in nature, not adversarial, and are intended to give the committee as much flexibility as it believes is appropriate to the case.
5. For an appeal alleging discrimination or a violation of academic freedom, the Investigative Committee shall determine whether discrimination or a violation of academic freedom was a determining factor in the decision. Ordinarily, when there is a finding of discrimination or a violation of academic freedom, the Investigative Committee will recommend that the review of the matter be returned for reconsideration to the next stage (as defined in section I.A.5) in the decision process beyond the stage where discrimination or the violation of academic freedom took place. That reconsideration shall take account of the Investigative Committee's report. (e.g. If the discrimination or violation of academic freedom took

place at the department level, the case would be returned to the Advisory Board.)

6. The Committee shall communicate its finding and, if appropriate, its recommendation, in writing to the President's Advisory Board and to the appellant. The authority to act on any such finding or recommendation resides with the President. In the event the President decides to reject the recommendation of the Committee, they shall provide, in writing, the reasons for their action to the Investigative Committee and the appellant, and the Investigative Committee shall have an opportunity to reply.
7. For an appeal alleging inadequate consideration, the Investigative Committee shall determine whether the decision was the result of inadequate consideration at any stage of the candidate's review. Ordinarily, when there is a finding of inadequate consideration the Investigative Committee will recommend that the review of the matter be returned for consideration to the stage in the decision process where the inadequate consideration first took place. Reconsideration shall take account of the Investigative Committee's report.
8. The Investigative Committee will communicate in writing to the President's Advisory Board and to the appellant the Committee's finding and if appropriate, its recommendation. The authority to act on any such finding or recommendation resides with the President. In the event that the President decides to reject the recommendation of the committee, they shall provide in writing the reasons for that action to the Investigative Committee, and the appellant and the Investigative Committee shall have an opportunity to reply.

7. Extension of the Probationary Period for Tenure

1. A faculty member on a tenure-track contract may apply for up to a two-year extension of the normal six-year probationary period because of personal illness, parental leave, care of a seriously ill or injured person, or other factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service (see *Faculty Handbook* section VIII.C.6-8 for leave policies).
2. Requests to extend the probationary period should be addressed to the department chair, who will consult with the tenured members of the department and arrive at a department recommendation. The request to extend the probationary period, along with the departmental recommendation, is then sent to the President's Advisory Board, which makes a recommendation to the President. The request must be submitted prior to the academic year in which the normal tenure review is scheduled. A request to extend the probationary period is not relevant to any consideration of any candidate for contract renewal, tenure, or promotion.
3. Extension of the probationary period will be granted only when a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities are significantly affected by personal or family-related factors. The length of the extension, not to exceed two years, will be based upon an assessment of the degree to which these factors interfere with the normal responsibilities of the faculty member.
4. Several options for extending the probationary period exist, including the following:

   a. Full or partial unpaid leaves of absence. For example, a faculty member may request moving to half-time status for four years (an equivalent of two years), thus extending the tenure review two years beyond the time it would be normally scheduled.

   b. Maintaining full-time status but extending the length of the probationary period. For example, a faculty member may request, due to personal circumstances, to lengthen the normal 6-year probationary period to 7 or 8 years.

5. When extensions of the probationary period are granted, a revised schedule of reviews for reappointment will be determined by the Provost in consultation with the faculty member and President's Advisory Board.

8. Termination

1. The contract of a faculty member may be terminated according to the following conditions:

a. Through voluntary resignation to take effect at the end of any year of service. A resignation should be submitted prior to February 1.

b. By mutual agreement between the University and the faculty member in cases not covered by provision (a.) above.

c. Through dismissal by the trustees or their designated representatives for moral delinquency or professional incompetence, incapacity or non-performance. Dismissal for reasons other than moral delinquency shall normally take effect at the end of the semester following the semester in which the initial notice of intention to sever relations is given. Dismissal for moral delinquency shall take effect immediately.

2. When a charge is made against a member of the faculty alleging moral delinquency or professional incompetence, incapacity, or non-performance as a basis for dismissal, the following procedure shall normally be followed. (Please note that the Policy on Inappropriate Relationships Between Students and Faculty (section VII.H.) may govern the proceedings for cases involving romantic or sexual relationships between faculty and students.)

a. The President of the University shall notify the faculty member, in writing, of the nature of the charges and inform the faculty member of the name or names of the individual(s) making the charges. This written notice may be preceded by an informal verbal notification if that seems appropriate.

b. An informal consultation shall be arranged that includes the President, the Provost, one or more members of the President's Advisory Board, the faculty member involved, and any other persons who might make a contribution to an informal agreement with mutual consent.

c. If this attempt to resolve the matter by mutual agreement is unsuccessful, the matter shall be referred to the entire President's Advisory Board. Normally, the following procedure shall be followed:

1. A full statement of the charges and any other pertinent data related thereto shall be furnished in writing to each member of the Advisory Board.
2. The faculty member against whom the charges are made shall respond in writing, and copies of the faculty member's response shall be distributed to each member of the Advisory Board.
3. The Advisory Board shall set a date and time for a hearing to consider the charges and the response. This date and time shall be agreeable to the faculty member charged. The person making the charges shall appear before the Advisory Board and the person charged shall have full right to cross-examine. Witnesses may be summoned independently by both parties or by the Advisory Board.
4. A record of the hearing shall be kept and be made available to the faculty member charged. Because specific procedures may vary depending on the case, the Advisory Board shall be responsible for determining such special procedures as the circumstances warrant.
5. At the conclusion of the hearing, the elected members of the Advisory Board shall present their recommendations to the President in writing. If the President concludes that the individual is guilty of the charges, they shall then make a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, furnishing a copy thereof to the members of the Advisory Board and to the faculty member charged. If the President's recommendation differs materially from the conclusions of the Advisory Board, the President shall explain the reasons for the differences, with copies thereof to the members of the Advisory Board and the member charged.
6. If the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees affirms the President's recommendations, the faculty member charged shall have the right to appear before that committee and request a review of its decision.
7. The faculty member charged may request to be represented in the proceedings by legal counsel. If faculty member does so, the person or persons making the charges may also request counsel. In any case the Advisory Board shall have the right to employ its own counsel, as shall the President.

9. Suspension and Compensation

a. Suspension of a faculty member during investigation of charges against the faculty member shall occur when the Advisory Board determines that harm to the University, the faculty member themselves, or to any other member of the University community may occur if the faculty member is retained in active status. If a faculty member is suspended pending a decision, full compensation shall be paid until the case is resolved.

b. The Advisory Board shall make recommendations with regard to the question of compensation, if any, to be paid if the faculty member is dismissed.

c. The Advisory Board will determine the procedures for determining the role of its elected members in proceedings with regard to termination of contracts for cause.