

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Faculty Handbook	2
I. Personnel Policies	2
A. Full-Time Faculty	3
B. Non-Tenure-Track Appointments	13
C. Periodic Assessment of Tenured Faculty	15
D. Salary Reviews	16
E. Procedures for Senior Administrator Reviews	22
II. Professional Development Opportunities	22
A. Leave Programs	23
B. Professional Development Grants	28
C. Professional Travel Policy	30
D. Sponsored Grants	30
III. Faculty Responsibilities	30
A. Teaching-Related Responsibilities	30
B. Important Academic Regulations	36
IV. Financial Arrangements and Faculty Benefits	36
A. Payroll Policy	36
B. Employment Eligibility Verification	36
C. Faculty Benefits	37
D. Insurance Coverage	39
V. Periodic Review of Departments & Programs	40
VI. Policies, Programs, and General Information	42
A. Academic Integrity	43
B. Guidelines for Human Participants Research	43
C. Misconduct in Scholarly Activities	45
D. Conflict-of-Interest for Federal Grants	46
E. Privacy/Educational Records	47
F. Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom	48
G. Discrimination and Harassment Policy	48
H. Policy on Inappropriate Relationships Between Students and Faculty	49
I. Policy on Outside Employment by Denison Faculty	49
J. Policy for University Records	50
K. Policy on Fundraising Activities	50
L. Publications for External Consumption	51
M. Copyright Policy	51
N. Alcohol Policy for Faculty Events	52
O. University Space and Equipment Management	52
P. Procedures When Spouses/Partners are Appointed to One Department	52

Q. Guidelines for the Care and Use of Animals in Research & Teaching	52
R. Faculty/Student Meal Program	52

FACULTY HANDBOOK

The Faculty Handbook is generated at the beginning of each academic year. As policy changes and administrative updates occur in the course of the year, the online handbook will be updated accordingly. These changes may not be reflected in the PDF version of the Handbook. Faculty should also review the Employment Handbook available via MyDenison.

Academic offerings, practices, and personnel policies are subject to change in the event of exigent circumstances.

- I. Personnel Policies (p. 2)
 - A. Full-Time Faculty (p. 3)
 - B. Non-Tenure-Track Appointments (p. 13)
 - C. Periodic Assessment of Tenured Faculty (Senior Reviews) (p. 15)
 - D. Salary Reviews (p. 16)
 - E. Procedures for Senior Administrator Reviews (p. 22)
- II. Professional Development Opportunities (p. 22)
 - A. Leave Programs (p. 23)
 - B. Professional Development Grants (p. 28)
 - C. Professional Travel Policy (p. 30)
 - D. Sponsored Grants (p. 30)
- III. Faculty Responsibilities (p. 30)
 - A. Teaching-Related Responsibilities (p. 30)
 - B. Important Academic Regulations (p. 36)
- IV. Financial Arrangements and Faculty Benefits (p. 36)
 - A. Payroll Policy (p. 36)
 - B. Employment Eligibility Verification (p. 36)
 - C. Faculty Benefits (p. 37)
 - D. Insurance Coverage (p. 39)
- V. Periodic Review of Departments & Programs (p. 40)
- VI. Policies, Programs, and General Information (p. 42)
 - A. Academic Integrity (p. 43)
 - B. Guidelines for Human Participants Research (p. 43)
 - C. Misconduct in Scholarly Activities (p. 45)
 - D. Conflict-of-Interest for Federal Grants (p. 46)
 - E. Privacy/Educational Records (p. 47)
 - F. Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom (p. 48)
 - G. Discrimination and Harassment Policy (p. 48)
 - H. Policy on Inappropriate Relationships between Students and Faculty (p. 49)
 - I. Policy on Outside Employment by Denison Faculty (p. 49)
 - J. Policy for University Records (p. 50)
 - K. Policy on Fundraising Activities (p. 50)
 - L. Publications for External Consumption (p. 51)
 - M. Copyright Policy (p. 51)
 - N. Alcohol Policy for Faculty Events (p. 52)
 - O. University Space and Equipment Management (p. 52)
 - P. Procedures When Spouses/Partners are Appointed to One Department (p. 52)
 - Q. Guidelines for the Care and Use of Animals in Research & Teaching (p. 52)
 - R. Faculty/Student Meal Program (p. 52)

I. Personnel Policies

- A. Full-Time Faculty (p. 3)
- B. Non-Tenure-Track Appointments (p. 13)
- C. Periodic Assessment of Tenured Faculty (Senior Reviews) (p. 15)

- D. Salary Reviews (p. 16)
- E. Procedures for Senior Administrator Reviews (p. 22)

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 (p. 30)). 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 (p. 30)).
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 be 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.

I. Personnel Policies: B. Non-Tenure-Track Appointments

(Revised per proposal 25-84)

1. Full-Time, Visiting Non-Tenure-Track Appointments

Although the University seeks to employ a full-time, tenure-track faculty, it is occasionally necessary to hire individuals to full-time, non-tenure-track positions in visiting appointments. Such faculty will be typically hired through a national search process, comparable to that for tenure-track hires. Individuals in these positions serve for limited periods of time, usually for one year and normally not to exceed three years. When distinctive needs arise and candidates have demonstrated excellence in job performance, departments may request visiting appointments longer than three but no longer than six years. (In some circumstances, such as spousal/partner employment, continuing long-term non-tenure track appointments [see I.B.3-4] are possible.)

a. Retention of visiting faculty beyond the initial appointment will be determined by the Dean of the Faculty, in consultation with the Provost. Such decisions will be based on clearly demonstrated academic need in the department, and qualifications and performance of the candidate.

b. A visiting member of the faculty normally teaches three courses, or the equivalent, each semester and maintains office hours. They may also assume responsibilities such as the supervision of directed studies or senior research and service to the department, keeping in mind their differential teaching load.

c. A visiting faculty member on a semester or a yearly contract and working the equivalent of a 75% teaching load or greater over the contracted period is eligible for all staff benefits available to full-time faculty (see "Faculty Benefits" section for further information).

d. Scholarly or artistic productivity is not formally required for visiting faculty during their initial one-to-three-year appointment, but they are strongly encouraged to continue their scholarly or artistic work during their employment as a part of their overall professional development.

e. To qualify for reappointment beyond three years, the candidate must undergo a formal faculty review no later than during the third year of the original appointment. Through this review, the faculty candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching during their time at Denison, and they are expected to outline plans for future scholarly or artistic development as well as engagement in the life of the college. The outcome of the review will be used in part to determine whether a renewal beyond the initial appointment is merited; however, any such renewal depends upon determination of relevant staffing needs by the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the Provost.

i. The performance of the candidate will typically be evaluated by a committee of three tenured faculty from the department/program, to be selected by the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the department/program chair. Each member will draft a confidential letter to assess the performance of the candidate, based on the dossier and on observations of the candidate's teaching. One member of the committee will serve as chair of the group, overseeing the review process and writing a composite letter to be shared with the candidate. The review committee chair may, but need not, be the chair of the department.

ii. Upon completion of the departmental review, the dossier and all review letters will be submitted to the President's Advisory Board for further consideration. For the purposes of overseeing these reviews, the Dean of the Faculty will serve in place of the Provost.

iii. Assuming a successful review (and demonstrated continued department/program need), a reappointment may be made for a 1–3-year span, as deemed most appropriate for the needs of the department or program by the Dean of the Faculty.

A full-time, non-tenure-track member of the faculty normally teaches three courses, or the equivalent, each semester, maintains office hours, and engages in some form of scholarly activity. A full-time member also assumes additional responsibilities such as the supervision of directed studies, senior research, senior project for recognition and the like, and the advisement of students, service to the department in a variety of ways, service on committees and/or councils, and the like.

2. Part-Time, Visiting Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

a. Normally, part-time visiting faculty appointments are made on a semester-by-semester basis, or year-by-year basis. A review of the person's work will usually occur after no more than six semesters of service. If a decision is made not to offer reappointment, the appropriate chair will inform the person of the rationale for the decision. If such faculty members are rehired, they will typically also be reviewed in their sixth year of employment, and at regular intervals thereafter.

b. Part-time faculty, working less than a 75% teaching load for the contracted period, are eligible for coverage under the State of Ohio Unemployment Compensation System, Workers' Compensation Program of the State of Ohio, the Federal Social Security Program. Part-time faculty working at least a 67% teaching load for the contracted period are additionally eligible for the core retirement benefit. (See section on "Faculty Benefits," for further information).

c. Part-time teaching faculty are appointed according to the normal procedure for the recruitment and appointment of full-time faculty to the extent feasible, with modifications appropriate to their particular position. In general, in recruitment and hiring, Equal Opportunity procedures relative to race, color, national or ethnic origin, religion, and gender are followed. The search normally is restricted to the immediate central Ohio area. Dossiers are submitted and reviewed by members of the department and personal interviews take place with the candidate(s). Appointments are made according to professional qualifications with due regard for high-quality prior service to Denison.

d. Part-time faculty generally are not expected to assume responsibilities related to advising students or service on committees or councils.

3. Continuing Faculty Appointments

In rare circumstances, a visiting faculty member may be retained in a non-tenure track capacity beyond six years. Such circumstances may include spousal employment (as noted in section 4 below), persistent curricular needs that may not be readily addressed with a tenure-track appointment, or staffing support to cover tenure-track faculty who are in long-term administrative roles. While continuing appointments are not tenure-track, they are afforded opportunities for professional development and advancement as described below.

a. Retention of non-tenure track faculty beyond six years will be determined by the Dean of the Faculty, in consultation with the Provost. Such decisions will be based on clearly demonstrated academic need in the department/program and the qualifications and performance of the candidate as demonstrated through a formal review as outlined below.

b. To attain the status of continuing faculty, candidates must normally undergo a successful review no later than their sixth year of employment. The general principles of the review process will be essentially the same as those for the review of tenured faculty (section I.A.5), except for the following.

i. The performance of the candidate will typically be evaluated by a review committee of three tenured faculty from the department/program, to be selected by the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the department/program chair. Each member will draft a confidential letter to assess the performance of the candidate, based on the dossier and on observations of the candidate's teaching. One member of the committee will serve as chair of the group, overseeing the review process and writing a composite letter to be shared with the candidate. The review committee chair may, but need not, be the chair of the department.

- ii. Expectations regarding scholarly or artistic and service work will be adjusted relative to tenure-track expectations, taking into consideration the teaching responsibilities of the faculty member (typically a 3/3 load) and the stage in their appointment.
- iii. The candidate's dossier and all review letters will be submitted to the President's Advisory Board for further consideration. For the purposes of overseeing these reviews, the Dean of the Faculty will serve in place of the Provost unless the candidate is applying for promotion to Associate Professor (see below).
- iv. Usually, external reviewers will only be engaged in non-tenure track reviews if the candidate is seeking promotion in rank to Associate or Full Professor.
- v. The President's Advisory Board will make a recommendation to the Dean on changing the candidate's status from "visiting" to "continuing" faculty. The Dean, together with the Provost, will make the final decision.
- c. Continuing faculty are reviewed on a seven-year review cycle, with a salary review taking place after three years of active teaching since the most recent review, a senior faculty review three years later, and a presumed sabbatical in the following year, as per the conditions described in section II.A.2.
- d. Continuing faculty are expected to take on additional responsibilities to those of short-term visiting faculty, including formal academic advising, scholarly or artistic productivity, and other contributions to the department and the college. Such expectations, however, must be tailored to the faculty's teaching load, which by default is 3/3 (rather than the usual 3/2 teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty). Consonant with these expanded expectations, such faculty will be provided increased Professional Development Fund support comparable to that provided to tenure-track faculty.
- e. Continuing faculty may request consideration for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, as appropriate relative to their current academic rank. This may be done as part of the sixth-year review described above, as part of a subsequent senior faculty review, or at a time deemed appropriate by the Provost. Whether such a request is warranted will depend on the status not only of the candidate's teaching, but also their scholarship and other contributions to the college, and as such, the candidate should consult with their department/program chair as well as the Dean of the Faculty and the Provost. Any promotional review should a) involve all tenured members of the candidate's department/program, b) involve an external review of scholarship, and c) be overseen by the Provost in line with tenure-track promotional reviews.
- f. Continuing appointments remain non-tenure track and may be terminated at the end of a contract period, at the discretion of the Dean of the Faculty and the Provost or for other reasons as described in section I.A.8.

4. Spousal/Partner Faculty Appointments

As part of its program to attract and retain faculty, Denison attempts to offer continuing non-tenure-track appointments to qualified spouses/partners of faculty. Such appointments are initially contingent upon institutional need and the qualifications of the spouse/partner; reappointment is contingent upon continuing need as well as satisfactory performance as determined through the regular review process. These will normally be part-time appointments. Spouses/partners in such appointments are eligible to apply for full-time positions, including tenure-track positions, when they occur.

I. Personnel Policies: C. Periodic Assessment of Tenured Faculty (Senior Reviews)

1. Purpose

- a. To encourage colleagues to reflect about their work and to plan for their continuing professional development as thoughtfully as possible, and to do so with the discipline that a periodic assessment provides.
- b. To help colleagues share their plans for sabbaticals and other experiences that should aim to refresh and renew senior faculty, to further develop the University and its departments, and, to these ends, to make creative use of such professional development resources as may be available.
- c. To provide the University from time to time with an assessment of each tenured colleague's performance.
- d. In all of these ways, to be certain that as an institution, as a community, and as individuals, we are giving full assurance to ourselves and our students that we take our charge with the utmost seriousness to perform consistently at the highest level possible.

2. Procedures

(Proposal #17-03, 17-07, adopted 3 May 2018)

- a. The evaluation for tenured faculty will take place in the year before the faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical. This will normally enable the sabbatical year and, where applicable, other resources available for professional development to be of maximum use to the faculty member for both personal development and development appropriate to the needs of the department and the University.

- b. The evaluation will not be held when, in the opinion of the Provost, its purpose has been served by a recent review for tenure or promotion.
- c. The centerpiece of the evaluation will be a professional statement addressing teaching, scholarship, and contributions to the other purposes of the University. The professional statement will describe accomplishments in terms of the goals stated in the previous review and will discuss the faculty member's plans, aspirations, and needs for subsequent years. It will also include, when applicable, a prospectus for the sabbatical for which the faculty member is eligible to apply, and will link these plans to the faculty member's professional development.
- d. The faculty member being evaluated will be responsible for seeing that their dossier includes the following per the Senior Reviews Checklist (available from the Provost's Office).

1. Provost's letter from previous senior review

2. A professional statement including:

- a reflection on teaching objectives, approaches, students' evaluations, and advising
- a brief statement about recent scholarly/creative activities
- a brief statement about recent service and leadership activities
- a brief statement of plans regarding teaching, research/creative work, and other services to the University for the next few years

3. Sabbatical prospectus

4. Supporting documents, including:

- updated CV with activity since the last senior review highlighted
- list of course enrollments, number of completed evaluations, and grade point averages (for all semesters taught since the last senior review)
- course materials: samples of syllabi, assignments, and exams (for all semesters taught since the last senior review)
- copies of student evaluations (for all semesters taught since the last senior review)
- list of scholarly/creative activities, noting whether the work was peer reviewed (for all work completed and accepted since the last senior review)
- copies of scholarly work (for all work completed and accepted since the last senior review)
- list of activities indicating committees, professional responsibilities, and community service (for all service since the last senior review)

e. The President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board will review the faculty member's materials, including the Provost's letter from the previous review. The Board will then advise the Provost regarding strengths and weaknesses and, when appropriate, suggest ways in which any problem areas might be addressed. Merit pay at the senior review will be evaluated based on criteria in section I.E.3.g (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/personnel-policies/i-e-salary-reviews-updated-proposal/>).

f. The evaluation will conclude with a conference between the faculty member and the Provost, followed by a letter from the Provost to the faculty member and the relevant chair recording the results of the review and extending the opportunity for the faculty member to meet with the Provost if requested by the faculty member. The purpose will be to assist the faculty member to assess strengths and weaknesses and to determine ways in which the University can contribute in the following years to the faculty member's intellectual growth and professional development.

g. If a tenured faculty member does not meet expectations in teaching, scholarship, or service at the time of the review, the faculty member will discuss with the Provost issues of concern and develop a plan to improve the faculty member's work. The plan should be grounded in the feedback from the most recent review conducted by the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board. A written copy of the plan will be included in the dossier for the faculty member's next regularly scheduled review.

I. Personnel Policies: D. Salary Reviews

Updates to Section I.E. via governance proposals #13-42, 14-34, 17-07, 20-123.

1. General Information

a. Salary increases are based upon recommendations that result from regularly scheduled personnel reviews conducted by the President's Advisory Board or the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board or, in the cases of tenured faculty, upon Interim Salary Reviews conducted between regularly scheduled Senior Reviews, or upon the results of Special Review. Based upon the recommendation, and in consultation with the President, the Provost makes the final decision on salary increases.

b. The criteria upon which faculty are evaluated for merit increases are I.E.2.f (Third year) and I.E.3.g (Salary/Senior Reviews).

c. Faculty are determined through this review process to be “meeting expectations,” “exceeding expectations,” or “not meeting expectations” in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and other contributions to the University. Each category receives equal weighting. A percentage increase to the base salary is attached each year to each of these rankings, based upon the size of the salary pool. The same merit rating may not necessarily result in the same percentage increase during the years in which the merit rating applies: if the pool is larger, the percentage increase may be larger; if the pool is smaller, the percentage increase may be smaller. The merit rating holds until the next review, unless the faculty member requests a Special Review (see below). This is accomplished through the following schedule.

2. Untenured Faculty

- a. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty are assumed to be meeting expectations during their first three year contract and, thus, receive the percentage increase appropriate for that ranking during the second and third years of their initial four-year contract.
- b. The third-year review results in both a contract reappointment decision and a recommendation for merit-based salary increases, if any, which will then hold for years four, five, and six of the probationary period.
- c. The tenure decision in the sixth year results in a salary recommendation that holds until the Interim Salary Review.
- d. Faculty whose initial appointment acknowledges years of service at another institution will be evaluated for merit increases on their review schedule rather than upon actual years of service at Denison. Thus, a faculty member whose initial appointment acknowledges one year of prior service would be evaluated for a merit increase as part of the “third-year review” in their second year at Denison.
- e. Non-tenure-track faculty will receive the percentage increase associated with meeting expectations. They will be reviewed for merit increases when they are reviewed as part of the normal review process for non-tenure-track faculty. The merit ranking that results from that review holds until the next such review.
- f. The following criteria will be used to determine if faculty undergoing third-year review are meeting, exceeding, or not meeting expectations.

1. Teaching

Faculty members are expected to maintain excellence in teaching, which is meeting expectations. Not only are student evaluations of teaching examined, but the faculty member’s statement on teaching plays a vital role in demonstrating exemplary pedagogical development.

Meeting Expectations:

- Professional statement conveys a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising as well as a willingness to adapt one’s teaching to the liberal arts.
- Course materials are clear and appropriate to the course.
- Student evaluations of teaching consistently exhibit student engagement and learning.
- Faculty peer evaluation reflects the candidate’s progress toward excellence in teaching.
- Feedback to students on their work is timely and substantive.
- Faculty member is regularly accessible to students.

Exceeding Expectations:

A faculty member’s teaching is considered exceeding expectations if, in addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member accomplishes much of the following:

- Professional statement conveys a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising and an early facility for teaching successfully within the liberal arts.
- Course materials indicate a significant level of clarity, rigor, and engagement and make evident the methods to meet the aims of the class.
- Student evaluations of teaching exhibit very high levels of student learning, engagement, and enthusiasm.
- Students voice high regard for the faculty member’s feedback on their work as well as the clearly articulated and demanding standards of the course.
- Faculty peer evaluation reflects the candidate’s progress toward excellence in teaching.
- Feedback to students on their work is timely and substantive.
- Faculty member is regularly accessible to students.
- When possible within a departmental curriculum, effective teaching already occurs at all course levels (introductory to advanced).

Not Meeting Expectations:

A faculty member does not meet expectations if the dossier indicates any of the following:

- Professional statement does not convey a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising nor does it show a commitment to the liberal arts.

- Evidence indicates a perfunctory approach to teaching.
- Course materials lack clarity.
- Student evaluations of teaching do not exhibit sufficient student engagement and learning.

2. Scholarship

All faculty are expected to engage in scholarship or creative activity appropriate to their discipline and to remain informed about current work in their area of expertise. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly research/creative agenda as well as identifiable progress on scholarship/creative work.

Meeting Expectations:

A faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement would be considered meeting expectations, if the faculty member accomplishes the following:

- All faculty are expected to engage in scholarship or creative activity appropriate to their discipline or interdisciplinary field and to remain informed about current work in their area of expertise. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly research/creative agenda as well as significant and identifiable progress on work that would lead to a professionally peer-reviewed body of scholarship/creative work appropriate for one's discipline or interdisciplinary field of expertise at the time of tenure.
- Evidence of progress toward a successful tenure review may include work completed mostly or entirely at Denison.
- Such evidence may include book reviews; drafts of articles, book chapters, and/or working papers; book or journal-length manuscripts currently under peer review; peer-reviewed conference paper presentations or conference poster presentations; submitted book or grant proposals; festival submissions, performances, exhibitions, and/or screenings.
- Professional statement articulates the candidate's research agenda for the years leading to the tenure review. This includes an agenda that will demonstrate continued scholarly/creative activity, growth, and productivity of work begun after employment at Denison.

Exceeding Expectations:

A faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement would be considered exceeding expectations, if the faculty member accomplishes the following:

- A candidate will be deemed to exceed expectations in scholarship at the third-year review if the candidate makes a significant, peer-reviewed, contribution to one's disciplinary or interdisciplinary engagement while at Denison.
- This may include having accepted for publication or published book chapters, journal articles, book projects or juried exhibitions, performances, or screenings in venues recognized by one's discipline, or receipt of a substantial grant or fellowship to fund a scholarly/creative project.

Not Meeting Expectations:

A faculty member would be considered not meeting expectations if:

- The candidate's professional statement lacks a coherent scholarly research/creative agenda.
- The candidate demonstrates minimal progress in successfully pursuing a research/creative agenda.
- There is insufficient evidence of a trajectory that would meet scholarship/creative work expectations at time of tenure review.

3. Service

Meeting Expectations:

The candidate is expected to participate in the life of the University. Faculty are encouraged to select activities that they find engaging and that will foster the development of the University community. Quality is valued above quantity in all instances. The professional statement should accurately and thoughtfully account for one's involvement in service. In the early years, involvement in service to the institution is an excellent and important means of learning how Denison functions.

Participation in the life of the University by the third-year review includes:

- Attending department/program meetings.
- Assuming service responsibilities at the department/program level and possibly at the University level.
- Attending faculty meetings to learn about the university governance system and identify areas where the faculty member can contribute.

Exceeding Expectations:

A junior faculty member may exceed expectations for service if the faculty member takes an effective and meaningful role in the life of the University:

- This may involve taking an active role on University-wide committees as elected or appointed; serving as faculty sponsor for student activities; supporting admissions efforts; serving on consortium committees; or serving in professional organizations beyond Denison.
- Faculty member demonstrates leadership in disciplinary/professional organization(s).

Not Meeting Expectations:

- The candidate does not assume service responsibilities at the department/program level.

3. Tenured Faculty

a. Tenured faculty are reviewed for merit increases as part of the regularly scheduled Senior Review. This merit ranking holds until the Interim Salary Review.

b. Tenured faculty also receive an Interim Salary Review normally in the third year between Senior Reviews. These reviews are based upon a salary report that consists of information for all of the elements of the Senior Reviews dossier since the last Senior Review. These reports are read by the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERIM SALARY REVIEW REPORT

Please submit a current CV. Highlight all activity since your last review.

Please submit teaching evaluations for all courses taught during the review period.

Please provide simple bulleted lists of the following:

Teaching

- All courses you have taught during the review period. Please include course numbers, titles, enrollments, and GPAs. (Course GPAs are available from the Registrar.)
- Any additional teaching responsibilities (e.g., Advising, Advising Circles, Directed or Independent Studies, Summer Scholars, Practicums, etc.).
- Any other professional activities related to teaching that you think we should know about (e.g., Professional Development Workshops or Training, Center for Learning and Teaching programs, Teaching Conferences, etc.).

Scholarship and Professional Growth and Development

- Any peer-reviewed publications, exhibitions, performances, or other scholarship and professional activities completed during the review period.
- Any works-in-progress that were begun or continued during the review period.
- Any conferences or professional meetings attended, and/or any professional presentations given during the review period.
- Any other professional activities related to your scholarship that you think we should know about.

Leadership and Service

- Any university committees you have served on during the review period.
- Any noteworthy departmental activities during this review period.
- Any other leadership and service activities you think we should know about.

Narrative Reflection

Limiting yourself to 1500 words, please reflect on your work as a faculty member at Denison. Tell us what you have accomplished during this review period and what you hope to accomplish going forward. You do not necessarily need to address all of the following questions, but these are the sorts of questions you might consider:

- Is there anything we should know that would help clarify how and why you have allocated your time and effort during this particular review period?
- What do you most look forward to as your career progresses? What risks are you hoping to take?
- What accomplishments are you most proud of as a teacher and/or scholar and why?
- What teaching and/or scholarship challenges have you encountered and how are you addressing them?
- What is the trajectory of your scholarship and how do you plan to move it forward in the future?
- What about your work brings you the greatest satisfaction or causes the greatest challenge?
- How have you contributed to the mission of the college in ways that don't fit neatly into the traditional categories?

- c. These board members will review materials submitted by the faculty member under review and vote on whether the faculty member is meeting, exceeding, or not meeting expectations in each of three individual categories (teaching, scholarship/creative expression, service).
- d. The members of the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board will make recommendations to the Provost who makes the final decision regarding salary increases on the basis of those recommendations.
- e. If a member of the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board is also a member of the same department as a colleague under review, the board member will recuse themselves from the review process; the Provost will ask another former member of the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board or the President's Advisory Board, who is not in the department of the person under review, to serve as a replacement for the person who has recused themselves. The person chosen will be from the same Division as the person under review.
- f. The salary review evaluation will conclude with a letter from the Provost to the faculty member recording the results of the review. A conference between the faculty member and the Provost will be scheduled at the faculty member's request. This salary decision holds until the next tenured faculty review. (See Special Reviews below).
- g. The following criteria will be used to determine if tenured faculty are meeting, exceeding, or not meeting expectations at the time of salary review.

1. Teaching

Once faculty have earned tenure, they are expected to maintain excellence in teaching. This constitutes meeting expectations. In order to exceed expectations of excellence in teaching, faculty will demonstrate continuing engagement as well as growth, which may take many forms. Not only are student evaluations of teaching examined, but the narrative reflection of the faculty member plays a vital role in demonstrating exemplary continuing pedagogical development.

Meeting Expectations:

- Evidence of a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising.
- Evidence that teaching is not stagnant.
- Indications that course materials are clear.
- Feedback to students on their work is timely and substantive.
- Faculty member is regularly accessible to students—not only as a teacher, but also as advisor, director of student research, and mentor.
- When possible within a departmental or program curriculum, effective teaching occurs at all levels (introductory to advanced).
- Teaching evaluations consistently exhibit student engagement and learning.
- Percent of student evaluations obtained are not routinely significantly below the campus norm.

Exceeding Expectations:

A faculty member's teaching in a review period is considered exceeding expectations if, in addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member accomplishes much of the following:

- Evidence of a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising that reflects how the faculty member's views and practice of teaching have developed over time in a liberal arts context.
- Dossier contains clear evidence that teaching develops over time (i.e., is not stagnant). Development over time does not mean changing something that works well or changing for the sake of change. Rather, it means continuing growth as a teacher.
- Such evidence might encompass a wide range: developing new courses, updating courses by incorporating new materials, assignments, technology, pedagogical approaches, incorporating own scholarship and research particularly well into courses to facilitate student learning, attending workshops and conferences at Denison and beyond, as well as fresh thinking about course material that contributes to curricular renewal and redesign.
- Indication of a significant level of clarity, rigor, and sustained engagement and make evident the methods used to meet the aims of the classes taught during the review period.
- Student evaluations of teaching consistently exhibit very high levels of student learning, engagement, and enthusiasm.
- This is often manifested in students' high regard for the faculty member's feedback on their work as well as the clearly articulated and demanding standards of the course.
- Grades are not routinely significantly different from departmental or program norms.
- The faculty member may engage in a notably high number of directed studies or senior research projects.

Not Meeting Expectations:

A faculty member does not meet expectations if the dossier indicates any of the following:

- Evidence indicates the absence of a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising.
- Evidence indicates a stagnant approach to teaching
- Indications that course materials are unclear.
- Teaching evaluations do not exhibit student engagement and learning.

2. Scholarship/Creative Work

All faculty are expected to engage in scholarship or creative activity appropriate to their discipline and to remain informed about current work in their area of expertise. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly research/creative agenda as well as identifiable progress on scholarship/creative work since the previous salary/senior review.

Meeting Expectations:

Evidence indicates a clear vision of the general framework and the trajectory of the faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement. Evidence indicates an integrative and innovative dimension to the faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement in the relevant disciplinary or interdisciplinary fields in the review period.

- Scholarship/creative work should reflect a degree of originality in the generation, application, or reinterpretation of concepts, methods, or creative works.
- A faculty member demonstrates evidence of continued growth and progress in scholarly and creative work.
- Such evidence may include but is not limited to conference presentations and poster sessions, drafts of journal-length manuscripts, drafts of chapters in edited collections, drafts of chapters of a single-authored monograph, grant proposals, book proposals, proposals for special issues of journals, performances and exhibitions, screen plays, and festival submissions.
- Unpublished work is poised to progress toward peer-reviewed publications, performances, juried exhibits, screenings, etc. A faculty member should not submit the same work-in-progress materials for multiple review cycles.
- During the shorter salary review cycle, the faculty member meets expectations by demonstrating how one's scholarly/creative work is moving toward peer review and publication. During the longer senior review cycle, the faculty member meets expectations with peer-reviewed publication/performance appropriate to one's discipline.

Exceeding Expectations:

A faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement in a review period would be considered exceeding expectations if, in addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member accomplishes the following:

- During the review period the faculty member makes some significant, peer-reviewed, contribution to one's disciplinary or interdisciplinary engagement.
- This may include publication of book chapters, journal articles, book projects or juried exhibitions, performances, or screenings in venues recognized by one's discipline, or receipt of a substantial grant or fellowship to fund a scholarly/creative project.
- During the shorter salary review cycle, the faculty member exceeds expectations with peer-reviewed publication/performance appropriate to one's discipline. During the longer senior review cycle, the faculty member exceeds expectations with multiple peer-reviewed publications/performances appropriate to one's discipline.

Not Meeting Expectations:

- Faculty member fails to articulate a clear vision of scholarly/creative growth.
- Faculty member fails to provide evidence of scholarly/creative growth.

3. Service

All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the formal and informal governance and life of the University. This ensures an equitable distribution of service responsibilities among faculty members. Faculty members are encouraged to select activities that they find engaging and that will foster the development of the University community. Quality is valued above quantity in all instances. The professional statement should accurately and thoughtfully account for one's involvement in service.

Meeting Expectations:

Faculty support the mission of the University in the following ways:

- Faculty member attends and participates as appropriate in Department and Faculty meetings so as to remain aware of issues related to the goals of the community.
- Faculty member actively participates in the governance and the life of the University.
- Examples may include: serving on University-wide committees, working groups, or task forces as elected or appointed; serving as faculty sponsor for student activities; supporting admissions efforts; offering a course for reunions and homecomings; serving on consortium committees; serving in professional organizations.

Exceeding Expectations:

A faculty member's service will be considered to exceed expectations if, in addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member accomplishes some combination of the following:

- Faculty member demonstrates leadership and active involvement in formal and informal governance.
- Faculty member participates in decision-making.
- Faculty member contributes to initiatives that facilitate the growth and development of the institution.
- Faculty member demonstrates leadership in disciplinary/professional organization(s).

Not Meeting Expectations:

- Faculty member does not participate in departmental, program, or faculty meetings.
- Faculty member does not participate in the governance and life of the University on a regular basis or in an effective manner.

h. If a tenured faculty member does not meet expectations in teaching, scholarship, or service at the time of the review, the faculty member will discuss with the Provost issues of concern and develop a plan to improve the faculty member's work. The plan should be grounded in the feedback from the most recent review conducted by the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board. A written copy of the plan will be included in the dossier for the faculty member's next regularly scheduled review.

4. Special Reviews

In any year, any full-time member of the teaching faculty, tenured or non-tenured, may initiate a Special Review. This review will be based upon a salary report containing all of the information an individual would normally submit for a contract renewal or tenured faculty review. It will be read by the Provost and either the President's Advisory Board or the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board. The salary decision will hold for that individual until the next regularly scheduled review.

I. Personnel Policies: E. Procedures for Senior Administrator Reviews

(Proposal #13-31, adopted 7 March 2013)

Procedures

1. The Administrator Review shall be conducted by the Senior Administrator Review committee. Membership of the Senior Administrator Review committee shall consist of the Chair-Elect of the Faculty and four members of the Teaching Faculty, one from each division of the University, to be elected by the General Faculty to two-year, staggered terms.
2. The committee shall first convene early in the fall with the Chair of the Faculty and the President or the President's designate to discuss the process and establish the schedule for review(s). Meetings will be chaired by the Chair-Elect of the Faculty. The goal is to review two administrators each year. All reviews will be completed by the end of the academic year.
3. The next step of each review is a meeting of the committee with the administrator to discuss the review process. During this meeting it is important to a) establish the scope and responsibilities of the position, b) list areas of particular importance for consideration during the review, and c) outline the schedule for the review.
4. The administrator then prepares a self-evaluation for the committee, to be submitted by a date agreed upon by the committee, the President or President's designate, and the administrator under review. The administrator's self-evaluation should include a list of others with whom the administrator has frequent contact so that the committee can solicit input from them.
5. The committee, at its discretion and in consultation with the President, may draw up an additional list of people pertinent to the review who will be contacted. Any additional list of names will be shared with the administrator. The committee will then formulate a set of questions to ask of those on the list(s) and solicit input from them. All teaching and general faculty will also be invited to submit letters evaluating the administrator. All letters are confidential. Additional data pertinent to the particular position under review (e.g. library statistics, computer-usage information, etc.) may be collected by the committee as agreed upon by the President or the President's designate and the Chair of the Faculty in the initial organizational meeting.
6. The committee shall then prepare a written report to the President summarizing all input and evaluating the performance of the administrator. No recommendations regarding salary or renewal shall be given in the report. The report, along with all letters collected, shall be submitted to the President. Copies of the report will also be sent to the administrator.
7. The faculty will continue the ongoing cycle of five-year reviews except that it should establish the principle that administrators are not reviewed before their third year in office. Although this may create an imbalance in the work of the committee from year to year, it eliminates the possibility that an administrator could come up for formal review in just the first or second year.

II. Professional Development Opportunities

- A. Leave Programs (p. 23)
- B. Professional Development Grants (p. 28)

- C. Professional Travel Policy (p. 30)
- D. Sponsored Grants (p. 30)

A. Leave Programs

Leaves from teaching responsibilities are provided by the University to permit members of the faculty to participate in activities that will:

- enhance their expertise as teachers and scholars upon their return to Denison;
- permit the utilization of special expertise of faculty in programs of broad interest (for example, programs sponsored by professional societies or by the federal government).
- permit experiences in other non-academic settings that hold promise of developing new competencies and provide opportunities to test out alternative careers.

1. Sabbatical Leaves

- The primary objective of the sabbatical leave is to keep a person intellectually engaged by providing an opportunity to do research, to pursue critical and imaginative writing, or to develop a new course, or new approaches to teaching – whatever, in short, contributes to the growth and effectiveness as a teaching member of the faculty and in a manner which will be of benefit to the University.
- Faculty are expected to return to Denison following a sabbatical for at least one year. Financial support has been provided so that Denison students will benefit from the renewal and enhanced competence the faculty member has gained while away.
- A sabbatical is an investment in the future. It is not a reward for past service. Leaves are not made to persons who have completed six years of service to the University and are completing a terminal contract.
- A full-time member of the tenured teaching faculty is eligible to apply for a sabbatical leave after six years of teaching at Denison, excluding any time spent on leave without pay. Subsequently, the faculty member is eligible to apply for leaves according to the schedule given below.
- A faculty member who is considered for tenure during the sixth year at Denison may postpone the leave one year without penalty (that is, the second sabbatical would be “due” in the fourteenth year).

Options for Sabbatical Leaves

Number of Semesters of Full-Time Teaching since the End of the Academic Year in which the Previous Sabbatical Occurred	Duration of Leave	Compensation for the Year
6	1 semester	3/4
12	1 semester	Full
12	2 semesters	1/2

In applying for sabbatical leave, the faculty member first submits to the department a substantive plan in some detail explaining the nature of the project and the projected goals. The plan is reviewed and evaluated by the chairperson of the department for consistency with departmental needs and objectives. The request, along with the chairperson's evaluation, is then submitted to the Provost, who may consult with the faculty member about the plan and may make suggestions for modifications. This may be done in the context of a tenure or senior review, or it may be submitted on its own in the event that the review and the sabbatical are not in sync.

Normally, one is not granted a sabbatical leave for teaching courses elsewhere that are regularly taught at Denison. Nevertheless, it is understood that some teaching may be a part of the total sabbatical activity, especially if the person is on leave for a full academic year.

Following return to campus, the faculty member reports to the Provost about the leave. The report may take the form of a summary of the activities for the year, a copy of a book, article, or paper, the syllabus of a new course, etc. A presentation to the general University community may be appropriate. The quality of the leave accomplishment is taken into account at the next salary review in evaluating the total contribution of the faculty member to the University. The Provost has the authority to decide on all applications for sabbatical leaves. They may consult with the Advisory Board.

The Provost makes an effort to ensure that the number of leaves each year is approximately the same within departments and in the University as a whole.

In the event that a faculty member is requested to consider applying for a sabbatical leave a year early, and if a leave is in fact taken a year early, the faculty member is eligible for the next sabbatical leave after the completion of seven years of service at Denison. If a person is requested and agrees to postpone for a year, then the person is eligible subsequently after completing five years of teaching at Denison. In the event the person does not take advantage of the eligibility for a sabbatical leave after six years of teaching at Denison, the person may apply any year. Eligibility for a subsequent sabbatical leave normally occurs after completing the requirements set forth above.

Every effort must be made by the department to make arrangements so that a replacement is not required. Requests for a replacement will be reviewed by the Dean of the Faculty. A request for a part-time replacement is more likely to be approved than is a request for a full-time replacement. Departments ought to make every effort to absorb the workload of a person on leave, especially if the leave is only for one semester. If a faculty member is uncertain about taking either the full year or a semester, this should be stated clearly in the application. Changes in plans that would disrupt the departmental program or would result in unanticipated costs to the University should be avoided. A person may not switch from a year leave to a semester leave later than March 15 of the year preceding the intended sabbatical year and expect to be compensated for the entire year.

2. Sabbatical Policy for Continuing, Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty on continuing appointments with at least one-half time teaching responsibilities, and with additional expectations of engaging in scholarly/artistic work, are eligible to apply for sabbatical leaves. Time of eligibility and compensation during leaves will be prorated, based upon teaching load. For example, a faculty member teaching one-half time will be eligible to apply for a one-semester leave at full pay after 12 years or a one-semester leave at half pay after 6 years. An approved application for a leave and a pre-sabbatical review by the President's Advisory Board should occur in the year prior to the proposed sabbatical leave.

3. University Leaves

A University leave is granted without pay for one or two years. An individual may be under contractual agreement with another institution during a University leave. Permission may be granted by the Provost after consultation with the President's Advisory Board. A sabbatical leave and a University leave of one year may be combined, again with the approval of the Provost. Under no circumstances may such a combination extend beyond two years.

4. Robert C. Good Faculty Fellowships

a. Terms of the Program

The R. C. Good Faculty Fellowship is a competitive program whose purpose is to provide a leave in order to advance or complete a major research project, creative project, or pedagogical research project. Under this program, a tenured faculty member is released from all normal teaching and advising responsibilities for one semester. This opportunity is limited to faculty whose contracts assure at least one year of service at Denison following completion of the leave. Faculty are eligible for only one R.C. Good or Bowen Faculty Fellowship per regular sabbatical cycle.

Recipients of Good awards will be expected to present the results of their work at an appropriate campus-wide event (e.g. Global Studies, Denison Scientific Association, Faculty Research Dinner or other equivalent forum) during the year following the leave. Faculty are expected to address the outcomes of the Good leave as part of their next senior or promotional review.

This program is intended for faculty members with a demonstrated record of excellence in the area to be pursued during the leave. Such evidence can be demonstrated through their publication and/or presentation record, or other means appropriate to the proposed project.

b. Eligibility

Eligibility requirements for an R.C. Good Faculty Fellowship are as follows:

1. Faculty must have earned tenure by the beginning of the academic year in which the leave is to be taken. Pre-tenure faculty are permitted to apply for an R.C. Good fellowship during the year in which they are being reviewed for tenure, assuming that they fulfill the additional requirements outlined below.
2. Faculty must have completed at least six years of service prior to the fellowship leave, and must be on an appointment that assures at least one year of service at Denison following completion of the leave.
3. The "six years of service" requirement may be waived for tenured faculty who were hired into a tenure-track position with an accelerated tenure review clock that precluded a "pre-tenure fellowship" leave (described in section II.A.6).
4. Faculty who were previously on a University leave (section II.A.3) must have returned to full-time active teaching status for a time period equivalent to the length of the University leave in order to take an R.C. Good fellowship leave (e.g. if a faculty member takes a two-year University leave, they must have completed two years of full-time teaching prior to taking a leave supported by an R.C. Good fellowship).
5. Faculty are eligible for only one R.C. Good or Bowen Faculty Fellowship per regular sabbatical cycle.

c. Guidelines for Application

The Provost's Office will issue a request for proposals, normally in the fall semester, outlining the details of the date and form of submission. Applicants must notify the Provost's Office of their intention to apply in response to the request for proposals. Electronic applications must include the following:

1. Project Proposal that describes a plan to advance or complete a major research project, creative project, or pedagogical research project.

- The proposal should be written at a level appropriate for the external reviewers.
- The proposal should be written in a way that enables the external reviewers to effectively evaluate the four primary “criteria for selection” (as described below).
- The project description must not exceed five pages (single spaced); if necessary, you may include an additional 1-page appendix or bibliography.

2. Project Summary that highlights the key elements of the proposal, written for a non-specialist audience.

- The description should be written in such a way as to be accessible to the members of the President’s Senior Faculty Advisory Board (which is populated by representatives of each division of the University).
- The proposal should be written in a way that enables the members of the President’s Senior Faculty Advisory Board to effectively evaluate the four primary “criteria for selection” (as described below).
- The summary must not exceed two pages (single spaced).

3. An updated curriculum vitae that shows evidence of excellence in the proposed area of work.

4. Applications for the pursuit of external funding that are relevant to the proposal (if applicable).

5. Plans for presentation of the completed work.

6. Signed form by department or program chair indicating awareness of the candidate’s intention to apply for the R.C. Good Fellowship.

7. A list of any scholars or artists to be excluded as external reviewers, to ensure that the proposal is not being evaluated by anyone who knows the candidate personally or professionally in such a way that their opinion of the candidate’s work might be predicted based on their prior relationship. External reviewers normally will be solicited from Ohio Five or GLCA consortia institutions, or other comparable institutions.

d. External Reviewers

The Provost’s Office will recruit external reviewers from the Ohio 5, GLCA, or comparable institutions to review project proposals. Reviewers will be solicited from the corresponding academic division of each applicant. Two external reviewers will evaluate each proposal. Individuals excluded by the applicants (see II.A.4.b.7 above) will not be solicited as external reviewers.

e. Criteria for Selection

1. Quality/Merit of the Proposal/Project

- Is the proposal well written, clearly articulating the purpose and value of the project in terms that a non-specialist can understand?
- How are the objectives of the project congruent with the agenda of the proposer?
- Does the proposal reflect the activity of an informed and lively intellect and talent? Is the work intellectually, pedagogically, and/or artistically sound?
- How would this proposal be ranked relative to peer proposals in a national competition?

2. Importance of the Contribution to the Field

- How original is this proposed project? To what extent does it increase knowledge, push creative boundaries, or advance pedagogy in this person’s field?
- To what extent is this project relevant to its field? What is the likelihood that this work will have a significant and lasting impact on this person’s field?

3. Appropriateness of the Scope of the Project in the Proposed Time Frame

- Does the size of the project warrant an entire semester’s leave? Conversely, is the project overly ambitious for the suggested time frame?
- Does the proposed project include a clear description of the anticipated proposed scholarly/artistic/pedagogical research outcomes?

4. Record of Achievement of the Applicant

- Does the applicant have the necessary background and experience to carry out this project?
- How strong is the applicant’s record of achievement relative to the applicant’s career stage? Have past publication/presentation venues been strong ones? Has the work received awards or recognition?
- Has the candidate pursued and/or obtained external funding in support of this project?

f. Selection Process

The President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board will make recommendations for awards to the Provost. All other things being equal, some preference will be given to those who have never received a Good. Pursuit of external funding related to the project will be viewed favorably in applications. Unsuccessful applicants may apply for the Good Fellowship in subsequent years. The Provost's Office will make copies of the external reviews available to all the Good candidates, with identifying information deleted.

5. William G. Bowen Faculty Fellowships

a. Terms of the Program

The Bowen Faculty Fellowship is a competitive program whose purpose is to provide a one-semester leave for tenured faculty to immerse in a scholarly project after a period of sustained leadership commitments and/or engagement in teaching and pedagogy. Under this program, a tenured faculty member is released from all normal teaching and advising responsibilities for one semester. This opportunity is limited to tenured faculty. Recipients of Bowen Fellowships will be expected to present the results of their work at an appropriate campus-wide event (e.g. Global Studies Seminar, Denison Scientific Association, Faculty Research Dinner, or other equivalent forum) during the year following the leave. Faculty are expected to address the outcomes of the Bowen leave as part of their next senior or promotional review.

b. Eligibility

Eligibility requirements for a Bowen Faculty Fellowship are as follows:

1. Applicants must have tenure by August 1 of the year of application.
2. Applicants must have completed six years of service. The "accelerated tenure clock" exception described above for R.C. Good fellowships does not apply for Bowen fellowships.
3. Applicants may receive only one Bowen or R.C. Good Faculty fellowship per regular sabbatical cycle.
4. Prior recipients of a Bowen fellowship are ineligible.
5. Fellowship recipients must complete at least one year of service after the fellowship semester. A sabbatical will not count toward that year of service.
6. Faculty who were previously on a University leave (section II.A.3) must have returned to active teaching status for a time period equivalent to the length of the leave in order to take Bowen fellowship leave (i.e. if a faculty member takes a two-year University leave, they must have completed two years of active full-time teaching prior to taking a leave supported by a Bowen fellowship).

c. Guidelines for Application

The Provost's Office will issue a request for proposals outlining the details of the date and form of submission. Applicants must notify the Provost's Office of their intention to apply in response to the request for proposals. Electronic applications must include the following:

1. Statement on Contributions to the College that describes and demonstrates significant leadership and service commitments and/or focused engagement in teaching and pedagogy.
 - See "Criteria for Selection" below.
 - The statement may not exceed three pages.
2. Project Proposal that describes a plan to initiate, advance or complete a major research project, creative project, or pedagogical research project:
 - See "Criteria for Selection" below.
 - The project description may not exceed five pages; if necessary, an additional one-page appendix or bibliography may be included.
 - The description should be written in such a way as to be accessible to the members of the President's Advisory Board (which is populated by representatives of each division of the University).
3. An updated curriculum vitae.
4. Plans for presentation of the completed work.
5. Signed form by department or program chair indicating awareness of the applicant's intention to apply for a Bowen Fellowship.
6. A list of any scholars or artists to be excluded as external reviewers, to ensure that the proposal is not being evaluated by anyone who knows the candidate personally or professionally in such a way that their opinion of the candidate's work might be predicted based on their prior relationship. External reviewers normally will be solicited from Ohio Five or GLCA consortia institutions, or other comparable institutions

d. External Reviewers

The Provost's Office will recruit external reviewers from the Ohio 5, GLCA, or other comparable institutions to review project proposals. Reviewers will be solicited from the corresponding academic division of each applicant. Two external reviewers will evaluate each proposal. Individuals excluded by the applicants (see II.A.5.c.6 above) will not be solicited as external reviewers.

e. Selection Process

Applications will be assessed both on the merits of the applicant's contributions to the college and on the merits of the scholarly proposal. The President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board will review the statement on contributions to the college, the project proposal, and all other components of the fellowship applications, including external review reports. Based on that review, the Board will submit a ranking of candidates to the Provost. The Provost will announce the fellowship recipients prior to the annual deadline for R.C. Good applications. Unsuccessful applicants may apply for the R.C. Good Fellowship in the same academic year as the Bowen Fellowship application, and may apply for the Bowen Fellowship in subsequent years. The Provost's Office will make copies of the external reviews available to all Bowen candidates, with identifying information redacted.

f. Criteria for Selection

1. Statement on Contributions to the College

- a. Leadership: Does the statement effectively demonstrate a record of significant leadership or service commitments? Has the candidate contributed to the life of the college in substantial ways?
- b. Teaching: Does the statement effectively demonstrate focused engagement with teaching (such as inspiration of student interest, development of new courses, exploration of innovative pedagogies, evidence of sustained excellence over time)?
- c. Successful applications may focus on either (a), (b), or a combination of (a) and (b) above.
- d. Statements may not exceed three pages; appendices beyond three pages may be attached.
- e. Statements will be evaluated by President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board based on the following scale:
 - A - Has had truly exceptional positive impact on campus and / or outstanding engagement with teaching
 - B - Has had positive impact on campus and / or significant engagement with teaching
 - C - Has had more limited impact on campus and / or engagement with teaching

2. Project Proposal:

- a. Does the proposal clearly indicate a plan to initiate, advance or complete a major research project, creative project, or pedagogical research project?
- b. Is the proposal well written, clearly articulating the purpose and value of the project in terms that a non-specialist can understand?
- c. Are the objectives of the project well established and relevant to the applicant's professional trajectory?
- d. Is the work intellectually, pedagogically, and/or artistically sound? Is it likely to have an impact in its field?
- e. Does the proposed project include a clear description of the anticipated proposed scholarly/artistic/ pedagogical research outcomes?
- f. Does the size of the project warrant an entire semester's leave? Conversely, is the project overly ambitious for the suggested time frame?
- g. Proposals may not exceed five pages.
- h. External reviewers will provide a summative rating of the proposal based on the following scale:
 - 5 - Truly Exceptional, worthy of funding
 - 4 - Very strong, worthy of funding
 - 3 - Proposal with some merit, worthy of funding
 - 2 - Proposal of questionable merit, may not be worthy of funding
 - 1 - Proposal is not worthy of funding

6. Pre-Tenure Fellowships

Pre-tenure fellowship leaves consist of one semester of released time from teaching for untenured faculty, normally in the fourth year at Denison. They are available only to faculty occupying full-time, tenure-track positions at Denison, following a successful third-year review (or comparable pre-tenure reappointment review). Those who receive a Pre-Tenure Fellowship are expected to return to Denison University for a year of full-time teaching.

Application for a pre-tenure leave is made as part of the third-year review process. The third-year review dossier should include a pre-tenure leave proposal that includes a description of the project and a discussion of how the project fits into the applicant's longer-term scholarly agenda. Departments are expected to include an assessment of the proposal as part of their evaluation of the candidate's dossier. The proposals will be evaluated by the President's Advisory Board along with the other third-year review materials.

II. Professional Development Opportunities: B. Professional Development Grants

Questions about any of the professional development programs listed below should be addressed to the Dean of the Faculty.

1. Funding for Teaching Workshops and Seminars

This funding is for attendance (often by teams from a department) at teaching workshops, conferences, and seminars that have departmental or institutional impact. The request should be made to the Provost's Office and include a rationale and itemized budget.

Faculty members who attend workshops, conferences, or seminars to improve their individual teaching should use their personal PD accounts.

2. PD (Professional Development) Accounts

The purpose of the PD Account is to provide each full-time, tenured or tenure-track member of the teaching faculty (who is not already being supported by some other professional development account, such as the Michele Myers PD Account) with an account of \$3,000 a year to support teaching and research. These funds will take the form of individual accounts with specific worktags, accessible through Workday.

The PD Accounts fund any legitimate professional expense, such as faculty travel for research or attendance at professional meetings, journal subscriptions, memberships, books, software, research aids, and supplies. PD funds also support research-related items or materials not already covered by the University through a departmental or other account. PD funds may be used to purchase a tablet or e-reader; these items must be purchased via Workday procurement and tagged by ITS. PD funds do not support teaching materials that should otherwise be covered by departmental budgets. Nor do they support student research or travel, both of which are covered by separate budget lines. Because the University already provides a computer for each faculty member, the fund also does not support the purchase of a second computer nor does it cover the purchase of a home computer. Denison offers the Faculty Home Computer Purchase Program (<https://my.denison.edu/campus-resources/office-of-the-provost/faculty-resources/computer-purchase/>) which offers an interest-free loan of up to \$2,500 for full-time teaching faculty to purchase home computers. Professional development grant policies enable faculty members to keep journals, books, and other similar purchases made for professional development. All other items, including technology and equipment, purchased with university funds become the property of the university. A maximum of \$3,000 in professional development funds may be carried over in any given year.

Special conditions apply to the use of professional development funds for the purchase of supportive technology:

- Tablets / E-readers: PD funds may be used to purchase a tablet or e-reader. These items must be purchased via Workday procurement and tagged by ITS. Denison will not reimburse any purchase of a tablet or e-reader if a personal credit card or cash is used. Consult with your Instructional Technologist for recommendations on supportive technology.
- Software: All software purchases must be made through Workday procurement. Faculty members must consult with their instructional technologist before making software and other computer equipment purchases in order to ensure that duplicative purchases are not being made and all licensing is within compliance.
- Per the terms of the professional development grant policies, any computer equipment and software purchased with professional development funds becomes the property of the University.

Denison strongly prefers that all tenured and tenure-track faculty members use Denison credit cards for expenses related to travel, memberships, and subscriptions. Most material purchases can be made via Workday procurement. In exceptional circumstances PD funds also may be accessed through submission of a receipt using a Workday expense report. Purchases made with a Denison credit card must be reconciled frequently in Workday and PD account balances should be checked regularly.

Faculty members should discuss the use of the PD Account funds with their chairs if they have any questions about what is or is not an appropriate use of the funds. If chairs have any questions about gray areas, they or the faculty member should contact the Dean of the Faculty.

3. Michele T. Myers PD Accounts

(Formerly Fairchild Accounts)

New faculty in tenure-track positions are allocated up to \$5,000 per year for their first three years in support of teaching and research. Department chairs will approve expenditures from these accounts. Funds may be used for travel to conferences or research sites, books, subscriptions, or memberships, page charges for journals, and the like. Faculty members who receive a Myers grant are expected to use this account as their first resort for professional expenses, including travel to conferences. See PD accounts for procedures.

4. Computer Purchase Program (<https://my.denison.edu/campus-resources/office-of-the-provost/faculty-resources/computer-purchase/>)

Denison provides a 12-month interest-free loan of up to \$2,500 for full-time teaching faculty to purchase home computers. Contact the Academic Operations Coordinator for additional information.

5. DURF Grants (Denison University Research Foundation)

Established in 1942 through the generous bequest of a Denison alumnus, Elmer Jones, DURF is an independent foundation whose purpose is to promote research and scholarly activity at Denison. A primary means of advancing this purpose is the awarding each year of research and scholarship grants to faculty using income earned through investments of the original bequest as well as other gifts. Short proposals for these grants are solicited from the faculty, and are a means for the faculty to communicate to the DURF Board activities that can promote research and scholarly activity at Denison. While the most common type of proposal is for activities that advance individual faculty research or scholarship, proposals for any activity that advances the DURF purpose will be considered. The main restrictions are that DURF grants must be completed within the year, do not fund stipends other than student and faculty stipends related to summer research at Denison, and do not provide funding for food.

Awards normally range from \$1,000 to \$15,000 per faculty member and proposals involving multiple faculty are welcome. A few examples of what DURF grants may be used for include but are not limited to: travel, equipment or laboratory needs, student research assistants, preparation of materials for publication, survey costs, fees to attend institutes or for showing/performing work, book subventions, and collaboration costs.

The DURF Board meets in March to consider proposals, interview applicants, and make the awards. In selecting awards, the DURF Board considers the impact on promoting research and scholarly activity, the quality of the proposed activities, and the relevance to the college's current strategy and priorities. Preference is usually given to faculty with continuing contracts at Denison. Awards for research with human subjects are contingent upon IRB Approval.

Further information and application instructions can be found on the Provost's Office tab on MyDenison under Faculty Development. Questions should be addressed to the Senior Associate Provost.

6. DURF Contingency

Each year the DURF Board provides the Office of the Provost a small DURF Contingency Fund, used to assist faculty research and scholarship with small grants (normally not over \$1,000). Requests for a contingency grant should be made to the Senior Associate Provost. The Contingency Fund cannot be used to meet large requests from faculty during the year. Large requests must be made through the annual DURF application process.

7. Emeriti Travel and Publication Grants

(Approved by Faculty Development Committee, 2014)

Denison seeks to recognize the continued public contributions made by emeriti faculty to their respective professions, contributions that also enhance the University's reputation. Accordingly, Denison will entertain requests from emeriti to have it support expenses incurred in connection with the presentation of such professional contributions (e.g., an article, a book, a film, a performance, a poster, a talk, a clinic). Session chairing or organizational board meetings will not be covered, but there will be no distinction between foreign and domestic travel expenses that are suitably incurred.

- The amount of presentation support requested should comport with the project involved, up to \$500. There is a limit of two awards per person in any fiscal year (July 1 to June 30). All travel needs to be in accordance with University travel regulations.
- For publication subvention a contract must have been awarded; there will be a limit of \$1000, and the subvention cannot be combined with support for travel incurred for a performance or product.
- Award recipients will be contacted to arrange for reimbursement of funds.

Because the number of requests that can be approved will be constrained by the funds available each fiscal year, not all worthy requests can be assured of support. Once the granted requests have exhausted the funds available for a fiscal year, no further requests can be considered until the following fiscal year.

Application for Emeriti Grants:

Requests for such emeritus support should include a current C.V., as well as a short (one-page) description of the work produced or performed and of the impact the work affords to the appropriate professional community. Appropriate supporting documentation must be submitted.

Applications should be made in the fall for fall conferences and in the spring for spring conferences, (at least one month before conference date).

Applications should be sent to the attention of the Dean of the Faculty for endorsement and will be reviewed by the Faculty Development Committee

II. Professional Development Opportunities: C. Professional Travel Policy

1. Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty will use their PD Accounts to fund professional travel.
2. The Faculty Professional Development Airline Travel (PDAT) Fund serves to cover airline-related expenses for any faculty travel that is related to professional development (e.g. attending professional conferences, research site visits, visits to collaborators, etc.), which would normally be covered by the faculty member's Professional Development (PD) account. Effective 7/2/2023, this fund is available for faculty who have a standard \$3,000/year PD account (or Michele Myers account, for those in their first three years of a tenure-track appointment). Full guidelines for this funding can be found on MyDenison (<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uAoWTDzNeEb00LLc8glqwvlgYhOiBh1TTxRBdLDfoeg/edit?usp=sharing>).
3. Other full-time faculty can be reimbursed up to \$1,300 per academic year for travel to a professional conference to deliver a paper. Prior approval from the Senior Associate Provost (cc'ing the Academic Operations Coordinator) is required.
4. Continuing part-time faculty should make individual requests to the Senior Associate Provost (cc'ing the Academic Operations Coordinator) for funding for travel to professional conferences to deliver a paper.
5. There are two options for accounting for food costs on the travel report form: 1) submit a per diem of \$39 per day without receipts, or 2) enter the exact amount for the meals on the travel report form and include the receipts. The maximum daily reimbursement for food with receipts is \$75.
6. An additional \$50 per day is available for child care above regular child care expenses when presenting at conferences.
7. The Denison credit card is the preferred method of payment for all travel expenses and conference registration fees.

Under special circumstances travel advances can be granted through a Workday process. Consult with the Dean of the Faculty for more details.

II. Professional Development Opportunities: D. Sponsored Grants

Faculty members who are interested in information about sponsored grants should contact the Director of Foundation and Corporate Relations. Sponsored grants include governmental and private granting agencies that support a broad array of activities such as research, attendance at seminars and institutes, and teaching abroad. New grant opportunities appear in the *Faculty Newsletter*.

III. Faculty Responsibilities

- A. Teaching-Related Responsibilities (p. 30)
- B. Important Academic Regulations (p. 36)

III. Faculty Responsibilities: A. Teaching-Related Responsibilities

1. Teaching Load and Office Hours

The normal teaching load for tenure track and tenured faculty is five courses per year. Non-tenure track faculty members normally teach six courses per year. Equivalency norms exist in the sciences (for laboratory responsibilities) and in the performing and studio arts. The supervision of Directed or Independent Studies, Senior Research, or Senior Creative Project is expected as well. Faculty members are expected to keep a reasonable number of office hours for consultation and discussion with students, especially students in their classes.

2. Syllabi

Faculty should be clear and explicit as to course expectations, learning objectives, and methods of assigning grades. While the content or coverage of material in the syllabus may change as the semester progresses, the descriptions of expectations and determinations of grades is viewed as an agreement between the instructor and students, which should be honored as stated in the initial syllabus.

The amount and nature of classroom instruction and direct faculty instruction should be evident on a course syllabus. Likewise, the nature of a student's out-of-class work should be indicated on the syllabus. This should not be interpreted as a requirement to include on syllabi or course proposals a detailed accounting of hours. Rather, the syllabus should provide a clear understanding of how the minimum credit standard is met.

3. Academic Integrity

See section VII. A. (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/community-standards-policies/vii-a-academic-integrity/>) for the statement that affirms the value the University attaches to academic integrity and serves as a model that faculty may use or adapt in their course syllabi.

4. Evaluation of Teaching in Courses

- a. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness at Denison University will consist of formative and summative evaluation procedures.

Formative evaluation is a means or process to help an individual assess the effectiveness of teaching and improve teaching. Formative evaluation methods should focus on the intellectual questions that inform course design and direct attention to assisting an instructor in determining what works well and what is not working as effectively. Methods of evaluation will vary depending upon the goals of an instructor, disciplinary goals, and departmental or institutional goals. The selection and use of particular formative evaluation methods will draw upon discussions between the

instructor and the instructor's colleagues. However, the process of formative evaluation will use information collected from the instructor, colleagues, and students. Feedback and consultation are part of the formative evaluation process. In addition, formative evaluation occurs over time and also continues throughout one's teaching career.

Summative evaluation produces a judgment of teaching effectiveness. Those faculty and administrators charged with rendering personnel decisions use these judgments in making decisions regarding contract renewal, tenure, promotion, salary review, and for periodic senior review. Thus, summative evaluation continues throughout one's teaching career.

Summative evaluation is an interpretation of information collected from the instructor, students, and colleagues. Summative evaluation processes should be based on reasonable professional judgment about what constitutes good teaching in the discipline, with a focus on shared criteria for teaching effectiveness. Colleague review is both a professional responsibility and an essential element of developing and implementing consensus about teaching effectiveness.

b. Departments and programs should have the primary role in developing a formative evaluation system and should produce a written plan that describes the essential components of this system. The formative evaluation system should be sensitive to the variety of teaching contexts, goals, and methods used by the department's or program's instructors. Information regarding the purposes, operation, and implementation of a department's or program's formative evaluation system should be considered "community property" and be available to all University faculty in order to foster a climate of cooperation, professional development, and mutual enlightenment. The formative evaluation system should include the direct and ongoing participation of some or all of the instructor's department colleagues.

Classroom observation is a required component of formative evaluation. The instructor and the observer(s) should agree upon a specific schedule and the procedures for evaluation before the observations take place. Classroom observation undertaken by colleagues should occur in different courses and at different periods of time within a semester and across semesters. Thus, there will be multiple opportunities for feedback and discussion following the observations. 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 for the purposes of formative evaluation.

The formative evaluation procedures should be manageable and practical within the resources of the department or program and the University. The formative evaluation plan should also be monitored and periodically assessed by the department or program and by the appropriate councils or offices of the University.

c. Departments will conduct formative evaluation of teaching of candidates during the first and second years in preparation for the third-year summative review and in accordance with the foregoing description of the evaluation of teaching courses.

d. 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.

e. A common summative evaluation form will be distributed electronically to students during the last two weeks of the semester. The instructor and department or program chair will receive the evaluation results after student grades have been posted.

The instructor is responsible for providing the rating-scale summaries and the individual questionnaires (i.e., the original form with rating-scale and the written responses) when a summative evaluation is conducted for the purpose of a personnel review. Faculty can ask students to respond to additional questions. However, these questions will be presented on a form separate from the summative evaluation questionnaire, and these may or may not be submitted in a review.

Note on Evaluation of Teaching, Spring 2020: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in spring 2020 Denison moved from in-person to remote instruction at the mid-point of the semester. Because of the disruption to the semester and the unanticipated changes that faculty had to make to their courses and instruction in the remote format, the Provost altered the course evaluation process for that semester. Teaching evaluations were administered and the evaluation feedback shared as usual with individual faculty members. These evaluations were shared only with individual instructors and were not shared with department chairs/program directors, unless the faculty member independently chose to do so. The Provost also advised faculty that it would be an individual decision about whether to submit spring 2020 evaluations in future professional review dossiers. Whether or not Spring 2020 evaluations are submitted as part of a dossier, it is not relevant to the consideration of any candidate for contract renewal, tenure, or promotion. If spring 2020 evaluations are submitted, they will be considered as a usual component of a review dossier.

5. Advising

Section III.A.5. of the Faculty Handbook was updated by governance proposal #14-32.

Advising is a form of teaching that is purposeful, ongoing and regular. Advising is integral to teaching at Denison. The academic advisor plays a key role in helping students learn to become autonomous thinkers, capable of self-determination through their exploration of the liberal arts. Following their first year of employment, all tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as some visiting faculty (as determined by departments and the Provost), will be responsible for academic advising.

The chief role of a faculty advisor is to assist students in thinking through their undergraduate liberal arts experience and their educational goals so that they may take full advantage of the resources available at Denison University. The advising relationship develops and changes over the course of four years, as student needs and concerns evolve. Advisors are expected to encourage students to think critically about the benefits of a liberal education. They are also expected to know Denison's current academic regulations as well as the educational resources available at the university. Knowledge of the General Education program and the ability to assist students in navigating the University's academic programs are essential. Advisors should also be proactive in directing students to additional advising and mentorship persons and resources from across campus.

Faculty should also offer guidance beyond these matters: assisting students in identifying their interests; helping students make links between their immediate and long-range goals; discussing career paths and graduate school options; referring students to institutional resources for academic or personal support; and giving advice, when appropriate, on decisions relating to personal or quality-of-life choices.

Specific Goals: Specifically, the goals of academic advising are as follows:

- a. Facilitate student understanding of the purposes of a liberal arts education.
- b. Encourage and guide the advisee in identifying interests and setting personal goals.
- c. Promote the development of student autonomy in making educational decisions.
- d. Advise students on questions and problems related to their academic progress.
- e. Assist students with information and referrals regarding academic policies, procedures, and opportunities.
- f. Advise students on course selection and proposed academic schedules.
- g. Monitor students' academic progress.

Oversight: The Office of the Provost will oversee and coordinate advising. The office will:

- a. Track advising loads with the support of departmental chairs.
- b. Work with the Director of Advising in coordinating and facilitating the advising of first-year students. In the assignment of first-year advisees, a variety of criteria will be taken into account, including the current university median of advisees per faculty member.
- c. Oversee the implementation of regulations and processes related to academic advising.
- d. Coordinate support for academic advising with academic departments, academic programs, and relevant offices.
- e. Develop programs for advisor orientation and continued training.

Department Responsibilities: Academic departments and programs will assume an active role in monitoring the effectiveness of academic advising. Departments are expected to:

- a. Discuss expectations regarding advising.
- b. Provide support for new faculty in the development of advising skills.
- c. Develop resources for advising within the major and exploring Denison opportunities.
- d. Examine variability in advising load among faculty and seek ways to reduce variability in advising loads.
- e. Regularly reflect on advising statistics and processes, perhaps as part of departmental assessment.
- f. Work with other offices of the University involved with student academic advising.

6. Mid-Semester Grades

Mid-semester grades must be submitted for all first-year students and sophomores. Although mid-semester grades are not required for juniors and seniors, should grades of C- or below be submitted, the Registrar will notify those students of their performance. Mid-semester grade reports will go to all first-year students and sophomores and to their academic advisors.

7. Senior Thesis or Senior Creative Project with Distinction

(Proposal #20-46, adopted 7 November 2019)

Denison values the intellectual accomplishment demonstrated by completion of a Senior Thesis or Senior Creative Project. The university has a long tradition of acknowledging that accomplishment by preserving projects that attain the specified grade level in the campus library and recognizing them in the commencement program. This policy establishes a process by which senior student work can receive institutional recognition by designating such projects as a Senior Thesis with Distinction or Senior Creative Project with Distinction.

DEFINITIONS OF RELEVANT TERMS

Senior Research: 8-credit senior immersive experience in major; normally 451-452 sequence.

Senior Thesis: A Senior Research project that has met all the terms of Distinction as described below, including: declaration of intent by the appointed deadline, designation of a second evaluator, and final submission by the deadline and location as designated by the Provost; and which meets or exceeds the standards of evaluation described herein. The product of a Senior Thesis is *submitted in the form of a written document*. The product of a Senior Thesis is preserved in Denison's library, indicated on the student's transcript, and recognized in the commencement program.

Senior Creative Project: A Senior Research project that has met all the terms of Distinction as described below, including: declaration of intent by the appointed deadline, designation of a second evaluator, and final submission by the deadline and location as designated by the Provost; and which meets or exceeds the standards of evaluation described herein. The product of a Senior Creative Project is *submitted in the form designated by the department/program* as indicated in the declaration of intent. The product of a Senior Creative Project is preserved in Denison's library, indicated on the student's transcript, and recognized in the commencement program.

Product: the tangible item submitted by the appointed deadline in fulfillment of the Senior Thesis / Senior Creative Project requirements. The product is normally a text that either:

- Comprises the entirety of the Senior Thesis
- Is approved by the department or program in substitution of a text that comprises the entirety of the senior thesis. This might take the form of an abstract or description of a Senior Creative Project.

GUIDELINES FOR RECOGNITION OF SENIOR WORK WITH DISTINCTION

A. A final product that is judged to merit Distinction will receive the following acknowledgment:

1. the student's name, the title of the project, and the name of the project advisor will be included in the commencement program;
2. the student's name, the title of the project, and Distinction will be indicated on the student's transcript;
3. a copy of the final product, in its appropriate form as determined by department or program, will be preserved in the library.

B. The following are the criteria and procedures to be fulfilled for a project to receive Distinction:

1. The student must be enrolled in Senior Research 452 or parallel eight-credit research sequence as determined by department or program.
2. The student must successfully complete a year-long Senior Thesis or Senior Creative Project (which could be done either in a fall-spring semester sequence or a summer-senior semester sequence in cases where the department or program approves of this option).
3. The thesis/project must be integrally connected to the student's major and must be advised by a faculty member either in the student's major or approved by the chair of the major.
4. Each thesis/project must be evaluated by at least one faculty member other than the thesis/project advisor. The student, in consultation with the advisor, will secure a second evaluator by February 1 (or the following work day if February 1 falls on a weekend).
5. The student must declare to the major department/program and to the Registrar the intention to submit a Senior Thesis or Senior Creative Project as the result of an eight-credit research sequence no later than February 1 (or the following work day if February 1 falls on a weekend) of the senior year. This declaration will require the signatures of the thesis/project advisor, the second evaluator, and the chair of the department/program. The declaration also must indicate the form of submission of the final product (text, creative piece, computer program, etc.).
6. The final product must be submitted to the Office of the Provost (or an alternative location designated by the Provost) no later than one week before the last day of classes, by a date and time to be determined by the Provost. The Office of the Provost will provide clear instruction to students submitting theses/projects as to the date, time, number of copies (hard and/or electronic copies), and location for submission of the final product. The form of submission of the final product will be based on information provided in the declaration submitted by February 1. The Office of the Provost will distribute the submitted products to the thesis/project advisor and second evaluator for review.
7. Final products submitted after the deadline will not receive Distinction.
8. Evaluation:

a. Senior Research: The final grade for the eight-credit Senior Research, normally Senior Research 451/452 (or four-credit project in case of a summer-semester sequence, in cases where the department/program approves of this option) will be submitted by the research advisor. The Distinction process has no bearing on the grade submitted by the research advisor for the eight-credit Senior Research.

b. Senior Thesis/Creative Project: Both the advisor and the second evaluator will assign a grade to the Senior Thesis/Creative Project. This grade reflects the quality of the final Thesis/Creative Project itself. A final Senior Thesis/Creative Project will be judged to merit Distinction if both the advisor and other evaluator give it a B or above, and at least one of the grades is a B+ or above. (These grades of the thesis/creative project are separate from the grade for the eight [or four] credits submitted by the advisor for the Senior Research, as described in B.8.a. above).

c. Grades submitted for the Purposes of Distinction must be submitted to the Registrar in a form designated by the Registrar no later than the Monday of commencement week in spring semester and when final grades are due in fall semester.

C. Departments and programs have the authority to determine the guidelines governing the design and execution of the project. Departments and programs may establish minimum requirements for students to undertake a project. Departments and programs may not alter the deadline (as described in B.6-7 above) or the minimum grade requirements for eligibility for Distinction (as described in B.8.b. above).

D. The Registrar will provide to the Provost and the Director of the Library a list indicating which theses/creative projects have merited Distinction. The Office of the Provost will provide the Library with a copy of the final product to be preserved in the Library.

Note 1: If a Senior Thesis/Creative Project follows a summer-fall semester sequence, the Registrar will adjust the date to submit intention to receive Distinction accordingly.

Note 2: Appropriate adjustments will be made in the case of a project that is part of an independently designed major.

8. Regulations Governing the Last Week of Classes

No final examinations (i.e., cumulative examinations having a significant impact on a student's final grade) or major papers given in lieu of a final examination may be given during the last week of classes; final examinations may be given only during the time period assigned by the Registrar. Travel plans are not acceptable excuses for requesting a change in the final exam schedule. The final exam schedule is normally posted at the pre-registration time and at the beginning of the term, and should be consulted when making travel plans. Contact the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs for interpretation of this regulation.

9. Final Grades

All faculty members are required to submit a final evaluation for every student officially enrolled in their courses. Grades are submitted electronically to the Registrar's Office on the dates specified in the calendar. Faculty should use the full spectrum of Denison's Grading System (<https://catalog.denison.edu/catalog/academic-program/grading-system-evaluation/>), including plus and minus grades, in assigning final grades. Final grades may be changed only as a result of an error in computation. All other cases involving a final grade change require the consent of the Academic Standing Board.

10. Guidelines for Departmental Assistants

In reviewing information gathered from faculty and departments concerning the employment of students, and wishing to establish guidelines that reflect both the needs and concerns of the university, Academic Affairs Council offers the following guidelines.

Given the broad nature of the employment of students as assistants to departments and faculty members, and with the understanding that such duties should preclude any major evaluative or teaching responsibility, it is proposed that the general title of "Departmental Assistants" is preferable as a description of such student responsibilities.

The University then would distinguish students as either "Departmental Assistants" or "Departmental Fellows." The following guidelines should be used in the case of those students who are selected as Departmental Assistants or Departmental Fellows and who are employed to perform certain duties as a result of that selection. In addition, a third category of "Teaching Practicum" is set forth as a possibility for students to gain academic credit for doing work relating to the profession of teaching.

There are three general areas in which students may participate in the professional work of faculty and departments:

a. Departmental Assistants

- The primary duties of a Departmental Assistant will be in the form of assistance, i.e., assisting departments and faculty in various activities that support the academic and research aspects of the university. Duties should be limited to the support of departments and faculty (e.g. lab assistants, discussion leaders, research assistants, tutoring and help sessions, secretarial and clerical support, etc.), and in no way should students assume the primary responsibilities of the faculty for teaching and grading. Students, however, may contribute to the objective evaluation of minor course work under the supervision of faculty (e.g. grading multiple choice tests, or checking the appropriate completion of lab notebooks or daily homework assignments), but students should not be in a position of making subjective evaluations of course work (e.g. grading essays or papers, or evaluating contributions to a discussion). In any case, to the greatest degree possible the anonymity of the student being evaluated must be preserved. Students should never be allowed to enter grades in a grade book, nor be in any position that would permit knowledge of the overall record of any student in a course.
- There should be training and supervision appropriate to each student's responsibilities. Students should be selected according to written guidelines established by each department or program. It is expected that such qualifications require students to show good academic standing

and responsible character. Furthermore, the guidelines should include provisions for review and evaluation of the students employed by the departments and faculty.

- Students employed by departments and faculty should be given financial support, since the primary activity or purpose is assistance; academic credit is not appropriate and should not be associated with payment for services rendered to departments or faculty. Where financial support may be problematic (e.g. student athletes under NCAA restrictions), the department or faculty member must bring the case before Academic Affairs for review and approval. In all cases, students should never be allowed the option of choosing either academic credit or money as payment for employment.

b. Departmental Fellows

- Departmental Fellows are selected to emphasize recognition of a student's work, i.e., outstanding achievement in a particular area of study. In many cases, this honor will not necessarily involve employment by faculty or departments. If employment is involved, however, the description of duties, selection, review, and remuneration for Departmental Assistants will be applicable.

c. Teaching Practicum

- A student enrolled in a Teaching Practicum should be interested in education, i.e., learning about the teaching profession through participation in the academic process under the close supervision of the faculty. If part of a student's work within the practicum is related to assisting a faculty member in the teaching and grading of students in another course, the guidelines established for Departmental Assistants in those areas will be applicable.
- A Teaching Practicum should be considered similar to any other course offered by a department and meet the same demands of academic rigor. As with any course, it must be submitted to the university's governance system for approval.

All departments and programs should submit a copy of their written guidelines for review by Academic Affairs Council.

11. Role of Department Chairs

All members of departments share responsibility for sustaining a culture that is rigorous in scholarship, imaginative in pedagogy, visionary in curriculum design, and collegial in spirit. The chair is the convener of the department and is responsible for leading colleagues toward fulfillment of these responsibilities. Given departmental differences in size, equipment needs, personalities, and budget complexities, the form of oversight by chairs of human and physical resources will likely exhibit a healthy variety in the approaches they adopt to fulfill their mission. The chair takes the lead in and coordinates the full range of departmental activities, including those listed below. Chairs should also consult the Chair's Handbook.

Administration

1. Oversee the process by which the department prepares course schedules each semester that reflect the needs of the University, the goals of the department, and the concerns of both faculty and students.
2. In consultation with colleagues create and then administer the department's budget.
3. Supervise support staff and ensure that student workers are used productively and creatively.
4. Meet with students as needed to address issues that an advisor may not be able to resolve, such as transfer of credit in the major, plans for off-campus study, mediating student concerns about department matters, etc.
5. Represent the department within the University and to a wider constituency when appropriate.
6. In consultation with the Provost, identify for the Development Office special needs of the department for resources.
7. Encourage the department to reflect on the processes it uses as a department to do its work.

Personnel

1. Promote regular conversation among departmental colleagues concerning the quality of the department's teaching, research, and other contributions to the University.
2. Fulfill roles prescribed by the faculty handbook for faculty contract renewal, tenure, promotion and senior reviews.
3. Communicate university expectations regarding promotion and tenure, consult at regular intervals with colleagues concerning their teaching and research agendas and performance, and support colleagues in their pursuit of appropriate opportunities for development of both teaching and scholarship.
4. Present staffing needs as determined by the department to the Provost.
5. Lead efforts to recruit faculty for the department.

Curriculum

1. Stimulate discussions that review at regular intervals the nature and quality of departmental offerings and requirements.
2. Develop with colleagues means of assessing the effectiveness of the program in relation to student interest and performance.
3. Advocate forms of research and off-campus studies that enrich students' academic experience.
4. Seek opportunities for the department to support University-wide programs when developing its course offerings and staffing plans.
5. Assess the adequacy of physical and staff resources in relation to curriculum.

Selection and Appointment of Department Chairs

Department chairs are appointed by the Provost in consultation with the department's faculty. The term of the appointment is normally three years. Chairs may serve successive terms. If a department chair becomes unable or unwilling to serve, or in cases when conflicts within a department have become irreconcilable, the Provost may appoint a new chair or make other temporary arrangements for departmental leadership before the expiration of the term. In the third year of a department chair's term, the Provost consults with the members of the department whether the chair is willing to, and should, continue.

III. Faculty Responsibilities: B. Important Academic Regulations

Faculty are required to have a productive and comprehensive understanding of Denison's academic policies and regulations, which are described in The Academic Program section of the Course Catalog. The Course Catalog includes critical information regarding individuals courses of study and their degree requirements, and serves as the primary source of broader information regarding the academic program.

See also the Department and Program Advising Plans available on the Teaching and Learning (<https://my.denison.edu/teaching-and-learning/>) section of MyDenison.

IV. Financial Arrangements and Faculty Benefits

- A. Payroll Policy (p. 36)
- B. Employment Eligibility Verification (p. 36)
- C. Faculty Benefits (p. 37)
- D. Insurance Coverage (p. 39)

IV. Financial Arrangements and Faculty Benefits: A. Payroll Policy

1. Payroll Policy

a. Deductions

The university is required by law to deduct the following from your wages: Federal, state, local school district income taxes, Granville Village*, Medicare and Social Security. It is the employees' responsibility to advise the Payroll Office of any changes to their exemptions or a change in place of residence, to ensure proper school district and state taxes are withheld. Please contact the Payroll Office at Payroll@denison.edu.

Deductions for employee contributions to staff benefit programs are made upon your enrollment and authorization. It is the practice of the university to make only those deductions required by statute or by court order and certain other deductions authorized by you and the university such as United Way, rent for Denison owned housing, and special gift contributions to Denison.

* Fully remote employees are not subject to Granville Village tax.

b. Direct Deposit

Denison requires all employees to receive their pay through direct deposit. If you have any questions regarding direct deposit, please contact the Payroll Office at Payroll@denison.edu.

2. Salary Advance

Faculty members may obtain one salary advance per academic year, not in excess of one month's gross pay, by submitting a Request for Payment to the Provost's Office, with a brief statement outlining the general purpose of the advance. Such advances will be recovered over the remaining pay periods of the current contract year.

3. Salary Payments

Faculty salaries are earned over the nine (9)-month academic year but are paid on a twelve (12)-month basis. Individual checks showing gross pay and all deductions are issued on the 25th of each month, or the last working day before the 25th if the latter falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday. New faculty with one-year contracts may request to have their salaries paid on a nine-month basis and will have an annual election to be paid over nine (9) or twelve (12) months. Faculty members in this category waive forever the option to be paid over a nine-month basis whenever they elect payment on a twelve-month basis. Annual pay increases are not guaranteed. When it is determined that there will be an increase, faculty salary adjustments will normally be effective with the August pay period. For additional information on pay increases, please refer to the Employment Handbook.

IV. Financial Arrangements and Faculty Benefits: B. Employment Eligibility Verification

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 requires Denison to examine and verify certain documents in order to establish the employment eligibility of all employees hired after November 6, 1986. All members of the faculty and administrative staff placed on the payroll November 7, 1986 and later are required to complete the Immigration and Naturalization Services Form I-9, Employment Eligibility Verification. Denison is required to

examine certain documents as listed on Form I-9 within three days of hire, certify that such documents have been examined, that they appear to be genuine, and that the individual is authorized to work in the United States. The Office of Human Resources will assist new staff members through this procedure during employment registration.

IV. Financial Arrangements and Faculty Benefits: C. Faculty Benefits

Benefit Programs and Eligibility

Denison's Board of Trustees has established the staff benefit programs which are briefly outlined below. These programs are subject to periodic review, normally in three-year intervals and may be amended at its discretion. Participation in university staff benefit programs is subject to eligibility requirements as published for the individual programs. For the purpose of eligibility for the various benefit programs, faculty under a yearly contract and working the equivalent of .75 FTE, and administrative staff scheduled to work at least 1,365 hours per year receive the same benefits as full-time employees. Domestic partners are eligible for participation in staff benefit programs that include coverage for spouses and dependent children. Coverage for all benefit programs is discontinued when the faculty/staff member's association with the university ends or if the contract or position falls below the relevant threshold.

Please see all benefit programs in the Denison Employment Handbook (<https://my.denison.edu/group/6728/staff-benefit-programs/>), including the following categories:

- Accidental Death & Dismemberment
- Adoption Assistance Program
- Business Travel Accident Policy
- Comprehensive Health Insurance
- Core Retirement Plan
- Death of Faculty or Staff
- Dental Insurance
- Education
 - Education Benefits for Employee's Dependent
 - GLCA Tuition Exchange Program
 - Tuition-Free Scholarship at Denison
 - Tuition-Free Scholarship Cash Assistance Awards Elsewhere
 - Employee Education
 - Off-Campus Courses
- Emeriti Retirement Health Solutions Program
- Flexible Spending Accounts
 - Dependent Care Spending Account
 - Health Care Spending Account
- Group Life
- Identification/Activity Card
- Long-Term Disability Insurance
- Parental Leave Policy
- Short-Term Disability Policy
 - Benefit Provisions
 - Interaction With Other Policies
- Supplemental Retirement Annuity Option

Home Mortgage Guarantee Program

A Home Mortgage Guarantee Program is available to members of the general faculty to assist in the purchase of a personal residence within a ten-mile radius of Granville. A complete copy of the policy is available in the Office of Human Resources.

Retirement Plans

While not mandatory, normal retirement at Denison University is at age 65. To be considered for retirement, employees must meet the following length of service requirements:

- Age 60 - 62 with 15 years of service
- Age 62 - 65 with 10 years of service
- Age 65 and over with 5 years of service

Faculty retirement options include:

Core Retirement Plan

Denison provides a core retirement plan for full-time faculty and administrative staff members with investment options through TIAA. Eligibility exists on the first day of the month after completing one year of service at the university and attaining age 21.

Full-time faculty and administrative staff members receiving salary checks as fulltime employees before August 31, 1974 participate in the Core Retirement Plan, when eligible, on the basis of a contribution of 15% of salary by the university. Full-time faculty and administrative staff hired and/or rehired by the university after August 31, 1974, participate in the Core Retirement Plan when eligible on the basis of a step rate plan. The university contributes 10% of regular salary up to the Social Security wage contribution base and 15% of the regular salary above that base to the plan. See Plan provisions for more details.

Supplemental Retirement Plan

A member of the faculty or administrative staff may, through a properly authorized salary reduction agreement, divert part of their compensation before taxes and/or after taxes to the purchase of supplemental annuity contract or mutual funds from TIAA. All faculty and administrative staff are auto-enrolled in the plan at 3% of salary. Employees can opt out of the plan or change the contribution amount by following instructions sent to them from TIAA. Federal and state income taxes on the salary reduction and on the investment earnings credited to the contract are deferred until they are received in the form of benefits. At that time, payments are taxed as ordinary income in the year or years in which they are received. Faculty may also contribute after-tax dollars to a Roth 403b account.

Special Retirement Plan

Since 1997 the university has maintained a special retirement incentive plan for faculty. Under the terms of this program, additional retirement income is paid to faculty members who meet the following criteria:

- Highly compensated (in the top 15% of university employees, ranked by pay)
- Full-time (tenured or at least a .75 FTE teaching faculty member)
- Either (a) have completed at least 15 years of service with the university and attained age 60, or (b) been designated as eligible by the plan's administrator
- File a participation election form designating a proposed retirement date that is accepted by the plan's administrator

Under the terms of this program:

- The annual benefit provided is equivalent to 40 percent of the retiring faculty member's compensation, adjusted after 12 months of payment for changes in the cost of living index (but not more than five percent annually);
- The benefit is normally paid for up to 60 months (or until the participant dies), although this benefit is reduced for people who have less than 15 years of service at age 60 or who delay retirement after they first meet the age and service criteria. The plan administrator may approve other, more rapid forms of payment.

You can request a full copy of the plan from the Office of Human Resources or the Provost's Office. Although the plan prescribes generally applicable rules affecting eligibility and benefits, the program administrator has latitude to modify those rules consistent with the plan's purpose and the university's interest. In addition to the benefits provided under this program, eligible faculty members continue to participate in the university's health insurance and tuition abatement programs and to enjoy other perquisites extended to retired faculty members (e.g., access to athletic facilities). These benefits are provided through other programs and policies.

Family and Medical Leave for Teaching Faculty

The goal of this policy is to enable the teaching faculty to meet their medical and family needs while ensuring the continuity of operations for the university.

For certified medical leaves under FMLA, teaching faculty may take up to 12 weeks of unpaid family leave in a 12-month period. For certified medical leaves, full salary may be paid for up to six months. For more information or to obtain a copy of the Family and Medical Leave Act policy, contact the Office of Human Resources.

Because the timing and duration of leaves vary considerably, arrangements for leave also vary. Examples of leave arrangements include release from teaching responsibilities for all or part of a semester, adjustment of class meeting schedules, and reduction of teaching load. Teaching faculty are responsible for designing a leave plan in conjunction with the Provost and department/program chair. This plan may include a program of paid work-related activities for the weeks in a given semester that precede or follow the family or medical leave.

When appropriate, faculty may request an extension of the probationary period prior to a tenure review (see section I.A. (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/personnel-policies/i-a-full-time-faculty/>) Extension of Probationary Period for Tenure).

Parental Leave for Teaching Faculty

Parental leave is available to eligible members of the teaching faculty. Eligible members of the teaching faculty are tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty and teaching faculty in the Physical Education department on long-term, multi-year, renewable contracts who have served at the university for at least one year.

Parental leave is offered in cases of the birth or adoption of a child. Parental leave must be taken within one year of the birth or adoption placement and must be used in the course of one academic year. Only one such leave will be granted in any twelve-month period and will occur concurrently with leave provided by FMLA. In the case of a summer birth or adoption, parental leave would normally be taken in the course of the academic year following the event.

The policy allows for a faculty member to choose from one of the following Parental Leave Options:

1. Reduction to a 3 course load for the academic year at full pay;
2. Reduction to a 2 course load for the academic year at 3/4 pay;
3. Year off from teaching at 1/3 pay;
4. A leave plan negotiated with the Provost that does not exceed the leave time or benefit offered in options 1, 2, and 3 above. Because the timing, duration of leaves, and needs and interest of faculty regarding parental leave can vary considerably, a flexible leave plan may be the best option to meet the faculty member's and university's needs.

To enact the benefit, the faculty member must meet with the department/program chair and the Provost in order to discuss the Parental Leave Options and to indicate which Parental Leave Option has been elected. This meeting should occur as far as possible prior to the onset of the leave. In instances in which parents are both eligible members of the teaching faculty, as defined above, the Parental Leave Option can be taken by either parent or be split between them.

If appropriate, the university will provide funding for leave replacements. Faculty may request an extension of the probationary period prior to a tenure review (see section I.A (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/personnel-policies/i-a-full-time-faculty/>)). Extension of the Probationary Period for Tenure).

Additional Information

Additional information on absences from work can be found here (<https://my.denison.edu/campus-resources/staff-handbook/>) in the Denison Staff handbook.

IV. Financial Arrangements and Faculty Benefits: Insurance Coverage

Insurance Coverage

Outlined below are basic University policies related to insurance about which faculty members should be knowledgeable. These policies have been in place for a period of years and can be found in Section III of the Finance and Management Policy Manual (located with the Academic Administrative Assistants of each department) for future reference.

1. Automobiles

Please refer to the Automobiles (<https://my.denison.edu/group/6728/employment-conditions-and-policies/>) policy in the Denison University Employment Handbook.

2. Aircraft

Employees are instructed to use commercial airlines when flying on OFFICIAL UNIVERSITY BUSINESS. Non-owned aircraft (i.e., non-commercial) such as charters, private planes, and courtesy shuttles, etc., are not considered approved forms of transportation and are not covered by the University's insurance.

3. Personal Property

Coverage or protection against loss of personal property by fire or theft in University buildings is minimal.

Most personal fire and extended coverage insurance through "tenant" or "homeowners" type policies, as applicable, can be endorsed to include off-premise effects used while engaged in one's profession.

Employees are encouraged to minimize the amount of personal effects used in their work. To the extent that the use of personal effects is necessary in an individual's work, employees should have their own personal fire and "homeowners" type policy endorsed to include items used while engaged in one's profession.

4. International Travel Insurance

International travel insurance is provided for Denison employees traveling on behalf of the institution, or as a participant in sponsored trips, outside of the United States or its Territories and Possessions. Please see the MyDenison Faculty Resource (<https://my.denison.edu/node/1299/>) page for more information.

V. Periodic Review of Departments & Programs

A. Department Reports

Department Reports entail a review of the core elements of academic department and program engagement including Academic Assessment. Department Reports are required of departments once every four years. Assessment data and/or artifacts are to be collected annually, with assessment analysis due every four years as a component of the quadrennial Department Report. The External Review process is integrated with assessment via the Department Report process. This integration provides departments and programs with the consistent opportunity to reflect on ways to improve programs, curriculum, and the learning experience.

1. Department Report Requirements

The following questions are to be addressed as departments and programs undertake their Department Reports.

- a. Goals: What is the Mission Statement of the department/program? What are the specific learning goals for students and how do they relate to the mission statement?
- b. Curriculum: Briefly describe the requirements for the major, minor, and/or concentration, with emphasis on any changes to the curriculum since the last review. How does the curriculum meet the learning goals described above? Are any changes to the curriculum needed? If so, why? How does the curriculum compare to other colleges and universities?
- c. Broader Impact of Curriculum: General Education - Describe your contributions to General Education. Is the department or program adequately serving the needs of non-majors? Interdisciplinary programs - Describe your contributions to interdisciplinary programs, if applicable. Other curricular contributions? (W101, Denison Seminars, etc.)
- d. Student Learning Opportunities - Describe and evaluate the effectiveness of opportunities for majors to engage in advanced work (e.g., summer research, senior research), and opportunities made available to students outside the classroom (e.g., engagement with visiting scholars, practitioners of practice, travel opportunities associated with the program). Any other high-impact or innovative pedagogical practices associated with your department or program?
- e. Academic Advising: Describe faculty contributions to advising (e.g., academic advising, Advising Circles, orientation programs). How does your department or program work to develop a culture of engaged advising?
- f. Commitment to Inclusive Learning Environment: How does your department or program support and demonstrate the institution's commitment to fostering an inclusive learning environment?
- g. Academic Assessment: Departments and programs are advised to consult the Academic Assessment Toolkit for information regarding the assessment process and analysis. Describe the measures used to regularly assess the extent to which the department or program's learning goals are being achieved. Include the assessment plan as an appendix to this report. Summarize the results of your assessment efforts since the last department review or report. To what extent are the learning goals described in V.A.1.a being achieved? Do the results of assessment indicate that changes are needed in the curriculum or pedagogical approaches of the department/program? How does the department utilize assessment outcomes to develop its curriculum and broader engagement?
- h. Outreach and Partnerships: Describe the department or program's contributions to Admission efforts. Describe the department or program's engagement with campus partners such as the Lisska Center, Global Programs, Denison Museum, Library, etc. Describe the department/program's engagement with career and internship advising (e.g., programs, partnerships with the Knowlton Center). How does the department/program facilitate students' launch into their post-Denison vocations? Describe the department or program's work in staying in touch with alumni. How does the department track outcomes for their majors after graduation? How do you work to develop an understanding of outcomes post-graduation? What have you learned? How does your department create awareness of its news and accomplishments (features on website, partnerships with University Communications, etc.)?
- i. Faculty: Do the staff and expertise of the faculty reflect the diversity of the discipline? To what degree has the department kept abreast of developments in the field, and how does that engagement relate to the curriculum? Do faculty maintain scholarly or creative engagement? Are they sufficiently supported in that work? How does the department cultivate awareness and engagement with campus, governance, and professional service opportunities? Describe and comment upon the department/program's plan for mentoring faculty.
- j. Resources: Is the department or program adequately staffed? If not, what are the shortcomings and perceived effects on student learning? Are the department's or program's physical resources adequate (e.g., offices; computers/printers; student lounge area; learning spaces including classrooms, laboratories, and studios)?

2. Department Report Data

The following data is to be included with the Department Report:

- a. Enrollments by course and by semester
- b. A list of faculty teaching in the department/program by semester
- c. Numbers of majors and minors by year
- d. Numbers of advisees carried by faculty in the past year or any representative year(s) in the review period
- e. Numbers of student research projects including annual number of summer research projects and senior research projects. Numbers of directed & independent annually offered may also be included.
- f. Any data related to alumni placement
- g. Assessment plan, assessment data, and any associated rubrics or supporting documents
- h. Curriculum vitae for faculty in the department or program
- i. Sample course syllabi (in years of an external review only)

B. Department Report Process and Timeline

Evidence used to assess student learning and the effectiveness of the department or program should be collected each year according to the department's or program's assessment plan. Departments may choose to evaluate and discuss this evidence each year, however, Department Reports are due only once every four years.

Each department and program submits to the Provost's Office a Department Report once every four years. A schedule of upcoming Department Reports can be obtained from the Provost's Office. The report should address the topics indicated in section V.A1.

Every third Department Report (that is, once every 12 years) entails an External Review. The composition of the external team and the process of the external review are provided in section V.C.

Departments may add topics or questions to be addressed, or include additional data, in their Department Reports, however, changes to the above list of topics must be approved by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

Department Reports will be due to the Provost's Office in September of the fall in which they are due. (A schedule of Department Reports can be obtained from the Provost's Office).

Departments will receive written feedback on their Report from the Department Report Review Committee (DRRC) in years when an external review is not required. The DRRC will be appointed by the Provost and composed of one faculty member from each division of the college plus the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

In some cases the Provost may determine that a particular program which is due for a review does not need a full external review team visit. In these cases, in cooperation with the program, the Provost will appoint an internal review team. The program prepares a Report which addresses the questions and prompts described above, and the internal review team, comprised of Denison faculty and students, fulfills the role that an external review team would play.

C. The External Review Process

Once every twelve years the Department Report will be followed by a visit from an external review team. The Department Report written in advance of an external review addresses the same questions as the standard quadrennial report as detailed in V.A.1. At the External Review stage of the twelve-year cycle, departments and programs often provide more detailed responses to those questions. Thus, the Department Report written in anticipation of the External Review is referred to as the Department Self-Study in order to signal the different stage of the cycle. Contact the Provost's Office for an up-to-date schedule of Departments Reports, and the Department Self-Study & External Review.

The External Review Team will be selected by the department or program in consultation with the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. It will include one individual in the field from a college comparable to Denison who chairs the team, and another person in the field from a Ph.D.-granting institution.

The third member of the team will be a Denison faculty representative from the same academic division as the department under review. This faculty member, selected by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the department or program under review, will take part in all aspects of the external team's activities except for meetings with individual members of the department.

The department, in consultation with the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, has the option of adding a Denison graduate to the committee.

The External Review Team will be invited to campus for a two-day visit to familiarize themselves with the department or program. It will have access to the Department Self-Study, and to faculty and students in the department or program. The two external reviewers will draft the External Review Report, with the other member(s) of the team serving in an advisory capacity. In its report the External Review Team will respond to the following questions:

- a. Comment upon what you think to be the most important issues raised in the self-study. How does the department's program compare with programs at similar institutions? Has the department kept abreast of developments in the field and how are they reflected in the curriculum? What distinctive strengths do you find in the department's program? What weaknesses do you find in the department's program?
- b. Curriculum: Comment on the structure of the major. Would you propose changes? Assuming the staff size remains the same, what changes would you suggest in the department's array of course offerings, including offerings for majors and non-majors?
- c. Student Learning: Do students have a grasp of the discipline? Are they able to talk both specifically and comprehensively about the discipline? Do you find evidence of student interest and involvement in the intellectual life of the department? Do you find evidence that students receive adequate training in research, laboratory, studio, or performance skills? Comment on the quantity and quality of student involvement in research, laboratory, studio, or performance activities.
- d. Resources: Where appropriate, please comment on the department's physical resources. What changes would you suggest? Are there compelling reasons to change staff size? Do you find library and other academic support resources (technology, tutoring, etc.) adequate to support the department's curriculum? What areas of acquisition would you suggest?

The chair of the External Review Team shall send the External Review Report to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs who will share it with the chair of the department or program under review and the Denison faculty representative on the External Review Team. The External Review Report is to be treated as an internal document with limited access granted to all faculty upon request to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

The chair or director of the department or program under review will write a brief response to the External Review Report. It should include mention of possible changes to be made as a result of the review and significant areas of disagreement, if any, with the report. All members of the department or program and the Denison faculty representative on the External Review Team shall be provided with a copy of this response and have an opportunity to supplement it with statements of their own.

Once the department has delivered to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs a written response to the External Review Report, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs shall share the Department Self-Study, the External Review Report, and the Departmental Response with the Academic Affairs Council. The chair of the department or program and the Denison faculty representative on the External Review Team will meet with the Academic Affairs Council to discuss appropriate action to be taken as a result of the review. This group will decide which actions should be initiated by the department or program and which, if any, should be initiated by the Academic Affairs Council or the Administration. AAC reviews the Department Report process and documents only once in every three Reports, that is, once in the twelve-year cycle when an external review may have been conducted.

VI. Policies, Programs, and General Information

- A. Academic Integrity (p. 43)
- B. Guidelines for Human Participants Research (p. 43)
- C. Misconduct in Scholarly Activities (p. 45)
- D. Conflict-of-Interest for Federal Grants (p. 46)
- E. Privacy/Educational Records (p. 47)
- F. Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom (p. 48)
- G. Discrimination and Harassment Policy (p. 48)
- H. Policy on Inappropriate Relationships between Students and Faculty (p. 49)
- I. Policy on Outside Employment by Denison Faculty (p. 49)
- J. Policy for University Records (p. 50)
- K. Policy on Fundraising Activities (p. 50)
- L. Publications for External Consumption (p. 51)
- M. Copyright Policy (p. 51)
- N. Alcohol Policy for Faculty Events (p. 52)
- O. University Space and Equipment Management (p. 52)
- P. Procedures When Spouses/Partners are Appointed to One Department (p. 52)
- Q. Guidelines for the Care and Use of Animals in Research & Teaching (p. 52)
- R. Faculty/Student Meal Program (p. 52)

As employees of Denison University, faculty are expected to review and be aware of the Denison Employment Handbook available MyDenison.

VI. Community Standards and Policies: A. Academic Integrity

The following statement, endorsed by the DCGA Student Senate in November 2005 and by the Faculty in March 2006, affirms the value the University attaches to academic integrity and serves as a model that faculty may use or adapt in their course syllabi.

Proposed and developed by Denison students, passed unanimously by DCGA and Denison's faculty, the Code of Academic Integrity requires that instructors notify the Associate Provost of cases of academic dishonesty. Cases are typically heard by the Academic Integrity Board, which determines whether a violation has occurred, and, if so, its severity and the sanctions. In some circumstances the case may be handled through an Administrative Resolution Procedure. Further, the code makes students responsible for promoting a culture of integrity on campus and acting in instances in which integrity is violated.

Academic honesty, the cornerstone of teaching and learning, lays the foundation for lifelong integrity. Academic dishonesty is intellectual theft. It includes, but is not limited to, providing or receiving assistance in a manner not authorized by the instructor in the creation of work to be submitted for evaluation. This standard applies to all work ranging from daily homework assignments to major exams. Students must clearly cite any sources consulted—not only for quoted phrases but also for ideas and information that are not common knowledge. Neither ignorance nor carelessness is an acceptable defense in cases of plagiarism. It is the student's responsibility to follow the appropriate format for citations. Students should ask their instructors for assistance in determining what sorts of materials and assistance are appropriate for assignments and for guidance in citing such materials clearly.

An additional note on technology may be added to the statement:

Unauthorized use of technology (including, but not limited to, artificial intelligence sites and translation programs) in the preparation or submission of academic work can be considered a form of cheating and/or plagiarism. Instructors may at their discretion create assignments that incorporate the use of supporting technologies and will inform students of acceptable uses of technology in their courses. It is the responsibility of the student to ask the instructor for clarification whenever they are unclear about the parameters of a specific assignment and to understand that presenting the work of artificial intelligence as your own constitutes a violation of Denison's Code. Cases of suspected inappropriate use of technology may be submitted to the Academic Integrity Board to initiate an investigation of academic dishonesty.

Denison University is committed to making all aspects of the institution—inside the classroom and out—a community characterized by honesty, integrity, and responsibility. That commitment was reaffirmed when Denison students developed and proposed the Code of Academic Integrity (<https://denison.edu/forms/code-of-academic-integrity/>), which the faculty adopted unanimously in 2008.

Denison's faculty are charged with the responsibility for encouraging ethical conduct in their students, for clarifying what sorts of assistance are permissible for different projects, and for helping students learn how to make proper and rhetorically effective use of source material.

If an instructor believes and has evidence that a student has violated the Code of Academic Integrity, the instructor is required to notify the the Provost's office. The form for submitting an integrity charge is on the Provost's Academic Integrity (<https://my.denison.edu/node/487/>) MyDenison site, along with a description of the process and information regarding what materials to submit. An instructor may not issue a grade penalty for an integrity violation unless there has been a finding of responsibility by the Academic Integrity Board. After a charge is received, either the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs or the Process Advisor then meets with the student and either schedules a hearing of the Academic Integrity Board to determine if an offense has occurred, or, in some cases, exercises an administrative resolution procedure. The Academic Integrity hearing board is charged with ascertaining whether the student has violated the Code, the severity of the offense, and the appropriate means of addressing the offense with penalties and/or educational programming. In the case of a grade penalty, the Integrity Board will make a recommendation to the course instructor who shall have the final authority to assign the grade. The Administrative Resolution procedure may be applied only in some cases and at the discretion of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

For additional information and links to report an incident go to the Academic Integrity (<https://my.denison.edu/node/487/>) MyDenison site.

VI. Community Standards and Policies: B. Guidelines for Human Participants Research

The complete statement of Denison's Guidelines for Human Participants Research, Procedures, Approval and Consent forms is available at the Provost's Institutional Review Board (IRB) site (<https://my.denison.edu/node/158/>) on MyDenison. Applications for IRB approval should be submitted online using the Human Participants Research Approval Form (<https://my.denison.edu/node/1826/>) (hereafter "Approval Form"). For more information contact the Chair of the IRB, Eric Winters.

1. Statement of Policy/Activities Covered

Denison University is responsible for assuring that research activities conducted under its auspices do not violate the rights and welfare of human participants. The Denison University IRB is guided by the ethical principles set forth in the *Belmont Report: Respect for Persons, Beneficence and Justice*. We strive to create a culture of respect for, and awareness of, the rights and welfare of human research participants while facilitating compliance by our researchers with applicable guidelines and regulations. University IRB Guidelines for Human Participants Research are designed to conform to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Code of Federal Regulations, revised as of January 2009 (Federal Register 45 CFR 46 (<https://>

www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/retrieveECFR/?gp=&SID=83cd09e1c0f5c6937cd9d7513160fc3f&pitd=20180719&n=pt45.1.46&r=PART&ty=HTML), including the Revised Common Rule (2018).

The following activities are covered if they involve research that uses human subjects: All faculty research, all administrative research, and all student research (e.g., independent studies, senior research, student-designed research for courses). In addition, some classroom studies or projects have features that IRB principles apply to and thus will require IRB review.

Denison University IRB has a Federalwide Assurance (FWA) that enables prospective researchers (PIs) at Denison to secure Federal grant funds provided by agencies overseen by the HHS, where approval for research involving human subjects is required.

Well in advance of a study or project, instructors should discuss their plans with a member of the University IRB. Instructors and prospective researchers (faculty, staff, students) cannot approve their own research. All current IRB Members are listed on at the IRB MyDenison site (<https://my.denison.edu/node/160/>). See also federal regulations on protection of human subjects (https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/retrieveECFR/?gp=&SID=83cd09e1c0f5c6937cd9d7513160fc3f&pitd=20180719&n=pt45.1.46&r=PART&ty=HTML#se45.1.46_1107).

For student research (senior research, summer research, directed/independent study, course-related research, research projects conducted during off-campus study), students are expected to carefully consult with their faculty advisor about their research plan and if the faculty advisor deems it helpful, the student will consult with a member of the IRB to determine whether a project requires IRB review. For study abroad / away students, follow these procedures for IRB approval (<https://my.denison.edu/node/2243/>).

Students need to gain IRB approval for research/creative endeavors conducted off campus, if the organization that supervises their work does not have a process in place for granting human participants approval. In order for students to use research conducted off campus for academic work at Denison, the student will need to have such approval through an established process at the Off Campus site, or through Denison University's IRB.

2. Basic Principles

Ethical principles applicable to research with human subjects are based on the Belmont Report and are described in the Denison University IRB Guidelines, available at the IRB MyDenison site (<https://my.denison.edu/node/158/>), along with detailed information and resources regarding IRB processes. Those principles that apply to a researcher's research plan must be addressed fully in responses to items in the Approval Form.

- a. **Informed Consent:** Informed consent refers to a process in any research or creative work plan with human subjects. Participants' participation must be voluntary and informed. Before participation, participants must receive an explanation of the purposes of the research, what they will be asked to do, and any potential risks and benefits involved. They must be told that they may refuse to participate in the study and may discontinue participation at any time. In cases of verbal consent, a witness must be present, and a written copy of the oral summary must be approved by the IRB and given to the participants or to a participant's legal guardian. In the case of minors or another protected group, signed permission must be obtained from a parent or legal guardian, after the parent or legal guardian has been informed (as indicated above); and child assent is needed for minors. Details about informed consent are in the Approval Form, and examples are on the IRB website.
- b. **Deception:** Deception is a basic violation of informed consent and must be avoided whenever possible, even in the most seemingly minor forms. If a mild/benign form/degree of deception is necessary to the integrity of the study, strong justification must be made that specifies why deception is necessary, is not likely to cause harm to participants, and how consequences of the deception will be managed.
- c. **Protection from Risks:** Stress and distress to participants shall be minimized as much as possible. Signed consent must be obtained if the participant is subjected to more than minimal risk or stress. Potential risks include physical, psychological, emotional, legal, financial, stigma, employment, and other risks. Equitable distribution of risk(s) is also important when potential risks are possible.
- d. **Anonymity / Confidentiality:** Participants in research must be anonymous or any private/sensitive information about them must be kept confidential by the researchers. This is an extremely critical assurance researchers must plan for and make. The advent of new technologies (e.g., online surveys, electronic recording) has caused the IRB to review new aspects of data gathering that impact degrees of confidentiality more thoroughly than in the past. If anonymity or confidentiality cannot be maintained, the investigator must provide strong justification in the description of their research plan.
- e. **Benefits v. Risks:** Risks to participants must be outweighed by the sum of the benefit(s) to participants and the importance of the knowledge to be gained.
- f. **Debriefing:** For many research methods, the exact nature and purpose of the study must be explained to participants, either prior to, during, or after completing the study. Participants have a right of access to a report of the results of the research/project.

3. IRB Procedures

- a. All researchers must complete the CITI Program Modules online course for ethical principles and procedures in research, and submit the resulting certificate to the University IRB prior to making a research submission

b. Prospective researchers should complete and submit the Human Participants Research Approval Form, along with any other necessary supporting documents (e.g., forms for informed consent, debriefing, and/or instruments). See instructions on the Approval Form (<https://my.denison.edu/node/1826/>).

c. All researchers must comply with the Best Practices for Electronic Data Security for Human Subject Research (BPEDS-HSR) document (adopted August 30, 2018).

d. For prospective student researchers, submission of the Approval Form (<https://my.denison.edu/node/1826/>) prompts an Advisor sign-off procedure in which, via automated email process, the student's faculty advisor is contacted to ensure the student has (i) worked closely with their advisor on the submission and (ii) that the faculty advisor approves of the full description of the research plan that the student has submitted. We wish to avoid students submitting IRB materials without obtaining faculty guidance or approval.

e. The Chair of the University IRB, acting in consultation with, or on behalf of, the IRB will review the Approval Form responses and determine whether the research falls in the exempt, expedited, or Full-Board Review category. Procedures appropriate to that category will be followed. Review categories are described in the IRB Guidelines (see Levels of Scrutiny).

f. Expected time frames for IRB Review are approximate and are described in the IRB Guidelines. Review duration will depend on level of scrutiny, length of submission queue, the extent to which submissions are complete and comprehensible, and researcher promptness in responding to IRB inquiries. With no queue, exempt and expedited reviews may take as little as 2-3 business days to complete. Full Reviews require an average of 40 days and could require several more weeks than that. These are rough estimates. Ensuring the welfare of people who volunteer for research involves processes and decisions that cannot be rushed by course demands, student urgency, limitations to prospective researcher's planning, or other outside circumstances.

VI. Community Standards and Policies: C. Misconduct in Scholarly Activities

Scholarly activity is an important component in one's efforts in achieving teaching excellence. Because of the role scholarship has in the academic process, both in the development of students and the discipline at large, it is also important that integrity of scholarly work be maintained. In the event that misconduct in this area is suspected, a procedure has been established by which such allegations are to be handled. It is important to note that retaliation of any kind against a person reporting or providing information in good faith about suspected or alleged misconduct will not be tolerated. Rather, it is the University's intention to protect, to the maximum extent possible, the positions and reputations of these individuals, in addition to those against whom allegations of misconduct are not confirmed.

1. Definition

Scholarly misconduct is defined as follows: falsification, fabrication, plagiarism, or other practices which seriously deviate from accepted practices in proposing, carrying out, or reporting research or other scholarly activities. It does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.

2. Procedure

When a charge is made against a member of the faculty alleging scholarly misconduct, the procedures under the Termination section of the Faculty Handbook will generally be followed except when federal funds are involved.

3. Procedures for Federally Funded Projects

Applicability. The following procedures will apply to all individuals involved with a research project supported by federal grant monies. This would include but not be limited to faculty, students, and technicians.

Allegations. Notification of an allegation of misconduct should be made in writing to the Provost of the University. Upon notification of an allegation of misconduct, an immediate inquiry into the allegation is to take place.

Inquiry. An inquiry consists of information gathering and initial fact finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of misconduct warrants an investigation. An inquiry shall be completed within 60 calendar days from the receipt of the allegation unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. The President of the University is to notify the accused individual in writing of the nature of the charges and inform that individual of the name(s) of the individual(s) making the charges. This written notice may be preceded by an informal verbal notification, if appropriate. A group of impartial experts will be selected to conduct the inquiry. These individuals will be screened to prevent possible conflicts of interest.

Additionally, the individual(s) against whom allegations are made may be prohibited from expensing any remaining federal funds during the inquiry until such time as a decision regarding the allegations is reached. If a co-principle investigator is assigned to the grant, the co-principle investigator is to become the principle on the grant until the inquiry has come to an end and a decision has been reached.

During the inquiry the privacy of those who in good faith report apparent misconduct shall be protected, to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, the affected individual(s) shall be afforded confidential treatment to the maximum extent possible. A written report shall be prepared that states what evidence was reviewed, summarizes relevant interviews, and includes the conclusions of the inquiry. The individual(s) against whom the allegation was made shall be given a copy of the report of inquiry. During the inquiry, the individual will have an opportunity to comment on the allegations which

are made, in addition to responding to the findings of the inquiry. If they comment on that report, their comments may be made part of the record. If the inquiry takes longer than 60 days to complete, the record of the inquiry shall include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 60-day period.

If the findings of the inquiry provide sufficient basis for conducting an investigation, the initiation of the investigation is to occur within 30 calendar days of the completion of the inquiry. If an inquiry is terminated for any reason without completing all relevant requirements, a report of such termination, including a description of the reasons for such termination, shall be made to the Office of Research Integrity (ORI).

Investigation. An investigation is a formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if misconduct has occurred.

The ORI of the federal agency affected is to be notified that an investigation is to be conducted. The ORI should be told of any immediate health hazards, the need to protect federal funds or equipment and individual(s) affected by the investigation, and that the alleged incident will probably be publicly reported. If reasonable indication of possible criminal violations is found, ORI must be notified within 24 hours. The ORI also is to be advised if any developments occurring during the course of the investigation disclose facts that may affect current or potential funding for the individual under investigation.

The group of impartial experts selected to conduct the inquiry, shall conduct the investigation if necessary. These individuals will be screened to prevent possible conflicts of interest.

Additionally, the individual(s) against whom allegations are made, may be prohibited from expensing any remaining federal funds during the investigation until such time as a decision regarding the allegations is reached. If a co-principle investigator is assigned to the grant, the co-principle investigator is to become the principle on the grant until the investigation has come to an end and a decision has been reached.

During the investigation the privacy of those who in good faith report apparent misconduct shall be protected to the maximum extent possible.

Additionally, the affected individual(s) shall be afforded confidential treatment to the maximum extent possible.

A written report shall be prepared that states what evidence was reviewed, summarizes relevant interviews, and includes the conclusions of the investigation. The individual(s) against whom the allegation was made shall be given a copy of the report of investigation. During the investigation, the individual(s) will have an opportunity to comment on the allegations which are made, in addition to responding to the findings of the investigation. If they comment on that report, their comments may be made part of the record.

The investigation is to be completed within 120 days from the start date and the written report shall be submitted to the ORI upon conclusion of the investigation. The final ORI report must describe the policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, how and from whom information was obtained relevant to the investigation, the findings, and the basis for the findings, views of any individual(s) found to have engaged in misconduct, as well as a description of any sanctions taken by the institution. If an investigation takes longer than 120 days, a request for extension shall be submitted to the ORI. The request for extension must include an explanation for the delay, an interim report on the progress to date, an outline of what remains to be done, and an estimated date of completion.

If an investigation is terminated for any reason without completing all relevant requirements, a report of such termination including a description of the reasons for such termination shall be made to the ORI.

At the conclusion of the investigation, the expert panel shall present their findings to the President in writing. If the President finds the individual not guilty, they are to explain the reasons for their findings and provide these in writing to the individual(s) charged and the individual(s) bringing the charges. If the President concludes that the individual is guilty of the charges, upon the advice of University counsel, they shall then make a decision regarding sanctions, furnishing a copy thereof to the individual(s) charged.

The individual(s) charged may request representation in the proceedings by legal counsel. If the individual(s) charged do so, the individual(s) making the charges may also request counsel. In any case, the President shall have the right to employ the University's legal counsel.

Detailed documentation of all inquiries and investigations is to be maintained for at least three years, which, upon request, is to be provided to the authorized federal granting agency personnel. The documentation used in the preparation and substantiation of an inquiry's or investigation's findings shall also be maintained for a minimum of three years after acceptance by the federal agency of the final report.

The processes and procedures described herein above for cases involving federal grant monies shall be interpreted consistent with 42 CFR 50 Subpart A and may be expanded as necessary to comply with said standards or successor federal standards as may be applicable to scientific misconduct and scholarly activities.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: D. Conflict-of-Interest for Federal Grants

Consistent with the University's general Conflict-of-Interest Policy governing related actions of Board members, University Officers and members of the Administrative Staff of the University, all decisions made by faculty and staff engaged in any research-related activities funded, or to be funded, by federal funds are made solely on the basis of a desire to promote the best interests of the University, the federal agency providing the funding for the research, and the federal government. It is therefore the policy of the University:

That each Investigator of a federally-funded grant disclose to the University, on a continuing basis, all the Investigator's relationships, business affiliations and significant financial interests that reasonably appear to be directly and significantly affected by the research or educational activities funded, or proposed for funding, by any federal funding agency or in entities whose financial interests would reasonably appear to be directly and significantly affected by such activities. The Investigator must provide all required financial disclosures at the time the proposal is submitted and must be updated during the pendency of the award on an annual basis via the completion of a conflict-of-interest questionnaire.

For the purposes of this conflict-of-interest policy, the term "Investigator" is defined as the Principal Investigator of the grant, Co-Principal Investigators, and any other person at the University who is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research or educational activities funded or proposed for funding by any federal agencies. The Investigator is considered to be "affiliated" with an organization if the Investigator or a member of the Investigator's immediate family (i.e., spouse and dependent children):

1. is an officer, director, trustee, partner, employee, or agent of such organization; or
2. has financial interests in business enterprises or entities of over \$5,000; or
3. is either the actual or beneficial owner of more than 5% of the voting stock or controlling interest of such organization when aggregated for the Investigator, the Investigator's spouse and dependent children; or
4. has any direct or indirect dealings with such organizations from which the Investigator knowingly is materially benefitted.

The Investigator is considered to have "significant financial interest" when the Investigator, a spouse, or dependent children receive, or is beneficiary, to anything of monetary value, including, but not limited to, salary or other payments for services (e.g., consulting fees or honoraria); equity interests (e.g., stocks, stock options or other ownership interests); and intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights and royalties from such rights). The term does not include:

1. salary, royalties or other remuneration from the University;
2. income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by public or nonprofit entities; or
3. income from service on advisory committees or review panels for public or nonprofit entities; or
4. financial interests in business enterprises or entities if the value of such interests does not exceed \$5,000 or represent more than a 5% ownership interest for any one enterprise or entity when aggregated for the Investigator, the Investigator's spouse, and dependent children.

All required disclosures must be directed in writing to the Vice President for Finance and Management, or their designee, who, with the Provost and, when necessary, the President and University Counsel shall have responsibility for administration of this policy. This will include reviewing the financial disclosures, which have been made, determine whether an actual or potential conflict of interest exists, and determine what conditions or restrictions, if any, should be imposed by the institution to manage, reduce, or eliminate any conflicts of interest which may exist. In the event that a conflict of interest is considered to exist (or potentially exist), certain conditions or restrictions will be imposed by the aforementioned parties to manage, reduce, or eliminate the potential conflict.

These include: public disclosure of the Investigator's significant financial interests (as defined above), monitoring of research by independent reviewers, modification of the research plan, divestiture of significant financial interests, or the severance of relationships that create the actual or potential conflicts. In the event that any of the above are undesirable or unobtainable, the disqualification from participation in the portion of the federally funded research that would be affected by the significant financial interests will be considered in addressing the potential conflict-of-interest. However, if, in the opinion of the Vice President for Finance and Management or their designee and the Provost, it is determined that imposing conditions or restrictions would be either ineffective or inequitable, and that the potential negative impacts that may arise from a significant financial interest are outweighed by interests of scientific progress, technology transfer, or the public health and welfare, then the research may be allowed to proceed without imposing any conditions or restrictions.

If the University finds that it is unable to satisfactorily manage an actual or potential conflict of interest, the Vice President for Finance and Management, or their designee, will notify the federal agency involved and keep them appropriately informed. In these situations, the reviewers shall present their findings in writing to the President with recommendations for corrective action.

The President, in consultation with University legal counsel as appropriate, will make a decision regarding sanctions, communicating the decision to the faculty member. All records of financial disclosures and actions taken to resolve actual or potential conflicts of interest will be retained for a period of at least three years after the letter of the termination or completion of the grant award to which they relate, or the resolution of any government action involving the records.

The processes and procedures described hereinabove for cases involving federal monies shall be interpreted consistent with NSF GPM Provisions, Section 510, involving conflicts-of-interest and may be expanded as necessary to comply with said standards or successor federal standards as may be applicable to financial conflicts-of-interest and scholarly activities.

VI. Community Standards and Policies: E. Privacy/Educational Records

Denison University guarantees both the privacy and the confidentiality of all student education records and a student's right to access those records according to the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. Student educational records may be maintained only by members of the University with legitimate educational interest in the student.

Students may inspect the contents of their official files and placement credentials, including personal references. Exceptions are letters collected under a waiver of inspection and information on parents' financial status. Requests should be in writing to the office responsible for those records and upon inspection may not be removed from that office.

The Office of Student Life is the depository for most student records. The Registrar's Office maintains all academic information, the Financial Aid Office maintains all forms and correspondence regarding financial aid, scholarships, and student employment, and the Office of University Communications maintains directory information as well as information used for news releases to the media.

In addition to the regular sharing of grade information among University offices concerned with student academic standing and advisement, cumulative GPAs are furnished to officers of chartered honoraries for the purpose of membership selection.

Contents of inspected records may be challenged upon the grounds that the information is inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise in violation of the person's privacy or other rights. The administrator responsible for maintenance of those records will hear the challenge, and based on the information presented may decide to let the record stand, allow the student to insert a letter of explanation, correct the record, or delete the item in question.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: F. Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom

Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom

(Proposal #16-122, adopted 7 April 2016)

Denison University actively promotes the free expression and exchange of ideas. Academic freedom is essential to the aims of higher education and to the University's goals of fostering critical thinking, moral discernment, and active citizenship among its members. It is the responsibility of the faculty and the administration to protect academic freedom. Furthermore, because Denison is a residential, liberal arts college, academic freedom must be extended to all members of the university community in the broadest of contexts. Indeed, academic freedom is a core value of liberal education and is essential to the transformative power of that education promised in our mission statement.

Academic freedom is the right of all members of the University to exercise the broadest possible latitude in speaking, writing, listening, challenging, and learning. It applies to opinions and inquiry regarding political, cultural, religious, scientific, and social matters, as well as to those regarding the University itself and its policies. Academic freedom is especially critical in the classroom, in research and publication, and in all educational activities.

Academic freedom applies to views and ideas that most members of the University may consider mistaken, dangerous, and even despicable. The ideas of different members of the University community will often conflict, but it is not the proper role of the University to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or offensive. Although the University values civility, and although all members of the University community share the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for limiting discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of the community.

Academic freedom does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, whenever they wish. The University may prohibit expression that violates the law, defames specific individuals, constitutes a genuine threat or harassment, or unjustifiably invades substantial privacy or confidentiality interests. These limitations, however, are narrow exceptions; it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University's commitment to a free expression of ideas.

Members of the University community must act in conformity with the principle of academic freedom. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views of others, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it. Such an open exchange of ideas is essential to liberal education.

(Portions of the above statement are from the University of Chicago Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression.)

VI.Community Standards and Policies: G. Discrimination and Harassment Policy

All members of the Denison community are responsible for reviewing and adhering to the Discrimination and Harassment Policy (<https://denison.edu/forms/discrimination-and-harassment-policy/>) and fully cooperating in its enforcement.

Denison is a community dedicated to learning, teaching, and scholarship. Free inquiry and expression are critical to those commitments. At the same time, unlawful discrimination, including discriminatory harassment, undermines the integrity on which our community pursuits are based and the environment needed for all individuals to flourish. Denison is committed to providing a workplace and educational environment, programs, and activities free from discrimination and harassment.

This policy's anti-discrimination and anti-harassment obligations apply to all university faculty, staff, affiliates, and volunteers acting on behalf of the university. The policy's protections apply to all members of the Denison community, including students, faculty, and staff, as well as third parties engaging or seeking to engage in a Denison program or activity, such as applicants for admission and employment. This policy applies to misconduct

(1) on Denison property or (2) off Denison property if the conduct occurred in connection with a college or college-run program or activity, or if the conduct has or reasonably may have the effect of creating a hostile educational or work environment for a member of the Denison community.

For information on how to report discrimination, harassment, or retaliation, or for questions about this policy, please refer to section IV of the Discrimination and Harassment Policy (<https://denison.edu/forms/discrimination-and-harassment-policy/>).

VI. Community Standards and Policies: H. Policy on Inappropriate Relationships between Students and Faculty

A relationship between a faculty member and a student that is romantic or sexual is not in harmony with the values of the Denison community. Such an inappropriate relationship exploits the inherent inequality of power between faculty and students, creates a situation that inhibits the learning environment, and has a negative impact on the community. As such, it is incumbent upon faculty not to engage in such relationships; to do so will be considered the basis for disciplinary action.

This policy provides a process by which an allegation of an inappropriate relationship between a student and a member of the teaching faculty is investigated by a Preliminary Review Body (PRB). The purpose of the PRB is to attempt a resolution of the allegation that is in keeping with the values and responsibilities of the institution. In the case of an alleged inappropriate student/faculty relationship, the PRB takes the place of the informal hearing described in I.A.8 (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/personnel-policies/i-a-full-time-faculty/>).1-2. If the allegation cannot be resolved through the Preliminary Review Body, resolution of the allegation will move to a formal hearing and the procedure outlined in I.A.8 (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/personnel-policies/i-a-full-time-faculty/>).2c. shall be followed. In addition, the charged party may, at any time, request that the matter move to a formal hearing under the procedure outlined in I.A.8 (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/personnel-policies/i-a-full-time-faculty/>).2c.

Allegations of an inappropriate relationship shall be made to the Provost, and may be brought by any member of the community. Within two weeks of the allegation being brought to the Provost, they shall notify the charged party in writing of the charges. Within 30 days of the written notification of the allegations being received by the charged party, the Provost shall convene a Preliminary Review Body. The membership of the PRB shall be comprised of the Provost and five former members of the President's Advisory Board. The Provost shall be a non-voting member of the PRB while the other members shall be voting members. No person shall serve as a member of the PRB when the allegation under consideration is (a) against them or (b) against a colleague whose primary affiliation is within the potential PRB member's department or program.

The PRB shall pursue an investigation of the allegations including gathering all information necessary to conduct a full review. Following the investigation, the PRB shall make one of three recommendations to the President:

1. If the PRB, by a majority vote, finds the charges to be unfounded, the PRB shall recommend that charges be dropped and the matter be considered resolved.
2. If the PRB, by a majority vote, finds that the charges are founded and, if the PRB determines that an institutional response other than the formal termination procedure is appropriate, the voting members of the PRB shall agree, by a majority vote, on suitable sanctions to recommend to the President. If the President proposes and the charged party agrees with these sanctions, the President shall have the responsibility to administer the sanctions. If the charged party finds the sanctions proposed by the President unacceptable, the matter will move to a formal hearing and the procedure outlined in I.A.8 (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/personnel-policies/i-a-full-time-faculty/>).2c. shall be followed.
3. If the PRB, by a majority vote, finds that the charges are founded and that the appropriate institutional response is to proceed with formal termination procedures, it will recommend to the President that the matter move to a formal hearing and the procedure outlined in I.A.8 (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/personnel-policies/i-a-full-time-faculty/>).2c. shall be followed.

If the President's recommendation differs materially from those proposed by the PRB, the President shall provide a written explanation of the reasons for the difference to members of the PRB.

The filing of charges under this policy on relationships between students and faculty does not preclude the filing of charges under the Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom or Anti-harassment Policies (VII.G (<https://catalog.denison.edu/faculty-handbook/community-standards-policies/vii-g-freedom-expression-academic-freedom-anti-harassment-policies/>)), if the party making the allegation construes the alleged relationship to be harassment.

This policy does not apply to relationships existing prior to the student's matriculation at Denison.

VI. Community Standards and Policies: I. Policy on Outside Employment by Denison Faculty

A full-time faculty member's professional responsibility is to Denison University. Accordingly, faculty members accepting outside employment are expected to remain fully effective in their teaching, scholarship, and service within the University.

Consulting or other similar activities are welcome provided they enhance the professional growth of the faculty member and/or bring favorable recognition to the University. Faculty members engaged in such activities are expected to discuss the nature and extent of these responsibilities

in advance with their chairs and the Provost. Normally such activities ought to take no more than the equivalent of one day out of six during the academic year.

Regulations and guidelines have been established by both the State of Ohio and the U.S. Internal Revenue Service governing the use of facilities and for private gain at tax-exempt institutions. Anyone intending to use Denison facilities for private gain should consult with the Provost.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: J. Policy for University Records

All members of the Denison University community are expected to understand and comply with the campus Records Management Policy. Copies of the Record Management Handbook and the current Records Retention Schedule for all offices and departments are available on the MyDenison Records Management (<https://my.denison.edu/node/65/>) page.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: K. Policy on Fundraising Activities

Whether Denison is involved in a formal capital campaign or simply pursuing ongoing efforts to enhance available resources, we must ensure that our efforts, both individual and collective, are carefully coordinated if we are to achieve optimal results. This policy sets forth the fundamental principles of Denison's fund raising programs and a description of responsibilities.

The following is a description of the different kinds of fundraising activities:

1. Institutional

These are programs, plans, and needs which generally are broad in nature. The focus and effect may range from the departmental level to the entire University community. Examples are endowed funds, general faculty development programs, departmental programs, facility enhancement or renovation, or any solicitation of parents, alumni, and friends for any purpose.

2. Individual

These are programs and projects which clearly belong to and focus on the individual. They include such things as individual research grants, sabbatical grants, Fulbright fellowships, etc. An important point here, however, is that although programs at this level focus on individual rather than institutional objectives, it cannot be assumed that such activity has no broader implications. The fact that several grants had been made to individual faculty members by Research Corporation or the National Science Foundation, for example, could very well be an important factor in our receiving a major institutional grant from the same agency or from a private foundation.

These descriptions are illustrative only. Fundraising is a complex process and, in most cases, will overlap these two categories. For example, in its exploratory stages a proposed project may seem to be an example of individual fundraising, yet in the final analysis the impact of the project could have University-level priority and budgetary implications. Moreover, such activity may involve potential funding sources with whom Denison is already negotiating for other support. For these reasons, thorough coordination is essential from the very first stages of project development, well before any external inquiries are made.

3. Gifts-in-Kind Donations

Gifts-in-kind are donor contributions to Denison in the form of goods, property, or services, as opposed to gifts of cash or securities. They include gifts of equipment, art, instruments, furniture, etc.

- a. Denison accepts gifts-in-kind on a limited basis and they must be approved by Institutional Advancement (IA) in advance of accepting any such gift.
- b. Institutional Advancement will help provide the tax receipt needed by the donor.

Contact gifts@denison.edu for support through this process.

4. Procedures

- a. The Vice President for Institutional Advancement is charged by the President with planning and directing all fundraising in support of institutional goals. Any institutional fundraising initiatives, whether directed at organizations or individuals (alumni, parents, or friends) must be approved by the Vice President or their designee.
- b. For proposed programs which may overlap the individual and institutional boundaries, individuals or departments seeking outside funds should consult with the Provost before any preliminary external inquiries are made. It is important at this stage that extensive coordination be maintained, and in many cases Institutional Advancement may assist in identifying potential funding sources, developing appropriate strategies, and writing proposals. No request for funds may be sent without the approval of the Provost and Institutional Advancement.
- c. Individual initiatives in seeking funds are desired and encouraged; indeed, they help ensure that Denison continues to be an active and stimulating academic community. At the same time, individual fundraising activity, including planning and preliminary inquiries by telephone or mail, must be coordinated with institutional fundraising and public relations activity to ensure that the best interests of both the individual and the University are

served. Individuals seeking support on their own should, at a minimum, confer with the Provost before initiating inquiries with external sources. The Provost will consult with Institutional Advancement, as appropriate, to ensure that individual and University activities are in concert.

d. Proposals requesting funds from external agencies or from individual donors represent the University. Accordingly, they should be approved at a minimum by the Provost and Institutional Advancement, if appropriate, for form, wording, and intent. In some cases, the President will grant final approval. Please note: requests from external agencies (i.e., National Science Foundation) or foundations in which the funds go to Denison and then are disbursed by the accounting office, must be approved through a process. For more information, please contact the Director of Foundation & Corporate Relations at galipaultm@denison.edu.

e. Institutional Advancement will maintain a complete file of all gifts and grants received and pending proposals for institutional objectives. Any information related to such activity (correspondence, reports of personal visits, etc.) should always be shared with Institutional Advancement.

f. Institutional Advancement also collects and maintains general information on corporate and foundation charitable giving policies and trends, and this information is available for use by the Denison faculty and administration. By the same token, similar information received by individuals and departments should be shared with Institutional Advancement.

g. For gifts and grants applied to programs other than individual projects, acknowledgment letters as well as interim and final reports will be coordinated by Institutional Advancement. Any such correspondence must be approved by Institutional Advancement before it is sent.

h. In the event a proposed program is judged by the Provost to have broad impact on the curriculum, to impose obligations on the faculty, to divert significant resources from present programs, or to require modifications in the current academic program structure, the Provost will consult with the Academic Affairs Council and/or other appropriate governing bodies on curricular and other substantive changes required by the proposed program.

i. The President and Senior Administrative Staff retain final approval authority with regard to seeking funds from external sources. They also have the responsibility to ensure that financial resources are available to carry out proposed programs.

VI. Community Standards and Policies: L. Publications for External Consumption

In order to ensure that what the University conveys to the general public about Denison is consistent, accurate, and stated in a way that does credit to the institution, all substantive official publications about Denison programs must be cleared by the Vice President of Institutional Advancement and University Communications or their designee.

Announcements intended for a limited audience, or brochures, or letters, or similar communications about specific events need not be included. Descriptions of University programs, information brochures, recruitment materials—in short, items that make a statement of substance about Denison's mission or programs—are to be approved before they are put in final form. The Vice President will answer any questions about this policy and about procedures to be followed, and will expedite clearance that may seem advisable with other senior administrators and department heads.

This policy is not meant to inhibit initiative. It is meant only to assure that important messages about the institution in fact speak on behalf of the institution with consistency and quality.

VI. Community Standards and Policies: M. Copyright Policy

Under United States Copyright Law (17 U.S.C. Section 101ff.), work prepared by employees within the scope of their employment is presumed to belong to the employer. For faculty members, this means that work of scholarship (e.g., books, paintings, scientific processes) that are produced by them—from the standpoint of federal law—are presumed to belong to the University unless the applicable parties have agreed otherwise.

Although federal law gives Denison this presumption of ownership, the University does not view this as in any way limiting faculty members' opportunities and rights to publish or exhibit their work wherever they choose or to receive compensation for the sale, performance, etc., of their work.

As a result, it is the stance of the University that ownership for all works created prior to, during, and after the 1989-90 academic year is transferred from Denison to the individual faculty member, along with all the responsibilities related to ownership (including but not limited to care, custody, and control).

It should be noted that because these works are no longer the property of the University, they are not covered by University insurance. Consequently, faculty members need to review their own insurance policies for such coverage.

Exceptions to the above would be activities beyond the scope of general scholarship where the use of University facilities and resources is significant in the development of the work produced (or is on-going in nature) and for which private gain (e.g., compensation) from such is anticipated. These activities could adversely affect the University's tax-exempt status, and, as such, should be discussed in advance with the Provost on an individual basis.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: N. Alcohol Policy for Faculty Events

The university restricts locations and times at which alcoholic beverages may be served in conjunction with departmental- or faculty-sponsored events on campus where students are present. Further information may be obtained from Business Services.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: O. University Space and Equipment Management

There is no dedicated facility space at Denison. Facilities are assigned to departments and programs by the President and the Board of Trustees:

(a) the assignment of classrooms and laboratory spaces is made by the Registrar, normally in consultation with the chair of the department and the faculty; (b) the assignment of office space is the responsibility of the Provost, normally in consultation with the chair of the department.

- a. The University maintains a perpetual inventory of all land, buildings, improvements other than buildings, and equipment/books regardless of where such equipment is located or how it is acquired.
- b. Deans, directors, administrators, and department chairs are responsible for all University equipment purchased for or assigned to their respective areas; however, all equipment is owned by the University as a whole, rather than by a single department, and interdepartmental transfers will be made where they are in the best interests of the University.
- c. University office and instructional equipment may be removed from the campus under unusual circumstances with prior approval of the Provost and the Vice President for Finance & Management.
- d. All books and equipment obtained through grants where Denison is the fiduciary agent shall become the property of Denison. It is understood that these materials may be on loan to the individual as long as needed to pursue research.
- e. Any material not subject to federal regulations and no longer possessing utility to the department may be declared as general University surplus. Items purchased under federal grants are handled in accordance with the regulations under which they are purchased. If there is any doubt as to the original source of funds, the Business Affairs/Purchasing Office is to be notified to determine whether the item is subject to federal encumbrance.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: P. Procedures When Spouses/ Partners are Appointed to One Department

Spouses/partners may hold individual or joint appointments in the same department or program. However, spouses/partners may not participate in the search process or personnel reviews of one another, nor may they report directly to one another. A spouse/partner should not participate in decisions regarding teaching assignment, office space, or similar matters for the other person. If a spouse/partner becomes chair of the department, the Provost shall identify another faculty member to serve as the chair for the other spouse/partner.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: Q. Guidelines for the Care and Use of Animals in Research & Teaching

Statement of Policy & Activities Covered

Denison University seeks to assure that research and teaching activities conducted under its auspices support the humane care and use of animals.

To achieve this, Denison maintains an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) and gives the IACUC oversight in assuring that vertebrate animals receive humane care and treatment. The Denison IACUC draws upon federal guidelines and resources, such as the Public Health Service Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, and the Animal Welfare Act, as well guidelines provided by American Veterinary Association and other scholarly societies as it evaluates proposed activities that involve the use of animals.

VI.Community Standards and Policies: R. Faculty/Student Meal Program

The Student/Faculty Meal Program fosters mentorship and community between faculty and students by providing limited funds for student snacks and meals with faculty. The Office of the Provost administers this fund and provides guidelines regarding its use.