

# Outline of College Shared Governance Document

FINAL VERSION: 5/15/11, with amendments 6/30/18

1. Statement on Shared Governance
2. The Office of the Dean
3. LAS Faculty Governance—The College Senate
  - 3.1 Purpose of the College Senate
  - 3.2 Membership of the College Senate
  - 3.3 Leadership—Officers, Terms and Responsibilities
  - 3.4 Meetings
  - 3.5 Actions and Responsibilities
  - 3.6 Process for Approving Changes to the College Shared Governing Document
4. Faculty Committees
  - 4.1 College Personnel Committee
  - 4.2 College Curriculum Committee
  - 4.3 Other College Committees
  - 4.4 Senate-Authorized Appointments to Committees
5. Guidelines for Annual Performance Review and Probationary Review for Tenure-line Faculty
  - 5.1 Definition of Reviews
  - 5.2 Annual Performance Reviews
  - 5.3 Probationary Reviews
  - 5.4 Faculty Right of Response
  - 5.5 Schedule of Formal/Informal Reviews
6. College Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Processes, and Guidelines
  - 6.1 Definition of Tenure/Promotion Review
  - 6.2 University and Professional Criteria (Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activities, and Service)
  - 6.3 Local Academic Unit Guidelines and Criteria for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure
  - 6.4 The Responsibilities and Rights of the Candidates
  - 6.5 Local Academic Unit Review of Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion
  - 6.6 The Review at the College Level by the College Personnel Committee
  - 6.7 The Review at the University Level (UBPT)
7. Curriculum Approval Criteria, Processes, and Guidelines
  - 7.1 The College Curriculum
  - 7.2 Curriculum Development and Review
  - 7.3 Responsibilities of Home Unit(s) or *ad hoc* Proposal Sponsors
  - 7.4 Role of the CCCP in Reviews at the College and University Levels
8. Home Unit Governance
  - 8.1 Faculty Membership
  - 8.2 Department or Program Leadership
  - 8.3 Meetings and Committees
9. Contingent Faculty
  - 9.1 Definition of Contingent Faculty Rank and Titles

9.2 Term Faculty

9.3 Adjunct Faculty

9.4 Special Appointments

9.5 Rights of Contingent Faculty in the College of LAS

# College Shared Governance Document

## (5/12/11)

This College Shared Governance Document represents the consensus of the Dean of the College, the faculty representatives of the LAS Faculty Governance Council (and subsequent College Faculty Senate), and the faculty of the college and is intended to guide the shared governance of the college. This document complements the university Faculty Handbook and contains information specific to the college policies, practices and governance.

### 1) Statement on Shared Governance

According to the “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” (1966) by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), “The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.” This primary responsibility is subject to the final review and approval by the appropriate designated administrator, with opportunities for faculty input prior to—and responses after—this final review. The AAUP statement calls for the establishment of:

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university [which] should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.

The statement further notes that these agencies may include “a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.”

The university Faculty Handbook asserts that “[b]y tradition and by training, the faculty are expected to make judgments about the academic integrity of the curriculum and the professional requirements of faculty status. Therefore, curriculum, academic programs, and faculty status questions shall be considered primary responsibilities of the faculty” (FH: I, 1.2, 5). The handbook also states that “Faculty governance regarding academic programs, curriculum, and faculty status regularly takes place through departments, programs, colleges and schools. Primary governance within these bodies shall continue as in the past to reside within these bodies as well” (FH: I, 1.2, 6).

## **2) The Office of the Dean**

The Dean of the College is the chief academic officer of the college and has executive authority for the administration of the college. The dean is both one of the officers of the university and the academic leader of the college. This position carries great responsibility to both the university and the college. The dean is the college's primary advocate to the university and the university's primary interlocutor to the college.

The role of the dean in shared governance is one of great importance to the faculty, staff, and students of the college. It is the expectation that the dean will work collaboratively with the faculty in all areas of her/his responsibility, but especially in the areas that deal with the faculty's areas of primary responsibility, indicated in section 1, above. To this end, the dean will consult and work with the elected representatives of the college's faculty in the College Faculty Senate on issues of college policies and priorities. Policy recommendation must ultimately be approved and implemented by the dean.

The College Senate will also have a role in the selection, evaluation, and retention of the dean.

### **3) LAS Faculty Governance—The College Faculty Senate**

#### **3.1) Purpose of the College Senate**

The purpose of the College Faculty Senate is four-fold. First and foremost, the Senate is expected to serve as the voice of the faculty, to represent faculty concerns in its deliberations and to the Office of the Dean. Second, it serves to advise the dean on faculty concerns, such as (but not limited to) college academic policies and college curriculum and personnel policies and processes, and when requested by the dean on other issues of concern for the college. Third, and in order to fulfill its first two functions, it serves as the college deliberative body on issues of college academic policies. This function requires the College Senate to consider and recommend policies to the dean, who has ultimate authority to accept or reject Senate recommendations. Fourth, it serves as the oversight body of the college’s curriculum and personnel committees. This includes receiving annual reports from these committees on the academic year’s activities and on suggested changes to committee policies and procedures. Additionally, this function includes the collaboration of the College Senate with departments and programs in producing their own governance documents and curricular and personnel policies and procedures at the home unit level. In order to fulfill its charges, the College Senate has the right to create task forces to investigate academic and governance issues more deeply and to pass resolutions to express its position on certain issues and practices. It also has the authority to call college-wide advisory referenda and conduct special meetings.

The principles that should guide the College Senate are the two pillars of the professoriate—academic freedom and shared governance in matters of curriculum and personnel. The College Senate, in carrying out its responsibilities, seeks to engage departments, programs, and individual faculty in the collaborative responsibilities for effective and constructive shared governance. Thus, the College Senate calls upon the college’s home units and faculty to carry out their responsibilities in good faith and in a timely manner. It is understood that academic freedom and the right of shared governance confer responsibilities on the faculty for participating in the processes of governance.

#### **3.2) Membership of the College Faculty Senate**

##### **3.2.1) Composition of the College Faculty Senate**

The College Senate shall be composed of thirteen elected voting members and six *ex officio* non-voting members, specifically:

##### **3.2.1.1) Voting Members**

- Ten tenured<sup>1</sup> or tenure-track faculty members, with no more than two per department or program; tenure-track faculty are limited to one seat per academic area (*i.e.*, HUM, SSC, IDS)

---

<sup>1</sup> Contracts at the university are issued to “tenure-line” faculty with the status indicated as either “untenured” or “tenured”; thus, those who are referred to in this document as tenured faculty are

- Three Term or Adjunct faculty members, including:
  - Two with 6- to 9-course load contracts
  - One staff member with responsibility for a minimum of a three-course teaching load (blended position), or a long-term teaching professional (LTTP) whose job responsibilities include regular teaching

**3.2.1.2) Ex officio Non-voting Members**

- One department chair or program director selected by LASAC
- One college representative of the university Faculty Council (by the LAS representatives of FC)
- One associate dean of the college selected by the dean
- The dean of the college

**3.2.1.3) Additional ad hoc Representation**

- Two liaison members, one from the LAS College Committee on Curriculum and Programs and one from the LAS Research Committee, each of whom is selected by the relevant committee peers to serve as needed

**3.2.1.4) Alternates on the College Senate**

Those who receive the next highest vote totals in each area shall be designated as Senate alternates.

The three Senate alternates shall: 1) regularly attend College Senate meetings; 2) serve on committees and subcommittees; 3) have the authority to vote and make motions in Senate meetings in the absence of a representative from her or his area; 4) assume the full responsibilities of Senate membership when a representative from her or his area has an extended absence or leave (whereupon, the Alternate would cede those responsibilities once the elected representative returns; both representative and alternate would then complete their respective terms); and 5) assume the full responsibilities of Senate membership when a representative from her or his area resigns or is dismissed from the Senate, until the next election cycle.

**3.2.2) Representation of the Academic Areas on the College Faculty Senate**

Representation is determined by two factors. First, a minimum of one tenured and one tenure-track representative shall be chosen from each of the three academic areas below (six of the twelve seats). Second, the remaining four tenured seats shall be filled according to the proportions of college faculty with appointments in the three academic areas below.

The academic areas, with associated departments and programs, are provisionally defined as follows (and shall be amended as necessary to reflect future changes):

---

considered contractually “tenure-line, tenured status” and tenure-track faculty are “tenure-line, untenured status.” We have retained the terms “tenure-track” and “tenured” as short hand.

- *Humanities*: Art, Media, and Design, English, History, History of Art and Architecture, Modern Languages, Philosophy, Religious Studies, and Writing, Rhetoric, and Discourse
- *Social Sciences*: Anthropology, Geography, Political Science, Public Policy, Public Service, Social Work, and Sociology
- *Interdisciplinaries (only designated, not affiliated, faculty)*: African and Black Diaspora Studies, American Studies, Catholic Studies, International Studies, Islamic World Studies, Latin American Studies, Peace and Justice Studies, Public Health, and Women’s and Gender Studies

In 2017-2018, the proportions of tenure-line faculty in these areas would yield the following appointments: five from the humanities (tenure line four tenured, one tenure-track), three from the social sciences (two tenured, one tenure-track), and two from the interdisciplinaries (one tenured, one tenure-track each for the latter two categories). The proportional distribution of the college faculty should be reported to the College Senate every five years (in the spring quarter of years ending in 5 and 0). Should the proportional distribution of LAS faculty significantly change, the number of representatives from the three academic areas may be amended by a majority vote of the College Senate.

### **3.2.3) Election to the Council**

#### **3.2.3.1) Voting Privileges**

LAS faculty vote for all open seats in all academic areas in May. Thus, with one-third of the membership up for election each year, every tenured and tenure-track faculty member will be eligible to vote and have three to four votes to be allocated among the three divisions and two categories (tenured and tenure-track) indicated above.

To be eligible to vote in a College Senate election, non-tenure-track faculty must teach at least one course per quarter at DePaul and be in at least *their second consecutive year* at the college.

To be eligible to vote in a College Senate election, LTPs or staff members with teaching responsibilities of at least three courses per year may vote in their first year at the college.

#### **3.2.3.2) Election Eligibility, Nominations Process, Election Procedures and Notification Process**

With the exceptions noted below, all tenured faculty in a division are eligible for election and all tenure-track faculty who have been at the University since the autumn quarter prior to the May elections are eligible. Tenure-track faculty with less than one year of service are ineligible to be elected. For non-tenure-track representatives, one year of service within the college is required to be eligible for election.

Eligible faculty may wish, but are not required, to submit a short statement of 250 words or fewer on their interest in, or reasons for, serving on the Faculty Senate. These statements will be included with the electronic ballots.

Following the election, individuals who receive majority or plurality votes in their academic areas will be notified of this by the College Senate president for the purpose of confirming their availability in serving on the Senate. If an individual who has a majority or plurality must decline such service, the individual with the next highest vote will be contacted, and this same procedure will be followed until the requisite number of slots are filled for each of the following four categories: 1) tenured faculty, 2) tenure-track faculty, 3) non-tenure-track faculty (*i.e.*, those on 6- to 9-course load contracts), and 4) LTTP or staff member with teaching responsibilities. Once verbal agreements to serve on the College Senate are secured from elected members, election results will be announced to the college faculty.

### **3.2.3.3) Service Eligibility**

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to serve as representatives in their respective disciplinary categories (on the LAS Senate). No more than two members of a given department or program may serve in that category. Tenure-track faculty representatives who are granted tenure in the spring of their first year on the College Senate shall remain in that category of membership only until the following May, when the Senate membership is rotated. Those who receive tenure after their first year on the College Senate may serve out their term. In either case, they may be eligible for election as a tenured faculty representative in subsequent elections.

To be eligible to serve as the non-tenure-track faculty representative, candidates must have taught at least one course per quarter at DePaul and be in at least their second consecutive year at the college. (The non-tenure track faculty representative who teaches six courses or fewer per year will receive financial compensation, with the amount determined by the dean. The non-tenure track faculty representative who teaches more than six courses per year will have the choice between one course of released time or financial compensation, with the amount determined by the dean.)

To be eligible for the College Senate slot reserved for **an LTTP** or a staff member with teaching responsibilities of at least three courses per year, candidates must be in at least their second consecutive year at the college.

### **3.2.3.4) Exclusions**

The following categories of faculty members, though eligible to vote, are ineligible to serve as voting members of the College Senate: associate deans, full-term department chairs and program directors (*i.e.*, interim or acting chairs and directors may continue to serve), members or alternate members of the university Faculty Council. They may, however, serve as *ex officio* non-voting members of the council if chosen by their respective groups (*i.e.*, LASAC, Faculty Council).

### **3.2.4) Terms of Service on the Council**

Terms of College Senate representatives last three years (as with the curriculum and personnel committees), with these terms staggered so that one-third of the membership is up for election each year. Terms begin and end at the end of the academic year, or the week following graduation. Representatives may be elected to no more than two consecutive terms, with at least two years



between any two consecutive terms (in other words, after six years of continuous service, representatives may not serve again until the beginning of the third year following their last term).

### **3.3) Leadership—Officers, Terms and Responsibilities**

The College Senate representatives should select, from their voting membership, a president and secretary of the council.

The president should be tenured and have served at least one year on the council. The president's term lasts for two years, but she or he may be reelected up to another consecutive two-year term (depending on the president's reelection to the council).

The president will receive a course reduction per year of service. The president's responsibilities include scheduling College Senate meetings; setting agendas; presiding over Senate meetings; presiding (and working with the dean on the agenda) over quarterly LAS meetings; serving as the Senate representative to LASAC; keeping members and the dean informed of Senate-related matters; and communicating to the college faculty at large.

The secretary should be chosen from the elected, voting members. The secretary's term lasts for one year, but she or he may be reelected up to another three consecutive one-year terms (depending on the secretary's reelection to the council).

The secretary will receive a course reduction per year of service. The secretary's responsibilities include taking minutes of the deliberations and action items of each meeting; distributing the meeting agenda, minutes, and documents to the Senate members in a timely fashion; reserving meeting locations (including refreshments); keeping the Senate website current (including a list of membership, with terms of service, agendas, minutes, documents, and this College Shared Governance Document); working with the dean's office to conduct annual elections; and other record-keeping responsibilities as needed.

The officers of the Senate will be elected during the first meeting following the spring quarter Senate elections. Their terms begin immediately following the spring academic term.

### **3.4) Meetings**

Meetings should be open to all LAS faculty and be scheduled regularly and at a central location on campus. Agendas should be distributed before meetings to all LAS faculty. Minutes to previous meetings, including full motions, should be made available on the College Senate website. The College Senate reserves the right to meet in executive session to discuss those issues which require greater discretion.

The College Senate should meet twice quarterly (in addition to the college-wide quarterly faculty meetings), six times during the academic year, preferably in September and October (in the autumn quarter), January and February (in the winter), and April and May (in the spring). The meetings should

be held on the third or fourth Fridays of these months. The Senate meeting schedule for the three quarters should be set by the president at the beginning of the academic year. Additional and/or emergency meetings, with a topic-specific agenda and as circumstances require, may be called by the president, or on the request of the dean, and held on shorter notice.

The College Senate meetings should be held in a central location in Lincoln Park that can seat members of the council as well as other college faculty who wish to attend. Possible locations include the Richardson Library, the Humanities Building, and the Student Center.

The College Senate meetings will be structured to allow for traditional agenda items: approval of minutes (which reflect the previous meeting's discussions, not emendations or developments since the previous meeting), president's report, dean's report, committee reports, task force reports, old business, new business, comments and announcements. Meetings will require half of the voting members to be present for a quorum and be conducted according to an informal reading of *Robert's Rules*.

In addition to these meetings, the president of the College Senate and the dean will collaborate with the council on the agenda of the college-wide quarterly faculty meetings and convene these meetings.

### **3.5) Actions and Responsibilities**

#### **3.5.1) Representing the Faculty**

The College Senate is elected by the LAS faculty, from the ranks of the LAS faculty, to serve the interests of the LAS faculty in the shared governance of the college. As with any representative body, the members are elected both as representatives of the faculty at large and as individuals who are called upon to exercise their judgment in the interests of shared governance.

In order to fulfill the first of these responsibilities, the College Senate is required to make available the current copy of the governing document and list of members and officers; inform the LAS faculty of meeting days, times, and locations in a timely manner; post minutes of previous meetings and communicate agendas of future meetings; provide an open forum during the standard agenda portion of all Senate meetings; and maintain the Senate website to assist in these communications. (Access to the College Senate website is limited to all LAS full-time faculty, as well as to LAS contingent/adjunct faculty who have worked in the college for at least one quarter.)

The College Senate may also elicit faculty input via email, blogs, advisory (*i.e.*, non-binding) referenda, and other methods as the technology allows. In order to operate effectively as the "voice of the faculty," all LAS faculty are encouraged to vote and to serve, when elected, on the council.

College Senate members are also called upon to exercise their judgment as professionals, academics, and members of the DePaul community and to represent their colleagues and their college wisely and

effectively. The balance between these responsibilities is a matter of personal disposition and choice. College Senate discussions and deliberations should respect academic freedom in all its forms and dissent as a fundamental element in open and free discourse.

### **3.5.2) Advising the Dean**

Shared governance implies a mutual commitment of the faculty representatives of the College Senate and the college administration to work collaboratively and constructively with one another. Effective shared governance requires that the College Senate and the dean seek a collegial relationship characterized by information sharing, discussion, and mutual respect. Such a relationship simultaneously recognizes the dean’s right to act on behalf of the college and the dean’s obligation to do so in the context of broad consultation with the faculty.

In particular, the College Senate should provide the dean with advice on issues of policy and planning. To do so, it may initiate discussion on these issues, as well as providing counsel on these and other college matters when requested by the dean. To be effective, the College Senate is expected to fulfill its advisory function through open discussion, deliberation, full consideration of college interests, and frankness. The College Senate president, in particular, is expected to keep the dean informed of Senate initiatives and concerns.

The relationship between the College Senate and the dean includes the following responsibilities: the dean will share aggregate information on resource allocation with the Senate and seek its advice and counsel on these issues; the Senate will provide advice and counsel to the dean on college- and university-wide strategic planning issues and initiatives; the Senate and the dean will determine the structure and selection process for key college-level committees; the Senate and the dean will set the agenda for the quarterly College meeting; and the Senate will provide annual feedback to the dean on his or her performance in the spring quarter.

The tacit assumption of shared governance is that intelligent, informed individuals may disagree on issues and/or their approaches or solutions. Such disagreement, when well considered and forthright, becomes essential (as essential as agreement) for the advising function to be effective.

### **3.5.3) Recommending Policy**

As the representative and deliberative body of the LAS faculty, the College Senate is responsible for making policy recommendations primarily, but not exclusively, in matters related to academic freedom, college governance, the development, implementation, and integrity of curricula, and the appointment and review of faculty. Policy recommendations of the College Senate are passed on to the dean for approval.

Policy deliberations should be announced in advance of College Senate meetings and should be conducted openly and inclusively. Passed actions—requests, recommendations and decisions—will be noted in the minutes of meetings.

Policy recommendations must be approved by the dean before they become effective. The president of the College Senate will formally request, in writing, acceptance of the council's policy recommendations from the dean within ten days of the meeting in which they are passed. The dean then has four days prior to the next College Senate meeting to approve or not approve the council's recommendations. In the event that the dean does not approve of a recommendation, the dean should provide both rationale for the non-approval, as well as recommendations for emendations. These can be deliberated at subsequent meetings of the council.

Once policy recommendations have been approved, the College Senate president should communicate these decisions to the LAS faculty via email and the website, as well as to the appropriate bodies (*e.g.*, LASAC, home units, and college committees).

In the event that policy decisions conflict with those of the university, the College Senate should, when appropriate, advocate for amendments to university policies and practices. The president of College Senate should represent the Senate to the university Faculty Council and its president.

#### **3.5.4) *Overseeing Committees***

The College Senate is the main faculty oversight body for the college curriculum and personnel committees. Committee policies, procedures, and "best practices" should be clearly articulated and readily available to faculty through the College Senate website. The oversight responsibility means that the College Senate will review, disseminate, and archive committee reports and proceedings. This oversight responsibility requires that the College Senate receives annual reports from both bodies by their last meeting of the academic year (May). These reports should include aggregate data (*e.g.*, number and outcomes of program additions, changes, deletions considered by the curriculum committee; number and outcomes of tenure/promotion applications reviewed by the personnel committee; and suggestions for policy additions, clarifications, changes, deletions by either committee; etc.).

In addition, the oversight responsibility of these college committees may extend to requests for more in-depth reporting, either in writing or in person, by the committees, in so far as matters of confidentiality (particularly in matters of personnel) are not violated.

#### **3.5.5) *Relating to Other "Bodies" (e.g., Home Units, LASAC, and the University Faculty Council)***

Because the College Senate is the only elected representative body of the faculty and advises the dean, it assists in establishing priorities under its purview. The Senate should also collaborate with home units on college-wide initiatives generated by the Senate. In order to communicate more effectively with home units, the president of the College Senate should be a member of LASAC (the dean's administrative council of department chairs and heads of programs and other academic units).

Initiatives and policies passed by the Senate and approved by the dean should be implemented, when required, by the home units in a timely fashion. The College Senate should assist in implementation by providing clarity and guidance when requested.

In order to coordinate its actions on policies with—and communicate its concerns to—the university Faculty Council (FC), the College Senate will establish a working relationship with LAS representatives on Faculty Council and LAS representatives on major university-wide committees. In particular, the College Senate will work with LAS FC representatives and/or university-wide committee members in the following areas: recommending faculty to serve on search committees for major university administrative officers and college deans; recommending faculty to serve on major strategic planning committees; and addressing and responding to issues broadly affecting college academics and faculty life (*e.g.*, Status of Faculty Committee).

### **3.5.6) Additional Authority**

In order to serve the LAS faculty and college, the College Senate may appoint task forces to investigate specific issues and report back to the council. The appointment of task forces is determined by a majority of the council and requires no additional approval. The College Senate should charge the task force with a specific task and a general timeframe in which to deliberate and report back to the council. Task force reports are submitted to the council and require no vote by the council to approve or disapprove of its findings. Any policy recommendations or resolutions need to be approved by the procedures of the College Senate. In the event that a task force continues to deliberate for more than three years, the College Senate must vote on whether to make the task force a standing committee of the Senate.

The College Senate may also pass resolutions that express its opinion or position on a given issue or concern. Since resolutions are statements of view points, these resolutions are passed by a majority of the council and require no additional approval.

The College Senate may, by a vote of *seven* Senate members cast at two consecutive meetings, call for college-wide advisory referenda on specific issues. Additionally, at any time, the College Senate may call for a special meeting of the LAS faculty.

The College Senate shall have a role in the selection, evaluation, and retention of the dean of the college and shall establish guidelines for its participation in these processes.

### **3.6) Process for Approving Changes to the College Shared Governance Document**

This section of the College Shared Governance Document may be amended by simple majority of the council (and approval of the dean) for one year after the recommendation of the College Senate and the acceptance of the section by the dean. After a year of the passing of the completed governing document, amendments to this section will require a *supermajority of 60 percent* of its voting membership (and approval of the dean).

Amendments to the Governing Document are required in the event that the document and the university Faculty Handbook are found to be in contradiction. The college, its faculty, and its policies must adhere to the university Faculty Handbook. These amendments may be passed with a simple majority of the council (and approval of the dean) at any time.

## **4) Faculty Committees**

The primary areas of faculty responsibility are in matters of faculty personnel issues and curriculum. Thus, the College Senate has oversight of college committees that handle these matters. The College Senate will review substantively new college and unit policies put forward by these committees, request annual reports from these committees, and be responsible for a fair and open appointment process to these committees.

### **4.1) College Personnel Committee**

The Personnel Committee has primary responsibility for conducting the tenure and promotion processes outlined in SGD section 6.6 consonant with the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.5.5. In addition, the Personnel Committee shall review and approve all changes to tenure and promotion standards and guidelines created by local academic units, and has the responsibility to forward approved changes to the University Board on Promotion and Tenure for its review, as described in Faculty Handbook section 3.5.7.5. Finally, the Personnel Committee may recommend policy changes to the College Senate for any aspect of faculty hiring, review, or tenure and/or promotion procedures specific to the college. The committee shall produce, by June 1 of each academic year, an annual written report on its activities. This report will be forwarded to the College Senate for review.

#### **4.1.1) Committee Membership**

The Personnel Committee shall consist of seven tenured members of the college, at least one of whom must hold the rank of full professor. The seven seats shall be filled according to the proportions of the faculty with appointments in the humanities, in the social sciences, and in the interdisciplinary programs as reflected in the tenured membership of the College Senate.<sup>2</sup> Alternates shall be determined through the process described in 4.1.2.

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.7.4, the personnel committee members elect a chairperson for a one-year term. The chairperson conducts meetings of the committee and organizes the committee's reports. The dean shall not be the chairperson of the committee. In LAS, the dean sits *ex officio* as a member of the committee but shall not vote nor advocate for or against a candidate.

Personnel Committee members who wish to apply for promotion to full professor will be required to recuse themselves from the committee for the entire year of their review application. The alternate elected for the recused member's area shall serve in her or his place for a one-year term. Personnel Committee members who have department or program colleagues who are up for tenure and/or promotion will recuse themselves during the deliberation about and shall not vote on cases of candidates in their departments or programs. Personnel Committee members who have department or program colleagues who are under review for tenure and/or promotion must exercise their right of peer review in the local academic unit.

---

<sup>2</sup> In 2011-2012, these proportions would yield four representatives from the humanities, two from the social sciences, and one from the interdisciplinary programs.

**4.1.2) Election of Committee Members and Alternates**

The College Personnel Committee is an elected body. Any member of the college community who has been tenured for three years or more and is not the dean or an associate dean may be elected to the Personnel Committee.

All eligible faculty in each of the college's three academic areas shall be listed on a preliminary electronic ballot, and those whose names appear will be invited to submit a personal statement of 250 words or fewer, which shall be linked to their names on this ballot.

In the event that candidates have not received a majority of ballots cast, a second election will be conducted with a ballot listing the names of those who received the highest vote totals in the preliminary voting.

If no full professor is currently serving on the committee, and no full professor receives a majority of ballots cast, the full professor with a plurality will be elected. In this scenario, if no full professor receives any ballots, a second election will be conducted with a ballot listing only the names of all eligible full professors in the College. The candidate with a plurality of the votes cast is elected.

For each open seat, those who have received the next-highest vote totals at the end of the election shall be designated as alternates.

The election shall be conducted by the dean's office each spring, with voting and selection to occur before the end of the academic year. All tenure-line faculty vote in both elections for candidates in all three academic areas.

Service terms will be three years, staggered. Each term begins September 1 of the academic year following the vote. Once a faculty member has served a full term, she or he will be ineligible to serve on the committee for three years.

**4.1.3) Duties of College Personnel Committee Alternates**

Those members designated as alternates to the College Personnel Committee (by the process discussed in 4.1.2) shall attend the preliminary College Personnel Committee meetings called during the autumn quarter. After the autumn quarter, alternates shall be called upon to serve as full members of the committee only in the event that a Personnel Committee member from their area must withdraw for the duration of an academic year. Alternates will not review tenure and promotion files unless called upon to serve as full committee members.

In such cases, the alternate member will perform all duties required of Personnel Committee members



for the remainder of the academic year. Upon return, the committee member shall resume full duties and will finish out the remainder of the term.

Alternate members shall not replace committee members in the event of a recusal from meetings pertaining to tenure and promotion cases of candidates from their local academic unit.

#### **4.2) College Curriculum Committee**

The Curriculum Committee shall primarily be responsible for oversight and approval of new degrees and programs as well as restructuring of existing degrees and programs. It follows the charge, process, and procedures laid out in section 7 of this document. An annual report of the committee's work will be submitted to the College Senate for review at the end of each academic year.

##### **4.2.1) Committee Membership**

The Curriculum Committee shall consist of six members of the college faculty (tenured and tenure-track). These six seats shall be filled according to the proportions of college *programs* (not faculty) in the humanities, in the social sciences, and in interdisciplinary areas, with the understanding that the committee shall include at least one member from each of these groups. (In 2011-2012, these proportions would yield two representatives from the humanities, two from the social sciences, and two from interdisciplinary programs.) Three alternates shall be appointed, one from each area.

The committee shall be chaired by an associate dean, chosen by the dean. An additional associate dean and an assistant dean will be appointed by the dean and serve *ex officio* in order to assist with administrative issues regarding curriculum.

##### **4.2.2) Election of Committee Members**

The College Curriculum Committee is an elected body. Each term begins on September 1 of the academic year following the vote.

Any faculty member of the college community who has been full time for three years or more or is not the dean or an associate dean may be elected to serve on the Curriculum Committee. Self-nominations are expected; chairs are urged to encourage representatives from their disciplinary areas to stand for election. All nominees may include brief (250 words or fewer) statements addressed to the College Senate.

Service terms will be three years, staggered. A committee member may serve a total of two consecutive terms. Once a faculty has served two consecutive terms, she or he must wait three years before being nominated as a candidate again.

#### **4.3) Other College Committees**

The College Senate may advise or request information from all college faculty committees. It may also establish new faculty committees as needed, with the approval of the dean. When forming a new

committee, the College Senate is responsible for developing a charge, a fair and open selection process for committee members, and a clear chronology for the committee's expected work.

#### **4.4) Senate-Authorized Appointments to Committees**

The LAS College Senate, in conjunction with the LAS Dean's Office, is responsible for holding annual elections for all open positions on the College Senate and the elected College Committees. These committees include the College Personnel Committee (CPC), the College Committee on Curriculum and Programs (CCCP), the Committee on Teaching, Learning and Assessment (TLA), and the LAS Committee on Undergraduate Research (LASCUR). Elections will be held during the spring quarter, after April 1, with terms beginning on July 1 (unless otherwise indicated in this document). In cases where no one runs for an open position in the spring election cycle – or a position remains open after the spring elections – the College Senate working in conjunction with the Dean's Office and Senate representatives of the disciplinary area will appoint a faculty member to fill the open position. All efforts should be made to maintain an equitable distribution of faculty based upon disciplinary areas.

## 5) Guidelines for Annual Performance Review and Probationary Review for Tenure-line Faculty

### 5.1) Definition of Reviews

The College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences conducts two distinct types of annual evaluative reviews—performance review for all tenure-line faculty and probationary review for untenured tenure-line faculty.

### 5.2) Annual Performance Reviews

According to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.4, the annual performance review consists of a review and evaluation of performance during the preceding **academic** year based on the local academic unit's criteria and responsibilities. Required of all tenure-line faculty, the performance review is conducted each **academic** year within the local academic unit by the local academic officer, who submits the review to the dean, and together the officer and dean come to a final evaluation that the dean uses to determine salary. The local academic officer shall share the final performance review with the faculty member. For complete guidance, see Faculty Handbook 2.3.4.

Performance reviews do not take the place of probationary reviews and do not address a faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

#### 5.2.1) Documentation

For the performance review, each faculty member is required to submit to the local academic officer an updated *curriculum vitae* and a written self-evaluation explaining his or her accomplishments in teaching, advising (if appropriate), scholarship/creative activity, and service during the past **calendar year**.

### 5.3) Probationary Reviews

Probationary reviews are critical assessments of a tenure-line faculty member's teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service in the context of the candidate's progress toward meeting the local academic unit's criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Probationary reviews are of two types, formal and informal, and are required for contract renewal.

#### 5.3.1) Formal Probationary Review

Each formal review must thoroughly evaluate the candidate's work to date, foregrounding both strengths and weaknesses in the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion. When appropriate, the review must recommend measures to address any weaknesses. The subsequent formal reviews should explicitly include an evaluation of the candidate's progress in addressing weaknesses cited in previous reviews. Local academic units must be cognizant of the need for candor in evaluating candidates so that formal reviews can serve as accurate and helpful guides to candidates as they move toward tenure and/or promotion.

#### **5.3.1.1) Documentation**

For the formal review, each untenured tenure-line faculty member is required to submit to the local academic officer an updated *curriculum vitae*, written self evaluation (supported by evidence or documentation) explaining his or her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service since the last formal or informal review. The candidate's narrative should specifically address measures taken to rectify any weaknesses cited in earlier reviews and should provide appropriate documentation of such actions taken.

#### **5.3.1.2) Procedures Governing Formal Reviews**

According to the Faculty Handbook, each local academic unit or its personnel committee conducts the formal review of its untenured tenure-line faculty members. In LAS, the formal review must be undertaken by the local academic officer and the personnel committee of the local academic unit, or in smaller units by the local academic officer and the tenured faculty. For units that have fewer than six tenured faculty members, the local academic officers will work with the dean to select additional tenured faculty (to a total of five members) to serve on the unit's personnel committee. Those additional faculty members will serve on the committee for all reviews conducted in that academic year. (In other words, there is to be one committee for all cases under review in any given year.)

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.3.1.1, the tenured faculty of the local academic unit vote by separate secret ballots on (1) adequate progress toward tenure and (2) reappointment, and prepare a final report according to Faculty Handbook guidelines. The College of LAS further mandates that the faculty member being reviewed must be provided with a copy of the report, which also becomes part of the faculty member's personnel file in both the local academic unit and the dean's office. This report shall also be shared with all tenure-line faculty in the unit.

#### **5.3.2) Informal Probationary Reviews**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.3.1.2, the purpose of an informal review is to recommend for or against contract renewal and to address progress towards tenure in review periods when the formal review is not conducted.

#### **5.3.2.1) Documentation**

For the informal review, each untenured tenure-line faculty member is required to submit to the local academic officer an updated *curriculum vitae*, written self evaluation (supported by evidence or documentation) explaining his or her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service since the last formal or informal review. Faculty may, if they wish, provide supplementary commentary or information, but such additional documentation is not required.

#### **5.3.2.2) Procedures Governing Informal Reviews**

The local academic officer is responsible for conducting informal reviews. Local academic units may, if they wish, require the personnel committee of the local academic unit to help conduct informal reviews. An informal review is appropriate when the local academic officer and/or personnel committee of the

local academic unit (or in smaller units, the local academic officer and tenured faculty) believe that the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure and/or promotion since the last formal review. The local academic officer need only write a very brief report to this effect, to be submitted to the dean; no vote by the full tenured faculty of the unit is required for informal reviews. The faculty member being reviewed must be provided with a copy of the report, which also becomes a part of the faculty member's personnel file in both the local academic unit and the dean's office.

#### **5.4) Faculty Right of Response**

For all of the aforementioned reviews, every faculty member has the right to respond in writing to the reviews, to have this response included in the unit's personnel files, and to forward this response to the dean.

#### **5.5) Schedule of Formal/Informal Reviews**

What follows is the standard schedule for an untenured tenure-line faculty member's formal and informal probationary reviews for the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, assuming no leaves. The Faculty Handbook section 3.2.2 mandates that if an untenured tenure-line faculty member takes a leave as defined by DePaul policies, including family or medical leave, research leave, teaching leave, or military service leave, the year during which the leave occurs is normally not considered as a year of probationary service, and the leave does not break the required continuity of full-time service. If the candidate, however, wishes for the leave not to affect the length of the probationary period, he or she must notify the dean in writing within six month upon return from the leave.

Year 1: Winter-quarter informal review for Year 2 contract.

Year 2: Autumn-quarter informal review (due December 15) for Year 3 contract; spring-quarter formal review for Year 4 contract.

Year 3: Spring-quarter informal review for Year 5 contract.

Year 4: Spring-quarter formal review for Year 6 contract. (Should a untenured tenure-line faculty member take a leave that interferes with the normal schedule of this second formal review, the review in the year following the leave must be a formal review.)

Year 5: Spring-quarter informal review for Year 7 contract. Note, however, that the Faculty Handbook section 3.8 requires that, if non-reappointment of the faculty member is a realistic possibility, a formal review must be conducted in Year 5. An unsuccessful formal review in Year 5 means that the candidate's Year 6 contract becomes a terminal contract, and the candidate is ineligible for tenure/promotion review.

Additional formal reviews may be substituted for informal reviews if the previous formal review revealed deficiencies and the local academic officer and personnel committee wish to determine whether the candidate is actively addressing those deficiencies. The substitution of a formal for an informal review in this case should not be regarded as punitive but rather as further assistance toward preparing the faculty member for the tenure/promotion review.

## **6) College Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Processes, and Guidelines**

### **6.1) Definition of Tenure/Promotion Review**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.3.1.3, the tenure review is the final review during the probationary period of tenure-line faculty. It begins with the candidate's tenure application and concludes with the provost's decision to grant or deny tenure. It is a systematic review involving university-wide consideration under detailed procedures. It includes solicitation of opinions from external reviewers and from students. The tenure review examines the faculty member's accomplishments and assesses the likelihood of future accomplishments.

The tenure and/or promotion review typically takes place in year six of the probationary period. The schedules of untenured tenure-line faculty who take approved leaves during the probationary period may require adjustment. According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.2.2, the year during which a leave occurs is normally not considered as a year of probationary service, and the leave does not break the required continuity of full-time service.

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.3.2, application for tenure and application for promotion to associate professor ordinarily occur simultaneously. A tenured associate professor ordinarily serves at least three years at rank before applying for promotion to full professor.

### **6.2) University and Professional Criteria**

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences adheres to university and professional standards for tenure and promotion as outlined in the Faculty Handbook section 3.4. Faculty are to be reviewed in the following three areas: 1) teaching, 2) scholarship and/or creative activities, and 3) service. These three areas are considered equally important and valued. The LAS guidelines, below, serve to further explicate those three areas in order to guide tenure-line faculty and their department and program colleagues in meeting college expectations.

### **6.3) Local Academic Unit Guidelines and Criteria for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure**

#### ***6.3.1) Tenure and/or Promotion Guidelines***

All departments and programs within LAS must have a written document, approved by the tenure-line faculty of the unit and subsequently by the Personnel Committee of LAS, that (1) describes the review process for faculty who are being considered for tenure and/or promotion, (2) states the criteria that will be used in the unit's evaluation of faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion, and (3) lists the kinds of supporting materials required for the candidate's dossier. This document must provide clearly defined expectations for teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service; at the same time, it should allow for flexibility in the evaluation of candidates whose work deviates from the norm. All new departments and programs must have tenure and promotion guidelines and processes in place which must be approved by the LAS College Personnel Committee within the first academic year of their inauguration.

Departments and programs are urged to establish a system of mentorship to assist untenured tenure-line faculty as they progress in their probationary periods.

Local academic officers must provide untenured tenure-line faculty, at the time of hire, with written schedules of their probationary reviews (informal and formal), and updated as necessary, as well as local academic unit, college, and university guidelines for tenure and promotion.

### **6.3.2) Membership and Responsibilities of the Local Academic Unit Personnel Committee**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.5.1, local academic units may choose to convene a personnel committee consisting of a subset of the tenured faculty of the unit to conduct its tenure and/or promotion reviews. In LAS, all units with more than six tenured faculty must convene a personnel committee of at least three members. Units with fewer than six tenured faculty must convene a personnel committee of at least five members. For guidelines governing local academic unit personnel committees, see Faculty Handbook section 3.5.5.1

In LAS, when local academic units have fewer than five eligible tenured faculty members, the dean, after consultation with members of the unit, will appoint additional tenured faculty (to a total of five members) to the unit's personnel committee to conduct the unit's tenure and/or promotion reviews. Those additional faculty will serve for all tenure and promotion reviews conducted by that unit in that academic year.

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.5.1, the personnel committee evaluates the candidate, votes by secret ballot, and submits a signed report for the dossier. In no case may the personnel committee vote on a candidate's tenure and/or promotion be used in lieu of a vote by the unit's entire tenured faculty. In LAS, the personnel committee report should include a brief standardized statement of department or program evaluative criteria for each of the three areas under review, as well as a summative statement of the candidate's probationary career. Formal probationary period reviews should be commented upon in the report in order to contextualize the pre-tenure progress of the candidate under consideration. Candidates retain the prerogative to include their formal probationary reviews in their dossiers. Local academic units *shall not* include annual performance reviews in the evaluation of a candidate for tenure and/or promotion. However, candidates themselves may include such documents in their dossiers if they seem relevant.

While the deliberations and voting of the personnel committee must be confidential, the unit's review processes should be transparent: there should be clear understanding of the eligibility of faculty to serve on the personnel committee; the process of selection/election of faculty to that committee; as well as the ways in which the personnel committee deliberates, reaches its recommendations, and issues reports.

### **6.3.3) The Local Academic Unit's Evaluation of Teaching**

The local academic unit's evaluation of the teaching done by a candidate for tenure and/or promotion should be based on (1) the unit's statement of teaching expectations; (2) peer evaluations and student

evaluations (aggregated and individual); (3) copies of the candidate's syllabi for all courses taught; (4) a statement by the candidate that includes discussion of these evaluations and of his or her pedagogical philosophy and practices, teaching innovations, and experience with course development (if any); and (5) the report from the student review committee mandated by the Faculty Handbook section 3.6.3.2. Syllabi should comply with the standards set out in the Faculty Handbook and (when relevant) the Liberal Studies Program guidelines.

#### **6.3.3.1) Liberal Studies Teaching**

As the university's largest provider of Liberal Studies courses, LAS places high value on teaching in the Liberal Studies Program (*e.g.*, First-Year Program courses, Sophomore Seminars, Junior-Year Experiential courses, Capstone Seminars, and Honors Program courses) as well as on teaching of courses in the learning domains. The unit-level review for tenure and promotion should weigh such teaching accordingly.

#### **6.3.3.2) Advising and Mentoring Students**

The college also values advising and mentoring students, both generally and in their major programs. The unit-level review for tenure and promotion should also weigh such advising and mentoring accordingly.

The local academic unit and the college should evaluate direct advising and mentoring of students in the Liberal Studies program, in major and minor programs, and through co-curricular programming as part of faculty's teaching contribution. Similarly, advising and mentoring graduate students—such as guiding research, reading or supervising theses and dissertations, and overseeing projects—will be treated as part of faculty's teaching contribution.

#### **6.3.3.3) Curriculum Development**

Most curriculum development refines or extends the teaching environment of the local academic unit, requiring the same pedagogical imagination as designing a course. The local academic unit and the college should evaluate course and curriculum development as "teaching writ large."

#### **6.3.3.4) Teaching Requirements for Promotion to Professor**

For promotion to full professor, local academic units should indicate the kind and level of teaching that is generally expected of those who seek the rank of full professor. The College expects post-tenure faculty to perform at a high level in the classroom. The local academic unit must be clear regarding this expectation and its means of assessing it.

#### **6.3.4) The Local Academic Unit's Evaluation of Scholarship and/or Creative Activity**

The local academic unit's evaluation of scholarship and/or creative activity of a candidate for tenure and/or promotion should be based on (1) the unit's statement of expectations in this area; (2) peer (*i.e.*, within the local academic unit) evaluation of the candidate's work, as well as reviews (such as book or exhibit/performance reviews) and other evidence as appropriate (such as citations in the work of



others); (3) a statement by the candidate that includes discussion of past and present research and future research directions and plans; and (4) external assessments of the candidate’s work as described in the Faculty Handbook section 3.6.1.2. The process and timeline for the request of external letters is elaborated in Faculty Handbook section 3.6.2 and section 6.3.4.5 of this document. The candidate is responsible for submitting evidence of all work to be considered (articles, books, art works, photographs of exhibits and installations, etc.).

**6.3.4.1) Norms; Exceptions to Norms**

The local academic unit is required to indicate its expectations for scholarship and creative activity. The local academic unit should identify these expectations in terms not of “minimums,” but of “norms” and should indicate any relevant criteria that would justify any deviation from these norms. Such criteria could include an important discovery, an influential article or one published in a “flagship” professional journal, publication by a distinguished press, or an exhibition at a distinguished venue. The local academic unit faculty should discuss and approve such criteria.

**6.3.4.2) Work to Be Included in the Tenure Review**

According to Faculty Handbook section 3.4.2.2, DePaul University evaluates untenured tenure-line faculty based on their total output of work. In considering scholarly or creative work completed by a candidate before his or her appointment at DePaul, all units shall be guided accordingly. “Completed work” includes publications, conference presentations, exhibitions, and similar public disseminations of scholarship and/or creative activity.

**6.3.4.3) Work in Press**

Work in press will be considered for purposes of the local academic unit’s and college’s assessment if the candidate includes the full manuscript and a written communication from the editor/publisher indicating the intent of publication, as well as the projected date of publication. In the event that there is any work that is completed or is in press after the local academic unit has reviewed the dossier, this work or publisher’s intent to publish may be submitted as “unreviewed” to the college personnel committee.

**6.3.4.4) Co-authored Work**

Home units are expected to develop criteria, appropriate to their fields, for assessing work that is co-authored or co-edited. Candidates for tenure and promotion are required to include a statement that clarifies the respective responsibilities and contributions of the co-authors or co-editors, with specific reference to their own contributions. Candidates are strongly encouraged to secure a corroborative statement, in writing, from at least one of their co-authors or co-editors.

**6.3.4.5) External Letters**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.6.2, by June 1 of the academic year prior to applying for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate must submit to the local academic unit officers a c.v. and selected publications/documentation of creative activities for transmittal to at least two external

reviewers for tenure candidates, and at least three external reviewers for candidates for promotion to full professor. By June 15, local academic units should identify an initial list of potential external reviewers. These reviewers will be asked to prepare letters over the summer for receipt prior to the candidate review in the fall.

LAS requires that the local academic unit must establish a written process and criteria for the selection of external reviewers. The process of selecting external reviewers must include input from the candidate. Candidates must disclose the nature of any relationship with any potential reviewers. External reviewers must be instructed on the context and limits of their reviews as defined by the Faculty Handbook section 3.6.2.2 through 3.6.2.4.

**6.3.4.6) *Scholarship/Creative Activities Requirements for Promotion to Professor***

For promotion to full professor, local academic units should indicate the kind and level of scholarship and/or creative activity that are generally expected of those who seek the rank of full professor. These criteria should be at least as rigorous as the criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor and should be based on scholarship and/or creative activity completed since tenure and/or promotion to associate professor.

**6.3.5) *The Local Academic Unit's Evaluation of Service***

The local academic unit's evaluation of service should be based on (1) the unit's statement of expectations in this area; (2) peer (*i.e.*, within the local academic unit) evaluation of the of the candidate's contributions to the local academic unit, the college, the university, as well as to the profession, the discipline, and (when relevant) the community; (3) documentation of the candidate's service in the form of letters from responsible persons within and outside the university; and (4) the articulation by the candidate of his/her service contributions in his/her tenure and/or promotion statement. See Faculty Handbook section 3.4.2.3 for definitions of types of service that may be considered as part of tenure/promotion review.

**6.3.5.1) *Internal versus External Service***

LAS places primary emphasis on internal services contributions to the university though it respects and encourages service to professional communities outside DePaul. The unit-level review for tenure and promotion should weigh such service accordingly.

**6.3.5.2) *Service Credit for Activities Related to Advising and Curriculum Development***

In addition to the teaching credit for advising and mentoring students described in section 6.3.3.2 above, the local academic unit and the college should consider as service other types of faculty involvement in advising and mentoring that benefit the university and its academic units, such as "open house" sessions for prospective or admitted students, major/minor fairs, and similar events.

In addition to the teaching credit for curricular development described in section 6.3.3.3 above, some curricular contributions may, at times, also be considered as part of service. Instances of this include

serving on a local academic unit curriculum committee, being part of a committee that redesigns or assesses the unit's curriculum, or serving on the unit's Academic Program Review Committee. The local academic unit should state in its guidelines the range of possible contributions to the curriculum that may be considered service.

#### **6.3.5.3) Service Requirements for Promotion to Professor**

Those who seek promotion to full professor should exhibit an ongoing record of notable service contributions at all levels.

#### **6.3.6) Advising and Mentoring Students, and Curriculum Development**

For purposes of tenure and promotion review, advising and mentoring students and curriculum development are not to be considered as separate from teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service.

#### **6.4) The Responsibilities and Rights of the Candidates**

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are responsible for preparing accurate, honest dossiers supported by evidence and for writing tenure and/or promotion statements that can be easily understood both by peers in their fields and by peers in the college and university.

Candidates for tenure and promotion have the rights accorded to members of the academy—to academic freedom, to clear guidelines for tenure and promotion, to fair and just review of their dossiers at all levels, and to due process and the right of appeal. To the extent that it is possible, and limited only by the rights of privacy of the candidate and of those who deliberate and vote on these candidates, the review process should be transparent and collegial. Candidates, with the written approval of their local academic officer and the dean, may also stop their tenure clocks for personal, family, medical, or research leaves as explained in Faculty Handbook section 3.2.2.

Though candidates will be evaluated according to the local academic unit and LAS *criteria* in place at the time of hire, the *processes* whereby evaluation is conducted are established by the Faculty Handbook in place at the time of evaluation. If the aforementioned criteria change, the candidate has the right, by written request, to be evaluated under the new criteria.

Candidates have the right to place in their dossiers written responses to all local academic unit and College reports, including those written by the academic officer and the dean. With the exception of a response to a local unit minority report (see Faculty Handbook section 3.5.2.2), all such responses must be placed in the dossier prior to the next level of review. The timelines for report submission and candidate response outlined in the Faculty Handbook sections 3.5.4.4, 3.5.5.4, and 3.5.5.7 must be observed.

Faculty concerns regarding issues other than those dealing with teaching, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service may not be considered in tenure and/or promotion deliberations and decisions.

Other issues should be addressed through the grievance procedures outlined in Faculty Handbook chapter 5.

### **6.5) Local Academic Unit Review of Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.5.2, the tenured faculty of the local academic unit is responsible for reading the candidate's entire dossier (including the personnel committee's report), evaluating the candidate, voting by secret ballot, and providing its own report for the dossier.

Home unit deliberation meetings on tenure and/or promotion should include the following elements: (1) an opportunity for the candidate to provide a statement to the unit and (2) discussion between the candidate and the members of the unit. After the candidate has been dismissed from the deliberations, (3) the members of the unit discuss the merits of the candidate's case in the categories of teaching, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service, then (4) vote on whether the candidate has met unit criteria for tenure and/or promotion.

Voting must be conducted by secret ballot. Only tenured faculty have the right to vote on cases of tenure and/or promotion. Absentee voting is not allowed, unless the absent faculty member participates fully in the unit's deliberations through appropriate and approved electronic means. According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.2 (b) the reviewing body's numerical vote must be reported to all subsequent levels.

The local academic unit shall next provide a recommendation report that may adapt or adopt the personnel committee's report, but must reflect the unit's deliberations over a candidate's tenure and promotion, including the final numerical vote. According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.2 (g) this report should fully discuss both strengths and weaknesses in the record so as to provide an explanation for positive and negative votes. All faculty participating in the decision will read the final unit recommendation report and sign one of two forms. One form indicates that the faculty member agrees that the report accurately describes the discussion of the unit. The other form indicates that the report does not accurately describe the unit's discussion. The faculty member's signature does not reflect his or her vote. Those who find the report inaccurate must provide a signed statement explaining why they believe the report does not accurately describe the discussion. See Faculty Handbook section 3.5.2.1 for detailed guidelines for such signing statements

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.2.2, an allegation that an evaluating unit violated its guidelines, criteria or processes, or those of the University, takes the form of a minority report. A minority report may not present information or opinion about the candidate beyond that offered during the meeting. See Faculty Handbook section 3.5.2.2 for minority report timeline.

While the deliberations and voting of the local academic unit must be confidential, the ways in which the local academic unit deliberates, reaches its recommendations, and issues reports should be transparent.

**6.5.1) Role of Local Academic Officer**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.5.3, the local unit academic officer may participate in the discussion of tenured faculty of the unit, but will not vote on, nor advocate for or against the candidate’s promotion or tenure. The unit academic officer will write a separate report for the dossier expressing his or her evaluation of the candidate.

Subject to the above restrictions, LAS requires that the local academic officer attend the deliberation meeting of the local academic unit about the candidate’s case. Further, the local academic officer shall submit his/her report to the department and the candidate only after the local academic unit’s deliberation is completed, but no later than five business days after the deliberation meeting.

Academic officers are advised to heed the time requirements for candidate response delineated in Faculty Handbook section 3.5.5.4.

**6.6) The Review at the College Level by the College Personnel Committee**

For complete guidelines about the composition of the college personnel committee, see above section 4.1. According to the Faculty Handbook (section 3.5.7.4), the college personnel committee members elect a chairperson for a one-year term. Only members with at least one year of service on the committee are eligible to serve as chairperson. The chairperson conducts meetings of the committee and organizes the committee’s reports. The dean shall not be the chairperson of the committee. In LAS, the dean sits *ex officio* as a member of the committee but shall not vote nor advocate for or against a candidate.

**6.6.1) The Procedures of the Personnel Committee in Evaluating Faculty**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.5.5, the college personnel committee conducts a separate evaluation of the candidate, votes by secret ballot, and writes a report that is placed in the candidate’s dossier and shared with the dean of the college. The basic procedures of the tenure and promotion review process at the college are as follows:

**6.6.1.1) Preparatory Procedures**

Prior to the college tenure and promotion review cycle, the personnel committee chair will convene the personnel committee to discuss the number and nature of tenure and promotion applications, the basic processes of accessing files prior to the meetings with the candidates, the schedule of candidate and local academic officer interviews, and other procedural matters.

**6.6.1.2) Meeting with Local Academic Officers and Candidates**

The college personnel committee shall meet separately with every candidate for tenure and/or promotion and the candidate’s local academic officer. Prior to each candidate meeting, the personnel committee chair will solicit general questions and concerns about the candidate’s application from the

personnel committee members. After these preliminaries, the local academic officer will be invited into the meeting to discuss and answer questions about his or her evaluation of the candidate under review. The committee will next invite the candidate into the meeting, and ask her or him to provide a statement (if she or he wishes to do so) and answer questions posed by the committee members.

#### **6.6.1.3) Committee Deliberations**

When undertaking a substantive review of each tenure case, college personnel committee deliberations should concentrate on assuring that the procedures of the local academic unit and college have been adhered to; that the unit and college criteria have been applied clearly, consistently and fairly; and that no biases or extraneous considerations have been involved in the process. The college personnel committee may conduct a “*de novo*” (or entirely independent) review of an individual case when the committee finds that the procedures and criteria of the local academic unit and college have not been adhered to or applied appropriately. The college personnel committee is charged with assessing whether the candidates have met the college-level requirements for teaching, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service as articulated in sections 6.3.3, 6.3.4, and 6.3.5, above. The college personnel committee is also charged with ensuring that the candidate and the local academic unit have complied with university procedures for tenure and promotion.

The personnel committee has two separate deliberations. Immediately following the meeting with the local academic unit’s personnel committee chair, the local academic officer, and the candidate, the College personnel committee chair will ask the committee members to fill out straw ballots, which will allow for a vote of “Yes,” “No,” and “Needs Discussion,” as well as space for explanatory comments. These will then be tallied, read and discussed. The next candidate meeting will follow, if so scheduled.

After the entire group of candidates has been interviewed, the College personnel committee chair will reconvene the personnel committee to review each of the candidates, again, and cast a final vote with a concluding discussion. After this final meeting the personnel committee Chair will draft—for each candidate under review—reports that 1) contain the numerical vote of the committee; 2) represent the committee’s deliberations; and 3) include the final judgments of the committee. These reports shall include both written and oral deliberations of the committee. These drafts will be circulated to committee members for final review, emendation, and approval that the documents represent the deliberations of the committee. Once approved, the reports become the formal recommendation of the committee to the university level and are made part of the candidate’s file as it proceeds through the tenure/promotion process. The chair of the personnel committee is responsible for sending a copy of the report to the candidate and his or her local academic officer, as well as to the dean of the college.

#### **6.6.1.4) The Report of the Dean**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.4.3, the dean writes a separate report for the dossier expressing his or her evaluation of the candidate. According to the Faculty Handbook section 3.5.4.4, the dean is also responsible for sharing all reports from the college review with the candidate. In LAS, the dean must also share his or her evaluation of the candidate with the College personnel committee.

**6.7) The Review at the University Level (UBPT)**

Candidates who are applying for tenure and promotion should refer to the university's Faculty Handbook section 3.5.6 for policies regarding tenure and/or promotion review by the University Board on Promotion and Tenure.

## **7) Curriculum Approval Criteria, Processes, and Guidelines**

### **7.1) The College Curriculum**

DePaul University's Faculty Council and the American Association of University Professors recognize that faculty have the primary responsibility for the development of the college curriculum. Although the dean of the college may initiate curricular or programmatic discussions, the faculty of an existing home unit—or, in the event that none exists, of an *ad hoc* committee made up of representatives of different departments or units—are responsible for developing specific curricular or programmatic proposals, subject to approval at the home unit, college, and university levels. The LAS College Committee on Curriculum and Programs (CCCP) has responsibility for the approval and oversight (in conjunction with the dean) of new degrees and programs at the college level, the restructuring of existing degree requirements, and the modification or elimination of existing offerings and programs.

### **7.2) Curriculum Development and Review**

The university Faculty Council has established criteria for the approval of new majors, degrees, or programs, which include the following: academic quality; centrality to the mission of the university; non-duplication of existing programs; utilization of existing resources; and financial viability. The extent to which these criteria apply to proposals at the home unit or college level varies according to the nature of the proposed curriculum. The College Senate may also develop additional criteria and approval processes, which may affect the proposal review process.

Proposals for new programs should include a discussion of learning goals and outcomes, the structure of curriculum (requirements, core courses, electives, etc.), and faculty resources. For the revision of existing programs, a rationale for the proposed changes is expected to include a pedagogical explanation (or justification) for the proposed changes.

### **7.3) Responsibilities of Home Unit(s) or *ad hoc* Proposal Sponsors**

The initiative for curriculum-related proposals may begin with either the dean or the faculty of the college. In either case, home units or *ad hoc* committees of interested faculty will be responsible for the development of the proposal. Proposals from an existing home unit should be reviewed by a department or program curriculum committee, by the unit's regular faculty, and by the department chair or program director. Proposals from an *ad hoc* interdisciplinary committee should have majority support of that committee and statements of support from affected programs or departments. Unless otherwise indicated, the *ad hoc* committee's chair will serve as the proposal's primary sponsor.

Some proposals from existing home units require only department- or program-level review and approval. These proposals include: the creation of new courses; the revision of existing course numbers, titles, or descriptions; the creation or revision of course cross-listings; and the deactivation of courses from the catalog. These changes shall be reported to the CCCP.



Other proposals from existing home units or *ad hoc* committees require college-level review by the CCCP and approval by the dean. In some cases, proposals also require university-level review by the university Committee on Curriculum and Programs (CCP) and approval by the university Faculty Council and the Provost. (For further details on which proposals require *only* college-level reviews and which require *both* college- and university-level reviews, see below.) These proposals should adhere to the following initial processes in order to provide orderly and collegial deliberation for examining the academic issues that arise from proposals for revised or new programs.

In preparation for college-level (CCCP) review:

1. Department chairs and program directors, or other proposal sponsors, are advised to contact the dean at a preliminary phase in the development of the proposal. It is further advised that a chair, program director, or sponsor contact the CCCP chair for guidance regarding the college-level approval process.
2. Proposals presented to the CCCP must be developed in collaboration with the faculty who will teach in the program. The proposal must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members of the department or program (or ad hoc interdisciplinary committee in conjunction with affected programs) prior to being sent to CCCP. If the proposal is not unanimously approved by the department or program, a minority report may also be included with the proposal materials.
3. Proposals must also include evidence of discussion and collaboration with faculty representatives of all programs directly affected by the revised or new program. Heads of affected programs should be invited to submit letters of support and/or comment on a proposal. If such letters are not included in the proposal materials, they may be sent directly to the CCCP chair with a copy to the proposing sponsor (chair, director, or primary sponsor).
4. Proposals that significantly impact university support services (such as the university libraries or information services) should include a written response to the proposed program from representatives of the affected area. In lieu of a formal letter, evidence of consultation with representatives from those service areas may be acceptable.
5. Proposals must address relevant Criteria for Review as approved by the Faculty Council (2008, and amended in 2011) and reflect new catalog deadline dates.

### **7.3.1) Proposals Requiring only College-level Reviews**

Proposals requiring only home unit- and college-level reviews include those which do not affect the total number of credit hours necessary to earn a degree, do not alter Liberal Studies Program requirements, nor affect or require coordination from other Colleges.

Examples of proposals requiring only college-level review include:

- a. Modifications of existing major requirements that neither change Liberal Studies Program requirements for that major, nor affect other colleges
- b. Minor curricular changes (*e.g.*, changes that do not substantively alter the spirit of the program, or the number of courses and credit hours required, such as modifying a few course

requirements or including additional course opportunities in a series of course options within a single department)

- c. New concentration(s) within a major
- d. New non-degree credit programs
- e. New minors (in most cases)
- f. Changing the status of an academic unit from a program into a department

**7.3.2) Proposals Requiring both College- and University-level Reviews**

Proposals requiring additional, university-level reviews are determined by criteria articulated in the university Faculty Handbook. Once proposals have successfully been reviewed at the college level and approved by the dean, they are submitted to the university Committee on Curriculum and Programs. The Committee on Curriculum and Programs (CCP) is a standing committee of Faculty Council and is comprised of one representative from each of the ten colleges in the University.

Examples of proposals which require university-level review include:

- a. New degrees or programs of study
- b. New titles to degrees
- c. New majors
- d. New credit-bearing or credit-related certificate programs
- e. Revisions of a program that alter its character by changing its major goals or organizing principles in any of the following ways:
  - When the proposed changes increase the number of credit hours required to complete a degree
  - When the proposed changes require cooperation with, or can affect the resources of, another college or academic unit
  - When the proposed changes modify a minor or a concentration in such a way that will affect the offered courses, programs, or curriculum in another college or academic unit
  - When the proposed changes add or modify a minor or concentration that involves courses from more than one academic unit or college
  - When the proposed changes add or modify a minor or concentration in such a way that necessitates the changing of degree requirements
  - When an existing degree is renamed
  - When a BA or MA program merges with other BA or MA programs

In addition, the university CCP and the Faculty Council must be notified and provided the opportunity to review the discontinuation of any program of study, including certificates, and the intended phase out plan for students currently pursuing that program of study.

**7.4) Role of the CCCP in Reviews at the College and University Levels**

The LAS College Committee on Curriculum and Programs is charged with the review and oversight of new degrees and programs, the restructuring of existing degree requirements, and the modification of existing offerings. In some instances, the CCCP review leads to a recommendation to the dean for

approval. In other instances, the CCCP recommendation to the dean is preliminary to the proposal going forward to the university Committee on Curriculum and Programs (CCP), Faculty Council, and Provost. The composition of the CCCP is established in Section 4.2 of this document.

**7.4.1) Process for Review at the College Level**

The chair of the CCCP convenes meetings monthly or quarterly, as needed. The chair shall distribute copies of submitted proposals to the CCCP members ahead of the meetings and provide additional materials and context, if necessary. At the CCCP meetings, the merits of proposals shall be discussed and assessed by the committee.

The faculty sponsor(s) will be invited to present an overview of the proposal when the CCCP first meets to review that proposal. This overview should summarize the steps the department, program, or *ad hoc* committee took to develop the proposal, the organizing principles of the proposal (including what the proposal intends and how it is structured to achieve those intentions), the resources required, and other pertinent information, as appropriate. After the proposal has been introduced, the faculty sponsor(s) should be prepared to address any questions or comments that are raised by the CCCP members. Once the members have fully discussed these with the sponsor(s), the CCCP may dismiss the sponsor(s) and begin its deliberations.

The CCCP deliberations will focus primarily on the quality of the proposal and its success in addressing the college and university criteria for assessing curriculum and programs. Members may have additional questions or comments that emerge from their deliberations and which will be forwarded to the proposal's sponsor(s) for response. The CCCP may also require emendations (both substantive and minor) in order to make the proposal more clear and consistent with the criteria. In the event that the proposal requires further, university-level review by the CCP and the Faculty Council, the CCCP will require that the proposal and all supporting materials necessary at the university level be submitted for review and approval by its elected members. In conducting its deliberations, the CCCP will endeavor to foster dialogue and discussion with faculty representatives of the proposal and of other programs affected by the proposal.

Once discussion of the proposal has been completed, and the CCCP has reviewed any additional emendations from the sponsor(s), the six elected members shall vote on a proposal's status. In the event that the CCCP requires further revision and re-submission of the proposal prior to final approval, the chair of the CCCP will communicate this to the proposal sponsor(s).

The CCCP and the dean will determine the proposal's status, as follows:

- If the committee recommends approval, the CCCP chair shall notify the dean of the CCCP's determination in writing. If the dean accepts this recommendation, the dean shall then notify the chair, director, or sponsor of the relevant LAS academic unit(s) of the proposal's approval.
- If the CCCP recommends approval of a proposal with the condition that some minor or clerical

changes (e.g., clarifying statements, editing text, adjusting the format, etc.) be made, the CCCP chair will inform the proposal sponsor(s). Upon receipt of the revised proposal, the CCCP chair will forward the proposal to the dean with a recommendation for approval. If the dean accepts this recommendation, the dean shall then notify the chair, director, or sponsor of the relevant LAS academic unit(s) of the proposal's approval.

- If the CCCP requests significant revision of a proposal, the CCCP chair (in consultation with the CCCP members) will provide a detailed response to the faculty sponsor(s) of the proposal in writing. In some cases the CCCP chair may discuss such a report with the Dean prior to sending the report to the faculty sponsor(s), but this is not required. The CCCP may further ask the faculty sponsor(s) and members involved in drafting the proposal to attend the next CCCP meeting in order to provide a better understanding of the proposal and/or the context in which the proposal has been developed. The faculty sponsor(s) of the proposal may also request to meet with the CCCP to discuss the CCCP's feedback. Upon receipt of the revised proposal, the CCCP chair will forward the proposal to the members of the CCCP for further deliberation. If the committee is satisfied with the revisions and recommends approval, the CCCP chair shall notify the dean of the CCCP's determination in writing. If the dean accepts this recommendation, the dean shall then notify the chair, director, or sponsor of the relevant LAS academic unit(s) of the proposal's approval.
- If the CCCP recommends against approval, the CCCP chair shall notify the dean of the CCCP's determination in writing. If the dean accepts this recommendation against approval, the dean shall then notify the chair, director, or sponsor of the relevant LAS academic unit(s) of the proposal's approval. The faculty sponsor(s) of the proposal may always revise and resubmit a proposal for subsequent review.
- In the event that the dean rejects the CCCP's recommendations for or against approval of a proposal, the dean shall inform the CCCP chair and the faculty sponsor(s) of his or her decision, in writing.

#### **7.4.2) Transition Process of Proposal from the College-level to the University-level Review**

Once the dean approves a CCCP recommendation for a modified or new curriculum requiring further, university-wide review, the dean will write a letter of support for the proposal, addressed to the CCP chair. That letter is sent to the CCCP chair and faculty sponsor(s) so that the faculty sponsor(s) may add it to the appendices of the proposal in preparation for its submission to the CCP for university-level review. The faculty sponsor(s) then prepare a single PDF document of the proposal, which is sent to the chair of the CCCP who is responsible for submitting the proposal in electronic form to the chair of the CCP, with a copy of the submission to the CCCP chair and the dean.

During its review of the proposal, the CCP may ask the faculty sponsor(s) for additional materials beyond that which the CCCP may have requested during its review. Where appropriate, the CCCP and/or the CCCP chair may assist with these materials.

#### **7.4.3) CCCP Dates and Timelines**

The college-level review process functions according to a timetable, largely determined by the nature of the proposal and university guidelines. Deadlines for proposals are driven by four main factors:

1. The proposal sponsors' preference for when the curriculum change will go into effect;
2. The nature of the proposal itself (*e.g.*, a minor or major change, a straight-forward or detailed proposal, etc.);
3. The level of review (*i.e.*, college-only or college- and university-level review) required; and
4. The university deadlines for bulletin copy changes.

There are two types of review processes and two cycles of publications to consider. If a proposal requires only a college-level review, the CCCP needs to approve the proposal no later than late May or early June, at the latest, for changes to be entered into the autumn catalog; and by mid-September to early October, at the latest, for changes to be entered into the winter and spring catalogs. If the proposal requires university-level review, and Faculty Council and Provost approval, then review by the CCCP needs to take place earlier. For a detailed submission timeline, contact the CCCP chair and/or see relevant material posted online.

## **7.5) Additional Processes**

### ***7.5.1) Proposals regarding Mergers or Splits of Existing Programs or Units***

Requests to merge or split programs or units may be initiated in two ways. The request may come, first, from faculty of the academic unit(s) in question, or, second, through a request by the dean or provost.

Proposals to merge or split programs or units must be voted upon by the faculty from each unit and be submitted to the CCCP along with the proposal. The CCCP reviews the rationale for the changes, and then makes a recommendation to the dean (who makes the final determination in the college). A merger or splitting of a program or unit nearly always involves a curricular change in a degree offering; therefore, in most cases, the proposal must be sent to the CCP, the Faculty Council, and the provost for university-level review and approval.

Such decisions, while extremely rare, are made on the basis of new academic trends rendering existing structures impractical or obsolete, or creating new options for students, such as double major opportunities. Other criteria could include enrollment trends and university mission.

### ***7.5.2) Proposals regarding the Termination of Existing Programs or Units***

Requests to terminate degrees or units may be initiated in two ways. The request may come, first, from the faculty of the academic unit(s) in question, or, second, through a request by the dean or provost to the academic unit(s) in question.

In academic units where more than one degree (*e.g.*, a B.A. and an M.A.) is offered, a request may be put forth to terminate one of the unit's degrees while maintaining the other. In such cases, the academic unit would remain intact, though its degree offerings would change. Proposals to take such an action may be initiated by the faculty of the unit, the dean, or the provost, and shall be submitted to the CCCP for review. The CCCP shall review the proposed degree termination and make a recommendation to the dean. The CCCP shall also solicit the views of faculty in the affected program – both in writing and

in person – prior to making its recommendations in cases where the proposal is initiated by an administrative officer of the university. If approved by the dean, the proposal must then move to university-level review, as it is the responsibility of the CCP and the Faculty Council to review degree terminations. If the proposed discontinuation of a degree is approved by the Faculty Council, the proposal is then submitted to the provost for final determination of the degree’s status.

If a degree program is terminated, the college will work with the unit’s faculty to develop a plan to assist in “teaching out” students already enrolled in the degree program.

Proposals to terminate programs or units that are initiated by the academic unit must be agreed upon by the majority of faculty from that unit. Such proposals are then submitted to the CCCP, which reviews the rationale for the changes, and then makes a recommendation to the dean.

In the event that the request to terminate an entire academic program or unit is initiated by the dean (or provost), she or he must notify the unit and the CCCP in writing, and explain the basis for requesting this action. The CCCP will review the rationale and consequences of this request. The CCCP should complete its work in a timely fashion (no later than ten weeks), and have access to necessary statistical information (*e.g.*, enrollment patterns, trends in comparative fields within and outside the university, etc.) and other relevant materials. In such cases, faculty of the affected program(s) shall have the opportunity to respond to the administration proposal, and present their views to the CCCP during its deliberation. The CCCP will then summarize its findings in writing, and include the parameters of its investigation, a set of prioritized recommendations, and a timetable for action. The CCCP then votes to approve (or not) the report. If the CCCP vote includes the termination of a unit, that recommendation must then go to the College Senate for discussion and a vote. The Senate vote is considered a recommendation to the dean, who may or may not accept the recommendation. The dean’s determination should be communicated, in writing, to the unit, the CCCP, and the College Senate. A termination of a program or unit may involve a curricular change in a degree offering; therefore, in most cases, the proposal must be sent to the CCP, the Faculty Council, and the provost for university-level review and approval.

Decisions for terminating academic programs or units should be made on curricular criteria.

If a degree program is terminated, the college will work with the unit’s faculty to develop a plan to assist in “teaching out” students already enrolled in the degree program.

If an entire academic unit is terminated, tenured and tenure-track faculty members shall be retained by the university in a manner consistent with Section 4.6 of the University Faculty Handbook. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are contracted to the university, thus elimination of programs should not affect their status and rank. Such faculty members may join another academic unit (depending on a vote of approval by the faculty in that academic unit), or be asked to serve in an administrative capacity within the university. The college’s first priority will be to place the tenured and tenure-track faculty members

within the college itself (if the faculty so wish). In the event that this cannot be done, the college will facilitate placement elsewhere within the university.

Initiations to terminate a stand-alone minor or close an academic center shall follow the same review process. Such requests may come, first, from the director, affiliated faculty or advisory board of the center in question, or, second, through a request by the dean or provost to the academic unit. In either case, the proposal to do so would be submitted to the CCCP, which subsequently makes a recommendation to the dean. If a center is only affiliated with LAS, the proposal need not be reviewed any further at a higher level.

## 8) Home Unit Governance

Shared governance at the university and college level requires shared governance at the department and program levels. To this end, in addition to tenure and promotion guidelines, the faculty of each home unit must discuss and agree upon a basic shared governance document for that unit.

### 8.1) Faculty Membership

Home unit governance documents should include a statement on faculty membership. For units with designated faculty lines, this statement should describe the types of appointments (*i.e.*, tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track full-time faculty, as well as other regular contingent faculty), as well as the expectations required of—and opportunities available to—them. Home units should also include non-tenure-track faculty, or a representative of these faculty, in some governance deliberations, especially in matters of teaching (but excluding those concerning the evaluation and retention of tenure-track faculty). For units with few or no designated faculty lines, this statement should describe the role of affiliated faculty in the governance of the program.

### 8.2) Department or Program Leadership

Home unit governance documents should indicate how department chairs or program directors are recommended to the dean. The process of selection should include open nominations, a secret ballot vote of at least the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and a written communication of the discussion and the vote to the dean. As part of this process, the dean will also request that individual faculty offer their evaluation of the qualifications of the candidate(s) for appointment or reappointment directly to the dean. The dean should consider all communication from the home unit faculty seriously and overrule a unit recommendation only in exceptional circumstances. Such a decision should include a written response from the dean to the unit providing a rationale for the action.

Home unit governance documents should also include criteria and processes for evaluating the chair or director, as well as whether the unit wishes to impose term limits on its leadership positions.

In the event that the home unit has other leadership positions, these should be articulated, along with job descriptions and a process for appointment. (ALSO see below, after section 9.5.6)

### 8.3) Meetings and Committees

Home units should establish regular meeting times throughout the academic year in order to disseminate information and conduct the business of the unit. Tenure-track and tenured faculty with regular appointments are expected to attend.

Service in the home unit is essential for basic shared governance and for providing service opportunities to its faculty. Home unit governance documents should include a list of the standing committees in the unit and a description of their functions and responsibilities. To ensure that faculty are given equal opportunities for service, these documents should also detail the procedures by which faculty are appointed or elected to these committees and to other service positions within the unit.



## 9) LAS Contingent Faculty

Contingent faculty nationally and at DePaul play an important role in delivering the curriculum, may provide pedagogic representation in otherwise uncovered areas of a discipline in the local academic unit, and aid in maintaining the rigor and quality of teaching necessary for the institution and its students. As such, they have a significant impact on the implementation of learning goals at the level of the local academic unit and beyond. In addition, each contingent faculty member is a unique professional who may also contribute valuable information and advice from her or his individual scholarly, administrative, or pedagogical experience. The LAS College Senate affirms the importance of contingent faculty in maintaining the substance and quality of DePaul's pedagogic offerings.

### 9.1) Definition of Contingent Faculty Rank and Titles

The American Association of University Professors prefers the term *contingent faculty* for non-tenure-line faculty, regardless of their part- or full-time status. According to the University Faculty Handbook, there are two primary contingent faculty categories at DePaul, **term faculty** and **adjunct faculty**. One additional category of contingent faculty, **special appointments**, is explained below in 9.4.

According to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2, **term faculty** positions are full-time, non-tenure-line, and do not lead to tenure. The percentage of term faculty in a local academic unit should not be more than 30% of the full-time faculty in that unit, except when exceptions are approved by majority votes of the unit's tenure-line faculty and by the Faculty Council. For detailed rationales for exemptions, see Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.1.

**Adjunct faculty** positions are part-time and do not lead to tenure. According to the Faculty Handbook sections 2.4 and 2.4.1, the dean appoints adjunct faculty on a course-by-course basis. In LAS, the dean delegates the responsibility for hiring adjunct faculty to the local academic officer. The university is not obligated to reappoint adjunct faculty.

Adjunct faculty include:

- Part-time appointments of six courses or fewer per year
- Part-time faculty appointments of six courses with partial benefits eligibility. (Note that six-course faculty need to have served one year—teaching six 4-credit courses—to be eligible for this position)
- Staff with teaching responsibilities (blended positions), formerly known as Faculty-Staff.

Staff who occasionally teach in a part-time faculty role outside of their staff assignment.

### 9.2) Term Faculty

#### 9.2.1) Term Faculty Ranks

According to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.2, term faculty may be appointed at the ranks of Instructor, Professional Lecturer, and Senior Professional Lecturer according to professional qualifications and years of service. Term faculty holding each of these ranks may be called upon to carry out minor administrative functions to help support programmatic and teaching related activities. Full-

time, non-tenure track faculty teach a maximum of nine courses, with course reductions for service and/or administrative responsibilities that are associated with the appointment. See the Faculty Handbook for detailed definitions of term faculty ranks.

### **9.2.2) Functional Titles for Term Faculty**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.3, colleges may confer upon term faculty members functional titles to reflect their particular status or role within the unit. Such titles will not affect the person's rank and should be set out explicitly in his or her contract. Functional titles should not be created on an *ad hoc* basis, but be created and defined by each local academic unit to reflect its programs and special needs. The titles themselves, but not individual appointments, shall be approved by the unit faculty, the dean and the provost.

### **9.2.3) Appointment**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.5, the duties of term faculty members and evaluation criteria must be specified in writing and approved by the unit or its personnel committee. Term faculty are initially hired on one- or two-year contracts.

In LAS, all units shall have a written document that articulates the hiring process for term faculty. This document should include a list of the members who constitute the hiring and retention (e.g., personnel committee for contingent faculty, or the responsible officer of the unit. These procedures must be approved by all tenure-line faculty.

All initial applications for term faculty positions must include: 1) a cover letter indicating teaching experience and interests, 2) a current CV, and 3) additional materials as requested by the unit and articulated in personnel guidelines.

In LAS, before a term faculty appointment is official, the Dean (in consultation with the local unit officer) must send a letter of intent to the term faculty member communicating the length of the contract; the term faculty member's rank; the number of courses to be taught; any required service and/or administrative duties associated with the contract; and, if relevant, the name of the administrative position associated with the appointment and associated course releases or other compensation. In cases of reappointment, the letters of intent are due by April 10.

The local unit officer is responsible for subsequently communicating to the term faculty member, in writing, the functional title of the position (if the unit has approved functional titles in place prior to the appointment); courses to be taught (subject to amendment); specific job descriptions related to administrative appointments; a link to the online LAS Contingent Faculty Handbook; and any other unit, college, or University requirements associated with the position (e.g., an orientation to liberal studies requirements and procedures, honors program requirements and procedures, etc.).

Units are reminded that all hiring practices must be in compliance with university and college policies.

## **9.2.4) Review, Reappointment, Promotion, and Termination**

### **9.2.4.1) Annual Performance Review**

The Faculty Handbook section 2.3.4. mandates written annual performance reviews for all term faculty members. This annual process consists of a review and evaluation of performance during the preceding academic year based on the local academic unit's criteria and responsibilities.

In LAS, the review of term faculty is generally assumed to be more extensive than that of adjunct faculty. The review processes for term faculty should be clearly articulated in unit guidelines and implemented by the local academic unit officer and the dean.

### **9.2.4.2) Reappointment and Promotion**

Successful annual performance reviews of term faculty are no guarantee of reappointment, as the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.6 makes clear that term faculty appointments carry no right of reappointment at the conclusion of a contract.

In LAS, a local academic unit must have completed its annual performance review of a term faculty member in adequate time for the dean or local academic unit officer to give term faculty written notice of the decision to reappoint or to terminate by April 10.

According to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.2, term faculty with the rank of Professional Lecturer may, after five years of satisfactory service and upon a *formal* review of the unit, be eligible for promotion to Senior Professional Lecturer.

### **9.2.4.3) Termination**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.6, non-reappointment of an Instructor or a Professional Lecturer shall involve input by the faculty of the local academic unit as specified in the unit's personnel policies. In the absence of such policies, the decision rests with the local academic officer. In a case of dismissal before the end of the period of appointment, the unit will set forth cause for the action. Non-reappointment of a Senior Professional Lecturer requires a formal review process by the local academic unit.

## **9.2.5) Appeals Process for Term Faculty**

### **9.2.5.1) Appeals**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 5.1.3, term faculty may only appeal dismissal during the contract term if they hold a contract of two or more years in length. Term faculty may appeal non-reappointment only on the grounds of a violation of academic freedom or discrimination in violation of University policies or federal, state, and local laws. Term faculty on single-year contracts may not appeal dismissal during the contract period. See Faculty Handbook for complete guidelines regarding the appeals process.

In LAS, the term faculty member submits her or his request for appeal to the LAS dean. The dean

consults with appropriate members of the University to determine whether an EEOC process or some other unit of the University administration would be the correct unit to address the appeal. If the LAS dean determines that it is an internal matter appropriate to the college, then the dean shall appoint a review board of three tenured faculty in units unaffiliated with the local academic unit of the class from which the term faculty member was dismissed. This appointment shall be made within ten days of the receipt of the request for appeal from the term faculty member. The decision of the review board, as determined by a majority vote, shall be forwarded to the dean as a recommendation for upholding or reversing the dismissal. The dean shall make the final determination on the case.

### **9.3) Adjunct Faculty**

#### **9.3.1) Appointment**

In LAS, all units should have a written document that articulates the hiring process for adjunct faculty. This document should include a list of the members who constitute the hiring and retention (e.g., personnel) committee for contingent faculty, or the responsible officer of the unit. These procedures must be approved by all tenure-line faculty.

All initial applications for adjunct faculty positions must include: 1) a cover letter indicating teaching experience and interests, 2) a current CV, and 3) additional materials as requested by the unit and articulated in personnel guidelines.

In order to hire an adjunct faculty member, the unit must send him or her an offer letter that stipulates the quarter(s) for which he or she is being hired. Local academic units must adhere to Human Resource requirements for the content, timing, and delivery of the offer letter. In addition, the local academic unit must explain any unit, college, or University requirements associated with the courses being offered (i.e., liberal studies requirements and procedures, honors program requirements and procedures, etc.). The local academic unit must provide, in writing, a link to the on-line LAS Contingent Faculty Handbook to all adjunct faculty members at the time of hire and any subsequent reappointment.

#### **9.3.2) Review**

##### **9.3.2.1) Adjunct Faculty With Six Course Agreements**

Adjunct faculty with six course agreements must be reviewed on an annual basis. The local academic unit is responsible for developing guidelines by which adjunct faculty are to be reviewed. These guidelines should include a schedule for review, and specify the material to be included in such a review (such as student evaluations, syllabi, updated CV, and other relevant material). Adjunct faculty have a right to see a copy of their review from the local academic unit. A copy of the review should also be placed in their personnel file, either in written form or from detailed notes taken by the personnel committee in a face-to-face meeting. Adjunct faculty should also be informed about the relationship between a review and any continuation of the appointment or further employment in the unit. The key element guiding the review process should be transparency and collegiality, engaging the adjunct faculty and the tenure-line faculty in a dialogue about teaching quality and standards that benefit the curriculum as a whole.

### **9.3.2.2) Adjunct Faculty Teaching Fewer than Six Courses**

Contingent Faculty teaching fewer than six courses may be reviewed or request a review, as per Home Unit guidelines and procedures.

### **9.4) Special Appointments**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.3, special appointments may take the form of visiting faculty, research faculty, and University Professors. These positions are so designated because the appointment has a definite time limitation or is an appointment whose continuation is directly connected to the faculty member's program. In LAS, such appointments can be made or extended only with the agreement of the tenure-line faculty of the local academic unit in which the appointment is sought.

### **9.5) Rights of Contingent Faculty in the College of LAS**

#### **9.5.1) Timely Appointment**

Contingent faculty members have the right to timely appointments as outlined above.

#### **9.5.2) Notification of Course Cancellations**

If a course is cancelled, both adjunct and term faculty have the right to know the reason for the cancellation in writing.

#### **9.5.3) Notification of Reasons for Position Termination**

If a contingent faculty member's position is terminated prior to the end of his/her contract, he/she has the right to know the reason in writing.

#### **9.5.4) Grievances**

According to the Faculty Handbook section 5.2, grievance procedures are available to all contingent faculty for issues other than dismissal and non-reappointment. See Faculty Handbook section 5.2 for complete grievance procedures.

#### **9.5.5) Participation in Governance**

##### **9.5.5.1) Participation and Representation of Contingent Faculty in Home Unit**

According to Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.4, term faculty have the right to participate in faculty governance except in matters of hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion. In LAS, local academic units must specify in their governance documents a mechanism for term faculty representation in relevant governance deliberations (see 8.1). It is the responsibility of the local academic unit to develop specific channels of communication for the contributions of term faculty in areas applicable to their work for the unit. In units in which term faculty members hold administrative appointments, unit governance documents should indicate in what capacity they are expected to participate in faculty governance.

It is further expected that all unit governance documents will contain specific guidelines for when and how adjunct faculty are expected to contribute to the local academic unit outside of the classroom (such as, for example, when they may and may not be included in faculty meetings, how their views will be

represented in unit deliberations, and about which areas of the local academic unit's operation they will be consulted).

#### **9.5.5.2) Participation of Term Faculty in Service**

While term faculty have the right to participate in service (with compensation when available), local academic units should not expect service contributions from term faculty members beyond those required in their contracts. Term faculty have the right to decline participation in service and should not be penalized for refusing service obligations that are not explicitly part of their job responsibilities.

#### **9.5.5.3) Participation and Representation of Contingent Faculty in the College Senate**

The College Senate includes three representative voting members of the term faculty. The three contingent faculty members will be from the following constituencies:

- Two with six course agreements or holding the position of term faculty.
- One staff member with responsibility for a minimum of a three-course teaching load

#### **9.5.6) Rights Specific to Adjunct Faculty**

*Service Expectations:* While adjunct faculty have the right to participate in service opportunities (with compensation when available), local academic units should not expect service contributions from adjunct faculty members. Members of the adjunct faculty have the right to decline participation in service opportunities.

*Compensation for Course Cancellations:* In the event of a course cancellation, adjunct faculty have the right to compensation as stated in the adjunct faculty information sheet included with the offer letter.

*Summer Course Compensation:* The college adheres to the university guarantee in Faculty Handbook section 2.7 that adjunct faculty members who teach in a summer session will receive the same compensation as for a course offered during the academic year.

ADDITION to 8.2?

**Administrative Positions.** Each local unit should have written descriptions of the responsibilities for each administrative position in the unit as well as processes for the selection of colleagues to fill these positions. These descriptions and processes shall clearly indicate which positions may be staffed by term faculty. Units should bear in mind that according to the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.2.4, duties of term faculty members may not include hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion. Units are advised that any administrative position that comes with course releases must be approved by the Dean.

## Acknowledgements

This document represents the work of many faculty and the dean over the course of four years.

The final document was drafted and approved by the **LAS Faculty Governance Council** in 2009-11, with the following elected representatives:

**Joanna Brooke**

**Roberta Garner**

**Susan Giles**

**Gil Gott**

**Scott Hibbard**

**Paul Jaskot**

**Darrell Moore**

**Gerald Mulderig**

**Scott Paeth**

**Mark Potosnak**

**Ann Russo**

**Jane Tarnow**

**Sandra Virtue**

**Eugene Beiriger, chair**

It was approved by **Charles Suchar, dean**, and forwarded to **the entire faculty of the college** for its approval in May 2011