

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES  
RANK AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA**

(Unanimously approved by secret ballot on February 2, 2016: 22-0-1)

(Unanimously approved on April 12, 2016: 17-0-0)

(Amendments unanimously approved on April 25, 2018)

**Approved by Provost on May 25, 2018**

Faculty in the Department of Theological Studies are evaluated for tenure and promotion in accordance with the *Faculty Manual of Saint Louis University* and the guidelines of the *College of Arts and Sciences' Policy Manual* ("Rank and Tenure Procedures and Criteria: College" at <http://www.slu.edu/x16360.xml>). The Department refers its candidates for tenure and promotion to these documents. Additional departmental procedures and criteria are noted below.

## **I. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION**

### **A. TENURE-TRACK (TT) FACULTY**

In accordance with the *College of Arts and Sciences' Policy Manual*, TT faculty are promoted on the basis of their research, teaching, and service.

#### **1. Credit Toward Tenure**

New hires who come into the Department from full-time tenure-track positions at other institutions of higher education may request that some of the time served at their previous institution(s) be counted toward the time required for earning tenure at Saint Louis University. This request must be made before signing their first contract. In the case of such a request, after reviewing the dossier (*curriculum vitae*, publications, teaching record) of the new hire, the Department Chair recommends to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in writing (1) a specific determination of the amount of time to be counted towards tenure, and (2) what parts of the candidate's prior record will be considered admissible evidence for his/her tenure dossier. The maximum amount of time that can be credited toward tenure is three years. Only those aspects of the candidate's record – post-doctoral publications, teaching, advising, and service – that meet a rigorous interpretation of the Department's tenure requirements will be considered admissible evidence. The Dean's written decision is final and the letter will be placed in the candidate's tenure dossier. **Pursuant the December 2017 amendment to *The Faculty Manual*, any agreement about credit towards tenure does not require the faculty member to use it.**

#### **2. Mentoring**

The goal of the Department is to provide every reasonable opportunity for untenured TT faculty to succeed at Saint Louis University. To that end, one of the most important duties of the Department Chair is to function as a mentor for each new faculty member. Additionally, the Chair will also delegate mentoring responsibilities to a tenured faculty member from the first semester of a new faculty member's employment through their third-year review. The mentoring of new faculty

primarily includes the clear communication of departmental requirements for tenure, and guidance on how best to reach these goals.

### 3. Annual Reviews

Untenured, TT faculty will be made aware of their progress toward tenure through an annual evaluation at the departmental level. The criteria in the annual evaluation are based upon the criteria for tenure, as documented below (see “II. Criteria for Promotion”). It is the obligation of the Peer Review Committee and Department Chair to report to the faculty member any deficiencies or other causes for concern that may play a role in a later tenure decision, as well as to suggest ways to overcome these difficulties. (For the membership requirements and responsibilities of the Peer Review Committee, please see the Department’s *Faculty Manual*.)

- By January 1 of each year, faculty will submit two documents to the Department’s Peer Review Committee: a report of their professional activities during the past calendar year, and a form on which they evaluate their own teaching, research, service, and (if applicable) administration. This form provides space for three successive departmental levels of evaluation.
- By January 15, the Peer Review Committee offers a second level of evaluation of each faculty member on the above-mentioned form, and submits both the reports and evaluation forms to the Chair.
- By January 30, the Chair offers a final assessment of the faculty member. The Chair shares the result of the annual evaluation with each faculty member.

The primary purpose of the annual review is to provide information that allows the faculty member to improve his or her research, teaching, and service. However, if an untenured, TT faculty member is found significantly deficient in one or more areas, the Chair will forward a written review to the Peer Review committee. After reading the Chair’s evaluation and meeting with the untenured faculty member, the Peer Review Committee, along with the Chair, will decide on a course of action. If the termination of contract is recommended, a two-thirds vote by the tenured faculty in the Department will ratify the recommendation.

Satisfactory performance on annual evaluations, however, is not sufficient to obtain tenure. A more thorough evaluation that provides a better measure of progress toward tenure comes at the third-year review.

### 4. Third-Year Review of TT Faculty

In the faculty member’s third year on the tenure clock, the tenured faculty in the Department will conduct a review of the candidate’s progress toward achieving tenure, using as a basis the Department’s criteria for tenure. The intent of this review is to provide the candidate with a clear report on this progress, including guidance about how to strengthen the application for tenure. Faculty who enter the Department with three years of credit toward tenure do not undergo a third-year review **unless they rescind the agreement on credit toward tenure.**

The candidate will submit a complete dossier (both a print and electronic copy) to the Department Chair by December 15. The dossier will follow the format of the tenure dossier as described in the College rank and tenure documents (less external referee evaluations and colleague evaluations).

The Peer Review Committee will evaluate the candidate's dossier. Each member of the Committee will review the dossier in its entirety and make an evaluation. The Committee Chair will write up a report based on a consensus of the Committee.

This report and the candidate's dossier will be made available to all the tenured members of the Department for examination before they meet to discuss the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

At a meeting of the tenured faculty early in the spring semester, individual members will be invited to state their views on the candidate, and then sufficient time will be allotted for general discussion. The assessment of the quality of the candidate's profile will be informed by as broad a range of evidence as is available. Following these statements and discussion, the Chair will state his or her own views on the applicant's candidacy. A vote will be taken by secret ballot. The Chair will count the ballots, which will be checked by a colleague, and declare the results.

If two-thirds or more of the voters determine that the candidate is not likely to achieve tenure, University policies regarding non-renewal of contract apply, as found in the *Faculty Manual* (2006/2008, section III.I.1.4).

After the meeting, the Chair of the Peer Review Committee will revise, if necessary, the Committee's report in light of the departmental discussion at the meeting and then circulate this report among the meeting participants to ensure its accuracy; the Department Chair will prepare his/her own separate, confidential recommendation on the applicant's candidacy; (3) and then, by February 15, forward the report and his/her own recommendation, with the vote, to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Thereafter the Department Chair will inform the candidate of the outcome of the vote, not disclosing the actual vote count.

A positive midpoint review does not guarantee an eventual positive tenure review.

## **5. Application for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Candidates normally apply for tenure in their sixth year on the tenure clock. The process of application begins in the Spring semester of the previous academic year. Candidates and Chairs should refer to the CAS deadlines for their respective responsibilities during that semester.

### *Intent to Apply, Copy of Publications and External Referees*

In the Spring semester, the candidate indicates to the Department Chair his or her intent to apply for tenure, provides the Chair with an electronic copy of the candidate's publications, and provides the names and contact information of twelve tenured, external faculty who are qualified to comment on the candidate's scholarship and standing in the field. The candidate may also submit the name or names of any referees who may be biased against the candidate. The Chair may add additional names to the candidate's list of potential referees. The Chair will select a group of names from the list to act as external referees.

The Chair will make every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting referees. The dissertation adviser of a candidate for tenure and promotion does not serve as a referee. Scholars who have served on the candidate's dissertation committee, belong to the candidate's home Ph.D. department, are former teachers, or are close research collaborators with the candidate must be avoided. Any compelling exception is discussed with, and approved by, the Dean.

The Chair will make every effort to secure up to six external referee reports. In no case may there be fewer than four external reports. External referees will be provided with the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, a copy of peer-reviewed publications, and the Department's criteria for tenure as they pertain to research.

### Internal Reviews

Colleague Evaluations: the candidate will supply to the Chair the name of one colleague from within the Department or College to act as an internal evaluator. The candidate may also submit the name or names of any faculty who may be biased against the candidate. The Chair will select an additional colleague, whose identity will not be revealed to the candidate, and will then solicit evaluations from both.

Teaching Evaluations – Students: the candidate will also supply to the Chair the names of two students who the candidate believes can fairly and accurately judge his or her teaching abilities. The candidate may also submit the name or names of any students who may be biased against the candidate. After selecting one of the candidate's chosen student reviewers, the Chair will select an additional student using the same criteria. Neither student will be currently under the candidate's instruction. The Chair will solicit a form (provided by the CAS) and a letter from both students, asking them to evaluate the candidate's skill as a teacher, knowledge of the subject, and, if appropriate, abilities as an academic advisor.

Teaching Evaluations – Faculty: by the Spring semester preceding the review year, the Chair will ask two, tenured faculty members to attend one or more classes of the candidate. The faculty will submit their evaluations as part of the tenure dossier, using the departmental rubric.

### Dossier and Deliberation

All materials constituting the candidate's portion of the dossier must be submitted to the Chair by September 1. The candidate will provide a print and electronic copy of the dossier. This dossier must follow the format outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences' Rank and Tenure Procedures and Criteria and include all relevant supporting materials. To this dossier the Chair will add supplementary materials, as outlined above.

The dossier will be made available to all the tenured members of the Department for examination before they meet to discuss the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. The dossier will be deposited in the departmental office or Chair's office at least one week before the meeting to deliberate tenure. Faculty may review the dossier, but may not copy or remove it from the office. The contents of the dossier will be kept strictly confidential. Faculty on leave may participate in promotion decisions. If

so, they will be supplied with an electronic copy of the candidate's dossier and participate either in person or by video conference in the faculty deliberation.

At the meeting of tenured faculty, individual members of the Department will be invited to state their views, and then sufficient time will be allotted for general discussion. The assessment of the quality of the candidate's scholarly profile will be informed by as broad a range of evidence as is available. A vote will be taken by secret ballot. The Chair will count the ballots, which will be checked by a colleague, and declare the results.

After the meeting, two statements will be prepared. A member of the Peer Review Committee will summarize and explain the departmental vote at the meeting and circulate this statement among the meeting participants to ensure the accuracy of the summary. The Chair will produce a separate, confidential recommendation on the applicant's candidacy.

### *Materials Sent to the Dean*

By October 1, the Chair will send to the Dean the following materials: a cover sheet on which the vote of the Department is recorded; a copy of the program criteria for tenure and promotion; the candidate's part of the dossier and all additional documents (external referee reports, internal recommendations and reviews, the Chair's two statements and, if applicable, the Dean's decision about credit toward tenure).

After October 1, the Chair will inform the candidate of the outcome of the vote, not disclosing the actual vote count.

## **B. TENURED FACULTY**

### **1. Annual Reviews of Tenured Faculty**

Tenured faculty are subject to annual reviews, as described above.

### **2. Application for Promotion to Full Professor**

**Although** Faculty are eligible for promotion to the rank of Full Professor **at any time, provided they have achieved the rank of Associate Professor, at least five years at the associate level is a typical minimum length before applying for promotion.** The procedures are the same as those for promotion to Associate status with the exception that only Full Professors will serve as external referees and only Full Professors will participate in the deliberation process.

## **C. NON TENURE-TRACK (NTT) FACULTY**

NTT faculty members are individuals who are not eligible for tenure, although some have renewable appointments. All NTT faculty with renewable appointments are subject to annual reviews. They may elect to seek promotion.

so, they will be supplied with an electronic copy of the candidate's dossier and participate either in person or by video conference in the faculty deliberation.

At the meeting of tenured faculty, individual members of the Department will be invited to state their views, and then sufficient time will be allotted for general discussion. The assessment of the quality of the candidate's scholarly profile will be informed by as broad a range of evidence as is available. A vote will be taken by secret ballot. The Chair will count the ballots, which will be checked by a colleague, and declare the results.

After the meeting, two statements will be prepared. A member of the Peer Review Committee will summarize and explain the departmental vote at the meeting and circulate this statement among the meeting participants to ensure the accuracy of the summary. The Chair will produce a separate, confidential recommendation on the applicant's candidacy.

### *Materials Sent to the Dean*

By October 1, the Chair will send to the Dean the following materials: a cover sheet on which the vote of the Department is recorded; a copy of the program criteria for tenure and promotion; the candidate's part of the dossier and all additional documents (external referee reports, internal recommendations and reviews, the Chair's two statements and, if applicable, the Dean's decision about credit toward tenure).

After October 1, the Chair will inform the candidate of the outcome of the vote, not disclosing the actual vote count.

## **B. TENURED FACULTY**

### **1. Annual Reviews of Tenured Faculty**

Tenured faculty are subject to annual reviews, as described above.

### **2. Application for Promotion to Full Professor**

**Although** Faculty are eligible for promotion to the rank of Full Professor **at any time, provided they have achieved the rank of Associate Professor, at least five years at the associate level is a typical minimum length before applying for promotion.** The procedures are the same as those for promotion to Associate status with the exception that only Full Professors will serve as external referees and only Full Professors will participate in the deliberation process.

## **C. NON TENURE-TRACK (NTT) FACULTY**

NTT faculty members are individuals who are not eligible for tenure, although some have renewable appointments. All NTT faculty with renewable appointments are subject to annual reviews. They may elect to seek promotion.

Unlike TT and tenured faculty, whose performance is evaluated based on their contribution to research, teaching, advising, service, **and** skill and knowledge of the field, NTT faculty are evaluated according to their particular responsibilities, as well as service and professional activities related to those responsibilities. Thus, at the time of employment the Chair of the Department will spell out the workload requirements for each NTT faculty member. Workload requirements might vary among NTT faculty, as well as for an individual NTT faculty member over his/her time in the Department.

NTT faculty are not prohibited from being involved in multiple duties related to research, teaching, or service. However, decisions regarding hiring, continuation of employment, and evaluation of NTT faculty performance relate to the primary purpose of their appointment.

NTT faculty are eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor **at any time, but at least five years of continuous service is a typical minimum length before applying for promotion. Likewise, NTT faculty who have achieved the rank of Associate Professor typically serve for at least five years of continuous service before applying for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.**

### **1. Mentoring**

The goal of the Department is to provide every reasonable opportunity for NTT faculty to succeed at Saint Louis University. To that end, one of the most important duties of the Department chair is to function as a mentor for each NTT faculty member. The chair may also delegate that responsibility to another faculty member in the first semester of the NTT faculty member's employment. The mentoring of an NTT faculty member primarily includes the clear communication of departmental norms as they pertain to his/her workload responsibilities.

### **2. Annual Reviews of NTT Faculty**

All NTT faculty members undergo annual reviews, as outlined above. They are only evaluated according to their workload responsibilities.

### **3. Third-Year Review**

There is no third-year review for an NTT faculty member.

### **4. Application for Promotion to Associate Professor without Tenure, or Full Professor without Tenure**

Should NTT faculty seek promotion, the process to be followed is the same as that for TT and tenured faculty, as described above.

Since NTT faculty are only assessed according to the requirements of their workload distribution, the composition of evaluation letters will vary depending upon the responsibilities of the candidate. Outside evaluations may come from comparable departments within or outside the University and may include University administrators, depending upon what is appropriate for evaluating the candidate's primary responsibilities.

## II. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

### A. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

In considering the award of tenure, the Department seeks to apply the highest standards with respect to professional achievement in the areas of research, teaching and service. When making a recommendation for tenure, the Department affirms that the candidate in question meets or exceeds the criteria discussed below. The Department also affirms that the candidate is supportive of the Catholic, Jesuit mission of Saint Louis University.

#### 1. Research

In evaluating research, the Department pays more attention to the quality than the quantity of the faculty member's scholarship. As such, the guidelines below, where they pertain to quantity, do not guarantee that their attainment will merit promotion, or that the failure to attain them will preclude promotion. A determination of the exemplary quality of scholarship is constitutive of promotion.

In assessing this quality, the Department attends to the distinctiveness of the candidate's scholarly contribution, its influence on the field, and the ways in which his/her scholarship reorganizes knowledge. To help with the assessment of quality, the Department will draw on the judgment of scholars from the appropriate sub-discipline within the Department as well as the external referees. While the Department evaluates past accomplishments, it also takes into consideration future promise, and expects faculty to have made progress in achieving long-term research goals. These goals should reflect a substantive extension of their expertise, the growing sophistication and impact of their work, and clear progress toward their promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

The centerpiece of the candidate's scholarly profile will be a significant academic monograph that has been published with a reputable university press or a press of similar stature with verifiable peer review. In exceptional cases the department may recognize manuscripts that have not yet been published but that have been accepted for publication with no requirement of further substantial development or revision. A "monograph" presents the candidate's primary and original research (i.e., not a textbook or collection of essays). The candidate may argue for an equivalent (e.g., a critical edition that attempts to construct a text of a work using all available evidence) by demonstrating that the book or project in question constitutes an important contribution to the scholarly field. The candidate will also have other publications: the Department puts greatest value on peer-reviewed essays in prestigious academic journals, though it recognizes other scholarly contributions such as chapters in high-quality, peer-reviewed, edited volumes and translations of foundational texts. In addition to such work, it is expected that candidates will have made verifiable progress toward their second monograph that reflects research independent of their first project. If the candidate's first monograph is a lightly-revised (or unrevised) dissertation, a higher number of additional publications will be required and a significant portion of his/her second monograph must be completed.

Other types of scholarly writing are desirable (such as co-authored books, edited or co-edited volumes, review articles, book reviews, and contributions to reference works), but they are not substitutes for the types of publications listed in the preceding guidelines. In addition, the

candidate's visibility and impact in the profession should be evident by way of papers given at national and international conferences, as well as other forms of professional academic engagement that indicate recognition by one's peers of preeminence in the relevant field.

The preceding guidelines presuppose a 2-2 teaching load.

## **2. Teaching**

Candidates are expected to give careful and consistent effort to providing their students with an education that is of the highest quality. They should make continuous improvement of their teaching a fundamental dimension of their careers in the department. As necessary or desirable, faculty are encouraged to avail themselves of the many resources the university provides them to improve their teaching, for example, the Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning, consultation with senior colleagues.

The Department acknowledges that successful teaching has many configurations, and that the manner of exhibiting these qualities will vary from faculty member to faculty member. Nevertheless, characteristics of such teaching include: the candidate's command of the appropriate subject and evidence of activities that lead to continuous growth in his/her field; clearly articulated learning goals; setting high expectations for student performance; the ability to organize material and present it with clarity; rigorous standards for assignments and examinations; the capacity to challenge students and awaken in them an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; the ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to creative, independent work; responsibility in meeting classes, grading and returning examinations and papers in a timely manner.

Primary evidence of teaching effectiveness includes the results of peer evaluation based on class visitations, the review of course materials including syllabi and examinations, and the results of periodic and systematic student evaluation, appropriately documented and explained. Other evidence may be included, such as is listed in the CAS Rank and Tenure statement.

In addition to teaching in their areas of specialization, faculty should be prepared and willing to serve the department and the students through effective teaching of introductory courses. They must be willing to teach at all levels of the curriculum.

Teaching includes not only classroom instruction but also a range of supervisory work, including directing theses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, supervising internships and independent studies, and running exams. The candidate for tenure should provide evidence of growing involvement in supervision. Only candidates who have successfully passed their third-year Review will be allowed to direct doctoral dissertations.

Teaching also includes mentoring, such as writing letters of recommendation and providing guidance for course scheduling. Candidates will supply evidence that demonstrates that they are effective student mentors. Evidence of effectiveness includes: number of students mentored and letters of recommendation written; comments in the formal student letters of recommendation solicited at the time of rank and tenure review.

### 3. Service

The Department expects collegiality from all its faculty, that is, respectful and civil interactions with all other members of the University community, and the ability to work collaboratively in achieving common goals.

Faculty members are expected to attend all departmental meetings and participate in an informed manner. They will also demonstrate an informed voting record on all hiring decisions. Faculty are to be regularly present at academic and social events sponsored by the Department, as well as College and University ceremonies and convocations.

The Department requires faculty to be service-responsive, accepting an administrative workload commensurate with their rank. The Chair is ultimately responsible for making appropriate committee assignments. Service on one minor committee (standing or *ad hoc*) in the Department each year is a norm for newly-hired, untenured faculty, with expectations for growing committee responsibilities within the Department, College, and University as the candidate approaches tenure. Ordinarily, no more than two committee assignments, or their equivalent, will be assigned per year to untenured faculty. The Chair will make every effort to allow untenured faculty to choose their service assignments and to protect them from heavy administrative responsibilities. The Department also expects various forms of service outside the University, such as organizing professional conferences, serving as a referee for academic journals and presses, and offering expertise to the wider community. Such external service does not replace service to the Department unless specifically negotiated with the Chair.

In evaluating the candidate's administrative work, the Department is less concerned with the number of service assignments than with their significance and the quality of the candidate's contributions to each one. Excellence is measured by responsiveness to tasks, attentiveness to deadlines, strong organizational skills, awareness of best practices in the academy, and the ability to create and implement new procedures and policies that promote a flourishing workplace. A range of evidence, including letters from other faculty, will be considered in assessing this aspect of the candidate's application.

## B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The candidate's application for Full Professor will present a file that is exemplary in its balance of professional responsibilities. The candidate will also exceed the standards for tenure as they concern research, teaching, and service. The following remarks supplement those outlined above.

### 1. Research

The candidate will have achieved national or international distinction in scholarship, which will be assessed through a variety of means (including reviews, awards and prizes, impact on the field, the ability to attract graduate students, invitations to participate in academic projects, etc.). The candidate's publications after tenure will include at least one substantial academic monograph with a prestigious university press, or a press of similar stature with verifiable peer review, that meets criteria for excellence (distinctiveness of the candidate's scholarly contribution, its influence on the field, and especially the ways in which his/her scholarship reorganizes a field). This monograph and

other publications will demonstrate continuous scholarly activity over the course of the candidate's career and a significant development and expansion of expertise beyond the candidate's earlier work. The candidate must demonstrate an important, vital, and on-going research agenda for the future that approximates the research expected of Assistant and Associate Professors.

## **2. Teaching**

The candidate will have achieved and maintained a record of excellence in teaching.

The candidate will be expected to develop and maintain a strong record of supervision in the department and have a documented record of conscientious mentoring. Candidates can routinely expect to supervise a number of undergraduate projects and graduate student theses and dissertations simultaneously.

## **3. Service**

The candidate will show evidence of distinguished and expanded service to the profession, as well as effective institutional citizenship within the Department, College, and University.

Service on two major committees (standing or *ad hoc*) in the Department, along with significant work on a College or University committee, is a norm for tenured faculty each year. Other configurations of committee work can be negotiated with the Chair provided they do not compromise the mission of the Department. Tenured faculty typically expand their service contributions over untenured faculty by assuming leadership positions on major departmental committees. Tenured faculty are also expected to expand their service contributions beyond the University.

Tenured faculty remain active in less formal ways (for example, as mentors to junior faculty members) and as substantial contributors to the collegial atmosphere.

As a general rule, the major administrative positions in the Department are assumed by tenured faculty.

## **C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION FOR NTT FACULTY**

The criteria for promotion of NTT faculty to the ranks of NTT Associate and Full Professor are the same as those for TT and tenured faculty, with the exception that NTT faculty are assessed only according to their particular workload responsibilities. If a NTT faculty member's responsibilities have been modified since the time of hire, the evaluation will be adjusted accordingly (e.g. NTT faculty will be assessed according to their original workload for years 1-4, and their modified workload for years 5-6). Information regarding all changes in the NTT work responsibilities will be sent to the Dean for inclusion in the NTT candidate's file.