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I. Introduction

The Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality is a unit of University College at Kennesaw State University. The Leven School will be recognized as a collaborative, collegial and diverse group of scholars who value excellence in teaching and mentorship, who are active in campus service and leadership and who are successful in research activities that may involve both undergraduate and graduate students.

The work of a university faculty member at Kennesaw State University involves many different facets that include the four areas of: 1) Teaching; 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity; and 3) Professional Service. We believe that individual faculty should develop goals that reflect their unique ways of contributing to the university and departmental goals. These goals are developed and evaluated each year in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) and Annual Review Document (ARD) process and serve to support the faculty member in his/her annual evaluations as well as in tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review (TP&PTR) decisions. This document is designed to provide guidance with respect to the standards of performance expected by the Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality in each of the areas.

II. Alignment of the Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality with the University and College Strategic Plan, Mission, and Faculty Performance Guidelines

The Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality is committed to achieving the Mission and Strategic Plans of the department, University College, and Kennesaw State University. The guidelines published here are intended to support and elaborate on the guidelines for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review of Kennesaw State University and the University College, as applied to faculty in the Leven School. Each faculty member should carefully consider all guidelines for portfolio preparation and review at the university, college, and departmental levels as she or he establishes goals and prepares for the annual review or tenure and promotion application.

The Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality acknowledges and supports the Resolution on the primacy of Departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines approved by the Faculty Senate (approved by the Faculty Senate, April 9, 2007), which includes the following:

1. Leven School T&P Guidelines that have undergone approval at all levels
(department, college, dean, and provost) are in essence an understanding between the faculty member and the university.

2. Reviews of T&P portfolios at each level (Leven School T&P committee, Leven School director, dean, provost, and if need be, college T&P committee) shall be based upon the criteria spelled out in the Leven School T&P guidelines, or in the case of joint appointments the criteria spelled out in the joint appointment agreement.

3. Letters written in review of T&P portfolios at each level (Leven School T&P committee, Leven School chair, dean, provost, and if need be, college T&P committee) shall make specific and detailed reference to the current Leven School T&P guidelines in justifying the T&P decisions made by that committee or individual.

III. General Guidelines for Faculty Performance

Faculty performance in the Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality is evaluated following the general guidelines established in the College and University guidelines. The general guidelines are given in Section III of the University College Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. The key points of these general guidelines are:

- The Faculty Performance Agreement;
- The Annual Review Document;
- College responsibilities to provide resources for teaching, research, and service; and the faculty member's responsibilities for funding and professional development;
- Definitions of scholarly activity and scholarship;
- Participation in approved teacher preparation efforts and in School improvement.
- Quality and significance (per KSU Faculty Handbook) are the major criteria for evaluating contributions in T, SCA and PS.

IV. Guidelines for each area of review for faculty performance

A. Teaching

As stated in the University and College guidelines, teaching effectiveness is considered to be fundamentally essential for continued faculty employment, tenure, and promotion in rank. Exemplary teaching, which may include supervision and mentoring of students, is an expectation for faculty in the Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality. Faculty must develop, articulate, and implement a philosophy of teaching that will introduce the teaching section of the portfolio narrative submitted for multi-year reviews. Meeting classes regularly and maintaining accessibility to students through regular office hours (at least five per week on campus) are basic obligations of faculty members and necessary for a satisfactory review. University guidelines require
documentation of teaching effectiveness through at least two measures.

Criteria for documenting effectiveness in teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Link to student end of course evaluations for all courses taught and a responsive summary statement addressing student comments;
- Other student, peer and/or supervisory evaluations of teaching and any quantitative or qualitative instrument that may be required by the School or used voluntarily by the faculty member;
- Measures of the achievement of student learning outcomes;
- Mentorship of undergraduate students in research and scholarship;
- Mentoring students on professional or career opportunities;
- Academic student advisement;
- Demonstrations of student mastery of key skills and concepts;
- Syllabi, assignment descriptions, assessments, and other instructional materials clearly delineating the faculty member's ability to fulfill the learning outcomes for courses;
- Development, description and assessment of innovative teaching techniques;
- Curricular development, including appropriate learning objectives, required skills, and instructional outcomes for new or updated courses;
- Evidence of adoption and appropriate use of instructional technology to enhance teaching and learning;
- Evidence of effective advising, mentoring, and supervision of students;
- Documentation of academic rigor, such as class GPAs and/or description of specific assignments or assessments that require critical thinking or advanced skills;
- Teaching awards and nominations;
- Evidence of effective handling of diverse and challenging teaching assignments;
- Mentoring other faculty to enhance their teaching effectiveness;
- Evidence of engaged teaching, or curricular and co-curricular instruction that is intentionally designed to meet learning goals while simultaneously fostering reciprocal relationships with a community partner. Engaged teaching is assessable and requires structured reflection by learners.

Documenting teaching effectiveness should focus on both the quality and significance of a faculty member's teaching. Achievement of student learning outcomes should receive prominent attention in the faculty member's discussion and documentation. Supporting evidence of student learning outcomes can be derived from quantitative and/or qualitative assessment measures. In the performance evaluation process, faculty members may augment student evaluation data with additional data analysis of the results.

Materials presented as evidence of teaching effectiveness will be most informative if they
demonstrate growth and improvement over time. Course revisions and pedagogical change in response to analysis and reflection on collected data demonstrate a commitment to continuous improvement and innovation in the classroom. Faculty members are expected to seek professional development opportunities to continuously improve their teaching effectiveness, for instance, through workshops or mentoring from senior faculty members.

B. Scholarship and Creative Activity

As an interdisciplinary School, Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality recognizes the value of high quality collaborative, interdisciplinary scholarship, as well as SCA conducted by the individual in his or her discipline, teaching, or administrative area. Scholarship of teaching and learning is valued equally to scholarship of discovery, integration and application. Regardless of scholarship focus, a faculty member's scholarly record should include dissemination of material through peer-reviewed venues and publications, and this peer-reviewed status should be clearly indicated in the portfolio or vita as evidence of the quality and significance of the work. Non-peer reviewed SCA should also be identified as such in the portfolio or vita. The review process recognizes the time and intellectual energy invested in scholarship that is submitted to scholarly venues but is not initially accepted. Reviewers' comment may also provide evidence of the quality of the work. In addition to publication and presentation, other scholarly activities include reviewing or judging conference papers and journal manuscripts, writing reviews of scholarly books or textbooks, serving as a discussant where review and critique of others' scholarship is required, and grant writing. Regardless of workload model, peer-reviewed presentations and non-peer-reviewed products alone are not sufficient to ensure tenure and promotion. All tenured and tenure track faculty are expected to pursue and be successful in achieving peer-reviewed publications of their scholarship and creative activity. Expectations for SCA productivity over a three-year period, aligned with each workload model, are displayed in Table 2 of the Appendix in this document.

The following is a list of examples of typical scholarly products. Refer to the section that follows for a discussion of criteria used to determine the significance and impact of faculty work products, as well as to Table 2 in the Appendix to this document.

Examples of Scholarly Products:
Discipline-Based Scholarship (Scholarship of Discovery) is the creation of new knowledge. Products from discipline-based scholarship include but are not limited to publications in peer-reviewed academic journals, research monographs, scholarly books, and chapters in scholarly books.

Scholarship of Application/Scholarship of Integration involves the application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge as well as the integration of knowledge from multiple sources. Outputs in these areas include, but are not limited to, publication in peer-reviewed professional journals, book reviews, and papers presented at regional, national and international meetings, as well as presentations of scholarship at practitioner-oriented
forums.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning systematically studies the impact of pedagogical approaches on student learning. Outputs in this area include but are not limited to:

- Peer-reviewed articles and/or presentations that assess the impact of instructional design on achievement of student learning outcomes publications in peer-reviewed pedagogical journals;
- Presentations at regional, national and international meetings presenting results or findings of teaching and learning assessments;
- Textbooks or textbook chapters;
- Instructional materials such as instructor manuals or student workbooks;
- Written, peer reviewed case studies;
- Development of published instructional software.

Community-Engaged Scholarship and Creative Activity* (Author, 2014) results from a partnership between faculty member(s) and community groups or members, broadly conceived. Scholarship is community-engaged when it involves reciprocal partnerships and addresses public purposes. It also meets the standards of scholarship when it involves inquiry, advances knowledge, and is open to review and critique by relevant scholar and community and professional peers. Scholarship is community-engaged when faculty, students, community-based organizations, government agencies, policy makers, and/or other actors work together to identify areas of inquiry, design studies and/or creative activities, implement and evaluate activities that contribute to shared learning and capacity building, disseminate findings and make recommendations or develop initiatives for change. The findings of community-engaged scholarship can be published in academic venues like peer-reviewed journals and university press books. However, this kind of scholarship often produces other kind of products, including but not limited to published reports, exhibits and multimedia forms of presentation, installations, clinical and other service procedures, programs and events, court briefings and legislation. Excellence in community-engaged scholarship requires that the research be of high quality, make significant contributions to the field, and be recognized by the appropriate community of peers, just like other forms of scholarship. Evidence for the quality of community-engaged scholarship can include the products listed above. Impact can also be demonstrated through the broad distribution of community engaged scholarship products and evidence of outcomes in terms of changes in policy and practice, legislative action, enhancing community capacity, and contributing to public discourse. Evidence of quality and impact can be provided from a relevant and qualified community of experts, which can include scholars, professionals, community members, and civic leaders.

*Language adopted from recommendations provided in Advancing Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engagement (2014)

Criteria for Quality and Significance of Scholarship and Creative Activity:

Publication and presentation venues vary in quality and significance. As in other
Schools, the most valued forms of research and creative work emerge from a peer-reviewed/adjudicated process. These significant activities are distinguished from other SCA activities (see Table 2). A consistently high quality of scholarly work is more important than the quantity of the work done. Faculty members' narratives should make a case for the quality and significance of their scholarship and creative activity as grounded in their disciplines. Indicators may include, but are not limited to:

- Contribution to a body of knowledge or the advancement of instruction;
- Publication or presentation in highly selective venues (where available information on acceptance rates should be provided in the portfolio);
- Citations of work by other authors;
- Evidence of adoption of teaching models or techniques by other faculty;
- Requests for research protocols from others seeking to replicate the author’s study;
- Reviews or discussions of the faculty member’s scholarship by other publications
- Awards of funding or grants (provide reviewers’ comments and funding program acceptance rates where available);
- Awards or nominations for awards;
- Invited presentations or publications indicative of scholarly expertise at state, regional, national or international forums.

Expectations for quality and significance increase with rank and experience. A typical pattern of effective and productive scholarly work is one that begins modestly in the early years, perhaps with a limited or local significance, and expands in depth, significance, recognition, and productivity in later years. With time scholarly focus likely narrows and deepens and all areas of work become integrated.

C. Professional Service

The KSU Faculty Handbook states that "all faculty members are expected to devote at least 10% of their time to professional service activities essential to the life of the institution" (Section 3.3). Multiple service responsibilities are essential to the life of the Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality, University College, and Kennesaw State University. Professional service is broadly defined as contributing to the affairs and governance of the School, the college, the institution, and one's discipline. Service within the greater community that links the faculty member's professional expertise to a project, initiative, or organization is also a part of professional service. As noted in the workload models that follow, in the Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality all faculty are expected to devote a minimum of 10% of their workload to professional service activities. The scope of service activities for each faculty member should be negotiated with the Director in the FPA and related to the faculty member's workload model.

As a School that emphasizes student contact and integration of campus services, as well as program administration, the Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and
Hospitality is committed to valuing professional service and evaluating it by its quality, significance and impact rather than mere quantity. Faculty must make clear in their narratives their individual contributions to committee work or group efforts and the significance of their contributions, in particular, highlighting tangible results that have significant impact. Assuming leadership roles on school, college, or university-level committees is an important consideration in tenure and promotion decisions. Assumption of leadership roles is expected to increase with rank and experience.

Documentation of scholarly service activities, as explained in the KSU Faculty Handbook, will be used to appropriately evaluate faculty contribution in the area of professional service. Evidence of scholarly service could be demonstrated with, but is not limited to:

- Service contributions inside or outside the School, as defined by the faculty member's situational context;
- Engaged, demonstrated participation or leadership in School, college or university committees;
- Directing time intensive School initiatives such as the summer Education Abroad program;
- Service that exceeds what is necessary for the everyday operation of the School, including serving as an advisor to a student organization or planning one- time or annual campus events;
- Engaged participation in curricular and co-curricular policy development at any level of the university;
- Formal program assessment;
- Conducting practitioner-oriented workshops at state, regional or national professional meetings; and;
- Assuming leadership roles within professional organizations related to the faculty member's discipline;
- Non-curricular service, or more specifically, any on- or off-campus community engagement that is not predominately related to teaching or research but clearly complements a faculty member's academic expertise. Service to the community should link the faculty member's professional expertise to a project, initiative or organization. According to KSU's Office of Community Engagement, engaged service "help[s] foster mutually beneficial relationships that serve the community while providing opportunities to further develop socially responsible, civically engaged and educated citizens."

Documents providing evidence substantiating professional service will need to be supplied in a faculty member's portfolio. This may take the form of thank you letters that specify details of the faculty member's contributions, various products that resulted from the service work (pictures, the cover page of a report, etc.), official documents that verify one's service (programs from conferences sponsored by professional societies that document involvement, official publications from professional societies that list role,
printouts of appropriate web pages that list one's involvement), and other such materials.

Professional service may also include the work of individuals who perform significant ongoing administrative duties, including the Director and Assistant Director, and occasionally, faculty undertaking comparable endeavors (e.g. education abroad program development and direction, master course coordination, curriculum development, etc.). Professional service in the form of program administration and leadership is unique for each faculty member based on the specific position(s) held. Therefore, activities and evaluation criteria in this area will be individually negotiated between the faculty member and the Director, with approval of the Dean.

D. External Letters

a. The person submitting a portfolio (herein after referred to as the "candidate") and the department chair/school director (herein after referred to as "chair") develop a list of potential letter writers, twice the minimum number of the total required, with the candidate supplying at least half the names on the list.

b. The chair and the candidate will discuss potential letter writers and in collaboration will develop a mutually acceptable, hierarchized list. The majority of letters must come from individuals who are neither co-authors nor dissertation committee members. If the candidate and the chair cannot reach agreement on the list of potential letter writers, the dean will make the final determination of the list.

c. Individuals who pose a conflict of interest (such as friends, relatives, KSU co-workers) will be removed from the list.

d. For promotion to Full, the candidate chooses 2 names out of the final 3 letter writers; the chair chooses 1.

e. For promotion to Associate the candidate chooses 2 out of the final 3 letter writers; the chair chooses 1.

f. The candidate may veto two names on the chair’s initial list with no reasons or explanations required.

g. Neither the chair nor the candidate may solicit a letter concerning Scholarship/Creative Activity from outside of the mutually agreed upon list.

h. The candidate may choose to solicit a maximum of 5 additional letters of support in any area of Teaching, and/or Service and/or Scholarship from outside the mutually composed list. When soliciting such letters, the candidate will include that the writer is asked not to make a tenure/promotion recommendation as such. No individual may write more than one (1) letter of support for a single candidate’s portfolio.

i. The department chair contacts the potential letter writers by email or phone requesting their assistance.

j. If the letter writer accepts, the chair will send the letter writer the standard KSU “Letter to External Reviewers,” the KSU faculty member’s CV, department guidelines for promotion and tenure, and reprints and/or
professional portfolios or other documentation as appropriate by discipline. It is unnecessary to have all materials evaluated. The candidate should select the work to be shared with the letter writer. Materials should be shared electronically with the letter writer to the degree possible.

k. If the letter writer declines, the chair will choose another letter writer in the order of the list.

l. Once packets are sent to external letter writers, no additional information regarding the candidate’s research/creative activity will be sent to the external letter writer.

m. The letter writers will send their letter to the department chair who will insert the letter into Binder 1 in a section clearly marked “External Letters.”

n. If requests are sent to more potential letter writers than are required, and if more than the required numbers are received, all letters will be included in the portfolio.

o. If fewer than the number of letters requested by the chair are received, the chair will note in the portfolio and the review will proceed.

V. Teaching Workload Models

The Leven School currently has two workload models for faculty (one for lecturers/senior lecturers and one for tenure-track/tenured faculty) and two for the School administrators. Each faculty member will divide his/her professional efforts among the performance areas of Teaching; Scholarship and Creative Activity; and Professional Service; as set forth in the faculty member's Faculty Performance Agreement. As noted previously, based upon consultation between the faculty member and the Leven School Director, with approval of the Dean, FPA agreements may change from year to year and even from semester to semester. The Leven School Director, in consultation with faculty stakeholders, and with the approval of the Dean, will determine which existing (and possible new) FPA combinations best suit school objectives. Illustrative examples of the most common workload FPA combinations likely to occur in the Leven School appear below and in Table 1. Other combinations are possible and can be individualized for faculty with specific, approved goals and objectives. Each unit represents 10% of a faculty member’s effort for the academic year.

Teaching Emphasis (for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers only)
8 course load per academic year (fall/spring)
80% Teaching effort
0% SCA effort
20% PS effort

Teaching-SCA & Service Balance (for Tenure-track/Tenured faculty only)
6 course load per academic year (fall/spring)
60% Teaching effort
20% SCA effort
20% PS effort
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Service Emphasis I* (Assistant Director)
2 course load per academic year (fall/spring)
20% Teaching effort
10% SCA effort
70% PS effort

Service Emphasis II* (School Director)
1 course load per academic year
10% Teaching effort
10% SCA effort
80% PS effort

Table 1: Expected Faculty Activities by Workload Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Emphasis</th>
<th>Teaching/SCA &amp; Service Balance</th>
<th>Service Emphasis I*</th>
<th>Service Emphasis II*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>8 courses/yr (80%)</td>
<td>2 courses/yr (20%)</td>
<td>1 course/yr (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Creative Activity</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Expected Faculty Activities in Scholarship and Creative Activity (over 3 year period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity over 3-year period as specified in FPA</th>
<th>Teaching Emphasis</th>
<th>Teaching/SCA &amp; Service Balance</th>
<th>Service Emphasis I*</th>
<th>Service Emphasis II*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed articles, chapters, major grants or other substantive work product with documented significance and impact.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations and other scholarly products or activities.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These areas define different levels of emphasis on service that include leadership and administration associated with certain types of positions and responsibilities (e.g. director/asst. director)
VI. General Expectations of Faculty

The Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality requires a baseline of service from all faculty members, as outlined in the College guidelines. This baseline of service includes:

- attending required department, College and University meetings, seminars, and graduation;
- working effectively with colleagues on appropriate ad hoc and chartered committees;
- meeting with students and members of the community on issues related to the mission of the Leven School and College;
- contributing ideas and effort to improve Leven School offerings and functions.

VII. Annual Reviews

Faculty members must document specific accomplishments, and the quality and significance of those accomplishments in their Annual Review Document (ARD). In the annual review process the Director will evaluate each faculty member’s performance as Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, or Not Meeting Expectations. The designation Meeting Expectations implies that the individual is performing satisfactorily, while Exceeding Expectations is reserved for exceptional performance that clearly goes well beyond the satisfactory performance in a given area. While not a specific area of performance review, collegiality is important to the functioning of the Leven School. All faculty are expected to foster respectful relationships with students, colleagues, and members of the larger KSU community.

VIII. Expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure by Rank

In accord with the university guidelines, faculty in the Leven School must indicate continual improvement in the quality, significance and impact of their work in each performance area in order to be tenured and promoted. Likewise, in order to be promoted to senior lecturer, lecturers must provide evidence of continual improvement in quality, significance and impact in the areas of Teaching and Professional Service.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

The Michael A. Leven School of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality follows the University’s guidelines concerning lecturers and senior lecturers:

"In most cases faculty hired as lecturers or senior lecturers have as their primary responsibility teaching, supervising, and mentoring and are therefore expected to be highly effective in these areas. Unless otherwise set forth in a Faculty Performance Agreement, there are no expectations for scholarship and their service responsibilities may be limited to the minimum necessary to successfully teach their assigned courses (e.g., attendance at relevant Leven School meetings and participation on appropriate..."
Leven School committees). In many cases their responsibilities will primarily be devoted to teaching multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses. The heavy teaching load of these individuals offsets the absence of a full range of regular faculty responsibilities that normally rounds out the typical full undergraduate faculty load at KSU. Because of this, lecturers and senior lecturers are expected to demonstrate exceptional teaching ability in order to qualify for reappointment at KSU. In some cases the responsibilities assigned to a lecturer or senior lecturer may be individualized and unique. In such cases the responsibilities should be delineated in the Faculty Performance Agreement.”

The process for promotion will be the same as that used for promotion within the professorial ranks (see KSU Faculty Handbook). A portfolio, following the format required by the University, will be submitted and evaluated at each level of review required by University promotion procedures, following the same schedule of deadlines. The portfolio for promotion to senior lecturer should demonstrate exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution, especially in the areas established in the faculty member’s FPA.

Example Guidelines for Faculty

Examples of continual improvement in quality and significance for faculty of all ranks include but are not limited to:

- Responsiveness to student feedback and evaluations as demonstrated by course improvements
- Continued updating and enhancement of pedagogical strategies and skills
- Professional development through certifications, training, fellowships, etc.
- Course and/or program development and implementation
- Recognition through teaching or service awards
- Service effort through leadership (as committee chair) or level (college, university or broader community)

In addition to the above examples, further examples of continual improvement in quality and significance for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will also include but are not limited to the following:

- Collaboration with faculty in other Schools/departments and/or from other campuses on teaching, scholarship and creative activity and/or professional service.
- Demonstrating how one’s work is related to the mission and strategic plan or initiatives of the School, college and university missions (i.e. diversity, global learning, community engagement, transformative learning, etc.)
- Conference presentations (as determined by FPA)
- Peer-reviewed journal articles and/or funded grants (as determined by FPA)
- Being invited to review conference presentation submissions, journal
articles, and/or grant proposals.

- Engaged service efforts through leadership (as committee chair) or level (college, university or broader community)

In addition to the above examples, further examples of continual improvement in quality and significance for tenure and promotion to Professor will also include but are not limited to the following:

- Leadership in development of new courses or programs
- Mentoring of junior faculty
- Conference presentations (as determined by FPA) at national or international venues
- Invited conference presentations and/or journal articles
- Peer-reviewed journal articles and/or funded grants (as determined by FPA) with high impact and/or low acceptance rates
- Being invited to review conference presentation submissions, journal articles, and/or grant proposals.
- Serving as committee chair on college and/or university-wide committee
- Providing leadership in a national or international professional organization
- Awards for teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and/or professional service

IX. Revisions to Departmental Guidelines

The Leven School Department Faculty Council in conjunction with the Assistant Director shall periodically review the Leven School Guidelines and make recommendations in writing to the Leven School Director regarding needed revisions. Revisions to the Guidelines shall be approved by two-thirds majority vote at a faculty meeting at which a quorum of voting faculty are present.
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