

[Header to be added back to p. 1 when notes are deleted]

Notes for Committee:

1. Unit and Department/Departmental are used interchangeably in this document
2. The Unit Peer Review Committee is the departmental committee established to conduct the (state-mandated) annual peer review of each faculty member. This committee provides input to the Department Head/Chair for consideration in the faculty member's Annual Review.
3. Annual Review refers to the review and evaluation of unit faculty by the department head/chair
4. The Unit Tenured Faculty consists of all tenured faculty in a department, excluding those in administrative positions
5. The Unit Personnel Committee is the departmental committee that evaluates candidates for purposes of promotion and tenure
6. The College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee is the committee charged with evaluating candidates from that college/school for purposes of promotion and tenure.

Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure

(Campus Faculty, May 3, 1990; Revised January 22, 1999; Corrected June 8, 1999; Revised August 20, 2001; Revised August 1, 2003; Revised May 21, 2010; Revised December 8, 2010; Revised April 14, 2011; Revised April 25, 2012; Revised October 8, 2012; Revised October 25, 2013; Revised June 18, 2014; Revised _____, 2019).

NOTE: The title “provost” as used in this document will be interpreted to mean both “the provost and the vice president for agriculture” and the title “dean” will be interpreted to mean both “dean and associate vice president(s) for agriculture” for employees of the Division of Agriculture for whom this document applies.

These criteria, procedures, and general standards, adopted by the Campus Faculty and approved by the Chancellor and President, apply to implementation on the Fayetteville campus of Board of Trustees Policy 405.1. They are also designed to reflect the following statement of the University’s mission and vision:

The University of Arkansas is determined to build a better world by providing transformational opportunities and skills, promoting an inclusive and diverse culture, nurturing creativity, and solving problems through research and discovery, all in service to Arkansas. In pursuit of its mission, the University of Arkansas encourages all of its members to strive for excellence in public higher education, advancing Arkansas while building a better world.

I. Initial Appointment

The faculty and chairperson/head of each department or equivalent unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for the initial appointment of all faculty members in the unit. These criteria and procedures must be approved by the dean, the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (hereafter referred to as Provost), the Chancellor and the President. The criteria and procedures adopted by the faculty and chairperson/head shall be consistent with applicable Board and UA System policies and the following criteria and procedures.

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Below the Rank of Assistant Professor

1. An appropriate degree or professional experience is an essential qualification for appointment to positions at academic ranks.
2. Other important qualifications include experience in teaching, research, or other scholarly or creative activity, and educational service either at other colleges and universities and/or in non-academic settings.

3. The academic rank awarded at the initial appointment shall be consistent with prior professional experience as well as Board policies and criteria adopted by the faculty and chairperson/head of the appropriate unit.

B. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Above the Rank of Associate Professor

In addition to the criteria specified under I.A., the following process shall be followed in making all initial appointments at or above the rank of associate professor:

Before a new faculty member shall be appointed at a rank at or above associate professor, the relevant Unit Personnel Committee and Tenured Faculty Committee must review the candidate's curriculum vitae and other relevant supporting application materials and vote on appointment at the proposed rank. The results of both votes and a letter describing the Unit Personnel Committee's rationale shall be submitted to the Unit head/chair and the College/School Dean and are to be considered in the appointment recommendation.

In addition, consideration for appointment at a rank at or above associate professor may require a vote and letter of rationale from the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee if specified in the College or School policy document.

C. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure

In addition to the criteria specified under I.A and I.B, the following process shall be followed in making all initial appointments where tenure is granted:

Before a new faculty member will be appointed with tenure, the relevant Unit Personnel Committee and Tenured Faculty Committee must review the candidate's curriculum vitae and other relevant supporting application materials and vote on the granting of tenure. The results of both votes and a letter describing the Unit Personnel Committee's rationale shall be submitted to the Unit head/chair and the College/School Dean and are to be considered in the tenure recommendation.

In addition, consideration for granting of tenure may require a vote and letter of rationale from the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee if specified in the College or School policy document.

D. Required Notification

No later than 30 days after beginning employment in connection with a first appointment, each faculty member shall be advised in writing by their

chairperson/head of the criteria, workload assignment, procedures, and instruments that are to be used in assessing their work.

II. Successive Appointments, Annual Review, Peer Review, Third-Year Review, and Post-Tenure Review

A. Successive Appointments

1. Tenured faculty members have a right to a next successive appointment except for the reasons for termination of a tenured appointment specified by the Board of Trustees.
2. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty do not have a right to a next successive appointment but may be offered an appointment after the expiration of a current appointment, provided it does not extend the time in probationary status beyond the limits set in Section IV.A.4 and IV.A.12 of Board Policy No. 405.1.
3. In the event that a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member is not recommended for reappointment, the procedure described in Section IV.B of Board Policy 405.1 shall be followed.

B. Annual Review

Each continuing faculty member shall be evaluated by their chair/head, or other immediate supervisor on an annual basis in accordance with the following procedures as relevant to their assigned activities. This annual review contributes to personnel decisions such as reappointment and merit salary increases, and annual review results are also considered in making recommendations for promotion and/or tenure.

1. The faculty and chairperson/head of each unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for an annual review and evaluation of the work and status of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member in the unit. These criteria and procedures must be approved by the dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President. The criteria and procedures adopted by the faculty and chairperson/head shall be consistent with Board policies and the following criteria and procedures.
2. No later than May 1 of each year, the chairperson/head shall inform each continuing faculty member in writing of their workload assignment and evaluation criteria for the next academic year, as well as evaluation procedures and instruments for the current calendar year. Each faculty member shall also be provided with any standard review forms upon which the faculty member is expected to submit information regarding professional activities.

3. To fulfill the educational mission of the University and in the best interest of each unit, the chairperson/head may later modify a faculty member's workload assignment and evaluation criteria, if necessary. Whenever there is a change in criteria, procedures, or instruments, each faculty member shall be informed by the chairperson/head in writing within four weeks of the change.
4. No later than March 30, each faculty member's annual review shall be conducted on the basis of the previous calendar year's workload assignment and assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures stated herein. The department head/chair shall consider the results of the faculty peer review when assessing annual performance.
5. The performance of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member shall be reviewed annually by their chairperson/head, provided that any faculty member on a terminal appointment will not be evaluated in their terminal year.
6. As long as it is submitted by the deadline established by the faculty and chairperson/head of the unit, each faculty member has the right to submit any material documenting the quality of their professional performance in the annual review.
7. The results of the annual peer evaluation shall be made fully available to the faculty member and those conducting the review.
8. Student evaluations of teaching, including both numerical ratings and students' narrative comments, shall be made fully available to the faculty member and those conducting the review.
9. The annual review forms, recommendations, associated narratives, and all other relevant materials used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member shall be maintained as long as the faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years thereafter. These materials shall be made available to the faculty member upon their request.
10. The responsibility for the initiation of the annual review of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member, including recommendations regarding reappointment of each non-tenured faculty member, lies with the chairperson/head. The chairperson/head shall make each recommendation regarding reappointment (which includes recommendations for non-reappointment) of a tenure-track faculty member only after considering the written report of the Unit committee conducting the annual peer review.

11. Prior to the chairperson's/head's completion of the annual evaluation (including any recommendations based on the evaluation) in any year, the chairperson/head shall meet with the faculty member to discuss all issues related to the review; however, a tenured faculty member receiving a satisfactory evaluation may waive this required meeting. A copy of the chairperson's draft of the intended evaluation and recommendations to the dean shall be provided by the chairperson/head to the faculty member, who shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response before the chairperson/head prepares their final recommendation. A copy of the chairperson's/head's final recommendation to the dean shall also be provided to the faculty member, who shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review.

12. Except for non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, a faculty member claiming that an evaluation or recommendation resulting from the annual review process violates their rights under established University personnel regulations, policies, or practices, has recourse through written appeal to the dean. This written appeal may request reconsideration of the evaluation by the dean, based on specific, articulated concerns. The dean shall make the final determination on the annual review. For non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, other University policies and procedures are applicable.

C. Peer Review

The purpose of the required annual Peer Review is to (a) provide feedback to the faculty member concerning their performance during that calendar year, and (b) to provide input advisory to the Unit Head/Chair in performing each faculty member's annual review.

1. Units may choose to have the Unit Personnel Committee also serve as the Unit Peer Review Committee.
2. Units may also choose to establish one elected Peer Review Committee (separate from the Unit Personnel Committee) for the purpose of conducting annual peer reviews.
 - a. When a separate Peer Review Committee is established, all fulltime tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor may vote to elect the members of the committee.
 - b. All fulltime tenure-track and non-tenure-track Unit faculty above the rank of assistant professor shall be eligible to serve on the Peer Review Committee. In addition, tenure-track and non-tenure track

assistant professors, having successfully completed three academic years of service in the Unit, shall be eligible to serve.

3. Each year, the members of the Unit Peer Review Committee shall elect a chair from among the members to coordinate the work of the committee.
4. Members of the Unit Peer Review Committee may evaluate Unit faculty at any academic rank.
5. Members of the Peer Review Committee shall not participate in their own reviews or for any colleague (such as a spouse) where there is a personal conflict of interest.
6. The committee as a whole shall have the opportunity to provide input into each peer evaluation before it is forwarded to the Unit Head/Chair.
7. All Peer Review discussions shall remain confidential. Committee members shall not discuss deliberations outside of the meeting.
8. Operation of the Unit Peer Review Committee shall be governed by the criteria and procedures adopted by the unit and approved as provided for above, and must be consistent with all applicable University policies.

D. Third Year Review

A written review of progress toward tenure shall be made of each faculty on the tenure track during their third year of the probationary period. As a reminder, promotion and tenure are not automatic based on years of service or performance that is merely satisfactory. Rather, in the pursuit of excellence, promotion and tenure are based on high levels of achievement and the trajectory toward sustained success over a career.

Third year review dossiers should utilize standard promotion and tenure packets. All dossiers should include material documenting the following:

1. Progress in teaching including student feedback (or progress in professional practice in the case of faculty with non-teaching titles)
2. Progress in all service activities
3. Progress in scholarly/creative activities including external funding if appropriate

Third year reviews should be conducted by Chairs/Heads of the academic unit after input from the faculty of that academic unit.

Assessment of performance in the third-year review includes three options:

1. Currently making satisfactory progress - appointment is continued for 4th and 5th years, subject to all University policies;
2. Appointment is continued for 4th year, subject to all University policies and a required 4th year review. Department Chair/Head will address weaknesses;
3. Notice of non-reappointment, subject to procedures outlined in Board Policy 405.1(IV)(B), with the 4th year as the terminal year.

E. Post-Tenure Review

As described in Section V. A. of Board Policy 405.1, every year the performance of every tenured and tenure-track faculty member at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, is reviewed and evaluated by their academic unit. When the overall performance of a faculty member during the preceding calendar year is evaluated as unsatisfactory, the faculty member is informed by their department chair/head of this finding. Overall unsatisfactory performance means that the faculty member's performance as a whole is unsatisfactory, taking into consideration the faculty member's workload assignment areas (teaching/professional practice, scholarly/creative activity, service) and overall contributions to the academic unit. Overall unsatisfactory performance may be a reflection of unacceptable performance in multiple areas or notably poor performance in one area. Before making a determination of overall unsatisfactory performance, chairs/heads shall consider evidence of relevant, documented efforts and outcomes within the context of the faculty member's assigned workload.

Effective July 1, 2019, campus procedures shall require that any tenured faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating be placed on a remediation plan. The remediation plan shall be developed by the faculty member's department chair/head and the academic unit Personnel Committee (or Peer Review Committee, if one has been established) in consultation with the faculty member and shall include remedial measures, including specific outcomes, designed to address the overall performance deficiencies, with the expectation that carrying out the plan will lead to an overall satisfactory performance rating. If, in the next annual review following an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, the faculty member fails either to attain an overall satisfactory performance rating or to demonstrate meaningful progress in remediating the overall performance deficiencies (as assessed in accordance with the outcomes specified in the remediation plan), the faculty member may be issued a notice of dismissal on twelve months' notice as provided for in this policy, and subject to the procedures contained in UA Board Policy 405.1.IV.C.

F. Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance

Each faculty member shall be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of (a) teaching (or professional performance, in the case of the faculty members with

non-teaching titles (e.g. in the Library, the Cooperative Extension Service, Instructional Development, or the Museum)), (b) scholarly or creative activities, and (c) academically-related service.

Each faculty member should be actively engaged as a collegial contributor to the life of the academic unit (e.g., department, school, college, university) and should exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks.

Each unit shall develop procedures for peer evaluation appropriate to its mission. The annual review of each faculty member with a teaching assignment shall include evaluation by students.

1. Evidence of Achievement in Teaching or Professional Performance.

In every case for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, achievement in teaching or professional performance is essential.

Teaching:

Evidence of achievement in teaching should take into account the level and type of courses taught, the course delivery method, and the percentage of faculty time devoted to teaching and/or advising. Faculty must provide item a.i. from the list below and at least one additional item of evidence from a, b, or c below; however more items may be added.

Evidence from these sources may include:

a. Students

- i. Qualitative and quantitative data from all electronic course evaluations and any other evaluations completed by students as specific to the unit.
- ii. Evaluation from former students addressing the candidate's instructional performance and effectiveness in learning course material garnered by exit interviews, letters of recommendation, or other methods specific to the unit.
- iii. Evidence of effectiveness in direction of research of undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students including student completion, placement, achievements, and publications.
- iv. Evidence of effective participation in unit examination activities such as written and oral examinations for honors or graduate degree candidates.
- v. Performance of students on uniform examinations or in standardized courses.
- vi. Evidence of effective advising and mentoring, both formal academic advising and mentoring of individual students.

- vii. Evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre- and post-testing or student work samples) that meet defined student learning outcomes.
- b. Other Faculty
 - i. Evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, assignments, syllabi, and/or a teaching portfolio.
 - ii. In-class visitation and evaluation of instruction by peers and/or administrators.
 - iii. External evaluation of teaching by evaluators knowledgeable about teaching and/or research in the faculty member's specific discipline either in-person or through recorded means.
- c. Instructor
 - i. Self-assessment of teaching such as a teaching portfolio that includes but is not limited to teaching materials, instructional techniques, innovative assignments, course structures or pedagogy, teaching philosophy statements, and/or responses to student and peer evaluations. Although a teaching portfolio is recommended, other methods of self-assessment can be used as directed by the unit.
 - ii. Evidence of curriculum development and interdisciplinary program participation including but not limited to:
 - a.) Development and improvement of teaching laboratories.
 - b.) Continuous improvement of courses on a regular basis and/or the creation of new courses.
 - c.) Development and improvement of distance learning.
 - iii. Design and implementation of individual study courses
 - iv. Evidence of participation in the scholarship of teaching including but not limited to:
 - a.) Publications (textbooks, abstracts, articles, or reviews).
 - b.) Conference presentations.
 - c.) Grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities/course development.
 - d.) Participation in teaching conferences.
 - v. Other professional development activities that support teaching.
 - vi. Recognition of teaching/advising including awards, election to offices, committee activities, and other service to professional associations as related to teaching.

Professional Performance (in the case of faculty with non-teaching titles):
Evidence of achievement in professional performance should take into account the level and type of professional responsibilities, the percentage of faculty time

devoted to various professional responsibilities, and may include evidence from supervisors, peers, clients, and self-evaluation. Evidence may include, among other items:

- a. Annual ratings by supervisors.
- b. Evidence of expertise in the area of professional responsibility and effectiveness in carrying out assigned duties.
- c. Evidence of ability and willingness to accept additional responsibility and/or leadership.
- d. Evidence of cooperation in dealing with personnel at all levels.
- e. Evidence of efforts at self-improvement.
- f. Evidence of innovations in program implementation.
- g. Evidence of the development of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of duties.
- h. Evidence of initiative and resourcefulness in solving unit problems.
- i. Evidence of ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing.
- j. Evaluations by clientele.
- k. Self-evaluations.

2. Evidence of Achievement in Scholarship or Creative Activities.

In every case for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, achievement in scholarship or creative activities is essential, and quality and impact are of the essence. In every case it is the responsibility of the reviewers to arrive at a judgment of the importance, originality, influence, sustained, and future promise of the candidate's body of work. The University process utilizes evaluations by outside experts in the formation of this judgment.

Assessments of scholarly contributions should consider the varying levels of depth, complexity, competitive rigor, and impact of achievements. Scholarly contributions that may be recognized include the following. This list is not exhaustive.

- a. Books, essays, articles, or bulletins reporting the results of original research.
- b. Novels, poetry, plays, exhibitions, or musical compositions.
- c. Musical performances, workshops, recitals, or theatrical productions.
- d. Visual arts, paintings, sculptures, videos or other media.
- e. Patents, processes, or instruments.

- f. Commercialization of discoveries or ideas.
- g. Scientific expeditions.
- h. Designs and built works.
- i. Technology development and applications.

Evidence and context used in judging the quality of scholarship include the following items. This list is not exhaustive.

- a. Publication by respected academic journals and publishing houses that accept work only after review and approval by experts.
- b. Published reviews by experts.
- c. Citations in research publications and other evidence of significance.
- d. Awards for excellence, especially from national or international academic organizations.
- e. Significance of completed performances, presentations, exhibitions, workshops, recitals, or lectures.
- f. Awards of grants and contracts that indicate recognition of research achievement or capability.
- g. Economically significant commercialized patents, ideas, or discoveries.
- h. Impact on public policy or practice.

3. Evidence of Academically-Related Service.

A faculty member's academic service to the community or to the profession beyond the campus may confirm stature in scholarship and teaching, may enliven the intellectual climate on campus, and may improve opportunities for students and faculty colleagues. Evaluations of high-quality contributions of service are valued and may have weight in decisions on appointment, reappointment, promotion, and advancement to tenure.

Academic-related service that may be recognized follows. This list is not exhaustive.

- a. Membership and leadership in committee service for the department, college/school, or university.
- b. Membership and leadership in campus governance bodies.
- c. Membership and leadership in a professional organization.
- d. Editorship or editorial board membership.
- e. Refereeing or reviewing manuscripts or grant proposals.
- f. Participation in certification boards.
- g. Expert advice to professions, businesses, community organizations, or government agencies.

- h. Organization of conferences or other events.
- i. Appointments to governmental agencies.
- j. Appointments to administrative positions with service beyond duties with the university.
- k. Service as advisor to student organizations.
- l. Contributions toward professional development of faculty
- m. Judging student or professional competitions.
- n. Service rendered to a community as a part of courses taught.

Evidence and context used in judging the quality of service include the following; this list is not exhaustive.

- a. Significant service to the program, department, college/school, or university.
- b. Awards, honors or special recognition for service.
- c. Significant service to professional organizations.
- d. Significant academic related service to the community.
- e. Editorial board membership or manuscript reviewer.

III. Promotion

Promotion shall be based primarily upon the accomplishments of the individual while in the most recent rank. Promotion is a distinct honor and is not based upon length of service. The University seeks to develop and sustain nationally and internationally prominent programs in teaching and research. A faculty dedicated to high standards is essential to this effort. The University's standards for promotion reflect these high expectations.

No minimum time in rank is required before a faculty member is eligible for promotion.

In addition to any criteria established by the campus concerning research, teaching and service, all candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to be in substantial compliance with applicable University policies and legal requirements.

The faculty and chairperson/head of each unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for promotion to each rank. These criteria and procedures must be approved by the dean, the Provost, the Chancellor and the President. Campus and unit criteria and procedures must be consistent with Board Policy 405.1 and other applicable University of Arkansas System policies.

A. Criteria for Promotion

Each faculty member who is being considered for promotion shall be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of (a) teaching (or professional

performance, in the case of the faculty members with non-teaching titles in the Library, the Cooperative Extension Service, Instructional Development, or the Museum), (b) scholarly or creative activities, and (c) academically-related service.

Each faculty member should be actively engaged as a collegial contributor to the life of the academic unit (e.g., department, school, college, university) and should exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks.

Although the criteria for promotion are similar to those used in annual evaluations, the relative emphasis, levels of achievement, and cumulative impact required for promotion, as opposed to reappointment, differ.

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (with tenure, if applicable)

In order to merit promotion from assistant professor to associate professor (and be granted tenure, if applicable), the candidate must document high-quality impact in both teaching and research or other scholarly activities as appropriate to the discipline. In addition, the candidate must document satisfactory service to the university, discipline, profession, or public. Candidates must be effective researchers and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishments in scholarship that indicates progress toward a national or international reputation in their discipline. Individual colleges or schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

No tenure-track faculty member shall be promoted to the rank of associate professor without also being granted tenure. (This does not preclude a faculty member from being hired into a tenure-track position with the rank of associate professor or full professor if they satisfy the applicable criteria.)

2. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

In order to merit promotion to full professor, the candidate must document continuous and high-quality impact in both teaching and research or other scholarly activities as appropriate to the discipline. In addition, the candidate must document satisfactory academic service to the university, discipline, profession, or public. Candidates must be effective researchers and teachers and demonstrate a pattern of distinguished accomplishments in scholarship that indicates achievement of a national or international reputation in their discipline. Individual Colleges or Schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

3. Promotion from Professor to University Professor or Distinguished Professor

Specific criteria for promotion to University Professor or Distinguished Professor are contained in Board Policy 470.1 and Academic Policy 1405.13.

B. Procedures for Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

1. No later than 30 days after beginning employment in connection with a first appointment, each faculty member shall be advised in writing by their chairperson/unit of the criteria, workload assignment, procedures, and instruments that are to be used in assessing their work.
2. By May 1 of each year, each faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the promotion and tenure review schedule, criteria, procedures, requirements, and instruments for the current year. Whenever there is a change in criteria, workload assignment, procedures, or instruments, each faculty member shall be informed by the chairperson in writing within four weeks of the change. Each faculty member shall also be provided with any standard review forms upon which the faculty member is expected to submit information regarding professional activities and shall be informed that they may submit as a part of their promotion/tenure packet a written list of three to five potential reviewers with a brief rationale for each nominee.
3. The performance of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member shall be reviewed annually by their chairperson/head.
4. As long as it is submitted by the deadline established by the faculty and chairperson/head of the unit, each faculty member has the right to submit any material documenting the quality of their performance in research, teaching, and service in the annual review, including for promotion determination.
5. The annual review forms, recommendations, associated narratives, and all other materials used in or resulting from the annual reviews of the faculty member shall be maintained as long as the faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years thereafter. These materials shall be made available to the faculty member upon their request.

6. In the spring semester, the chair/head shall begin, with input from the Unit Personnel Committee, consideration of whom to nominate for promotion that year. No later than May 1, the chair/head shall inform in writing each faculty member who is being considered for promotion that they are being considered. No later than May 5, any faculty member (whether so informed or not) may request in writing to the chairperson to be nominated for promotion that year; such request shall be honored by the chairperson/head.
7. The chairperson/head shall ask each individual to be nominated for promotion to submit material which they believe will facilitate consideration of their competence and performance. Since this recommendation includes material back to the time of initial appointment or last promotion, the candidate should consider these items and begin accumulation of appropriate material at that time.
8. The candidate and the chairperson/head should take the necessary steps to ensure that the file of supporting material is as complete as possible to facilitate a thorough and fair evaluation. The completed file of materials must be uploaded to the designated site no later than 5:00 p.m. on or before August 10. No new material shall be included in the files for promotion and/or tenure after August 10, except as described in item III.B.9
9. The candidate shall be allowed to add a maximum of three written statements to correct errors of fact or to update the packet concerning a final decision on a proposal, article or book submission, or similar significant scholarly work, so long as the item was included in the initial file. Such additions shall only be made up to a maximum of five business days after the candidate receives: (a) all redacted letters from outside reviewers; (b) the recommendation letters from both the Unit Personnel Committee and the Unit head/chair; and (c) the recommendation letters from both the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee and the College/School Dean. Except for these three specific instances a candidate shall not add to their packet once the deadline for initial submission has passed.
10. Each candidate's packet should include the following materials along with all documentation relative to satisfaction of the unit criteria:
 - a. A description of responsibilities with breakdown of teaching, research, and service assignments each semester since the initial appointment or the last promotion, whichever is pertinent. This material should address the need for untenured faculty in

particular to be given assignments which provide an opportunity to satisfy the criteria under which they will be judged.

- b. A statement of department criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- c. Any employment correspondence between the faculty member and their supervisor that clearly indicates job responsibilities. This includes the annual faculty workload assignments. In the absence of written confirmation to the contrary, heavy teaching and/or service loads do not mitigate the necessity for research and publication.
- d. Copies of all annual review forms, recommendations, and associated narratives since the initial appointment or the last promotion. Each annual review should include a clear statement that the candidate is or is not making satisfactory progress towards promotion and/or tenure, why, and what remedial steps, if any, are recommended.
- e. Summary of student evaluations (including quantitative and qualitative data) and other evidence of teaching effectiveness. The student evaluations should be based on responses using the instruments and procedures selected by the candidate's unit. The summary should cover all classes taught by the candidate since the initial appointment or the last promotion, whichever is pertinent. Candidates shall include at least one item of additional evidence of teaching effectiveness from students, faculty peers, or self as described in II.F.1.(a, b or c).
- f. External Review Letters. The purpose of impartial outside reviews is to provide an independent, unbiased evaluation of the impact of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service attainment in the discipline or achievement in professional performance. External evaluators may be asked to focus on the impact of research, professional performance, teaching, or service depending upon the nature of the appointment and criteria for promotion within the unit.
- i. A minimum of three letters from impartial outside reviewers at peer or aspirant institutions will be included. External reviewers should possess credentials that will demonstrate their expertise in evaluating the impact of the candidate's work within the context of the discipline or profession.

Impartial outside reviewers are those who lack a familial relationship with the candidate, who lack a former student/teacher relationship with the candidate, who have not collaborated on grants or publications, and who lack any apparent or actual conflict of interest. The candidate shall not solicit or contact potential or actual external reviewers.

- ii. In cases where it is impossible to secure qualified reviewers who have not collaborated with the candidate on grants or publications, as specified in the preceding paragraph, the department head/chair may write a letter to the College/School dean explaining the situation and asking that an exception be made. The dean, after consulting with the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee, shall decide whether or not to grant the exception. A copy of the dean's letter (whether positive or negative) shall be included in the external review section of the candidate's packet.
- iii. To assist in maintaining reviewer confidentiality, the candidate and the department Personnel Committee will each identify four (4) or five (5) appropriate reviewers. (The department Personnel Committee may, at their discretion, seek suggestions from the department chair/head about potential reviewers.) The candidate will be shown the complete list of potential reviewers and can strike any 2 reviewers within 5 business days of seeing the list. The departmental Personnel Committee will select a minimum of 3 reviewers from the combined accepted lists, including at least one reviewer from the candidate's list and at least one from the Personnel Committee list. The candidate will not be told of the final composition of the list of reviewers. The Unit Head/Chair/Dean is responsible for contacting the final list of reviewers.
- iv. Each college shall determine the relevant dimensions to be addressed by external reviewers for promotion to each rank and shall create a list of the materials that will be sent to external reviewers for their review of each dimension (e.g., tenure checklist, some number of publications, student course evaluations, etc.). The candidate's annual review documents as submitted by the unit head are part of the candidate's private personnel file and may not be among the materials sent to external reviewers.

- v. Each college shall create a template letter to be used to solicit external reviewers. The template may be modified as needed based on the nature of appointment and rank of the candidate. Although minor style changes are acceptable the confidentiality statement must be kept as written. External reviewers should be reminded to address all the dimensions of the review. The text of the letter of solicitation is to be made available to the candidate before it is sent to prospective external reviewers.
- vi. All external reviewer letters received must be included in the packet along with a short vita or bio for each from the external reviewers indicating areas of expertise, scholarly achievements and stature in the discipline. The reviews should be based on the evaluator's knowledge of the complete record of the candidate, including a description of responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research, and service assigned during the time period being evaluated. Candidates have the right to review the comments/written narratives of the external reviewers' letters. However, the reviewers' identifying information (letterhead, signature, etc.) will be redacted to provide the reviewer some confidentiality.
- vii. Letters requesting a review by external constituents shall contain the following confidentiality statement:
- "The University of Arkansas makes every effort to maintain the anonymity of external reviewers. Under University policy, candidates for promotion and/or tenure will consider a list of potential reviewers from which final reviewers are selected (but remain unknown to the candidate). Additionally, candidates for tenure and/or promotion may read the external letters of review, but identifying information, such as the letterhead and signature, will be redacted. In the event a candidate requests a copy of an external review letter under the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act, s/he would be entitled to receive a copy of the unredacted recommendation as a part of their personnel file."
- g. The candidate's file of supporting material, written evaluations from outside reviewers, and any other relevant material shall be evaluated by the Unit Personnel Committee. After both meeting and voting independently of the department chair/head, the Unit Personnel Committee shall make its

1 recommendation and recorded vote in writing and forward it to
2 the chairperson and the tenured unit faculty along with a written
3 statement of the Unit Personnel Committee's rationale for its
4 recommendation. The Unit Personnel Committee shall send a
5 copy of its recommendation and statement of rationale to the
6 candidate.

7
8 11. Each academic unit and the library will establish a single, elected
9 Unit Personnel Committee for the purpose of evaluating and voting
10 on all promotion and tenure (as appropriate) cases originating in
11 the Unit. This Unit Personnel Committee shall consider both tenure-
12 track and non-tenure-track candidates.

13
14 a. Fulltime Unit faculty at or above the rank of assistant
15 professor are eligible to vote when electing members of the
16 Unit Personnel Committee. If appropriate to the size of the
17 department and consistent with detailed consideration of
18 matters by the committee, a unit may, through its approved
19 policies and procedures, designate that its Personnel
20 Committee shall include all eligible tenured faculty.

21
22 b. Fulltime Unit faculty members at or above the rank of
23 associate professor are eligible to serve on the Unit
24 Personnel Committee, with two exceptions: (1) department
25 heads or chairs are not eligible to serve and (2) a faculty
26 member who has received notification of non-reappointment
27 or termination is not eligible to serve.

28
29 c. The Unit Personnel Committee must have at least one non-
30 tenure-track member, if the Unit has non-tenure-track faculty
31 eligible to serve. Non-tenure-track Unit Personnel Committee
32 members shall not vote on the awarding of tenure or on the
33 promotion of tenure-track candidates.

34
35 d. Members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall not vote on
36 any candidate for a rank higher than the committee
37 member's rank, except that professors shall be allowed to
38 vote on candidates for University Professor and
39 Distinguished Professor.

40
41 e. The Unit Personnel Committee considering any candidate
42 for promotion and/or tenure must consist of not less than
43 three eligible and voting members. In any case where a
44 minimum of three Unit Personnel Committee members are

not both eligible and intending to vote on any candidate, the Unit Personnel Committee chair, the Unit chair/head, and the Dean of the College/School shall, working together and with input from the candidate, shall select and secure one or more eligible members from related disciplines outside of the Unit to serve on the committee for that candidate. The number of outside committee members appointed to the Unit Personnel Committee shall not exceed the number required to ensure three eligible and voting members for all candidates.

- f. Each member of a Unit, College, or University Personnel or Promotion and Tenure Committee is expected to carefully consider and render either a positive or a negative vote on each candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure, subject to restrictions specified in this section. Committee members have a responsibility to vote. All voting shall occur by secret ballot.
- g. When voting as a member of any Personnel or Promotion and Tenure Committee (at the Unit, College, or University level) or Unit Tenured Faculty Committee, a member may cast one of two legitimate votes: Yes (affirmative) or No (negative). When any committee member (at the Unit, College, or University level) believes they have a conflict of interest with regard to any candidate, the committee member shall state that such a conflict exists and shall recuse from all discussion and voting on that candidate. The recusing committee member shall be absent from the meeting during discussion and voting on that candidate. The committee member is not obligated to state the nature of the conflict of interest. When counting and recording committee votes, any recusing member shall be considered as absent for that vote, reducing the total recorded committee vote by the number of recusals.
- h. Elected members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall be allowed to discuss and vote on candidates as part of the Tenured Faculty Committee (if qualified to serve).
- i. A member of the College or School Promotion and Tenure Committee shall not vote on any candidate from their unit during the College or School Committee meeting. However, members shall be allowed to participate in all discussions

concerning candidates from their unit during the College or School Committee meeting.

j. Members of the University Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure may discuss but shall not vote on any candidate on whom they have previously voted during the current promotion and tenure cycle.

k. All committee discussions and votes shall remain confidential. Committee members shall not discuss committee votes or committee deliberations with candidates or other colleagues outside of the meeting. The recommendations and rationale concerning any candidate shall only be communicated through the appropriate voting form and the committee chair's official letter.

l. Each College/School or Unit may develop additional, specific policies concerning the Unit Personnel Committee so long as these policies do not conflict with this policy.

12. The candidate's file of supporting material, written evaluations from outside reviewers, any other relevant material evaluated by the Unit Personnel Committee, and the Unit Personnel Committee's recommendation and recorded vote shall be evaluated by the unit's tenured faculty. After both meeting and voting independently of the chairperson, the unit tenured faculty shall make its recommendation and numerically recorded vote in writing and forward it to the chairperson. A copy of the tenured faculty's recommendation and numerically recorded vote must be sent to the candidate.

13. The candidate's file of supporting material, outside reviews, the written recommendation of the Unit Personnel Committee, the recommendation of the tenured faculty, and any other relevant material shall be evaluated by the chair/head in deciding whether to make a positive or negative recommendation. The chair/head shall inform the faculty member in writing of their recommendation and the rationale for the recommendation.

14. Prior to the time the chair/head forwards the nomination to the dean, the faculty member may withdraw from further consideration. Such withdrawal shall be in writing to the chairperson.

15. Each nomination shall be forwarded to the dean in writing by a date to be established by the college or school between October 22 and November 20 and shall be accompanied by the chair's/head's

1 recommendation and the candidate's file of supporting material,
2 including all materials provided to the chair/head by the faculty
3 member. Any recommendation shall also be accompanied by a
4 written statement of the chair's/head's rationale for the
5 recommendation as well as the Unit Personnel Committee's written
6 recommendation, vote, and rationale and the tenured faculty's
7 recommendation and recorded vote.

8
9 16. Each college or school shall provide for a formal review of all
10 nominations for promotion by a review committee elected by the
11 faculty of the respective college or school. Upon receiving each
12 nomination, the dean shall provide the review committee with all
13 materials submitted by the chair/head together with any other
14 materials submitted by the candidate. The department/unit
15 chair/head and Unit Personnel Committee should be informed of
16 any additional material submitted by the candidate. After both
17 meeting and voting independently of the dean, the review
18 committee shall make its recommendation and recorded vote in
19 writing and forward it to the dean of the college or school along with
20 a written statement of the review committee's rationale for its
21 recommendation. The review committee shall send a copy of its
22 recommendation and statement of rationale to the candidate.

23
24 17. If the candidate does not agree with the review committee, they
25 may provide the dean with a written response and may also request
26 a hearing with the dean. Prior to forwarding any recommendation
27 and rationale or materials to the Provost, the dean shall report their
28 decision and statement of rationale to the candidate and the
29 candidate's chair/head.

30
31 18. Prior to the time the dean forwards the nomination to the Provost,
32 the faculty member may withdraw from further consideration. Such
33 withdrawal shall be in writing to the dean.

34
35 19. Each nomination shall be forwarded to the Provost in writing by
36 December 10 and shall be accompanied by the candidate's file of
37 supporting material, recommendations of the candidate's
38 chairperson/head, the candidate's Unit Personnel Committee, the
39 tenured faculty of the unit, the college or school review committee,
40 and the dean. The dean's recommendation shall also be
41 accompanied by a written statement of their rationale for the
42 recommendation.

20. The Provost shall evaluate the submitted materials and shall communicate their recommendations in writing by January 28 to the candidate, to the Chancellor, to the candidate's dean and to the candidate's chair/head. Concurrent with each positive recommendation, the Provost shall also forward the candidate's file of supporting material, recommendations of the candidate's Unit Personnel Committee, the tenured faculty of the unit, the candidate's chair/head, the college or school review committee, and the dean (including a copy of the dean's written statement of rationale concerning the recommendation) to the Chancellor. If the Provost makes a negative recommendation, they shall provide the candidate with notice of the negative recommendation by January 28 accompanied by a written statement of the rationale for such recommendation.

21. Upon being notified of a negative recommendation by the Provost, the candidate may request a review by the Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (hereinafter referred to as the Tenure Committee). The request shall be in writing and submitted to the Provost by February 14. If the candidate requests review by the Tenure Committee, the Provost shall submit to the committee all recommendations and materials used at every stage of the matter. The complete file of materials shall be submitted to the chair of the Tenure Committee by February 16. The Tenure Committee will have access to the files of all candidates for the current year within the candidate's college. The candidate should include documentation in the appeal file of any deviation from the procedures of this section that is considered by the candidate to have damaged their application. The Tenure Committee shall provide the Chancellor with a written statement of its recommendation and the rationale therefor, and shall also provide copies of the statement of recommendation and rationale to the candidate and to the Provost and the candidate's dean and chairperson/head by March 5.

22. The final recommendations of the Chancellor shall be communicated in writing to the Provost and to the candidate, the chair of the Tenure Committee, the candidate's dean, and the candidate's Unit chair/head. In addition, the final recommendations for all candidates shall be communicated in writing to the chair of the Tenure Committee. If the final recommendation of the Chancellor is negative (contrary to a positive recommendation by the Tenure Committee), the Chancellor shall provide the candidate

and the Chair of the Tenure committee with a written statement of the rationale for such recommendation.

23. The final recommendations of the Chancellor and of the Tenure Committee shall be made to the President and the Board of Trustees in time for the Board's consideration of the promotion for the next academic year. If the candidate receives a negative recommendation from the Chancellor, the candidate shall have five (5) business days to furnish a concise statement responding to the Chancellor's recommendation, which the Chancellor will forward to the President for consideration, with copies to the Provost, Tenure Committee, and Dean.

V. Tenure

The faculty and chairperson of each unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for the granting of tenure. These criteria and procedures must be approved by the dean, the Provost, the Chancellor and the President. The criteria and procedures adopted by the faculty and chairperson/head shall be consistent with Board policies and the following criteria and procedures.

A. Criteria for Awarding Tenure

The University seeks to develop and sustain nationally and internationally prominent programs in teaching and research. A faculty dedicated to high standards is essential to this effort. The University's standards for tenure reflect these high expectations.

Ordinarily, attainment of tenure requires outstanding performance in research and teaching or professional performance in the case of faculty with non-teaching titles; merely good or satisfactory performance is not considered sufficient for a favorable tenure decision. Attainment of tenure requires a high standard of performance in both research and teaching, and acceptable performance in service, as well as a clear indication that such a performance level will be maintained over a career as a faculty member at the University. Otherwise, although the emphasis on accomplishment and potential contribution may differ, the criteria for the granting of tenure include the criteria for promotion contained in Section III.A of this document.

B. Procedures for Awarding Tenure

The procedures for the granting of tenure are the same as the procedures for promotion contained in Section III.B of this document provided that the final recommendation of the Chancellor and the Tenure Committee shall be made solely to the President.

C. Procedures for Suspending Probationary Period

The probationary period may not extend beyond seven years, except as specifically provided herein, or as otherwise required by law. An initial appointment of one-half year (academic or fiscal) or less will not be included in the probationary period. If more than one-half of any year is spent in approved leave of absence without pay status, that year shall not apply toward the probationary period.

During the first six years of the probationary period, a tenure-track faculty member may request, for reasons set forth below, that the probationary period be suspended by one (1) year. The reasons for such a request will generally be the same as required under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as amended, and are as follows: (a) the birth of a child to the faculty member or spouse and the child's care during the first year; (b) the adoption of a child by the faculty member or placement in the faculty member's home of a foster child within the first year of placement; (c) the care of the faculty member's spouse, child, or parent with a serious health condition; (d) the serious health condition of the faculty member that makes the faculty member unable to perform the functions of their job; (e) a qualifying exigency arising from the military deployment of an employee's spouse, child, or parent to a foreign country; (f) to care for a covered service member with a serious injury or illness if the employee is the spouse, child, parent, or next of kin of the service member.

On the rare occasion that an additional one-year extension is requested, such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. However, the faculty member will receive any leave to which they are entitled under the FMLA.

A request to suspend the probationary period for these reasons must be made at the time of the qualifying event and shall first be directed in writing to the department chair/head for approval and must also be approved by the dean (or approved through other established administrative channels), the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President, under such procedures as the President shall approve. These procedures may include, but shall not be limited to, the manner in which the faculty member's duties and salary, if any, are determined during such year, the information which is required to substantiate a request and the extent to which a faculty member's performance during such year may be considered in awarding tenure. A faculty member who has been notified that they will not be reappointed may not subsequently request to suspend the probationary period under this policy.

If the faculty member would prefer not to disclose the pertinent information to the chair/head, the faculty member may submit their written request and documentation directly to the Director of Human Resources. The Director will, within five (5) business days, make an assessment of whether the request falls under FMLA guidelines and communicate this assessment directly to the chair/head.

The period of any suspension of a faculty member's probationary period shall be the academic year (in the case of nine-month appointees) or the fiscal year (in the case of twelve-month appointees).

All requests for suspension of the probationary period shall (1) specify which of the six grounds for a suspension under Board Policy 405.1 is relevant to this request, (2) explain the circumstances, and (3) supply such medical or other documentation as might reasonably be required. To the extent necessary to properly evaluate the request, the chair/head may ask the faculty member for clarification or supplemental documentation. As quickly as possible after the request is presented, the chair/head and the faculty member shall discuss the request and implementation of the requisite leave period, if applicable.

The chair/head shall consider the request and submit their recommendation to the dean. The dean shall consider the request and submit their recommendation to the Provost as soon as possible but in no event later than two business weeks from the date of the faculty member's presenting their request to the chair/head.

The Provost shall consider the request and notify the faculty member of their recommendation as soon as possible but in no event later than two business weeks from the date of their receipt of the request. If the recommendation is to be negative, the faculty member may appeal to the Tenure Committee. The recommendation of the Provost and the Tenure Committee shall be submitted by the Provost to the Chancellor within one business week of the receipt of the recommendation of the Tenure Committee.

The Chancellor shall consider the request and submit their recommendation to the President as soon as possible but in no event later than two business weeks from the date of their receipt of the request.

As each administrator makes their recommendation, they shall notify the faculty member of the recommendation.

In connection with any faculty member whose probationary period has been suspended, each person involved in making a recommendation or decision

regarding promotion or tenure of the faculty member shall use their discretion as to whether to consider the faculty member's performance during the year of suspension and, if so, how much weight to give to such performance. If there is an approved tenure extension which is granted prior to the 3rd year review, the 3rd year review is also delayed by one year. If the extension is after the 3rd year review, only the tenure and promotion decision is delayed.

No person involved in the promotion and tenure process shall consider the fact of a faculty member's having sought or obtained a suspension of the probationary period under this policy in decisions concerning promotion or tenure of the faculty member.

If the tenure clock suspension request is granted, an appropriate indication shall be placed in the applicant's promotion file. All documentation regarding the rationale for the request shall be kept confidential and maintained in a file separate from the faculty member's official institutional personnel file. This confidential file may be accessed by and a copy must be released to the applicant upon request.

As part of the approval of a request to suspend the probationary period, the faculty member will be notified of (and acknowledge) the specific period of service which will not be counted towards tenure and of the adjusted timing of the faculty member's probationary period (including the mandatory tenure review). Any extension of the probationary period is subject to all other applicable policies.

Any faculty member whose request does not receive a favorable recommendation by the chancellor may submit within ten business days additional reasons or information to support a request for reconsideration by the chancellor. After considering such material, the chancellor shall promptly make a final recommendation to the president.

D. Mandatory Sixth Year Review - Terminal Appointment

An individual in a tenure-track position who was not awarded tenure within any of the first six academic year or fiscal year appointments must be evaluated for tenure as set forth in Section IV.A. Board Policy 405.1 during the sixth appointment. If they are not approved for tenure, the seventh appointment shall be a terminal appointment and the individual may not be reconsidered for tenure during the seventh appointment. Additionally, no individual shall be considered for tenure and/or promotion during a terminal appointment.

V. Dismissal of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

This section applies to all tenure-track or tenured faculty members and is intended to implement Board of Trustees Policy 405.1.IV.C. Dismissal of nontenure-track faculty and other personnel is addressed in Board Policy 405.4.

A. Preliminary Proceedings

1. Except in circumstances where there are personal safety concerns and consistent with applicable law, when a chair/head or dean has reason to consider a decision to dismiss a tenured or tenure-track faculty member prior to the expiration of an appointment, the chair/head or dean shall first discuss the matter with the faculty member privately. After the discussion, if the decision of the chair/head or dean is to recommend dismissal, they shall prepare a statement of the grounds constituting the cause for dismissal and forward it through the Provost to the Chancellor, with a copy to the faculty member. If there are personal safety concerns, the private meeting can be bypassed and the chair/head or dean can proceed with providing the statement of grounds for dismissal through the Provost to the Chancellor, with a copy to the faculty member. If the Chancellor, after considering the recommendation of the chair/head or dean, decides that a proceeding should be undertaken, action shall be commenced according to the procedures which follow.

2. If requested by either party, or if directed by the Chancellor, prior to further steps in the process, the parties shall engage in informal discussions to determine whether an acceptable resolution of the matter is possible. Such discussions may include assistance of one or more faculty selected for this purpose.

B. Hearing Procedures

1. The formal proceedings shall be initiated by a communication addressed to the individual by the Chancellor informing the faculty member of the dismissal and the grounds for it, and that, if they so request, a hearing to recommend whether their employment by the University shall be terminated on the grounds stated, will be conducted at a specified time and place by the University Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure. Sufficient time shall be allowed to permit the individual to prepare a defense. The individual shall be informed in detail, or by reference to published regulations, of the procedural rights to which they are entitled, including the right to advice of counsel.

2. The individual shall indicate whether they desire a hearing. If the individual desires a hearing, they shall, within 14 days of the mailing of the Chancellor's letter, file with the Chancellor an answer to the statement of grounds for the proposed dismissal.
3. If the individual does not request a hearing, no further action shall be taken by the Tenure Committee, and the termination shall proceed. Further, at the request of the individual the proceedings provided for herein may be terminated at any time after the request for a hearing on written notice to the Chancellor of the employee's acquiescence in the dismissal. Similarly, the administration may drop dismissal proceedings at any stage.

C. Suspension Pending Dismissal Proceedings

Suspension of the individual from normal duties or reassignment to other duties during the proceedings will occur only if circumstances exist which threaten harm or substantial disruption to the individual, to others, or to the University. Such determination shall be made by the Chancellor, in consultation with the President. Such suspension shall be with pay. This provision does not preclude disciplinary suspension without pay.

D. Hearing Committee

The Tenure Committee shall serve as the hearing committee for dismissal cases. If a member of the Tenure Committee is from the same department as the faculty member requesting the hearing, that member shall not serve on the hearing committee for that case. Upon receipt from the Chancellor of a copy of the statement of grounds for dismissal, accompanied by the individual's answer thereto, the chair of the hearing committee shall conduct hearings and recommend a course of action as provided in Section V.5.

E. Committee Proceedings

1. The committee shall proceed by considering, before the time of the hearing, the statement of grounds for dismissal already formulated and the individual's written response.
2. In addition to the members of the committee and its representative, only the person requesting the hearing and their representative, the Chancellor or their designee, and a representative, and witnesses called by the committee are permitted to attend the hearing.

3. Charges contained in the initially formulated statement of grounds for dismissal may be supplemented at the hearing by evidence of new events occurring after the initial communication to the individual which constitute new or additional cause for dismissal. If such supplementary grounds are adduced, the committee shall provide the individual with sufficient time to prepare their defense.
4. The Chancellor of the campus shall have the option to attend or not to attend the hearing, and they may select a designee to assist in developing and presenting the case. The Chancellor or designee may be assisted by the representative in developing and presenting the case and in other matters related to the hearing.
5. The committee shall determine the order of proof and shall supervise the questioning of witnesses. The committee may decline to accept unnecessarily duplicative material or unduly lengthy or repetitive testimony.
6. The individual shall have the aid of the committee when needed in securing the attendance of witnesses. The individual or their representative and the Chancellor (or designee) or their representative shall have the right within reasonable limits to question all witnesses who testify orally.
7. The committee will use its best efforts to provide an opportunity for those involved to confront all witnesses, but where this cannot be achieved despite the efforts of the hearing committee, the identity of such non-appearing witnesses, and any written evidence they may have furnished, shall be disclosed to all interested parties during the hearing.
8. Subject to these safeguards, written statements may, when necessary, be taken outside the hearing and reported to it. All of the evidence shall be duly recorded. These are not legal proceedings and formal rules of court procedure or evidence do not apply, but the committee shall exercise reasonable efforts to protect the rights of the parties in the receipt of evidence. For purposes of illustration, the proceedings shall be recorded digitally rather than via court reporter, and witnesses will not be sworn or subpoenaed. The ultimate objective of the hearing is consideration of the matter in a fair and efficient manner.

F. Consideration by Hearing Committee

1 The committee shall formulate its recommendation in private, on the basis of the
2 hearing. Before doing so, it shall give opportunity to the individual and the
3 Chancellor or their designated representative to make oral statements before it. If
4 written arguments are desired, the committee may request them. The committee
5 shall make its recommendation promptly, including explicit findings with respect
6 to each of the grounds for removal presented.

7
8 The Chancellor and the individual shall be notified of the recommendation in
9 writing and a copy of the record of the hearing shall be available to both parties.
10 A copy of the record of the hearing and the recommendations of the hearing
11 committee shall be furnished to the President of the University for their decision.
12 The decision of the President shall be transmitted to the Chancellor and to the
13 individual involved.

14 15 G. Consideration by Board of Trustees

16
17 If the decision of the President is appealed to the Board of Trustees, or if the
18 Board of Trustees chooses to review the case, the President shall transmit to the
19 Board of Trustees the full report of the hearing committee, stating its
20 recommendation and their own decision. The review shall be based on the
21 record of the previous hearing, accompanied by opportunity for argument, oral or
22 written or both, by the principals at the hearing or by their representatives. The
23 decision of the Board of Trustees on review shall be final. It shall be
24 communicated to the President and through him or her to the person involved.

25
26 If the decision of the Board is that the faculty member is to be terminated, and
27 the termination is based on unsatisfactory performance, the termination becomes
28 effective at the conclusion of the twelve-month period from the date of the initial
29 notice of termination. If that period has elapsed, or if the termination is based on
30 other grounds of cause, the termination becomes effectively immediately
31 following the Board's decision.