**Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual Review, and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

*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.

1. **Committees and Responsibilities**
2. Unit and Department/Departmental are used interchangeably in this document.
3. 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.
4. Annual Review refers to the review and evaluation of unit faculty by the department head/chair.
5. The Unit Promoted Faculty consists of all faculty in a department holding the rank of associate professor or above, excluding those in administrative positions from the department chair/head level and higher, unless specifically allowed by the school/college policy document.
6. The Unit Personnel Committee is the departmental committee that evaluates candidates for purposes of promotion and tenure.
7. The College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee is the committee charged with evaluating candidates from that college/school for purposes of promotion and tenure.
8. No administrator in the appointment, promotion, or tenure recommendation chain shall serve on any unit/department or college/school committee described in 1405.12. All school/college policy documents shall comply with this provision.
9. **Initial Appointment**

Appointments of non-tenure-track faculty are subject to all applicable policies of the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas, the University of Arkansas System, and of this campus. In particular, all appointments are subject to Board of Trustees Policy 405.1 and Board of Trustees Policy 405.4, including, but not limited to, with regard to the provisions on appointment periods.

The faculty and chairperson/head of each department or equivalent unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for the initial appointment of all non-tenure-track 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 of all faculty 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, scholarship (research 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.

4. Academic Policy 1435.50 provides detailed information about the criteria for faculty ranks and titles. Initial appointments of non-tenure-track faculty should be consistent with the criteria described therein.

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 the Unit Promoted Faculty holding at least the rank to which the faculty member is being considered, must review the candidate’s curriculum vitae and other relevant supporting application materials and vote on appointment at the proposed rank. The results of this vote 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. Initial and Successive Appointments of Faculty

Any appointment, extension or renewal of an appointment is at the sole discretion of the University. The typical length of appointment varies by the type of non-tenure track faculty. Specific provisions on the length of appointment by different academic title are as follows.

Any term of appointment in excess of one year, whether an initial appointment or a renewal, shall follow merit-based procedures established in departmental and college personnel documents approved by the President. Such merit-based procedures must include an application for such an appointment and subsequent review and evaluation of the application materials by the Unit Personnel Committee and the department head or chair. Any recommendations must address the criteria for appointment or reappointment reflected in the relevant personnel documents.

Lecturer. Appointment as a lecturer is usually part-time and on a semester-by-semester, or rarely, an academic year basis. These appointments may be renewed if successfully completed in accordance with department, college and university guidelines.

Instructor. Appointment as an instructor may be part-time or full-time and is usually on an academic year basis, though may be for up to a three-year term. These appointments may be considered for renewal for periods of up to three years if successfully completed in accordance with approved college and department personnel documents.

Clinical, Teaching, Research, and Professor of Practice. Appointments of clinical, teaching, research, and professor of practice faculty may be part-time or full-time and may be multi-year appointments. The first such appointment would usually be up to three years. If successfully completed, in accordance with approved college and department personnel documents, an initial appointment may be considered for renewal for an additional appointment of up to three years. After successful completion of a second three-year term (or after a total of six years of appointment), appointments may be considered for renewal for periods of up to five years.

Visiting. Appointments of visiting faculty may be for a term of up to three years and shall not extend beyond a total of three years. If a term of less than three years is successfully completed in accordance with approved college and department personnel documents, such appointments may be considered for renewal, at the discretion of the University. Any renewal shall require a merit-based review by the department personnel committee and the department head or chair. Appointments in visiting faculty positions are not renewable beyond three total years of service.

Executive in Residence. Appointments of executives in residence faculty may be for up to three years and can be renewed with successful completion of the initial appointment. Colleges, schools, and departments shall specify policies for appointment, review, and reappointment of Executives in Residence, so long as such policies are consistent with Board and University policies.

Again, any term of appointment in excess of one year must be merit-based and meet all criteria and procedural requirements addressed above. Any appointment not fully satisfying all such requirements shall not exceed one year.

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.

1. **Annual Review and Peer Review**

A. Annual Review

The annual review process for full-time non-tenure-track faculty at the rank of assistant professor and above should be consistent with that for tenured and non-tenured tenure-track faculty described in Academic Policy 1405.11. All other non-tenure-track faculty should be evaluated in a manner consistent with College and Departmental policies. Each continuingfaculty 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 may contribute to personnel decisions such as reappointment and merit salary increases, as applicable, and annual review results may be 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 non-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.

1. For non-tenure-faculty members on multi-year appointments 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 calendaryear. 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.
2. 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.
3. No later than March 30, each faculty member’s annual review shall be conducted on the basis of the previous calendaryear'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.
4. The performance of each non-tenure-track faculty member shall be reviewed annually by their chairperson/head. Any faculty member whose appointment is not being renewed or under consideration for renewal will not be evaluated.
5. 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.
6. The results of the annual peer evaluation shall be made fully available to the faculty member and those conducting the review.
7. Student evaluations of teaching shall be made fully available to the faculty member. The numerical ratings from student evaluations of teaching shall be made fully available to any persons conducting the annual review. Students’ narrative comments from evaluations shall be made fully available to the faculty member’s unit chairperson/head. The unit chairperson/head shall complete training in the evaluation of these narrative comments prior to conducting the review.
8. Each annual review of faculty holding positions eligible for promotion should provide feedback on their progress towards promotion and include the remedial steps, if any, that are recommended.
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.

1. The responsibility for the initiation of the annual review of each non-tenure-track faculty member, including recommendations regarding reappointment of each non-tenured faculty member, lies with the chairperson/head. The chairperson/head shall make any recommendation for reappointment of a non-tenure-track faculty member only after considering the written report of the unit committee conducting the annual peer review.
2. 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 non-tenure-track faculty member to discuss all issues related to the review**;** however, with the exception of non-tenure-track faculty at the rank of assistant professor, a non-tenure-track 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.
3. 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, or promotion decisions, other University policies and procedures are applicable.

B. Peer Review

The peer review process for full-time non-tenure-track faculty at the rank of assistant professor and above should be consistent with that for tenured and non-tenured tenure-track faculty described in Academic Policy 1405.11. All other non-tenure-track faculty should be evaluated in a manner consistent with College and Departmental policies.

C. Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance

Each non-tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas consistent with their appointment. The criteria for assessing faculty performance is described in Academic Policy 1405.11.

1. **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 scholarship. 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 scholarship, teaching and service, all candidates for promotion 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, as applicable to the faculty member’s appointment.

Each faculty member should actively contribute 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 promotionare 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, Teaching, Research, Clinical, or Professor of Practice

In order to merit promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, the candidate must document high-quality impact in teaching and scholarship as appropriate to the discipline and their appointment. In addition, where relevant to the candidate’s appointment, the candidate must document satisfactory service to the university, discipline, profession, or public. Candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishments in their primary role that indicates progress toward a state-wide, regional, national or international reputation in their discipline*.* Individual colleges or schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

1. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor, Teaching, Research, Clinical, or Professor of Practice

In order to merit promotion to full professor, the candidate must document continuous and high-quality impact in teaching and scholarship as appropriate to the discipline and their appointment. In addition, where relevant to the candidate’s appointment, the candidate must document satisfactory academic service to the university, discipline, profession, or public. Candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and demonstrate a pattern of distinguished accomplishments that indicates achievement of a regional, national or international reputation in their discipline and consistent with the responsibilities of their appointment. Individual Colleges or Schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

B. Procedures for Promotion

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 continuing faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the promotion 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 packet a written list of three to five potential reviewers with a brief rationale for each nominee.

3. The performance of each non-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 scholarship, 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. No later than May 5, any faculty member with an appropriate appointment (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 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 after August 10, except as described in item III.B.9

1. 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 (at a, b, and c) candidate-initiated statements shall not be included with one’s packet once the deadline for initial submission has passed.
2. Each candidate’s packet should include the following materials along with all documentation relative to satisfaction of the unit criteria:
3. A description of responsibilities with breakdown of teaching, scholarship, and service assignments each semester since the initial appointment or the last promotion, whichever is pertinent.
4. A statement of department criteria for promotion of non-tenure-track faculty.
5. Any employment correspondence between the faculty member and their supervisor that clearly indicates job responsibilities. This includes the annual faculty workload assignments.
6. Copies of all annual review forms, recommendations, and associated narratives since the initial appointment or the last promotion.
7. When a candidate’s appointment requires teaching, a summary of student quantitative evaluations 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).
8. 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 scholarship, professional performance, teaching, or service depending upon the nature of the appointment and criteria for promotion within the unit.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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., promotion 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.
13. 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. 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."

1. 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, scholarship, 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.
2. 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 recommendation and recorded vote in writing and forward it to the chairperson and the Unit Promoted Faculty along with a written statement of the Unit Personnel Committee’s rationale for its recommendation. The Unit Personnel Committee shall send a copy of its recommendation and statement of rationale to the candidate.
3. Each academic unit and the library will establish a single, elected Unit Personnel Committee for the purpose of evaluating and voting on all promotion cases originating in the Unit. This the same Unit Personnel Committee outlined in Academic Policy 1405.11 that shall consider both tenure-track and non-tenure-track candidates.

1. When electing members of the Unit Personnel Committee, fulltime unit faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor are eligible to vote, with three exceptions: (1) departments heads or chairs, (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination, and (3) visiting faculty members. If appropriate to the size of the department and consistent with detailed consideration of matters by the committee, a unit may, through its approved policies and procedures, designate that its Unit Personnel Committee shall include all eligible tenured and non-tenure track faculty.
2. Fulltime unit faculty members at or above the rank of associate professor are eligible to serve on the Unit Personnel Committee, with three exceptions: (1) department heads or chairs, (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination, and (3) visiting faculty members.
3. The Unit Personnel Committee must have at least one non-tenure-track member, if the unit has at least two non-tenure-track faculty eligible to serve. Non-tenure-track Unit Personnel Committee members shall not vote on the awarding of tenure or on the promotion of tenure-track candidates.
4. Members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall not vote on any candidate for a rank higher than the committee member’s rank.
5. The Unit Personnel Committee considering any candidate for promotion must consist of not less than three eligible and voting members. In any case where a 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, select and secure one or more eligible members from within the unit. If a minimum of three eligible and intending to vote cannot be found from within the unit personnel committee and within the faculty of the unit one or more eligible members may be selected and secured 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.
6. 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, subject to restrictions specified in this section. Committee members have a responsibility to vote. All voting shall occur by secret ballot.
7. When voting as a member of any Personnel or Promotion Committee (at the Unit, College, or University level) or the Unit Promoted Faculty, 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.
8. Elected members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall be allowed to discuss and vote on candidates as part of the Unit Promoted Faculty (if qualified to serve).
9. 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.
10. Members of the University Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (hereinafter referred to as the APT Committee) may discuss but shall not vote on any candidate on whom they have previously voted during the current promotion cycle.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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 Promoted Faculty. After both meeting and voting independently of the chairperson, the Unit Promoted Faculty shall make its recommendation and numerically recorded vote in writing and forward it to the chairperson. Members of the Unit Promoted Faculty shall not vote on any candidate for promotion to a rank higher than the faculty member’s rank. In any case where a minimum of three of the unit’s promoted faculty 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, select and secure one or more eligible members from related disciplines outside of the unit to serve to evaluate the candidate. The number of outside members shall not exceed the number required to ensure three eligible and voting members for all candidates. A copy of the Unit Promoted Faculty’s recommendation and numerically recorded vote must be sent to the candidate.
14. The candidate’s file of supporting material, outside reviews, the written recommendation of the Unit Personnel Committee, the recommendation of the Unit Promoted 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.
15. 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.
16. 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 recommendation and the candidate’s file of supporting material, includingall materials provided to the chair/head by the faculty member. Any recommendation shall also be accompanied by a written statement of the chair’s/head’s rationale for the recommendation as well as the Unit Personnel Committee's written recommendation, vote, and rationale and the Unit Promoted Faculty’s recommendation and recorded vote.
17. Each college or school shall provide for a formal review of all nominations for promotion by a review committee elected by the faculty of the respective college or school. Upon receiving each nomination, the dean shall provide the review committee with all materials submitted by the chair/head together with any other materials submitted by the candidate. The department/unit chair/head and Unit Personnel Committee should be informed of any additional material submitted by the candidate. After both meeting and voting independently of the dean, the review committee shall make its recommendation and recorded vote in writing and forward it to the dean of the college or school along with a written statement of the review committee’s rationale for its recommendation. The review committee shall send a copy of its recommendation and statement of rationale to the candidate.

1. If the candidate does not agree with the review committee, they may provide the dean with a written response and may also request a hearing with the dean. Prior to forwarding any recommendation and rationale or materials to the Provost, the dean shall report their decision and statement of rationale to the candidate and the candidate’s chair/head.
2. Prior to the time the dean forwards the nomination to the Provost, the faculty member may withdraw from further consideration. Such withdrawal shall be in writing to the dean.
3. Each nomination shall be forwarded to the Provost in writing by December 10 and shall be accompanied by the candidate’s file of supporting material, recommendations of the candidate’s chairperson/head, the candidate’s Unit Personnel Committee, the Unit Promoted Faculty, the college or school review committee, and the dean. The dean’s recommendation shall also be accompanied by a written statement of their rationale for the recommendation.
4. 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 Unit Promoted Faculty, 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.
5. Upon being notified of a negative recommendation by the Provost, the candidate may request a review by the APT Committee. The request shall be in writing and submitted to the Provost by February 14. If the candidate requests review by the APT 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 APT Committee by February 16. The APT 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 APT Committee shall provide the Chancellor with a written rationale of its recommendation. The APT Committee 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.
6. The final recommendations of the Chancellor shall be communicated in writing to the Provost and to the candidate, the chair of the APT 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 APT Committee. If the final recommendation of the Chancellor is negative (contrary to a positive recommendation by the APT Committee), the Chancellor shall provide the candidate and the Chair of the APT Committee with a written statement of the rationale for such recommendation.
7. The final recommendations of the Chancellor and of the APT 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, APT Committee, and Dean.

**V. Dismissal**

Dismissal procedures for Faculty members on merit-based multi-year appointments are described below. Those not on merit-based multi-year appointment are governed by 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 non-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.
3. Hearing Procedures
4. 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 APT Committee. 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.
5. 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.
6. If the individual does not request a hearing, no further action shall be taken by the APT 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.
7. 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.

1. Hearing Committee

The APT Committee shall serve as the hearing committee for dismissal cases. If a member of the APT 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

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

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

G. Consideration by Board of Trustees

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

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