

# **Policies 6-302, 6-303, 6-003 Appendix: Revisions of Policies on Faculty Appointments and Related Matters**

**Faculty Appointments Policies Proposal-- 2007 (final version, 2007-04-02)**

Background memorandum

## **SEQ Chapter 1 Memorandum**

**To: Senior Vice Presidents David W. Pershing and A. Lorris Betz**

**From: Associate Vice Presidents Susan M. Olson and Richard J. Sperry**

**Date: February 12, 2007**

**THIS DESCRIBES A PROPOSAL FOR REVISING VARIOUS PORTIONS OF UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO MAKING FACULTY APPOINTMENTS.**

### **I. Background**

Since June 2005, an ad hoc committee formed at the request of the Academic Senate Executive Committee has been developing this proposal for revising University policies on appointments of faculty and the closely related matter of granting tenure at the time of a faculty appointment.

The project was begun in response to a report made to the Executive Committee by a panel of the Consolidated Hearing Committee. The CHC panel had investigated a complaint about a particular incident in which there were significant misunderstandings between a faculty appointment candidate and the academic department which hired the candidate, and between administrators and the existing faculty of the department. The CHC panel reported to the Executive Committee that the unfortunate misunderstandings in that incident raised broader concerns about a lack of clarity in existing policies and procedures related to faculty appointments. The Executive Committee learned that other problematic incidents had occurred in recent years, raising similar concerns about inadequacy of existing regulations. Most

prominently, there were concerns about inadequacy of rules to ensure that administrators consult fully with departmental faculty before committing to the key terms of a faculty appointment, including the rank and tenure status of the appointment. The Executive Committee charged the ad hoc committee to carefully examine relevant existing policies and procedures, and then to “develop a proposal for revising University regulations so as to provide very clear requirements for the appropriate sequence of events in a hiring process.”

The proposal now being presented fulfills that charge. In addition, in carefully examining existing regulations, the committee identified a number of areas in which existing regulations are inappropriately silent, confusing, contradictory, or more fundamentally incorporate what is simply bad policy. Most of those problems are closely related to the faculty appointments process, and others are more distantly related but appear within the same portions of PPM that will need to be revised for the core of this project, and so included in this proposal are recommendations for resolving that broader set of problems.

Members of the committee were Bob Flores--Chair (Academic Senate President 2005-06, Professor of Law), Susan Olson (Associate V.P. Academic Affairs, Professor of Political Science), Richard Sperry (Assoc. V.P. Health Sciences, Assoc. Dean of Medicine, Professor of Anesthesiology), Joanne Yaffe (Senate Executive Committee Secretary, Assoc. Prof. Social Work), Leslie Francis (Senate Executive Committee, Professor of Law, Professor of Philosophy, Chair of Philosophy), Larry DeVries (Academic Senate President 2004-05, Distinguished Professor of Engineering). Karen Dace (Assoc. V.P. for Diversity, Assoc. Prof. Communication) assisted in limited parts of the project.

## **II. Guiding principles for the proposed revisions:**

- A. Clarity in describing the procedures to be followed, so that all persons involved in making an appointment can with relative ease understand what must be done, by whom, and when. With the degree of clarity achieved if these recommendations

are adopted, there will be minimal likelihood of misunderstanding the steps to be taken, and therefore little likelihood of any significant step being overlooked.

- B. Integration of regulations applicable when a particular candidacy involves multiple decisions. For example, when a senior level outside candidate is being considered to receive both an administrative appointment, and a faculty appointment, and being considered for granting of tenure at the time of appointment, there is a need to coordinate three distinct sets of procedures. The proposed revisions would provide a basic level of guidance for such coordinated activities.
- C. Comprehensive coverage- so that at least the most important aspects of most appointment proceedings are encompassed in the regulations. In particular, in a few areas the committee found that important, desirable, long-established practices were either entirely unacknowledged in the current regulations, or were mentioned only briefly and sometimes in odd locations. The proposal brings those desirable practices out of the shadows and gives them solid grounding in written regulations.
- D. Maintaining an appropriate balance of inclusiveness of various constituencies in decision-making, procedural fairness for all persons involved in appointments proceedings, and administrative ease. It is important on the one hand to ensure that faculty and others in the academic community have ample opportunities to present their views about particular appointments. On the other hand, there are a few situations in which the University is best served by giving administrators flexibility to move expeditiously to complete an appointment. The proposal identifies such situations and provides guidance on how those situations can be managed. In particular, it allows for short term visiting faculty appointments to be made through expedited proceedings, and it allows expedited proceedings for granting of tenure at time of permanent appointment of a senior-level candidate. Also related to the theme of administrative ease, the proposal takes into account the effects of modern technology by recognizing that in some situations voting by

committee members can best be managed 'virtually' through electronic mail rather than face-to-face gatherings. However, in each instance in which expediting of procedures is allowed for, the proposal carefully circumscribes such authorization to ensure against undesirable encroachment on the core principles of inclusion of faculty and others in important decisions.

### III. Highlights of specific changes:

Existing regulations affecting faculty appointments are found in various parts of Policies and Procedures Manual. The committee identified three distinct major parts of Policies and Procedures Manual that will need to be revised to fully accomplish the mission of clarifying and improving the rules. The three are listed below, with a brief description of the proposed changes affecting each.

#### **Policy and Procedure 6-302** (“Appointments of Faculty”).

Highlights:

- A. New statement of scope, to clarify relationship between this policy for faculty appointments, and other policies for tenure decisions and for administrative appointments, with guidance for cases in which all might be simultaneously applicable, as with a senior-level hire (e.g., an outside hire of a department chair with a faculty appointment and tenure).
- B. Statement of general policy revised to make clear the appointment-related powers of the president, departments, and colleges, with president's ultimate statutory authority in part delegated to departments and colleges through this policy. Includes new footnote describing tailoring of procedures to fit single-department colleges. 6-302-A-1, and -7.
- C. New part to provide basic guidance on appropriate methods of recruiting candidates for appointment, allowing departments great flexibility in selecting recruitment methods, but requiring that recruitment be done in compliance with the University's strong commitment to diversity. 6-302-1-A-4.

- D. New requirement that candidates be given “reasonable notice” about the appointments process. This was a core concern driving the revision project--based on incidents in which candidates reportedly were not being given sufficient information about the process, leading to serious misunderstandings about the status of an appointment. It is drafted in general terms so as to not hamstring administrators, or give rise to lawsuits, as might occur if the policy dictated details of precisely how such notice should be given. 6-302-1-A-6.
- E. Clarified rule for determining voting membership of departmental faculty appointments advisory committees. Allows for existing auxiliary faculty to be included as members for limited purposes of considering other auxiliary candidacies. Clarifies that the department chair leads meetings of the committee, but that neither the department chair nor any higher administrator who holds a faculty appointment within the department is allowed to vote within the committee.6-302-1, B.
- F. New part allowing for 'electronic meetings' of departmental committees under some circumstances, for administrative ease. 6-302-B.
- G. Important change--new rules on use of secret or open ballots for departmental faculty appointments committee voting. 6-302, C-1.
- H. Important change--giving junior faculty a greater role in appointments of senior-level candidates. Sets up a two-step procedure for such senior-level appointments, first having all regular faculty (including those of lower rank than is proposed for the candidate) vote on a threshold question of the general suitability of the candidate, and then having only the senior-level faculty vote on whether a senior-level rank is appropriate for the candidate. 6-302, C-2.
- I. Clarified rule that colleges have the option to establish college-level appointments advisory committees. Describes basic parameters for creating such committees. 6-302-1-D.

- J. Clarified rule empowering department chairs to make short-term visiting appointments without formal consultation with the departmental advisory committees when circumstances make such formalities overly burdensome. This eliminates some potentially troublesome vagueness in the existing policy. 6-302-1-G.

**Policy and Procedure 6-303**(“ Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews”).

Highlights:

- A. Important change-- new part codifying existing practices with expedited procedures for making tenure decisions in cases involving 'hiring with tenure.' The streamlined procedures allow moving quickly to extend an offer of a faculty appointment with tenure to a highly sought-after senior level candidate (while ensuring adequate consultation within department and college, and with UPTAC). Such practices have been widely used, although existing policy only very vaguely referred to the possible use of such expedited procedures, and gave almost no guidance on when they would be applicable or what steps should be followed, and the relevant passages were hidden in obscure parts of the Policies and Procedures Manual. The proposed revision consolidates the relevant contents into one new part, and gives clear guidance on when and how to use the authority for expedited procedures. As compared to ordinary tenure decisions involving 'in-house' candidates, these 'hiring-with-tenure' procedures are greatly streamlined, including eliminating opportunities for time-consuming appeals. 6-303-K
- B. Important change to membership of departmental RPT advisory committees. Revised so that for all decisions on tenure (including hiring with tenure and in-house candidates for tenure), and all decisions on formal retention, the voting membership would consist solely of the tenured faculty, regardless of rank. The existing rules on voting rights of committee members are overly complicated, set poor policy, and likely are so poorly understood that they have not been consistently complied with. They allowed voting on tenure or retention by some

persons who are themselves not tenured, and precluded voting by some tenured persons because their rank is lower than the rank of the candidate. This revised simplified policy would affect both the tenure-at-hiring cases which are the main focus of the proposed revisions, and also all other tenure and formal retention decisions. 6-303-A-3-a- i & iii, and 6-303-K

- C. Important new part, to provide limited guidance on how colleges should structure the membership of college-level RPT advisory committees. The existing rules do presume that college-level committees might exist, but provide no guidance whatsoever on how such committees should be structured. The new part would explicitly require that each college establish a college-level RPT committee, and would set out basic parameters to be considered in structuring such committees. This change would affect the function of college-level committees both for the tenure-at-hiring cases which are the main focus of the proposed revisions, and also all other tenure decisions. 6-303-G-1.

**Policy and Procedure 9-4**(“Areas of Responsibility of College Councils”).

The main principle for the proposal is to remove from this part of PPM certain language that does not belong here, because it purports to govern procedures for faculty appointments, and those should be controlled solely by the proposed revised contents of Policy and Procedure 6-302. As long as revisions are being considered for 6-003, it is appropriate to also propose other improvements which are not directly related to faculty appointments.

Highlights:

- A. Removal of existing language in 6-003-2 (B)(1) purporting to regulate faculty appointments procedures, and instead inserting similar provisions into the newly revised Policy and Procedure 6-302 and 6-303, as described above.
- B. Important change-- to clarify the structure of college councils, and clarify who is empowered to choose that structure. Existing policy gave very little guidance. The revised policy would clarify that it is the regular faculty of the college who

determine how a council is structured, within parameters requiring that majority power within a council must always be held by regular faculty, and that other persons may be included (including representatives of auxiliary faculty, students, staff). 6-003-2 (C).] [Note: By decision of the Senate April 2, the proposed changes to Part C were tabled and referred to an ad hoc committee for further study, with a revised proposal expected to be brought forward again in fall 2007.

#### **IV. Further details—drafting notes:**

The drafting committee created an extensive set of 'drafting notes' explaining each significant change included in the proposal. A separate document with those notes is available as an appendix to the proposal documents.

---

--end--

### **Policy and Procedure 6-303 (RPT) final version 2007-04-02.**

**Policy: 6-303 Rev. 18 19**

**Date: May 16, 2005 Effective July 1, 2007**

**Subject: Faculty Regulations - Section 2 Appointments, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure**

#### **Section 2. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure**

##### **A. Retention, promotion, and tenure reviews**

###### **1. Purpose**

- a. Retention. A probationary period is normally required for all individuals appointed to regular faculty ranks prior to the granting of tenure. Annual reviews shall be scheduled during this probationary period to evaluate the academic performance of nontenured individuals, to provide constructive



feedback on their academic progress, and to terminate the appointment of those who do not meet the standards of the department and the expectations of the university after their initial appointments.

- b. Promotion. Promotion in rank is the acknowledgment by the university of excellence in performance in teaching, research and creative work, professional competence, activity, and responsibility and university and public service.
- c. Tenure. Granting tenure implies a commitment by the university to defend faculty members' academic freedom. Likewise, faculty members who are granted tenure make an equally strong commitment to serve their students, their colleagues, their discipline, and the university in a manner befitting a responsible academic person. It also raises a strong presumption that those granted tenure are competent in their discipline and capable of scholarly contributions. Granting tenure is regarded as the university's most critical personnel decision. Except for extraordinary instances, when specific and persuasive justification is provided, tenure will not be awarded to faculty members prior to their advancement to the rank of associate professor. It is therefore imperative, before such commitments are made, that a responsible screening process be followed to ensure that the most highly qualified candidates available are granted tenure. Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years as per [Policy and Procedure 2-005, Section 5.C].

## 2. Criteria

- a. Content and approval of statement of RPT criteria and guidelines. Each department or college shall formulate and distribute to all regular faculty members a statement of criteria and procedural guidelines to be used in retention, promotion, and tenure ("RPT") reviews. These criteria shall address the qualifications of candidates with respect to the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative activity, (3) university,

professional, and public service. This statement ~~of these criteria~~ shall include the rationale for the criteria, and must be approved by majority vote of the department faculty, the dean, and the URPT Standards Committee. The statement shall include the procedural guidelines adopted for conducting reviews referred to in part B of this policy as well as any guidelines adopted for allowing non-voting participants in meetings of the departmental RPT advisory committee as referred to in parts A-3 and K-1 of this policy. The statement shall be consistent with applicable provisions of University Regulations, Faculty Regulations and the Code of Faculty Responsibility as well as professional codes if appropriate, and with the purpose of the University of Utah as stated in Chapter 1, Section 1, of the State Higher Education System Regulations.

- b. Standards for the criteria. Insistence upon the highest attainable standards for faculty members is essential for the maintenance of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery as well as the assimilation and transmission of knowledge. The criteria shall emphasize the university's commitment to superior intellectual attainment and responsible faculty conduct. In carrying out their duties in teaching, research/other creative activity and service, faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities [(Policy and Procedure [6-316.4](#))].
- c. Candidates in a regular faculty appointment may have accomplishments achieved prior to their probationary period at the University of Utah be considered as relevant to the demonstration of their achievement of the RPT criteria. Prior accomplishments, such as research publications or teaching experience, shall not substitute for a continuing record of accomplishments during the probationary period at the University of Utah. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements

satisfy the RPT criteria. (For evaluation process, see [Policy and procedure 6-311, Section 3.C.1.]).

- i. Teaching and research/other creative activity. A continuing record of achievement in the areas of both teaching and research/other creative activity, including the exercise of professional expertise, is an indispensable qualification for promotion and tenure. For the purpose of retention, a reasonable potential for meeting these criteria should be demonstrated.
- ii. Service. Recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and extent of their public service, both of which shall be taken into account in the evaluation made in the context of retention, promotion, and tenure.
- iii. Assessments of teaching, research/other creative activity and service may consider the candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty.

3. Department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee

a. Committee membership:

- i. Retention. In each department all tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank and all tenure-eligible faculty members of higher rank than that held by the candidate for retention, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for retention if allowed by department guidelines, but may not vote.
- ii. Promotion. In each department all regular faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on

recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for promotion if allowed by department guidelines, but may not vote.

- iii. Tenure. In each department all tenured faculty members ~~whose rank is equal to or higher than the rank currently held by the candidate for tenure, and all tenure-eligible faculty members of higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for tenure,~~ regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for tenure if allowed by department guidelines, but may not vote.
- iv. Small academic unit rule. Any department or division advisory committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the unit does not have at least three eligible members, the department or division chair must recommend to the dean one or more faculty members with the appropriate tenure status and rank and with some knowledge of the candidate's field from other units of the University of Utah or from appropriate emeritus faculty. In advance of the chair's contacting such faculty members, the chair shall notify the candidate of the potential persons to be asked, and the candidate must be offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the suitability of the potential committee members. The final selection rests with the dean.
- v. Single vote rule. No individual may cast a vote in the same academic year in any person's case in more than one capacity (e.g., as member of both department and academic program, as member of both department and college advisory committees, as member of both department and administration).

- b. Chairperson. The chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee shall be elected annually from the tenured members of the department. In this election all regular faculty members of the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor shall be entitled to vote. The department chairperson is not eligible to chair this committee.
- B. Informal or Formal Reviews. All tenure-eligible faculty shall be reviewed annually to assess their achievement in teaching, research/other creative activity, responsibility, and service. Informal annual reviews are required in each year in which a formal review is not held. More extensive, formal reviews are required for mid-probationary retention reviews; final probationary year reviews (consideration for tenure); consideration for termination at any point in the probationary period (such as triggered reviews); and promotion decisions. (A chart of the timing and review requirements is set forth below at [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Section 2 D.12.] )
1. Informal reviews. Informal reviews must minimally include 1) a face to face meeting between the candidate and the department chair (or a designee, as per department guidelines) to discuss the candidate's progress based on the file; 2) involvement, determined by the department, from the RPT advisory committee (and academic program if relevant); and, 3) a written report to be made available to the candidate, the members of the RPT advisory committee and the department chair.
    - a. ~~Department criteria~~ Procedural guidelines. ~~Department~~ The statement of RPT criteria and procedural guidelines adopted by the department (or college) must prescribe specific requirements for informal reviews. Minimally, the guidelines must state the required documentation and who provides it, procedures for preparing and distributing the written report, the nature of the involvement by the RPT advisory committee (and academic program if relevant), procedures and criteria for appointment of a chair's designee, if any, and the timetable for the annual reviews. Departments

may elect to include in their guidelines more extensive review procedures than the minimum required.

- b. Actions after the report. Candidates shall have the opportunity to make a written response to the report. The report and the response, if any, are then filed in the candidate's cumulative file with a copy of each sent to the dean. The informal review concludes at this point.
  - c. Triggering formal retention reviews. If a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee in consultation with the reviewers may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.
2. Formal reviews. Formal reviews must provide a substantive assessment of the candidate's research or other creative activity, teaching and service to date. Formal reviews require a vote of the full RPT advisory committee. External evaluations, as discussed below ([Policy and Procedure 6-303 Section 2 D.9]), are required for tenure and promotion reviews. Departments, through departmental policy, may also mandate external evaluations for mid-probationary and or/or triggered reviews. When such external evaluations are not mandated, candidates still retain the right to have external letters solicited unless quality of research or creative activity is not an issue in the review (e.g., a triggered review focused solely on teaching) and provided that such request is made before the review commences.
- a. Mid-probationary retention reviews. All tenure-eligible faculty members shall have at least one formal, mid-probationary review in their third or

fourth year, as determined by departmental policy. Department policy must prescribe the number of reviews and the year(s) in which they occur.

- b. “Triggered” reviews. The results of an informal review may “trigger” a formal review earlier than prescribed by departmental policy if an informal review has demonstrated inadequate performance or progress, as described in [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Section 2 B.1.c] above.
- c. Tenure. Tenure-eligible faculty members must be reviewed for tenure by the final year of their probationary period.
  - i. Deadline for tenure review. The final year is the fifth year for persons appointed at the ranks of associate professor or professor and the seventh year for those appointed at the rank of assistant professor (unless the department has established, through policy, a six year probationary period for assistant professors). See [Policy and procedure 6-311, Section 3. B].
  - ii. Request for earlier review. Within limits specified by departmental policy and by Policy and Procedure 6-311, Section 3.C.1., tenure-eligible faculty may request a review for tenure earlier than the year of the mandatory review.
- d. Promotion.
  - i. Timing for tenure-eligible faculty. Tenure-eligible faculty members are usually reviewed for promotion concurrently with their tenure reviews. Under unusual circumstances, tenure-eligible faculty members may request a review for promotion earlier than the year of the mandatory tenure review.
  - ii. Timing for tenured faculty. Tenured faculty members may request a review for promotion within limits specified by departmental policy.

### C. Notice to involved individuals

1. Notice to candidate. Each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure shall be given at least 30 days advance notice of the department RPT advisory committee meeting and an opportunity to submit any information the candidate desires the committee to consider.
2. Notice to department faculty and staff. At least three weeks prior to the convening of the departmental RPT committee, the department chairperson shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation.
3. Notice to student advisory committee. Prior to the convening of the departmental RPT committee, the department chairperson shall notify the college's representative to the Student Senate and the department student advisory committee(s) (SACs) of the upcoming review and request that the department SAC(s) submit written recommendations with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC shall be given at least three weeks to prepare its recommendations, but upon failure to report after such notification and attempts by the department chairperson to obtain the reports, the SAC's recommendations shall be deemed conclusively waived and their absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.
4. Notice to academic program. When a candidate for retention, tenure or promotion in a department is also a member of an academic program, the department chairperson shall notify the chair/director of the academic program of the action to be considered at the same time that the faculty candidate is notified. Academic program faculty as defined by procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review



committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation which shall be sent to the department chair in a timely manner.

D. Candidate's file. Proper preparation and completeness of each candidate's file are essential for the uninterrupted progress of a RPT review through all the stages of the review process. Required components and their timing are identified in the table below in paragraph [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Sec 2 D.12].

1. Structure of the file. The file is envisioned as a notebook in the department office, which is growing throughout a faculty member's probationary period at the University. However, a physical notebook is not the only method allowable -- for example an electronic file or other format may be used alone or as a supplement. The file shall be cumulative and kept current as described in the following sections.
2. Curriculum vitae. The candidate's file is expected to provide a current and complete curriculum vitae, which is organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings or categories related to the department's RPT criteria. The CV should be updated annually, but not during the course of a given year's review. During a review, new accomplishments may be reported and documented as a part of any of the reports or responses in the regular process.
3. Evidence of research/creative activity. The candidate is expected to provide evidence of research and other creative activity, updated annually.
4. Past reviews and recommendations. The department chair shall include the recommendations from all previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal reviews, i.e. SAC, department and college RPT advisory committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC (if present). Teaching evaluations and letters or reports from all informal reviews should also be included. The past reviews and

- recommendations in a file for promotion to Professor shall include the candidate's vita at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor), all reports and recommendations from tenured faculty reviews, and teaching evaluation summaries since the previous promotion (or appointment). If that promotion or appointment was more than five years earlier, teaching evaluation summaries should be included for at least the most recent five years.
5. Evidence of faculty responsibility. Letters of administrative reprimand and the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from university committees or officials, arising from relevant concerns about the faculty member should also be included in the candidate's file.
  6. Recommendation from academic program. In the event that an academic program produces a recommendation as under [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Sec 2 C.4], the department chairperson shall include the recommendation in the candidate's file before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.
  7. Recommendation from the department student advisory committee. If the department SAC produces a recommendation as under [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Sec 2 C.3], the recommendation shall be placed in the candidate's file by the department chairperson before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.
  8. Other written statements. Any other written statements -- from the candidate, faculty members in the department, the department chairperson, the college dean, staff, or interested individuals--which are intended to provide information or data of consequence for the formal review of the candidate, must be placed in the file by the department chairperson before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.

9. External evaluations. The purpose of external evaluations is to provide an objective assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the academic and/or professional community at large. Along with the actual review, the external evaluator should describe his/her qualifications and relationship to the candidate. The department chairperson should make sure that any letters of evaluation from outside the department are requested early enough for the letters to arrive and be included in the candidate's file before the program and department advisory committee meetings. Before external letters of evaluation are requested, the faculty member being reviewed shall be presented with a departmentally prepared form containing the following statements and signature lines:

*I waive my right to see the external letters of evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/ promotion/tenure review.*

*signature date*

*I retain my right to read the external evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/promotion/ tenure review.*

*signature date*

That form, with the candidate's signature below the statement preferred by the candidate, shall be included in the candidate's review file. When the candidate reserves the right to read the external letters of evaluation, respondents shall be informed in writing that their letters may be seen by the faculty member being reviewed.

10. Candidate's rights. Candidates are entitled to see their review file upon request at any time during the review process, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department if the candidate has waived the right to see them. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or to take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's

written comment or exception must be added to the file before the department RPT advisory committee meeting is held.

11. Review of file. The candidate's file shall be made available to those eligible to attend the departmental advisory committee meeting a reasonable time before the meeting, which may be specified in department policy.

12. Table of Minimum University Requirements for Reviews.

<b>TypeRetention</b>			<b>Tenure</b>	<b>Promotion to Associate or “full” Professor</b>	
Category	Informal	Formal	Formal	Formal	Formal
When	Annual	Triggered-b,c	Mid-Probationary	End of Probation	Typically end of probation or when meets department standards
Involved parties:					
External reviewers	No	As per Department Policy-a	As per Department Policy-a	Yes	Yes
Academic Program, if appropriate SAC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Department RPT	No Representation-d	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department chair-f	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
College RPT	No	As per 9-5.1, G.1.a	As per 9-5.1, G.1.a	Yes	Yes
Dean	Receives Report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate includes in file: (minimum requirements)					
Curriculum Vitae	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Includes in File: (minimum requirements)					
SAC report	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
External Letters (could be internal to University but external to department)	No	As per Departmental Policy-a	As per Departmental Policy-a	Yes	Yes
Past reviews and Recommendations-e	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Academic Program report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Comment from others	Optional	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Student Course Evaluations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

- a. Candidates retain the right to have external letters be solicited in a formal review if quality of research or creative activity is an issue in the review. See [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Section 2 D.9] above.
- b. This triggered review may occur in the same year as the review or in the subsequent year.
- c. The required components for triggered and mid-probationary reviews may be identical or different, as determined by department policy.
- d. This representation occurs through the type of involvement set forth in departmental criteria. See [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Section B.1]. above.
- e. Reports from all voting levels in all RPT reviews and letters or reports from all annual reviews. [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Section 2 D.4]
- f. A designee may be used for informal reviews in large departments' reviews as noted in [Policy and Procedure 6-303 Section 2 B.1].

E. Action by the department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee

- 1. Meetings. The department chairperson shall call a meeting of the departmental RPT advisory committee to conduct reviews as described in [Policy and Procedure 6-303 B].

2. Committee secretary. A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee and shall take notes of the discussion to provide the basis for developing a summary.
3. Quorum. A quorum of a department advisory committee for any given case shall consist of two-thirds of its members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum.
4. Absentee voting. Whenever practicable, the department chairperson shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting at which a vote is taken by the department advisory committee.
5. Limitations on participation and voting. Department chairpersons, deans, and other administrative officials who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity may attend and, upon invitation by majority vote of the committee, may submit evidence, judgments, and opinions, or participate in discussion. By majority vote the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded. Department chairpersons, deans, and other administrative officials who cast RPT votes in their administrative capacities shall not vote at the department level.
6. Committee report. After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure, with a separate vote taken on each proposed action for each candidate. The secretary shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare a summary of the meeting which shall include the substance of the discussion and also the findings and recommendations of the department advisory committee. If a candidate is jointly appointed with an academic program, the department advisory committee report shall reflect

- the department's discussion and consideration of the report and recommendation of the academic program.
7. Approval of the committee report. This summary report of the meeting, signed by the secretary and bearing the written approval of the committee chairperson, shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modification as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chairperson and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.
  8. Confidentiality. All committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law.

F. Action by department chairperson

1. Recommendations. After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chairperson shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.
2. Notice to faculty member. Prior to forwarding the file, the department chairperson shall send an exact copy of the chairperson's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member.
3. Candidate's right to respond. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the department faculty advisory committee and/or the evaluation of the department chairperson. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chairperson's evaluation, which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chairperson within seven business days, except in extenuating



circumstances, of the date upon which the chairperson's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson.

4. Forwarding files. The department chairperson shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the dean of the college.

G. Action by dean and college advisory committee

1. Referral of cases to the college advisory committee / membership of committee. Each college shall establish a college RPT advisory committee and define its membership. The definition of membership shall specify whether there must be representation from all or fewer than all departments within the college, and whether or in what way representatives from a department are to participate or not participate in matters involving candidates from the representatives' departments, consistent with the part A-3-a-v of this policy (single vote rule). The definition of membership shall be included in the charter of the college council, or may be included in the college's statement of RPT criteria and guidelines (described in part A-2 of this policy).
  - a. Retention. The dean at his/her discretion may request the college advisory committee to review and submit recommendations on any candidate for retention. However, if termination of a candidate is recommended by the SAC, or the department advisory committee, or the department chairperson, the dean shall transmit the entire file on that candidate to the college advisory committee.
  - b. Promotion or tenure. The dean shall forward the entire file on all cases dealing with promotion or tenure to the college advisory committee.
  - c. Attendance and participation at meetings. Neither the dean nor the chairperson of the department concerned shall attend or participate in the

deliberations of the college committee except by invitation of the committee.

- d. Recommendations of the college advisory committee. The college advisory committee shall review the file of each case referred to it and shall determine if the department reasonably applied its written substantive and procedural guidelines to each case. The college committee shall make its recommendations on an individual's retention, promotion, or tenure, based upon its assessment whether the department's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented. The college committee shall use the department's criteria (or college criteria if the college has college-wide instead of departmental criteria) in making its assessment. If documents required by policy are missing, the college committee may return the file to the department for appropriate action. The college committee shall advise the dean in writing of its vote and recommendations.
2. Recommendations of the dean. The dean shall then review the entire file for each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure and shall make recommendations in writing, stating reasons therefor, and shall forward the file, including all the recommendations, to the cognizant senior vice president (for academic affairs or for health sciences).
3. Notice to faculty members. Prior to forwarding the file, the dean shall send an exact copy of the college advisory committee's report of its evaluation and an exact copy of the dean's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member and to the department chair.
4. Candidate's right to respond. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the report of the college advisory committee's evaluation and/or the dean's evaluation. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the dean's evaluation which is sent to the candidate. If the

candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the dean within seven days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the dean's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the dean within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the dean.

5. Forwarding files. The dean shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the cognizant senior vice president.

H. Action by cognizant vice president, and the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee

1. Referral of cases to the university committee. The cognizant senior vice president shall forward to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee ("UPTAC") for its review and recommendation the files in all cases in which the college is organized and functions as a single academic department or there is a differing recommendation from any of the prior review levels--the student advisory committee, the academic program, the department advisory committee, the department chairperson, the college advisory committee, or the college dean. The cognizant senior vice president, in his/her sole discretion, may also send any other RPT case to UPTAC for its review and recommendations. UPTAC provides advice to the senior vice president.
2. Recommendations of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The committee shall review the entire file for all cases referred to it, and after due deliberation shall submit its recommendations with reasons and its vote to the cognizant senior vice president.
  - a. In cases reviewed only because they arise from single department colleges, UPTAC shall determine whether the college reasonably applied its written substantive and procedural guidelines to each case and

whether the college's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented.

- b. In cases in which there were differing recommendations from the prior reviewing entities, UPTAC shall identify the source(s) of the differences or controversy, determine how each level addressed the issues in controversy, and assess the degree to which the file is sufficiently clear to support any conclusive recommendation.
  - c. In cases which are reviewed at the discretionary request of the senior vice president, UPTAC shall review the file to respond to the specific issues identified by the senior vice president.
  - d. In making all reviews, UPTAC shall consider only the material in the file. UPTAC shall summarize its assessment of the issues identified in a, b, or c above in a written report to the senior vice president, but not report a conclusion of its own on the candidate's overall qualification for retention, promotion, or tenure.
3. Consideration by the senior vice president. The cognizant senior vice president shall review each file, including the recommendations (if any) of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. If the senior vice president determines that the file is incomplete or unclear, he/she may return the file to the department with a request to clarify specific matters, materials, and/or issues. All levels of review shall reconsider the file and their votes if appropriate, with the candidate responding in writing at the normal points in the process. (SAC need not reconsider the file unless teaching is the issue in question.)
  4. Senior vice president's decision. In cases of positive retention decisions, the senior vice president's decision shall be the university's final decision. In all cases of promotion and tenure and in cases of retention when termination is recommended, the senior vice president shall prepare a final

- recommendation to the president with respect to the candidate's retention, promotion, and/or tenure, stating reasons therefor.
5. Notice of senior vice president's recommendation. In positive retention cases, the senior vice president shall transmit the final decision and the report of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (if any) to the candidate, the department chair, and the dean. In all other cases, prior to forwarding the file to the president, the senior vice president shall send an exact copy of the report of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (if any) and an exact copy of the senior vice president's recommendation with respect to that faculty member to the candidate, the dean, the department chairperson, and the chairpersons of the departmental RPT committee and the Student Advisory Committee, together with a copy or summary of subsection I. The chairpersons of the departmental RPT and student advisory committees shall notify the members of their committees in an expeditious manner of the senior vice president's recommendation. The senior vice president shall not submit the final recommendation to the president until at least fourteen days have elapsed following the giving of such notice, so that parties may notify the senior vice president's office if they intend to appeal.
  6. Extension of time limits. The time limits provided by this subsection H may be extended by the senior vice president in the interest of justice.
- I. Appeal of recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure.
    1. Appeal by faculty member. A faculty member may appeal to the Consolidated Hearing Committee (CHC) for review of an unfavorable final recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure by following the procedures provided in Policy and Procedure 6-002, Section 10 and upon the grounds enumerated in that section. The CHC is the hearing body for an appeal brought on any grounds, including academic freedom, but if the candidate alleges that the unfavorable recommendation violates academic

freedom, then the CHC shall refer that part of the appeal to the Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Tenure Committee for pre-hearing consideration and report, as per [Policy and Procedure 6-002, Section. 10, III, F.1.a.ii.].

2. Other appeals. Appeals of the vice president's recommendation on promotion and/or tenure may also be initiated by the department SAC, a majority of the departmental RPTP advisory committee, the department chairperson, or the dean, when the vice president's recommendation opposes their own recommendation. The appeal is made to the Consolidated Hearing Committee and should follow the procedures provided in [Policy and Procedure 6-002, Section 10], and upon the grounds enumerated in that section. Authorized parties initiating an appeal may have access to the entire file except that the faculty member may not see external letters which he/she waived the right to read.

#### J. Final action by president

1. Action in absence of review proceedings. If no proceedings for review have been initiated under subsection I of this section within the time provided therein, the recommendation of the vice president with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure of a faculty member shall be transmitted to the president for action. After reviewing the recommendation, giving such consideration to the documents in the candidate's file as the president deems necessary under the circumstances, the president shall make a final decision granting or denying retention, or granting or denying promotion, and/or tenure, and shall advise the candidate, the cognizant vice president, the dean and the department chairperson of that decision, stating reasons therefor.
2. Action after conclusion of review proceedings. If proceedings for review have been timely initiated under subsection I of this section, the recommendation of the vice president with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure shall be placed in the candidate's file but shall not be transmitted to the president for action. Except as provided in subsection J (3), below, the president shall not

consider the merits of the matter and shall not take final action with respect thereto until the pending review proceedings have concluded. Upon conclusion of the review proceedings, the president shall review the file and make a final decision consistent with paragraph (1), above.

3. Notice of termination. When review proceedings have been timely initiated under subsection I of this section, the president, on recommendation of the cognizant vice president, may give a candidate advance written notice of termination pursuant to [Policy and Procedure 6-311, Section 4 / University Regulations, Section 4]. Such notice shall be effective as of the date it is given if a final decision to terminate the faculty member's appointment is subsequently made by the president, on or before the termination date specified in the notice, but shall have no force or effect if a final decision is made by the president on or before that date approving retention, promotion, and/or tenure or otherwise disposing of the case in a manner that does not require termination.

K. New appointments with tenure--expedited procedures for granting tenure

Tenure may be granted at the time of initial appointment of a faculty member (commonly known as 'hiring with tenure'). See [Policy and Procedure 6-311 Section. 2-B]. When a decision regarding tenure is to be considered contemporaneously with a decision regarding initial appointment, the procedures for the appointment and initial rank decisions are governed by [Policy and Procedure 6-302], and the procedures for the tenure decision are as described here in [6-303 part K].

This part K allows the use of expedited procedures for tenure decisions arising in circumstances in which more complex and lengthy procedures are inappropriate.

1. For purposes of expedited decisions on granting of tenure at the time of initial appointment of a candidate, the voting membership of the department RPT advisory committee shall consist of all tenured faculty members of the

- department, regardless of rank (subject to the limitations of [part A-3-a-v, and part E-5]). If allowed by departmental guidelines, other faculty members may participate in consideration of the candidate, but shall not vote on the tenure decision.
2. The chairperson of the department shall provide interested persons with notice of scheduled meetings of the committee, and invite them to submit information for consideration by the committee. Notice may be given orally, or in writing as circumstances permit, and should be given as early as practicable under the circumstances. Notice shall be given to the candidate, the department faculty and staff, and student representatives (including any members of the student advisory committee who are available, and/or other students determined by the department chairperson to adequately represent student interests). If it is contemplated that the candidate will also be appointed to an academic program separate from the tenure-granting department, notice shall also be provided to the chair/director of that academic program, who may in turn give notice to members of that program.
  3. The candidate's file shall include information submitted by the candidate, faculty, staff, and student representatives of the department, and representatives of any related academic program, and other information determined by the department chairperson or department RPT chairperson to be relevant. It shall include a curriculum vitae, available evidence of research/creative activity, available evidence of teaching effectiveness, and a report from student representatives, and may include available evidence regarding faculty responsibility. The file shall include letters of evaluation from at least three outside evaluators. It shall be presumed that the candidate waives any right to see such external evaluation letters, unless the candidate submits to the RPT chairperson a written request for access to any letters prior to the time the letters are submitted.



4. The actions of the department RPT committee and the department chairperson shall proceed as described in parts E and F of this policy, except that i) the RPT committee chairperson may set a shortened period for inspection of the report of the RPT meeting, ii) the candidate need not be provided copies of either the committee report or the chairperson's recommendation, and iii) the candidate need not be given an opportunity to respond to either the committee report or the chairperson's recommendation.
  5. The actions of the dean and college RPT advisory committee shall proceed as described in part G, except that the candidate need not be provided copies of the committee's or the dean's recommendations, and the candidate need not be given an opportunity to respond to either recommendation.
  6. The actions of the vice president and UPTAC shall proceed as described in part H for a tenure decision, except as follows. UPTAC reviews all recommendations of tenure accompanying new appointments, regardless of college or of votes by prior levels. UPTAC may delegate its responsibilities to a subcommittee formed for purposes of such expedited proceedings, and its reports may be made in abbreviated form. The candidate need not be provided copies of either the committee's report or the vice president's recommendation. The student representatives need not be provided such copies, but when practical shall be informed of the recommendations of UPTAC and the vice president. The vice president may submit the final recommendation to the president immediately (without awaiting notice from any person of an intent to appeal).
  7. In expedited proceedings neither the candidate nor any other person has a right of appeal of either a favorable or unfavorable recommendation of the vice president. The final action of the president shall be taken as provided in section J.
-

Approved: Academic Senate ~~5/2/2005~~ April 2, 2007

Board of Trustees ~~5/16/2005~~ \_\_\_\_\_, 2007

To take effect, as revised, July 1, 2007

{---end---}

## **Policy and Procedure 6-003 (College Councils), final version 2007-04-02**

**Policy: 6-003 Rev. 3**

**Date: November 10, 1997 Effective July 1, 2007**

**Subject: Faculty Regulations, College Faculties and Council**

### **Section 1. School and College Faculties**

Each school and college faculty shall have, subject to the approval of the Academic Senate and appeal to the university faculty, jurisdiction over all questions of educational policy affecting that school or college, including requirements for entrance, graduation, and major, and prescribed subjects of study.

Majors shall be authorized by the school or college faculty concerned, but the content of the major shall be determined by the department or departments in which it is given. Majors and their content shall be subject to the review of the Academic Senate. { in accord with [Policy and Procedure 6-001 / University Regulations, Section 4]. }

A statement of the action taken upon educational policy by any school or college faculty shall be presented at the next regular meeting of the Academic Senate for consideration and action thereon.

### **Section 2. College Councils**

A. Establishment and Authority of College Councils

1. Establishment. College councils are hereby established within the system of university governance.
2. Organizational Scope. A college council shall be organized and shall function within each college. Any academic unit or personnel with faculty rank not administratively situated within an existing college shall affiliate with and become a constituent part of a college council designated by the president, but only for the purpose of participating in the university governance responsibilities vested in such college council.
3. General Powers. A college council shall formulate policies and exercise primary authority to make decisions relating to college and department affairs to the extent authorized by Faculty Regulations. All actions taken by a college council shall be reviewable by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in accordance with criteria approved by the senate, and shall be subject to the power of the Academic Senate to establish uniform policies and take final action on all matters of university concern.

B. Areas of Responsibility of College Councils

1. Faculty Personnel Actions
  - a. Appointments, and retention, promotion and tenure.

The role of college councils within the process of making appointments of faculty shall be as prescribed in [Policy and Procedure 6-303]. As is more fully described in that policy, each college council may adopt college policy regarding the establishment and role of any college-level faculty appointments advisory committee, and may adopt college policy regarding the eligibility of auxiliary faculty to serve on departmental faculty appointments advisory committees.

The role of college councils with regard to decisions on retention, promotion, or tenure of faculty shall be as prescribed in [Policy and Procedure 6-303 ]. As is more fully described in that policy, each college shall establish a college RPT advisory committee, and such committees shall make recommendations with respect to certain RPT decisions.

Colleges may choose to establish a single committee to carry out both the advisory function for appointments, and the advisory function for decisions of retention, promotion and tenure, in all cases, or to serve both functions only for cases in which it is proposed that tenure be granted at the time of initial appointment (commonly known as hiring with tenure).

~~Recommendation for appointments shall be initiated at the department level and submitted successively, for evaluation and recommendation, to the dean of the college, the appointments committee of the college council, and the vice president for academic affairs; provided, however, that a college council may permit appointments at the rank of assistant professor and lower ranks to be processed by the department and appropriate college dean without reference to the appointments committee. Recommendations for appointments with tenure must include a statement of the views of the department student advisory committee. No offer of a faculty appointment with tenure shall be made until the proposal has been presented to the University Promotions and Tenure Advisory Committee, and the committee, or a subcommittee thereof, has had an opportunity to make a recommendation concerning the award of tenure at the time of appointment.~~

~~b. Other Personnel Matters. Action regarding retention, tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leaves shall be initiated at the department level and processed successively through an appropriate committee of the college council, the dean of the college, and the vice president for academic affairs. Where disparity occurs in the recommended actions, or other~~

~~cause exists, the vice president for academic affairs may refer the matter to an appropriate university committee.~~

## 2. Academic Policy Actions

College councils shall develop curriculum and related academic programs to meet the goals and purposes of the university. Any program requiring approval of the State Board of Regents including the establishment of a new department or a new degree, must be submitted to ~~the Executive Committee~~ of the Academic Senate for approval.

## 3. University Curriculum Policy Review Board

The chairpersons of the various college curriculum committees will be convened as a University Curriculum Policy Review Board to review curriculum policies and procedures, coordinate curriculum planning and intercollege consultations, and promulgate modifications in guidelines for processing curricular proposals. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Undergraduate Studies, or his/her designee, will chair the Review Board~~committee~~. The guidelines proposed by the ~~University Curriculum Policy~~ Review Board, after approval by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, will be the operating rules for making curriculum changes during the academic year. Each college council shall develop appropriate procedures consistent with guidelines established by the ~~University Curriculum Policy~~ Review Board for initiating and reviewing curriculum changes and adjustments for all programs within their respective jurisdictions.

## 4. General Policy Recommendations

A college council may recommend to the Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee of Academic Senate, new policies or policy modifications in relationship to any aspect of the university operation.

## 5. Additional Duties

College councils shall perform other functions and duties assigned to them by the Academic Senate from time to time.

#### C. Council Structure

The organizational structure and membership of each college council shall be determined, and may be modified from time to time, by majority vote of all voting faculty members of the college involved, and may be either plenary or representative. The college councils should include student members. Where a representative structure is adopted, the representation formula should be broad, and shall be subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

Each college council shall establish appropriate committees and procedures to expedite its work, and shall provide for meaningful involvement of students in department and college deliberations and activities, including effective coordinating with departmental student advisory committees.

When dealing with faculty personnel action, a college council representing two departments or less or having a total of fewer than twenty-five faculty members in the ranks of professor, associate professor and assistant professor, shall provide for committee processing, where necessary, by referring the matter to the appropriate university-wide committee.

#### D. College Council Coordination with University-Wide Committees

To the extent necessary to effectuate the purposes of the college council system of governance as provided herein, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall (1) direct the transfer to the college councils of responsibility for functions delegated to them and heretofore performed by university-wide committees and (2) modify the responsibilities of university-wide committees in corresponding manner.

Approved: Academic Senate ~~11/3/97~~ April 2, 2007

Board of Trustees ~~11/10/97~~ \_\_\_\_\_, 2007

To take effect, as revised, July 1, 2007

{---end---}

- 
1. On March 2, 1987, the Academic Senate adopted the following resolution: The University RPT process shall be reviewed in three years (spring 1990) by a committee selected by the Academic Senate. The committee shall consist of students, faculty (both tenured and nontenured), and administrators.
  2. The regulations stated here in [Policy and Procedure 6-303] are stated in terms appropriate for the most widely adopted form of organizational structure, in which a faculty appointment is made in a subdivision known as an “academic department,” which is organized together with related subdivisions in a parent “college.” In that structure, tenure is established in an academic department. There are several variations in organizational structure relevant to appointments and tenure of faculty, as explained in [Policy and Procedure 6-300-1,6-404-1].

These regulations in [Policy and Procedure 6-303] shall be interpreted for appropriate adaptation to accommodate such relevant variations in organizational structure, including the following.

- a. Where necessary, the term “department” shall refer to an academic subdivision within a parent college, which operates as equivalent to a department but is known by another name, including any “free-standing division” or “school”. See [Policy and Procedure 6-202-1].

- b. Where necessary, the term “college” shall refer to an academic organization which operates as equivalent to a college, but is known by another name, including a “school.” See [Policy and Procedure 6-300-1].
- c. For colleges that have no formal internal academic subdivisions (known commonly as 'single-department colleges' or 'nondepartmentalized colleges'), appointments and tenure are established in the college. See [Policy and Procedure 6-312, 6-300-1, 6-404-1]. Accordingly, the procedures described here for development of criteria, and making and reviewing of retention, promotion and tenure decisions, shall be modified appropriately, including as follows:
  - i. Formulation of criteria or guidelines for retention, promotion, and tenure reviews, described here in [6-303-2-A] and elsewhere, shall be conducted by the college.
  - ii. The functions described here in [6-303-2-A] and elsewhere as being performed by a department-level RPT advisory committee shall be performed by a college RPT committee. The description of the membership and leadership of the committee shall be interpreted to include appropriate modifications, including that the college dean is ineligible to serve as committee chair, and that committee members shall be drawn from the ranks of the college faculty.
  - iii. The functions described here in [6-303-2-B-1] and elsewhere as being performed by a department chair shall be performed by the college dean (see [Policy and Procedure 2-005-5-F]), including such activities as holding meetings with RPT candidates.
  - iv. The functions described here in [6-303-2-C-3] and elsewhere as being performed by a department-level student advisory committee shall be performed by the college SAC.



- v. The actions described here in [6-303-2-F-4, 9-5.1-2-G], and elsewhere as being performed by a college dean and college-level RPT committee shall be inapplicable. Instead, RPT actions from a single-department college shall be forwarded for review at the level of the cognizant vice president and appropriate committees as provided in [6-303-2-H] and elsewhere.