



THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

TO: Joseph S. Paul
President

FROM: Lance A. Nail
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Faculty Handbook Recommendations

DATE: July 12, 2024

Approved with MODIFICATIONS- 7/19/24
Item #4, 2.6, Emeritus Faculty - has been pulled
from the recommendations for further review.

Below you will find recommendations from the Office of the Provost regarding changes to the Faculty Handbook as submitted by the Faculty Handbook Committee. Upon receipt of these documents, I engaged General Counsel in a review to assess for conflicts or potential risk factors. Ms. Coopers' advice is reflected in my recommendations.

*Item # 1 (3.3.3): **APPROVE*** Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure. Clarifies definition of conflict of interest with Office of Research Integrity website.

*Item #2 (3.3.4): **APPROVE***. Scholarly Misconduct. Slight change to the definition of misconduct to align with official university policy.

*Item #3 (Appendix A): **APPROVE***. Remove Appendix A. Content contained in appendix is readily available from other sources on campus and often more current.

~~*Item #4 (2.6): **APPROVE***. Emeritus Faculty. Further details the emeritus selection process and defines benefits to be consistent with other sources of information.~~

*Item #5 (Bylaws Changes): **APPROVE***. Extensive changes to the bylaws, but the most prominent change was in allowing individuals from outside of governing bodies to bring concerns about bylaws interpretations directly to the FHC.

*Item #6 (2.3.1.1) **APPROVE.*** Teaching Tracks. Tightened up language about teaching track promotion and removed language that offered instructors with terminal degrees a guaranteed pathway to teaching professor faculty.

*Item #7 (5.7.1.3) **APPROVE.*** Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. Clarifies that early promotion to professor cannot occur before the fifth year in rank.

*Item #8 (5.7.1.4) **APPROVE.*** Tenure Application. Clarifies when the award of tenure becomes effective and provides notice of the consequence of an unsuccessful application or outcome.

*Item #9 (5.7.2) **APPROVE.*** Promotion in Tenure Track Ranks. Aligns time frame for promotion between teaching and tenure track faculty.

*Item #10 (5.2.2) **APPROVE.*** Pre-Tenure Review Evaluative Bodies and Actions. Wording more accurately reflects the automated Promotion and Tenure evaluative review process and defines process for reviewing dossiers in the University Libraries.

*Item #11 (5.8.1.2) **APPROVE.*** Evaluative Levels and Actions. Matches consistency for University Libraries for change in 5.2.2 above.

*Item #12 (5.8.1.2.1) **APPROVE.*** The School. Matches consistency for University Libraries for change in 5.2.2 above and the wording more accurately reflects the automated Promotion and Tenure evaluative review process.

Provost Nail and President Paul,

During the 2023-2024 school year, the University Faculty Handbook Committee met once a month from September until May, and with your generous approval we met in June as well. Meetings were held in Joseph Greene Hall 245 and we also streamed via Microsoft Teams for our coast member and others who occasionally needed it. The membership consisted of Allisa Beck from Gulf Coast faculty, Subrina Cooper from University Counsel, Trent Gould from the Dean's Council, Melinda McLelland from the College of Business and Economic Development faculty, Megan Marlowe from the College of Nursing and Health Professions faculty, Edgar Simpson from the Council of Directors, Danilo Mezzadri (September-December) and Jeremy Scott (January-June) from the Faculty Senate, Lorraine Stuart from University Libraries faculty, Alan Thompson from the College of Arts and Sciences faculty and Lindsay Wright from the College of Education and Human Sciences. Doug Masterson served as ex-officio for the Office of the Provost this year as well.

The first meeting was held September 11th and officer elections were held. Lindsay Wright was elected to be Chair and Allisa Beck was elected to be Historian. The meeting was adjourned after the election.

The next meeting was October 9th and three proposals were introduced to the committee for a first vote. Proposals [3.3.3. Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure](#) and [3.3.4. Scholarly Misconduct](#) were both matters of housekeeping to align the handbook with existing university policy. These passed the first vote. Proposal [2.6. Emeritus Faculty](#) was to provide details regarding the process by which the Emeritus Faculty designation is conferred. This item was tabled due to a stakeholder's inability to be present. All proposals mentioned in this annual report are hyperlinked and attached at the end of this report.

On November 13th, proposals [3.3.3. Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure](#) and [3.3.4. Scholarly Misconduct](#) passed the second vote.

During the December 11th meeting the Faculty Handbook Committee proposed to remove [Appendix A. Resources](#) from the Faculty Handbook and re-letter the appendices A-D respectively. This was recommended because changes to the official handbook take effect July 1 of the next fiscal year, but university resources are added, removed, and/or renamed across campus at any time, and changes may be unbeknownst to the Faculty Handbook Committee. Faculty can also find available resources on the University website, and the Center for Faculty Development and Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning frequently communicate with faculty about available resources/name changes via email, New Faculty Orientation, Faculty First Week, ongoing workshops, etc. and we believe these efforts better meet the needs of faculty at this time. This proposal passed the first vote. We also started discussing the need for a bylaws revision to help increase efficiency. Additionally, during this meeting, the Faculty Senate representative, Danilo Mezzadri, announced he was taking sabbatical in the Spring semester and Jeremy Scott would be taking his place.

At the January 8th meeting we continued discussing our bylaws. Proposal [2.6. Emeritus Faculty](#) that was first introduced in October passed a first vote, and proposal [Appendix A. Resources](#) passed a second vote.

JSP

As referenced in the memo, 2.6, Emeritus Faculty has been pulled from the recommendations for further review

On February 12th the chair announced that Drs. Winstead (Arts and Sciences), Story (Nursing and Health Professions), Eye (University Libraries), Patton (Council of Directors), and Courts (Faculty Senate) were notified of the need of new members for the 2024-2027 term on January 19th and that names of replacements/nominees were requested by March 1st. The chair of Faculty Senate responded stating they appoint their representative in the Fall and that they should not be serving a 3-year term. This was added to our ongoing conversation about our Bylaws revisions. Proposal [2.6. Emeritus Faculty](#) passed the second vote.

On March 11th we finished our Bylaws revisions.

The committee met again on April 8th. During this meeting the proposed Bylaw revisions were read to the floor to begin the 28-day review period before holding a vote. In April the chair also emailed the committee the results of the election for the 2024-2027 term. We will be joined next year by Mac Alford (Arts and Sciences), Melissa Brooks (University Libraries), and Lisa Morgan (College of Nursing and Health Professions), as Alan Thompson, Lorraine Stuart, and Megan Marlowe's terms end.

The last meeting of the academic year occurred on May 13th. Our Bylaws revisions passed with the required 2/3 vote. Seven proposals were introduced. [2.3.1.1. Teaching Tracks](#) and [5.7.2. Promotion in Teaching-Track Positions](#) align the time frame for promotion of non-tenure track faculty with tenure track faculty and streamlines some otherwise cumbersome language. Proposal [5.7.1.3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor](#) allows associate professors to apply for promotion during (or after) the fifth year of service in rank consistent with history and policy prior to the reorganization. Proposal [5.7.1.4. Tenure Application](#) provides clarification regarding when the award of tenure becomes effective. It also provides notice of the consequence of an unsuccessful application or outcome. Proposals [5.2.2. Pre-Tenure Review and Evaluative Bodies](#), [5.8.1.2. Evaluative Levels and Actions](#), and [5.8.1.2.1. The School](#) intend to more accurately reflect the automated Promotion and Tenure evaluative review process and provide a means for reviewing dossiers in the University Libraries, which "do not have schools or school directors in the same sense as the academic colleges." (1.10.2.5)

We met for the last time on June 10th to hold a second vote on proposals [2.3.1.1. Teaching Tracks](#), [5.7.2. Promotion in Teaching-Track Positions](#), [5.7.1.3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor](#), [5.7.1.4. Tenure Application](#), [5.2.2. Pre-Tenure Review and Evaluative Bodies](#), [5.8.1.2. Evaluative Levels and Actions](#), and [5.8.1.2.1. The School](#). All proposals passed the second vote.

I would like to commend the committee members for their hard work and contributions during the academic year, and for their willingness to meet during two student holidays (Mardi Gras Break and Spring Break) and again in June when many were off contract. Special recognition should be given to Alan Thompson, Lorraine Stuart, and Megan Marlowe for their years of service as they rotate off the committee. The committee recommends that the Provost and President approve these changes to the University Faculty Handbook prior to the next academic year.

Sincerely,

Dr. Lindsay Wright

Chair, University Faculty Handbook Committee

Dr. Sam Bruton proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 3.3.3., Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure, on October 9, 2023.

First Vote Date: Oct. 9, 2023

First Vote Results: 9-0

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: Nov. 13, 2023

University Counsel Opinion: None

Employee Handbook Opinion: None

Faculty Senate Opinion: None

Council of Directors Opinion: None

Deans Opinion: None

Vice President of Research Opinion: None

Provost Opinion: None

Second Vote Date: Nov. 13, 2023

Second Vote Results: 9-0

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Sam Bruton moves that the following section:

3.3.3. Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure

All faculty members must complete the University's [financial conflict of interest disclosure](#) annually. The [form](#) can be found at the University's Office of Research Integrity website, and it provides definitions for which kinds of financial interests must be disclosed under the policy.

Have its language changed to:

3.3.3. ~~Financial~~ Conflict of Interest Disclosure

All faculty members must complete the University's [financial conflict of interest disclosure](#) annually between September 1 and September 30. The [form](#) can be found ~~at-on~~ the University's Office of Research Integrity website, and it provides definitions for which kinds of ~~financial~~ interests must be disclosed under the policy.

Rationale: These changes are a mere matter of housecleaning.

Dr. Sam Bruton proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 3.3.4., Scholarly Misconduct, on October 9, 2023.

First Vote Date: Oct. 9, 2023

First Vote Results: 9-0

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: Nov. 13, 2023

University Counsel Opinion: None

Employee Handbook Opinion: None

Faculty Senate Opinion: None

Council of Directors Opinion: None

Deans Opinion: None

Vice President of Research Opinion: None

Provost Opinion: None

Second Vote Date: Nov. 13, 2023

Second Vote Results: 9-0

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Sam Bruton moves that the following section:

3.3.4. Scholarly Misconduct

All members of the faculty and others with responsibilities for research/creative activities are expected to adhere to the University's policy regarding [scholarly misconduct](#). As USM defines scholarly misconduct, it includes (but is not limited to): (1) research misconduct as defined by federal policy: "fabrication, falsification or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research or reporting research results;" (2) abuse of confidentiality, including improper use of information gained by privileged access, such as information obtained through service on peer review panels and editorial boards; (3) violations of University policies concerning the use of human subjects, animal subjects, and laboratory safety; and (4) misappropriation of funds or resources, such as the misuse of research funds for personal gain. Misconduct does not include honest errors or mere difference in judgment. Individuals with concerns or questions about possible violations of the University's Scholarly

Misconduct Policy are encouraged to consult with the University's Research Integrity Officer ([RIO](#)), the Director of the Office of Research Integrity.

Have its language changed to:

3.3.4. Scholarly Misconduct

All members of the faculty and others with responsibilities for research/creative activities are expected to adhere to the University's policy regarding [scholarly misconduct](#). As USM defines scholarly misconduct, it includes (but is not limited to): (1) research misconduct as defined by federal policy: "fabrication, falsification or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research or reporting research results;" (2) abuse of confidentiality, including improper use of information gained by privileged access, such as information obtained through service on peer review panels and editorial boards; (3) violations of University policies concerning the use of human subjects, animal subjects, [biosafety \(biosafety level 2 or above\) or materials transfer and laboratory safety](#); and (4) misappropriation of funds or resources, such as the misuse of research funds for personal gain. Misconduct does not include honest errors or mere difference in judgment. Individuals with concerns or questions about possible violations of the University's Scholarly Misconduct Policy are encouraged to consult with the University's Research Integrity Officer ([RIO](#)), the Director of the Office of Research Integrity.

Rationale: These changes are a mere matter of housecleaning. The slight tweak to the definition of misconduct is already official policy.

The Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning Appendix A. Resources, on December 11, 2023.

First Vote Date: 12/11/23

First Vote Results: 9-0

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: Jan. 8, 2024

University Counsel Opinion: None

Employee Handbook Opinion: None

Faculty Senate Opinion: None

Council of Directors Opinion: None

Deans Opinion: None

Vice President of Research Opinion: None

Provost Opinion: None

Second Vote Date: Jan. 8, 2024

Second Vote Results: 7-0

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Handbook Committee moves that Appendix A be removed from the Faculty Handbook, and that Appendices B-E be re-lettered A-D, respectively.

Rationale: Changes to the official handbook take effect July 1 of the next fiscal year, but university resources are added, removed, and/or renamed across campus at any time, and changes may be unbeknownst to the Faculty Handbook Committee. Faculty can find available resources on the University website, and the Center for Faculty Development and Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning frequently communicate with faculty about available resources/name changes via email, New Faculty Orientation, Faculty First Week, ongoing workshops, etc. and we believe these efforts better meet the needs of faculty at this time.

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to our Bylaws, on October 9, 2023.

Read to the floor: April 8, 2024

Length of Review and Potential Vote Date: Minimum 28-days; May 13, 2024

Vote Date: May 13, 2024

Vote Results: 8-0-0-1 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes our bylaws as written:

[Click here to access current bylaws](#)

Have its language changed to:

**THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN
MISSISSIPPI FACULTY HANDBOOK
COMMITTEE
BYLAWS**

Approved by Committee on May 7, 2019

**Approved by Rodney Bennett, President on June 6,
2019**

**Amended and Approved by Rodney Bennett, President on August 27, 2020, September 10, 2020, June
14,
2022**

Notice: governance and standing committee bylaws shall not supersede the authority of the University President as designated by the State Institutions of Higher Learning Board of Trustees or the State of Mississippi.

ARTICLE I

PURPOSE STATEMENT

The Faculty Handbook Committee considers proposals, modifications, and amendments to the Faculty Handbook brought to it from an official university governing body or administrative office, including the Faculty Handbook Committee. The committee ensures that proposed changes are clear, well-written, and consistent with other parts of the Faculty and Employee Handbooks as well as other University and IHL documents and policies.

**ARTICLE II
MEMBERSHIP
IP**

Section 1. Members

Voting Elected Members:

- Member of the faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences ~~selected~~elected by the college*
- Member of the faculty from the College of Business and Economic Development ~~selected~~elected by the college*
- Member of the faculty from the College of Education and Human Sciences ~~selected~~elected by the college*
- Member of the faculty from the University Libraries ~~selected~~elected by the library*
- Member of the faculty from the College of Nursing and Health Professions ~~selected~~elected by the college*
- At-Large Member of the faculty ~~appointed to~~from the Gulf Coast ~~selected~~elected by the coast locations*

Voting Appointed Members:

- Member of Faculty Senate ~~selected~~appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Member of the Dean's Council ~~Dean selected~~appointed by the ~~College Deans's~~Council
- Member of the Council of Directors ~~appointed~~selected by the Council of Directors

Non-voting Ex-officio Member:

- A representative from ~~Member of general counsel appointed by~~ the Office of General Counsel
- A representative from the Office of the Provost

* Must be regular faculty with at least 3 years' experience in a tenure-track or teaching-track line at the university, ~~be~~ below the level of school director, and cannot be serving on ~~one of the any other major university governing bodies~~ (described in the faculty handbook 1.8)y.

Section 2. Terms

~~Terms will begin on September 1, and end on August 31. Voting appointed members and non-voting ex-officio members will serve annual terms, renewable as deemed appropriate by their appointing body. Voting elected members will be split into two groups and The Faculty Handbook Committee membership shall serve staggered three-year terms. A university counsel member will serve as ex-officio on the committee. Terms will begin on September 1, and end on August 31. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms unless there are no available replacements.~~

~~The committee will be split into two groups. The chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee is responsible for notifying represented offices or bodies of term completions and the need for new members by February 1 of the year the replacement is needed.~~

The groups are assigned as follows:

Group 1 (3-year terms beginning September 1 of 2021, 2024, 2027, 2030, etc.)

- Member of the faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences
- Member of the faculty from the College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Member of the faculty from the University Libraries
- ~~School director from the Council of Directors~~
- ~~Member of the Faculty Senate~~

Group 2 (3-year terms beginning September 1 of 2019, 2022, 2025, 2028, 2031, etc.)

- Member of the faculty from the College of Business and Economic Development
- Member of the faculty from the College of Education and Human Sciences
- At-Large Member of the faculty from Gulf Coast
- ~~Dean selected by the College Deans~~
- ~~Member of the University Counsel~~

~~Group 3 (off year for appointments/elections 2020, 2023, 2029, etc.)~~

Section 3. Elections

~~The Faculty Handbook Committee will elect a chair and historiansecretary at the first meeting of the year. from the faculty members. Members representing Dean's Council, Council of Directors, The Office of General Counsel, and The Office of the Provost Counsel. School Director, and Dean are not eligible for election toto serve as chair or historiansecretary. Chairs and historians may serve up to three consecutive one-year terms. The The chair and historiansecretary will be voting members of the committee. and will assist in verifying qualifications. developing the ballot, administering elections, and reporting the elections of new members.~~

~~Elections to the Faculty Handbook Committee will be coordinated by the chair and historian and they will assist in verifying qualifications (see section 1 for qualifications), developing the ballot, administering elections, and reporting the elections of new members. If the bodies represented by both the chair and secretary are up for reelection, the committee shall select an alternate member of the committee to coordinate the election process.~~

~~Each constituency group needing an elected or appointed member will be notified in February of the need for an election or appointment (see section 1 for qualifications). All members of the corps of instruction (described in the Faculty Handbook 2.1.2) in the represented body constituency group are eligible to vote. The chair is also responsible for confirming membership for the academic year for the voting appointed and ex-officio members before the first meeting in September.~~

Section 4. Responsibilities

Members are to attend all regularly scheduled meetings of the Faculty Handbook Committee and communicate the issues raised in the committee meetings to their represented ~~constituencies~~bodies. ~~If a member of the Faculty Handbook Committee is no longer a member of their constituency group, their seat will be declared vacant.~~ If a members of the Faculty Handbook Committee fails to attend two regularly scheduled meetings ~~of the committee~~ in a single academic year without supplying a proxy, they shall be notified in writing by the chair of the committee that their position will be declared vacant in the event of a third absence without a proxy. Upon a third absence in a single academic year without a proxy, their position shall be declared vacant by the chair of the committee and recorded in the minutes. ~~A position shall also be declared vacant if a member is no longer a member of their represented body or are otherwise unable to continue serving.~~

Section 5. Proxies and Vacancies

Proxies: In the ~~ease~~-event that a member of the committee must be absent from a meeting it is expected that a proxy will be named to represent the committee member at the meeting. The proxy must meet the eligibility requirements for membership (see section 1 for qualifications) and ~~it~~ is preferred that the proxy be chosen from the members of the represented ~~constituency~~body. ~~In the case of an extended absence from the university committee members are expected to name a long term proxy for a set term as communicated to the chair. All proxies must be reported by the sitting member of the committee to the chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee at least one day prior to the meeting the proxy will attend.~~ It is the committee member's responsibility to notify the chair via email of need for a proxy and the name of the proxy. Proxies retain voting privileges in representing regular committee members. ~~If the chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee is not notified of a proxy attending at least one day prior to the meeting, the proxy may attend the meeting but will forfeit voting privileges.~~ Proxies may not represent more than one voting member of the committee.

Vacancies: Should a position on the Faculty Handbook Committee be vacated for any reason the chair of the committee shall notify the body or office from which the position was vacated of the need for a replacement. For voting elected members, an ~~It is expected that replacements be in place by the next scheduled meeting of the committee. Previous election results should be considered in appointing a new replacement, but if enough time has passed to warrant a new election, an~~ interim appointment will be made from the previous election results of the ~~constituency-represented body~~group with full voting rights until a new~~that~~ election can take place. After a new election, the newly ~~E~~lected replacements will be seated at the next scheduled meeting with full voting rights. Permanent replacements for members shall serve out the remainder of the original 3-year term and will be eligible for additional terms.

ARTICLE III

OPERATING PROCEDURES

Section 1. Meetings

Regular meetings of the Faculty Handbook Committee will be held on the second or third Monday of the month at 3 PM during the academic year. The chair may call special meetings as needed. A quorum, consisting of a majority of members or their proxies, is required. The chair will conduct meetings according to *Robert's Rules of Order*. Each meeting must have minutes, attendance, and proxies recorded. Each meeting agenda is expected to be posted distributed to the committee at least one week before the meeting, and all meetings are open to all faculty members. Effort should be made to explicitly invite any ~~constituency~~ group that might be particularly affected by a proposed modification.

Section 2. Changes to Handbook

Proposals, modifications, or amendments for changes to the Faculty Handbook may come from any official university advisory body or administrative office, academic administrative office or official University Representative and Advisory Body, including the Faculty Handbook Committee. Proposals, modifications, or amendments must be submitted in writing at least 10 days prior to the next meeting and shall receive reasonable consideration from the committee.

Faculty members may submit matters they would like the Faculty Handbook Committee to consider to their representative or the committee chair in writing at least 10 days prior to the meeting date. Matters should be described in as much detail as possible and reference specific sections in the Faculty Handbook. Matters will be distributed as written to the committee but will be blinded in an attempt to preserve anonymity. The matter shall receive reasonable consideration from the committee and will determine whether they should move forward with drafting a proposal, as indicated by a majority vote.

Proposals coming before the Faculty Handbook Committee are given two votes. After a first reading, the proposal is voted on and then taken to the represented bodies, the Office of Human Resources, and the Vice President of Research for a period of review and comments. The representative will report any feedback or suggestions regarding the proposed change to the Faculty Handbook Committee before the second vote. A proposal is considered approved after it passes a second vote by the committee. Editorial or clerical changes can be approved without a second reading upon approval of the majority of the committee.

Annually, the Faculty Handbook Committee secretary will review all active URL links in the current Faculty Handbook to verify accuracy. Any errant URLs will be reported to either the Office of the Provost or Office of Human Resources.

~~The Amendment Process for change in the University Faculty Handbook:~~

~~Step 1. Proposal phase~~

- ~~• Written proposals are brought to the Faculty Handbook Committee~~
- ~~• Proposal is given to the chair of the committee in writing at least 10 days before the scheduled meeting~~
- ~~• Chair responsibilities~~
- ~~• Chair confirms receipt of proposal~~
- ~~• Chair distributes the proposal to all members of the committee~~
- ~~• Chair notifies the relevant constituency groups of proposal~~

- Chair notifies University Counsel of proposal
 - Proposal is added to the agenda of the next meeting
 - Proposal is read to the floor at next scheduled meeting and recorded in the minutes (Step 2)
- Step 2. First vote process (to approve proposal to advance for review)
- Proposal read to the floor 2.1.1. Stakeholder comments (if present)
 - Voices of dissent for policy
 - Voices of support for policy 2.1.2. Proposal is discussed as a committee of the whole
 - Vote held, proxy votes allowed, plurality of those present to pass 2.2.1. Vote fails—policy rejected (Step 3)

2.2.2. Vote passes—policy moves to review process (Step

4) Step 3. Policy rejected

3.1. Process steps, is recorded in the minutes, and included in the annual report

Step 4. First vote review process

- Review and comment period (can be contemporaneous)
 - University Counsel review for conflict or legal concerns 4.1.2. Employee Handbook review through human resources for conflict 4.1.3. Senate and constituent review and comment period 4.1.4. Council of Directors' review and comment period 4.1.5. College Dean's review and comment period 4.1.6. Vice President of Research review and comment period 4.1.7. Provost review and comment period

• After a reasonable amount of time for review (stipulated by the chair in the minutes) the policy is added to the agenda for the next meeting (Step 5)

Step 5. Second vote process

- The policy is re-read to the floor.
- The chair reports a summary of all reviews of the policy from counsel, human resources, senate, provost, and constituent reviews
- Stakeholder comments (if present) 5.3.1. Voices of dissent for policy 5.3.2. Voices of support for policy
- Committee discussion on reviews
- If significant changes are needed (beyond editorial or clarification of language) or issue discovered with the policy after review, the policy does not have a 2nd vote but returns to first vote (Step 2), else it advances to second vote (Step 5.6).
- Second vote held, proxy votes allowed, plurality of membership to pass 5.6.1. Vote fails
 - 5.6.1.1. Returns to first vote (Step
 - 2) 5.6.2. Vote passes

• Final counsel review

• Final Provost review

• Advances to step 6

Step 6. Faculty Handbook Committee and Provost bring proposal(s) to Office of the President

• President rejects policy 6.1.1. Policy change fails (Step 3)

• President accepts policy as written (Step 7)

• President accepts policy with modification

• Modifications are substantial and send back to second first vote (Step 2-5) 6.3.2. Modifications are editorial or clarifying (Step 7)

Step 7. New language added to the Faculty Handbook

• Provost reviews revisions

• Revised text is sent to the chair of Faculty Handbook Committee to determine if changes are accurate.

- ~~New text is determined accurate by chair (moves to Step 8) 7.2.2. New text is not determined accurate by chair (moves to step 7.1)~~
- ~~Step 8. New Faculty Handbook is amended and updated to the provost's webpage~~
- ~~New Faculty Handbook records the new date of implementation and includes a note of the changes in an executive summary as a cover letter written by the Faculty Handbook Committee and full details of the change added to the appendix.~~
- ~~Faculty Handbook Committee reviews new Faculty Handbook for accuracy of changes~~
- ~~Faculty Handbook Committee verifies all URL links in the Faculty Handbook~~
- ~~Faculty Handbook Committee chair informs the Provost of approval of handbook as posted or informs the Provost of necessary edits~~

All changes approved by the committee will be formally recommended to the President of the University through the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs by June 1 so they can make a final decision. Changes to the official handbook take effect July 1 of the next fiscal year. All changes made to the handbook in a given year will be included in an annual appendix.

Section 3. Changes to Bylaws

These bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the committee's voting membership, excluding proxies, at any regular meeting of the committee. Proposed revisions must be submitted in writing at least 10 days prior to the meeting. Proposals will be read to the floor and given at least a 28-day review period before a vote is held. Revisions to the bylaws are submitted to the President of the University through the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs for approval.

ARTICLE IV COMMUNICATIONS/REPORTING

Section 1. Administrator to whom the committee reports

The Faculty Handbook Committee reports and moves recommendations to the President of the University through the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs. ~~If approved by the committee, changes are formally recommended to the University President for a final decision.~~

Section 2. Staff Support

The Faculty Handbook Committee will have staff support from the Office of the Provost as deemed appropriate by the Provost. The Office of the Provost will assign a point of contact for uploading minutes and other documents to the Provost's website. The Office of Human Resources will assign a point of contact for review of new policies against the current Employee Handbook. The Office of General Counsel will use the non-voting ex-officio as the point of contact for counsel reviews.

Section 3. Minutes

Minutes of the Faculty Handbook Committee meetings are recorded by the ~~historiansecretary~~ and approved by the committee members. The approved minutes are distributed to the designated Office of the Provost staff support member to post to the Provost's website within 60 days of the committee's meeting and for distribution to the committee members, directors, deans, the Provost, and the President. Past minutes are kept on the website for a minimum of five years.

Section 4. Website Location and Changes

The Faculty Handbook Committee will communicate to the university community utilizing an appropriate website. The Faculty Handbook Committee website will be the primary resource regarding amendments/revisions in the Faculty Handbook, committee minutes, membership list, and bylaws. ~~The Provost Office staff member and Faculty Handbook Committee chair will be responsible for posting the approved committee minutes within 60 days of the committee's meeting, using an appropriate website. Past minutes are kept on the website for a minimum of five years. The Faculty Handbook Committee historian will review all active URL links in the current Faculty Handbook to verify accuracy. Any errant URLs will be reported to either the Office of the Provost or Office of Human Resources.~~

Section 5. System for Preserving ~~Minutes, Changes, and Copies~~

The most current copy of the Faculty Handbook is retained by the Office of the Provost as a .pdf and is designated as the official Faculty Handbook. The Provost's Office will be responsible for keeping records of amendments and revisions to the Faculty Handbook and disseminating the amendments and revisions to the faculty.

Section 6. Annual Report

~~By June 1 the chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee will submit A~~an annual report ~~recommending the changes that were approved by the committee during the academic year to the President of the University through the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs so they can make the final decision. will be written by the chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee and submitted to the President of the University through the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the end of the academic year. Changes to the official handbook take effect July 1 of the next fiscal year. All changes made to the handbook in a given year will be included in an annual appendix.~~

~~By July 1 of each year, the Faculty Handbook Committee chair will submit a copy of the annual report to the Committee on Committees along with a letter from the president acknowledging receipt of the report. The annual report will include the major yearly activities of the committee, along with a list of amendments and revisions that have been approved by the President during the year.~~

[Since that is messy, here is another word document with changes tracked](#)

[And here is a clean version without track changes](#)

Rationale: Article 3, Section 2 of the current bylaws felt restrictive, only permitting fully written proposals to come to us from a University governing body and immediately go to a first vote. We had several individuals contact us over the last year asking us to look into sections (e.g. the handbook clearly said what year tenure-track faculty submit their dossiers, but a school expressed that was not as clear for non-tenure track faculty; or a clinic name was incorrect). We feel it is important for anyone to be able to notify us of areas of confusion or inaccuracies and for the committee to then discuss whether it is in our purview and then choose to draft a proposal or not. While making these changes, we also cleaned up membership terms so appointed positions are not on 3-year terms, as we were running into issues with the ability for those positions to serve their full terms due to their membership on their represented bodies, and we removed the requirement that the chair had to be notified of a proxy a day in advance or the represented group would lose their vote. Additional changes were made to clean-up language, decrease redundancy, and increase readability.

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning 2.3.1.1. Teaching Tracks, on April 8, 2024.

First Vote Date: 5/13/24

First Vote Results: 7-1-1-0 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 1 month/June 10th

University Counsel Opinion: none

Employee Handbook Opinion: none

Faculty Senate Opinion: 8 for/16 against

Council of Directors Opinion: none

Deans Opinion: none

Vice President of Research Opinion: none

Provost Opinion: none

Second Vote Date: June 10, 2024

Second Vote Results: 6-1-0-2 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

2.3.1.1. Teaching Tracks

Teaching faculty who do not have a terminal degree in the discipline, or a closely related one, in which they teach are initially appointed as instructors and can be promoted to lecturer and then senior lecturer. Individuals in these positions who earn the relevant terminal degree may be moved to the rank of assistant teaching professor.

Teaching faculty who hold a terminal degree in the discipline in which they teach, or a closely related discipline, are appointed at the rank of assistant teaching professor, unless a higher rank is negotiated when hired, and can be promoted to the rank of associate teaching professor and then teaching professor in a manner comparable to tenure-track faculty.

Have its language changed to:

2.3.1.1. Teaching Tracks

Teaching faculty who do not have a terminal degree in the discipline, or a closely related one, in which they teach are initially appointed as instructors and can be promoted to lecturer and then senior lecturer. Individuals in these positions who earn the relevant terminal degree may be moved to the rank of assistant teaching professor.

Teaching faculty who hold a terminal degree in the discipline in which they teach, or a closely related discipline, are appointed at the rank of assistant teaching professor, unless a higher rank is negotiated when hired, and can be promoted to the rank of associate teaching professor and then teaching professor ~~in a manner comparable~~ in an equivalent time frame to tenure-track faculty.

Rationale: The existing language was vague and could likely be construed as referring to the process whereas it should more clearly refer to the time frame (e.g., number of years required for eligibility to be promoted). Additionally, this policy was implemented as a short-term measure to fast-track long serving faculty. The need for this remedy has expired. All such cases were specifically identified and addressed. Further, all faculty remain eligible to apply for early promotion as specified under unit guidelines. Finally, aligning the time frames mitigates the likelihood of unnecessary conflict in the unit that might otherwise arise between faculty in the two tracks.

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning 5.7.1.3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, on April 8, 2024.

First Vote Date: 5/13/24

First Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 1 month/June 10

University Counsel Opinion: none

Employee Handbook Opinion: none

Faculty Senate Opinion: 4 for/19 against

Council of Directors Opinion: none

Deans Opinion: none

Vice President of Research Opinion: none

Provost Opinion: none

Second Vote Date: June 10, 2024

Second Vote Results: 7-0-0-2 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

5.7.1.3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The standard probationary period for promotion from associate professor to professor is five years. In the sixth year of service at rank, the candidate may apply for promotion from associate professor to professor. Early promotion may be considered once excellence is established in all work-related categories beyond the record considered for promotion to associate professor. Generally, eligibility for early promotion may be granted in the fifth year in rank.

Have its language changed to:

5.7.1.3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The standard probationary period for promotion from associate professor to professor is five years. In the ~~sixth~~ fifth (or later) year of service at rank, the candidate may apply for promotion from associate

professor to professor, with an approved promotion effective at the beginning of the following academic year. In exceptional cases, it is possible for an individual with qualifications far exceeding school guidelines to receive consideration for early promotion. ~~Early promotion may be considered once excellence is established in all work-related categories beyond the record considered for promotion to associate professor.~~ Generally, eligibility for early promotion may be granted prior to ~~in~~ the fifth year in rank.

Rationale: This modification allows associate professors to apply for promotion during (or after) the fifth year of service in rank consistent with history and policy prior to the reorganization.

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning 5.7.1.4, Tenure Application, on April 8, 2024.

First Vote Date: 5/13/24

First Vote Results: 9-0-0

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 1 month/June 10

University Counsel Opinion: none

Employee Handbook Opinion: none

Faculty Senate Opinion: 17 for/5 against

Council of Directors Opinion: none

Deans Opinion: none

Vice President of Research Opinion: none

Provost Opinion: none

Second Vote Date: June 10, 2024

Second Vote Results: 7-0-0-2 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

5.7.1.4. Tenure Application

Unless credit for time served at another institution has been awarded in the hiring process, faculty must apply for tenure in their sixth year.

Have its language changed to:

5.7.1.4. Tenure Application

Unless credit for time served at another institution has been awarded during the hiring process, faculty must apply for tenure in their sixth year of service with the award becoming effective at the beginning of the following academic year (i.e., 7th year). Faculty members who are unsuccessful in applying for tenure will receive a terminal contract.

Rationale: This modification provides clarification regarding when the award of tenure becomes effective. It also provides notice of the consequence of an unsuccessful application or outcome.

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning 5.7.2., Promotion in Teaching-Track Positions, on April 8, 2024.

First Vote Date: 5/13/24

First Vote Results: 8-0-1-0 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: _____

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: 15 for/1 against

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date: June 10, 2024

Second Vote Results: 6-1-0-2 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

5.7.2. Promotion in Teaching-Track Positions

A five-year probationary period for a new assistant teaching professor or instructor provides time to demonstrate excellence in teaching and service prior to being promoted to the next rank. A notable exception to this probationary period applies to candidates whose initial appointment gave them credit for service prior to joining the University. Individuals with qualifications far exceeding the guidelines may receive consideration for early promotion. However, non-tenure-track faculty do not have any mandate to move towards promotion unless that candidate so desires. Given the nature of non-tenured positions, promotion should be considered a desirable goal rather than a mandate. In particular, non-tenure-track promotable faculty at the University are allowed to remain at the University even if there is no promotion from assistant teaching professor to associate teaching professor or from instructor to lecturer.

There is no University-wide mandatory probationary period for promotion from associate teaching professor to teaching professor or for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer for the non-tenure-track corps of instruction.

Have its language changed to:

5.7.2. Promotion in Teaching-Track Positions

A five-year probationary period for a new assistant teaching professor or instructor provides time to demonstrate excellence in teaching and service prior to being promoted to the next rank. A notable exception applies to candidates whose initial appointment gave them credit for service prior to joining the University. Consistent with section 2.3.1.1. above, teaching track faculty may be promoted in an equivalent time frame to tenure-track faculty. In cases involving promotion from assistant teaching professor to associate teaching professor, or instructor to lecturer, an application for promotion may occur during the sixth year of service (or later) in the lower rank, with an approved promotion effective at the beginning of the following academic year. The standard probationary period for promotion from associate teaching professor to teaching professor, or lecturer to senior lecturer, is five years. In the fifth (or later) year of service at rank, the candidate may apply with the promotion becoming effective at the beginning of the following academic year.

~~A five-year probationary period for a new assistant teaching professor or instructor provides time to demonstrate excellence in teaching and service prior to being promoted to the next rank. A notable exception to this probationary period applies to candidates whose initial appointment gave them credit for service prior to joining the University. Individuals with qualifications far exceeding the guidelines may receive consideration for early promotion. However, non-tenure-track faculty do not have any mandate to move towards promotion unless that candidate so desires. Given the nature of non-tenured positions, promotion should be considered a desirable goal rather than a mandate. In particular, non-tenure-track promotable faculty at the University are allowed to remain at the University even if there is no promotion from assistant teaching professor to associate teaching professor or from instructor to lecturer.~~

~~There is no University-wide mandatory probationary period for promotion from associate teaching professor to teaching professor or for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer for the non-tenure-track corps of instruction.~~

Rationale: This modification aligns the time frame for promotion of non-tenure track faculty with tenure track faculty and streamlines some otherwise cumbersome language.

**The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the Faculty Handbook concerning
5.2.2 Pre-Tenure Review – Evaluative Bodies and Actions, on May 13, 2024**

First Vote Date: 5/13/24

First Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 1 month/June 10

University Counsel Opinion: none

Employee Handbook Opinion: none

Faculty Senate Opinion: none

Council of Directors Opinion: none

Deans Opinion: none

Vice President of Research Opinion: none

Provost Opinion: none

Second Vote Date: June 10, 2024

Second Vote Results 7-0-0-2 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

5.2.2. Pre-Tenure Review Evaluative Bodies and Actions

Pre-tenure review involves the same evaluative bodies and process as review of tenure or promotion, discussed in 5.8.1.2 below, with the following differences. Letters from external evaluators will not be solicited for pre-tenure review. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee will not review pre-tenure review materials and pre-tenure review stops at the Provost's level.

A principal task of the school promotion and tenure committee in the case of pre-tenure review is to identify areas in which the candidate may need to improve in order to eventually merit tenure. The members of the committee must assess whether the candidate is making satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward an award of tenure. In addition, the committee must identify areas where improvements are needed. As in the case of letters from the committee for promotion or tenure, the written recommendation must include the rationale and vote count of the committee.

School directors must submit the pre-tenure reviews to the college promotion and tenure committee and the dean of the college in which the faculty member under review holds academic appointment. School directors and the college promotion and tenure committees must also prepare and submit independent evaluations to academic deans, either concurring or dissenting with the school committee. If a school director is the subject of pre-tenure review, the recommendation of the school committee is forwarded directly to the college promotion and tenure committee and the dean. Pre-tenure reviews are forwarded from the deans to the Provost without involvement of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

As with promotion and tenure cases, the faculty member under review will receive a copy of the letter from each evaluative entity when it is sent to the next level of review. School directors also must assure that copies of pre-tenure reviews are retained in school personnel files. Upon request by a candidate, school directors must provide the candidate with a copy of the pre-tenure evaluations maintained in school personnel files.

Have its language changed to:

5.2.2. Pre-Tenure Review Evaluative Bodies and Actions

Pre-tenure review involves the same evaluative bodies and process as review of tenure or promotion, discussed in 5.8.1.2 below, with the following differences. Letters from external evaluators will not be solicited for pre-tenure review. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee will not review pre-tenure review materials and pre-tenure review stops at the Provost's level.

A principal task of the school promotion and tenure committee in the case of pre-tenure review is to identify areas in which the candidate may need to improve in order to eventually merit tenure. The members of the committee must assess whether the candidate is making satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward an award of tenure. In addition, the committee must identify areas where improvements are needed. As in the case of letters from the committee for promotion or tenure, the written recommendation must include the rationale and vote count of the committee.

Upon a candidate's dossier submission, the school director verifies that the submission is complete and ready for review by the school committee. School directors must submit the pre-tenure reviews to the college promotion and tenure committee ~~and the dean of the college in which the faculty member under review holds academic appointment.~~ School directors and the college promotion and tenure committees must also prepare and submit independent evaluations to academic deans, either concurring or dissenting with the school committee. If a school director is the subject of pre-tenure review, the recommendation of the school committee is forwarded directly to the college promotion and tenure committee and the dean. Pre-tenure reviews are forwarded from the deans to the Provost without involvement of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

As with promotion and tenure cases, the faculty member under review will receive a copy of the letter from each evaluative entity when it is sent to the next level of review. School directors also must assure that copies of pre-tenure reviews are retained in school-the candidate's personnel files. Upon request by a candidate, school directors must provide the candidate with a copy of the pre-tenure evaluations maintained in school personnel files.

University Libraries faculty will elect a pro tem school director from among the tenured department heads to fulfill the responsibilities of school director in the review process. The elected UL pro tem school director fulfills the role of the academic school directors in the pre-tenure, tenure and promotion process only. The UL pro tem school director may not sit as a member of the school, college, or University promotion and tenure committees.

Rationale:

The wording is proposed to more accurately reflect the automated Promotion and Tenure evaluative review process. Additionally, it provides a means for reviewing dossiers in the University Libraries, which “do not have schools or school directors in the same sense as the academic colleges.” (1.10.2.5)

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the Faculty Handbook concerning 5.8.1.2 Evaluative Levels and Actions, on May 13, 2024

First Vote Date: 5/13/24

First Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 1 month/June 10

University Counsel Opinion: none

Employee Handbook Opinion: none

Faculty Senate Opinion: none

Council of Directors Opinion: none

Deans Opinion: none

Vice President of Research Opinion: none

Provost Opinion: none

Second Vote Date: June 10, 2024

Second Vote Results 7-0-0-2 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

5.8.1.2. Evaluative Levels and Actions

The President is advised on personnel recommendations by the administrative heads of the University's academic units, the Provost, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the deans, and the college promotion and tenure committees. Advice from the Vice President for Research, General Counsel, and by the other vice presidents may be solicited by the President in matters that are within

their administrative jurisdiction. The advice rendered by University officers or committees does not limit the legal authority or responsibility of the President for all personnel decisions.

Review of applications for promotion or tenure occurs at each institutional level of the University in the following sequence: the candidate's school promotion and tenure committee, the school director (or a joint letter from school directors in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the college promotion and tenure committee, the dean of the college in which the candidate's school resides (or a joint letter from deans from all relevant colleges in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, Provost, and President.

Because promotion and tenure processes often coincide for tenure-track faculty, the composition of the promotion and tenure committees may be similar, but all processes should be separate. The committees are discussed in more detail in Chapter 1 of this Handbook.

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that additional language be added to the following section:

Have its language changed to:

5.8.1.2. Evaluative Levels and Actions

The President is advised on personnel recommendations by the administrative heads of the University's academic units, the Provost, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the deans, and the college promotion and tenure committees. Advice from the Vice President for Research, General Counsel, and by the other vice presidents may be solicited by the President in matters that are within their administrative jurisdiction. The advice rendered by University officers or committees does not limit the legal authority or responsibility of the President for all personnel decisions.

Review of applications for promotion or tenure occurs at each institutional level of the University in the following sequence: the candidate's school promotion and tenure committee, the school director (or a joint letter from school directors in the case of interdisciplinary faculty and the pro tem school director in the case of University Libraries), the college promotion and tenure committee, the dean of the college in which the candidate's school resides (or a joint letter from deans from all relevant colleges in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, Provost, and President.

Because promotion and tenure processes often coincide for tenure-track faculty, the composition of the promotion and tenure committees may be similar, but all processes should be separate. The committees are discussed in more detail in Chapter 1 of this Handbook.

Rationale:

The wording provides a means for reviewing dossiers in the University Libraries, which "do not have schools or school directors in the same sense as the academic colleges." (1.10.2.5)

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.8.1.2.1. The School, on May 13, 2024

First Vote Date: 5/13/24

First Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 1 month/June 10

University Counsel Opinion: none

Employee Handbook Opinion: none

Faculty Senate Opinion: none

Council of Directors Opinion: none

Deans Opinion: none

Vice President of Research Opinion: none

Provost Opinion: none

Second Vote Date: June 10, 2024

Second Vote Results 7-0-0-2 (for/against/abstain/absent)

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

5.8.2.1.1. The School

The candidate's school director first confirms the eligibility of candidates for promotion in academic rank or tenure and then convenes the school promotion and tenure committee to consider the qualifications of candidates. The director may be invited, after a majority vote via secret ballot by the members of the committee, to attend promotion and tenure proceedings and provide information.

The school promotion and tenure committee must base its deliberations on the standards for promotion or tenure mandated by the Board, those adopted by the University, and those of the school and college. The committee submits a written report to the school director supporting or opposing promotion or tenure. The recommendation must include the rationale and vote count of the committee. In cases when votes are not unanimous, the written evaluation must reflect within the same document the opinions of both positions. Acting on behalf of the faculty, the chair of the school promotion and tenure committee must sign the recommendation.

Upon receipt of the school promotion and tenure committee's written reports, school directors must review reports for substantive or procedural discrepancies or inconsistencies with annual performance reviews. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the director will reconvene the committee and direct that the discrepancies or inconsistencies be addressed.

The school director then prepares an independent written recommendation either concurring or disagreeing with the recommendations of the school promotion and tenure committee and submits both reports to the responsible dean(s) no later than the date published on the Provost's calendar. A copy of the reports is retained in school personnel files. The director provides copies of both reports to the candidate at the time they are submitted to the dean(s).

Have its language changed to:

5.8.1.2.1. The School

The candidate's school director first confirms the eligibility of candidates for promotion in academic rank or tenure and then convenes the school promotion and tenure committee to consider the qualifications of candidates. Upon a candidate's dossier submission, the school director verifies that the submission is complete, ready for review by the school committee, and uploads the confidential external evaluator letters, if applicable, which remain inaccessible to the candidate until the final promotion and tenure determination is made. The director may be invited, after a majority vote via secret ballot by the members of the committee, to attend promotion and tenure proceedings and provide information.

The school promotion and tenure committee must base its deliberations on the standards for promotion or tenure mandated by the Board, those adopted by the University, and those of the school and college. The committee submits a written report to the school director supporting or opposing promotion or tenure. The recommendation must include the rationale and vote count of the committee. In cases when votes are not unanimous, the written evaluation must reflect within the same document the opinions of both positions. Acting on behalf of the faculty, the chair of the school promotion and tenure committee must sign the recommendation.

Upon receipt of the school promotion and tenure committee's written reports, school directors must review reports for substantive or procedural discrepancies or inconsistencies with annual performance reviews. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the director will reconvene the committee and direct that the discrepancies or inconsistencies be addressed.

The school director then prepares an independent written recommendation either concurring or disagreeing with the recommendations of the school promotion and tenure committee and submits

both reports ~~to the responsible dean(s) to the college promotion and tenure committee~~ no later than the date published on the Provost's calendar. A copy of the reports is retained in the ~~school candidate's~~ personnel file. The ~~director candidate is provided~~ copies of both reports ~~to the candidate~~ at the time they are submitted to the ~~dean(s), college promotion and tenure committee.~~

University Libraries faculty will elect a pro tem school director from among the tenured department heads to fulfill the responsibilities of school director in the review process. The elected UL pro tem school director fulfills the role of the academic school directors in the pre-tenure, tenure and promotion process only. The UL pro tem school director may not sit as a member of the school, college, or University promotion and tenure committees.

Rationale:

The wording is proposed to more accurately reflect the automated Promotion and Tenure evaluative review process. Additionally, it provides a means for reviewing dossiers in the University Libraries, which "do not have schools or school directors in the same sense as the academic colleges." (1.10.2.5)