



University of Richmond Faculty Handbook

Table of Contents

Preamble	4
General Organizational Structure of the University	4
Academic Organizational Structure of the University	5
I. Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty Members.....	5
Preface	5
Appointments	5
Duties and Responsibilities of the Faculty Members.....	7
II. Compensation and Benefits	7
Preface	7
A. Payment of Salaries	8
B. Retirement Plan	9
C. Early Retirement Plan for Tenured Faculty.....	9
D. Emeritus Status.....	9
E. Health Insurance	9
F. Post Retirement Health Insurance (Medicare Supplement Plan)	9
G. Employee Assistance Program (EAP).....	9
H. Life Insurance.....	9
I. Disability Insurance	10
J. Workers' Compensation	10
K. Social Security	10
L. Travel Insurance	10
M. Unemployment Insurance	10
N. Section 125 Flexible Benefits Plan.....	10
O. Pre-Paid Legal Care Plan.....	10
P. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993	10
Q. Educational Benefits Policy	10

R. Tuition Exchange Opportunities	12
S. Same Sex Domestic Partner Benefits	12
T. Faculty Parental Leave Policy	12
III. Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures.....	13
Preface	13
A. Statement of Terms of Appointment	13
B. Evaluation for Personnel Decisions.....	17
C. Termination of Appointment by the Faculty Member	19
D. Procedures for the Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program of Instruction Involving Possible Dismissal of Tenured Faculty.....	19
E. Termination by the Institution of Continuous Tenure or Termination of an Appointment Before the End of the Specified Contractual Term.....	20
F. Academic Freedom.....	24
G. Grievance Procedures.....	25
IV. Policies Applicable to All Employees	28
V. Other Policies for Faculty.....	28
A. Summer School Contracts.....	28
B. Extra Compensation for Full-Time Faculty.....	28
C. Sabbatical Leave.....	29
D. Leave of Absence	31
E. Faculty External Consulting Policy.....	32
G. Reinstatement of Tenured Faculty on Long-Term Disability.....	34
VI. CHANGES TO THE FACULTY HANDBOOK	36
VII. Appendix I: School-Specific Personnel Policies and Procedures	37
VII.B. School of Arts & Sciences Personnel Policies and Procedures.....	37
A. Criteria for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Reviews	37
B. Tenure and Promotion Process and Procedures	38
VII.C. The Robins School of Business Personnel Policies and Procedures	45
A. Introduction	46
B. Standards for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Reviews	46
C. Tenure and Promotion Process and Procedures	51
VII.D. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Standards and Processes for Promotion	58
VII.E. The Jepson School of Leadership Studies Criteria, Guidelines and Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Tenure and Promotion	62

A. Teaching.....	62
B. Scholarship.....	63
C. Service.....	63
D. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.....	64
E. Promotion to Full Professor.....	65
VII.F. School of Law Personnel Policies and Procedures.....	66
A. Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.....	66
B. Standards and Procedures for Faculty Subject to Reappointment, Promotion, and Long-Term Appointment.....	71
VIII. Appendix II: School Specific Academic Organization, Policies, and Procedures.....	78
VIII.B. School of Arts and Sciences Academic Organization.....	78
VIII.C. School of Arts and Sciences Academic Approvals.....	80
VIII.D. Robins School of Business Academic Organization.....	81
VIII.E. Robins School of Business Academic Approvals.....	83
VIII.F. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic Organization.....	84
VIII.G. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic Approvals.....	85
VIII.H. Jepson School of Leadership Studies Academic Approvals.....	86
VIII.I. School of Law Academic Approvals.....	87

Preamble

The University of Richmond Faculty Handbook is a guide to benefits, policies, requirements, and procedures that affect faculty employees. The focus of the Handbook is on the individual faculty member. Topics include:

- I. Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty Members
- II. Compensation and Benefits
- III. Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures
- IV. Policies Applicable to all Employees
- V. Other Policies for Faculty (Sabbatical leave, ...)
- VI. Changes to the Faculty Handbook
- VII. Appendix I: School Specific Personnel Policies and Procedures
- VIII. Appendix II: School Specific Academic Organization, Policies, and Procedures

For completeness the Handbook references a number of University policies that refer to all employees. An example is the Harassment and Discrimination Policy which applies to both faculty and staff members. Of course, faculty members are expected to comply with all such policies. For organization and faculty governance information please refer to the University [Faculty Senate Charter](#) and the [University Faculty Senate Committee Policy Document](#) on the [Faculty Senate website](#).

Although not a formal contract, this Handbook is distributed to assist the University of Richmond faculty members in better understanding existing policies, practices, and requirements relating to their employment. The Board of Trustees may modify these policies, practices, and requirements. The information in this Handbook is intended to be accurate as of the date January 1, 2017.

The Provost is charged with maintaining as PDF files on the [Provost's website](#), current and archived versions of the [Faculty Handbook](#). Current and archived versions, as well as records of all changes, however minor, will also be kept on an electronic, shared file repository. The Provost works with the University Faculty Senate and others to see that the Handbook accurately reflects current practices that impact faculty. Possible errors should be brought to the attention of the Provost's Office.

Although many of the policies and procedures specified in this document are similar to those recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and other similar organizations, the University of Richmond declares that its policies and procedures are not necessarily bound by the interpretations given them by such external organizations.¹

General Organizational Structure of the University

The University's Articles of Incorporation, By-Laws, and Information about the Board of Trustees may be accessed on the [President's website](#). The President is the administrative leader of

the University. The [senior administrative structure](#), including the President’s Cabinet and the leadership of the Academic Affairs Division, may be accessed via the [Provost’s website](#).

Academic Organizational Structure of the University

The University has five schools: School of Arts and Sciences, Robins School of Business, Jepson School of Leadership Studies, School of Law, and School of Professional and Continuing Studies. As outlined in the University By-Laws, the dean of each school reports to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Academic Leadership Positions may be found on the [Academic Organization Chart](#) on the Provost’s website. The University Faculty Senate provides voice and leadership for the University faculty on matters that relate to two or more schools as provided by the [University Faculty Senate Charter](#), which may be accessed on the [Senate’s website](#).

The governance processes in individual schools are described in the Appendices of this Handbook and/or on the school specific websites.

Individual schools award no degrees; all degrees for work done in any of the schools are conferred by the “University of Richmond.” Ultimate authority is vested in the Board of Trustees and the President of the University.

I. Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty Members

Preface

Faculty members play a special role in the life of the University as teachers, mentors, scholars, and participants in academic governance. The terms of their appointments and duties are different from those of other University employees. The following sections explain the different kinds of faculty appointments and the duties of faculty members.

Appointments

The University faculty consists of the President, the Provost, the Deans of the schools, those with full-time faculty appointments, and others who have been granted faculty status. Membership in school faculties is defined as full-time faculty with rank who have a primary appointment in a school or an academic department of a school. Administrators (other than the President, Provost, and the Deans) who have entered their positions from the tenured faculty and hold limited period administrative appointments retain full membership in the faculty. As defined in the Senate Charter, such faculty are defined as having administrative status and include, but are not limited to, those who hold the titles of university president or vice president or report directly to the president or a vice president; of provost, associate provost, or assistant provost or report directly

to the provost; and in the offices of the academic deans, of dean, associate dean, or assistant dean.

There are five faculties of the University: Arts and Sciences, Business, Leadership, Law, and Professional and Continuing Studies. Each shall consist of the President, the Provost, the Dean (as appropriate), and all with faculty rank as Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor, including librarians and directors who hold faculty status, and not including faculty members holding visiting or part-time appointments.

Full-time faculty members are appointed in a department or school where their responsibilities include full-time teaching, advising, scholarship, and service to the University (unless temporarily assigned other tasks approved by their dean or the Provost). Certain benefits, such as eligibility for tenure, are restricted to members of the full-time faculty as explained elsewhere in this handbook.

Faculty rank, as Instructor, Assistant or Associate Professor, or Professor, is given in a specific department or school to those whose primary responsibilities are teaching, advising, and scholarship. Other individuals may be appointed to teach full-time or part-time on term or temporary appointments for a stated period of time. Such individuals may be assigned faculty rank as an adjunct or visiting member of the faculty. In the School of Arts & Sciences there are a number of faculty with the title of Director. Such individuals are affiliated with an academic department and teach in that department, although they may have a job description that involves a mixture of teaching and administrative duties. They are not eligible for sabbaticals, but otherwise have benefits similar to those of other full-time faculty. The School of Arts and Sciences uses the classification "Faculty of Practice" for the position of Director, a non-tenure track, continuing faculty position that combines teaching and administrative duties. The classification does not affect rank or individual titles, but does differentiate these faculty from staff who hold the title of Director, other contracted non-tenure track faculty, applied music faculty, post-doctoral fellows, exchange faculty, and artists-in-residence.

Professional librarians hold faculty status. Certain other positions directly involved in academic programs may hold faculty status by action of the faculty following the recommendation of the Committee on Faculty Status. Faculty status gives them both voice and vote in University faculty meetings, eligibility to serve on faculty committees, to serve as student advisors, and to participate in P.E.T.E. programs; and it acknowledges that they play an active role in the intellectual activities of the University. By action of its faculty, any school may include professional librarians as part of its faculty. Faculty status does not carry with it eligibility for tenure or sabbatical, nor does it automatically carry with it faculty rank (Professor, Associate, Assistant Professor, or Instructor), since faculty rank is in a specific academic department, nor does it carry eligibility for other benefits normally assigned to full-time teaching faculty.

Part-time faculty shall consist of those persons who are hired on a semester basis or less, and who contract to teach courses which are specified in their letters of appointment. The total number of units or credit hours taught at the University in one semester by a part-time faculty member cannot equal or exceed the number of units or credit hours defined as a full-time, normal teaching load.

Duties and Responsibilities of the Faculty Members

Each faculty member is expected to maintain the highest personal standards of character and conduct, to keep abreast of his or her academic discipline through continuing study, research, and/or participation in the activities of his or her professional organization, to strive to improve the effectiveness of his or her teaching, to take a sympathetic interest in the progress and development of each of his or her students, to keep accurate records of academic standing of each student in his or her classes, and to hand in promptly all reports of grades and other information required by the deans, the Registrar, the Provost, or the President.

Each faculty member is expected to meet his or her classes as regularly scheduled. In case any faculty member is kept from his or her duties by illness or other disability, the faculty member must inform the chair of the department and/or the appropriate dean in advance, if possible, so that arrangements may be made for assignments or a substitute instructor. If a faculty member finds it necessary to incur an extended absence from his or her regular duties, the faculty member must seek approval from his or her dean. In addition, each faculty member is expected to maintain adequate office hours so that he or she may be available to the students for conferences. Each faculty member is expected to participate in the faculty-student advisory program.

Each faculty member is expected to attend all meetings of the University faculty and the faculty of the school in which the member teaches, to attend commencements and convocations, to serve loyally and diligently on faculty committees, to assist the chair and colleagues of the member's department in carrying out the program of the department, and to cooperate fully with the trustees, the President, the Provost, and the deans in promoting all the interests of the University.

Each faculty member is expected to continue to teach until the end of the academic semester or year for which his or her services were engaged. Any faculty member who wishes release from his or her obligation to teach during an academic year is expected to make a written request to his or her dean, usually by April 15th of the preceding academic year.

During the regular academic year, faculty members must secure the approval of the Provost whenever they assume additional work for which they receive compensation (other than modest honoraria for activities directly related to their scholarly work.). This is normally allowed provided they do not engage in any occupations that conflict with their University duties, reflect poorly upon the University, or require more than the equivalent of one day per week. No faculty member may run for or hold political office without prior consultation with and consent of the President

II. Compensation and Benefits

Preface

In a tradition of shared governance, members of the Administration, particularly the Director of Human Resources, the Provost, and the Vice President for Business and Finance, work with the

University Faculty Senate to maintain a set of benefits that allows the University to attract and retain faculty in a competitive environment. As outlined in section I.C.4. of the University Faculty Senate Charter, changes in the availability of benefits normally occur only after consultation with representatives of University Faculty Senate and/or the University Fringe Benefits Committee. Any alterations to the benefits of faculty members must be announced to the faculty either directly or through the University Faculty Senate.

- A. Payment of Salaries
 - B. Retirement Plan
 - C. Early Retirement Plan for Tenured Faculty
 - D. Emeritus Status
 - E. Health Insurance
 - F. Post Retirement Health Insurance (Medicare Supplement Plan)
 - G. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)
 - H. Life Insurance
 - I. Disability Insurance
 - J. Workers' Compensation
 - K. Social Security
 - L. Travel Insurance
 - M. Unemployment Insurance
 - N. Section 125 Flexible Benefits Plan
 - O. Pre-Paid Legal Care Plan
 - P. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993
 - Q. Educational Benefits Policy
 - R. Tuition Exchange Opportunities
 - S. Same Sex Domestic Partner Benefits
 - T. Faculty Parental Leave
-

A. Payment of Salaries

Faculty members on nine-month appointments, i.e. most full-time faculty, will be paid in ten equal installments, the first payment being made on September 1 each year. Faculty may choose to be paid in twelve equal installments by completing the Payroll Options Form by August 1 of any year. This form does not need to be filled out yearly, unless a change is requested. Faculty who choose to be paid in twelve equal installments will be paid all deferred payments in a final June 1 paycheck upon completion of the year they retire or terminate their employment. This does not apply to faculty who retire after the fall semester. Faculty members on semester appointments (all part-time and a few full-time) receive their salaries in four equal installments during the fall semester (October, November, December, and January 1) and in five equal installments during the spring semester (February, March, April, May, and June 1). School of Professional and Continuing Studies part-time faculty will receive their spring semester pay over four installments beginning on March 1. Faculty may choose to have their checks mailed to their home address, campus address, or delivered to their bank via direct deposit. Forms are provided for the election of the above alternatives through the Payroll Office or Human Resources.

Explanation of deductions may be obtained from the Payroll Office or Banner Web at <https://bannerweb.richmond.edu/>.

B. Retirement Plan

Refer to the Human Resource Services web page for information on the retirement plan.

C. Early Retirement Plan for Tenured Faculty

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on the early retirement plan.

D. Emeritus Status

A faculty or administrative staff member who has served the University with distinction for 20 years or more, and who remains on active status until retirement, will normally be awarded the title of "Emeritus" upon recommendation by the President, by action of the Board of Trustees. The Board may, at its discretion, award emeritus status to particularly deserving retirees who have served less than 20 years.

E. Health Insurance

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on health insurance.

Health insurance coverage, for all full-time faculty, continues until the last day of the month in which he/she is employed by the University on a full-time basis. For full-time faculty leaving at the end of the spring semester, coverage will end May 31. Faculty who are resigning or who are on term appointments will not be covered beyond this date, even if they have opted to receive monthly paychecks for the twelve-month period. They are given the opportunity to continue their health plan at their own expense (paying the additional portion formerly paid by the University on their behalf plus 2%) under COBRA (Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act). Faculty who are not continuing with the University and wish to extend their coverage, should contact Human Resources.

F. Post Retirement Health Insurance (Medicare Supplement Plan)

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on post retirement health insurance.

G. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on the employee assistance program.

H. Life Insurance

1. Basic Life Insurance
2. Voluntary Life Insurance

I. Disability Insurance

1. Short-Term Disability

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on short-term disability.

2. Long-Term Disability

J. Workers' Compensation

Refer to the [Risk Management web page](#) for information on workers' compensation.

K. Social Security

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on social security.

L. Travel Insurance

Refer to the [Risk Management web page](#) for information on travel insurance.

M. Unemployment Insurance

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on unemployment insurance.

N. Section 125 Flexible Benefits Plan

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on section 125 flexible benefits plan.

O. Pre-Paid Legal Care Plan

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on pre-paid legal care plan.

P. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on family and medical leave act.

Q. Educational Benefits Policy

The University offers its faculty members and their dependents the benefit of sharing in the educational opportunities of the University. The following policies, procedures, and definitions apply to everyone receiving educational benefits. In addition, the usual rules of the school or division apply. In order for the tuition waiver to apply, the student must be academically qualified to enroll and must go through regular admissions procedures. ***A Tuition Remission Form for Credit Courses must be completed and submitted to the Department of Human Resources Services for each course taken or for the semester the student is enrolled.***

1. **Audited Classes:** The same provisions apply as for classes taken for credit.
2. **Special Fees:** The student is responsible for any special fees, such as music fees, late registration fees, drop-add fees, or overload charges.
3. **Virginia Tuition Assistance Grant Program:** Most children and some spouses of full-time faculty are eligible for the VTAGP. It is the responsibility of the student and/or faculty member to make application for this grant through the University's financial aid program. Failure to do this will result in the student or faculty member having to pay tuition equaling the amount which he/she would have received had he/she applied for the VTAGP.
4. **Grants and Scholarships:** Tuition and fees in any undergraduate division, for courses taken for academic credit, will be waived only to the extent that the student does not already have some form of scholarship or grant to cover his/her educational costs.
5. **Graduate Study:** If the student holds a bachelor's degree, he/she is deemed to be enrolling for graduate study, regardless of the nature of the courses being taken. There are limited exceptions to this rule for the spouses of some faculty. These exceptions must have the approval of the Provost. They are noted below, in the body of the policy description.
6. **Dependent Children:** A dependent child of an employee shall be defined as: (1) natural issue of the faculty member, (2) his or her stepchild, (3) a child legally adopted by the faculty member, or (4) a foster child, provided that the foster child shall have been living in the home of the faculty member and shall have been supported primarily by the faculty member for at least two years prior to matriculation in a college or university. The child must meet the definition as a legal dependent of the faculty member as stipulated by the United States Internal Revenue Code. If the faculty member's child is older than age 23, the parent employee must be able to claim the child as a dependent on his/her last annual tax return. In this instance, a copy of the tax return must accompany the request for tuition waiver.
7. **Appeals:** The Provost shall have the power to review individual cases, upon appeal.
8. **Non-credit Courses:** These are courses not taken for academic credit, and not offered as part of a regular degree program. A *Tuition Remission Form for Non-Credit Courses* must be completed and submitted along with the *Course Registration Form* to the appropriate division, either Campus Recreation or the School of Continuing Studies, for each non-credit course, no less than two weeks prior to the start of class. There is no tuition remission for special fees that may be associated with the class.
9. **Benefits for Spouses and Dependents of Deceased, Fully Disabled, or Retired Faculty:** The surviving spouse who has not remarried and the children of a deceased or fully disabled or retired tenured faculty member shall receive the educational benefits which would have been theirs had the faculty member not died, become disabled, or retired. The words "educational benefits which would have been theirs" are to be construed as educational benefits available at the time application for such benefits is made, not the educational benefits in effect at the time of death, disability, or retirement.
10. **Restrictions on the Educational Benefit:** The conditions listed below will be referred to by the letter within the description of the policy, as they apply.
 - a. The individual receiving the benefit must enroll after regular registration, except for those students formally admitted to, and actively pursuing, a degree or

certification program. (Note: Usual registration procedures for some non-academic credit courses may alter this requirement.)

- b. Approval consistent with the policies of the department or division must be given.
- c. The individual's enrollment does not cause a class to be held which would otherwise have been cancelled.
- d. Faculty Tuition Remission Benefits

R. Tuition Exchange Opportunities

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for information on tuition exchange.

S. Same Sex Domestic Partner Benefits

Refer to the [Human Resource Services web page](#) for same sex domestic partner benefits policy

T. Faculty Parental Leave Policy

Refer to the [Human Resources web page](#) for information on faculty parental leave

III. Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures

Preface

The following regulations are designed to enable the University of Richmond to protect academic freedom through tenure and the requirements of academic due process. The principles implicit in these regulations are for the benefit of all who are involved with or are affected by the policies and programs of the institution. A university is a marketplace of ideas, and it cannot fulfill its purposes of transmitting, evaluating, and extending knowledge if it requires conformity with any orthodoxy of content and method. In the words of the United States Supreme Court, "Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study, and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise, our civilization will stagnate and die."

- A. Statement of Terms of Appointment
 - B. Evaluation for Personnel Decisions
 - C. Termination of Appointment by the Faculty Member
 - D. Procedures for the Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program of Instruction Involving Possible Dismissal of Tenured Faculty
 - E. Termination by the Institution of Continuous Tenure or Termination of an Appointment Before the End of the Specified Contractual Term
 - F. Academic Freedom
 - G. Grievance Procedures
-

A. Statement of Terms of Appointment

The terms and conditions of every appointment to the faculty will be stated or confirmed in writing, and a copy of the appointment document will be supplied to the faculty member by the appropriate deans' office. Any subsequent extensions or modifications of an appointment, and any special understandings, or any notices incumbent upon either party to provide, will be stated or confirmed in writing and a copy will be given to the faculty member.

Persons with teaching or research appointments of any kind will be informed each year in writing of their appointments. Matters that have special significance relative to future tenure possibilities will be indicated.

Applicable terms of appointment are contained not only in the letter of appointment, but also in the Faculty Handbook of the University. Changes in the terms of the appointment are determined by the Board of Trustees.

All members of the faculty on probationary or term appointments must indicate their acceptance of the terms annually by signing and returning a copy of the appointment or contract letter.

Faculty positions, including teaching, research and others with faculty status at the University are held under one of five appointment status categories:

- **Tenured faculty** members are those persons who have been confirmed in such status by action of the Board of Trustees on recommendation of the President subsequent to appropriate peer and administrative review.
- **Probationary faculty** members are those persons who are appointed without contractual understanding that the appointment is for a maximum fixed term but who have not achieved tenured status. These appointments are also called tenure-track appointments and carry the possibility of tenure at a future date.
- **Two- or three-year term faculty** members are those persons who have been appointed to an annual contract which may be renewed to the limit of the specified term of two or three years assuming satisfactory service and continued University need. The appointment terminates at the end of the specified term.
- **Temporary and restricted term appointments**, whether full-time or part-time, are term appointments for up to one semester or one academic year and are not renewable except by subsequent and separate agreement. Visiting faculty appointments fall in this category.
- **Continuing appointments**, whether full-time or part-time, include those with faculty status that do not specify tenured, tenure-track, two or three-year term or temporary and restricted term appointments.

Each of these appointment status categories is further explained and defined below.

1. Tenured Appointments

Faculty members with tenure shall have permanent or continuous appointments, and their service shall be terminated only for cause (See Termination by the University of Continuous Tenure or Termination of an Appointment Before the End of the Specified Contractual Term).

Faculty members with tenure will be notified in writing of any changes of the terms (salary, etc.) of their appointment for the following academic year no later than three weeks after the Board of Trustees has met to approve those terms.

The awarding of tenure status to faculty members shall in every case only be made by the Board of Trustees, upon a nomination by the President following the recommendation of the Provost.

Before making a recommendation about tenure to the President, the Provost shall consult with and receive the recommendation of the academic Dean, and through the Dean, shall secure the advice and recommendation of the academic department or school involved. Recommendations for tenure are based on the criteria described in Evaluation for Personnel Decisions and in standards for each school. (See Appendix: School-Specific Personnel Policies and Procedures.) Fulfillment of these criteria, however, does not necessitate a positive tenure decision.

Academic deans of Arts and Sciences, Business, Law, and Leadership Studies may be granted tenure as a faculty member in a department following the same procedures. Tenure is associated with faculty appointment, not with an administrative position.

2. Probationary Appointments (Tenure-Track)

Probationary appointments may be made for one year, subject to renewal. The total period of full-time service at the University prior to the acquisition of continuous tenure will not exceed seven years. By mutual consent, in writing, prior teaching experience at other institutions of higher learning or at the University may be waived at the time of initial appointment to a tenure track position to give the individual the full seven-year probationary period.

In only the most exceptional cases will the probationary period be less than three years. Reappointment to a probationary position is made annually following review and satisfactory performance and continuing University need. Ordinarily, individuals on probationary appointments are considered for tenure during their sixth year. In the event the decision is positive, the individual will be awarded tenure at the beginning of the next academic year. In the event of a negative decision, the following year will be terminal and reappointment will not be made beyond that year. The Provost, on recommendation of the school Dean, may grant the request of a tenure candidate to be considered earlier than the normal sixth year. In such an instance, the decision reached will be final and conclusive and, in the event of a negative decision, the following year will be terminal.

Regardless of the stated term or other provisions of any probationary appointments, written notice that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed will be given to the faculty member in advance of the expiration of the appointment as follows: (1) As soon as possible, but not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of the academic year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination; (2) As soon as possible, but not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the second year of appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination; (3) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service at the institution. Probationary faculty members whose appointments will be renewed for the following academic year will normally be notified by March 15, but in no case will such information be given later than March 31. They will be notified in writing of any changes of the terms (salary, etc.) of their appointment for the following academic year no later than three weeks after the Board of Trustees has met to approve those terms.

Note: The academic year is defined as the time between the University Colloquy (or the first day of classes, whichever is earlier) and Commencement (or the last faculty meeting of the year, whichever is later). Therefore, a twelve-month notice of termination of contract must be given before Commencement of the academic year preceding the terminal contract.

"Stop the Clock" Requests.

A faculty member with a probationary appointment may request a delay in consideration for tenure for up to one (1) year as a result of:

- a. The birth, adoption or state placement of a child, provided the requested delay occurs within twelve (12) months of such birth, adoption or state placement;
- b. A documented medical condition of the faculty member that precludes him or her from engaging in the full array of faculty responsibilities, with or without reasonable accommodation; or
- c. An approved leave of absence from the University.

Any request for a delay in consideration for tenure must be made, in writing, to the Dean and must set forth specifically the basis for the request. The faculty member making the request must provide any additional information or documentation reasonably requested by the Dean or Provost. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean may approve or deny such request at his or her reasonable discretion. If the request to delay consideration for tenure is granted, the notice granting such delay shall specify the length of the delay, up to one (1) year.

Except in the case of extraordinary hardship, no faculty member shall receive more than one (1) delay in consideration for tenure and such delay shall not extend beyond seven (7) years the total period of full-time service at the University prior to the acquisition of continuous tenure. In the event a second delay is granted based on extraordinary hardship, the seven (7) year period for acquiring tenure may be extended commensurately.

3. Two- or Three-Year Term Appointments

Faculty members may be appointed on a full-time basis for one year with the contractual understanding that the annual contract may be renewed for a specified maximum term of two or three years, each annual renewal during this period being contingent upon satisfactory service and continued University need. Such appointments are not tenure eligible and are not renewable for a second two- or three-year period except by separate and specific written agreement. Notice that a two- or three-year term appointment is not to be renewed shall be given as indicated for Probationary Appointments.

4. Temporary and Restricted (Full- or Part-Time) Appointments

Faculty appointments may be made, on either a full-time or part-time basis, for a specified term of part or all of one semester or one academic year, with the contractual understanding that such appointments terminate on the date specified in the contract and are not renewable unless there is a subsequent, separate, and specific written agreement to do so, in which case a new contract will be offered. The requirement of written due notice of termination, as described in section Probationary Appointments above, *does not apply* to any temporary and restricted appointment; nor are such appointments tenure eligible.

5. Continuing Appointments

Certain employees of the University, whose appointments do not fall in one of the above categories may, because of their professional and educationally related roles at the University, be given faculty status. These individuals are employed under *continuing appointments* which adhere to the principles of employment-at-will and assume satisfactory performance and continued University need.

6. Joint Faculty Appointments Between Schools

To encourage, recognize, and formalize contributions by faculty to academic programs in schools other than the one in which they hold their primary appointment, the University has developed guidelines by which the President and Provost of the University may confer secondary appointments upon those faculty for whom such appointments are recommended by the deans of both schools.

According to these guidelines, the deans of the two participating schools will recommend joint appointments upon the good-faith agreement of the faculty member, the faculty member's department chair (or in the case of Leadership Studies and Law, the respective dean), and the participating department/program/school in the other school. At a minimum, such joint appointments will be for a two-year term and will typically entail the teaching of at least one course over a two-year period in the other program/department/school. One course equivalent may be gained through substantial advising and/or research supervision. Any disagreements about load and teaching assignment will be settled through mutual agreement of the participating programs/departments (or in the case of Leadership Studies and Law, the respective dean), and the individual faculty member with the deans serving as arbitrators in the rare cases when a consensus cannot be reached. In no case will the joint appointment entail tenure or voting rights in the secondary unit.

All joint appointments will be documented in a memo of understanding including a specification of how the coordinators/chairs/deans of the two programs/departments/schools will contribute to the annual faculty evaluation process and/or the mid-course/tenure review. The dean of the school of the faculty member's primary appointment is responsible for preparing this memo. Joint appointments will be confirmed in annual contract letters, be expressed as part of each faculty member's academic title, and be reviewed one year in advance of expiration.

B. Evaluation for Personnel Decisions

1. University Standards for Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Decisions

Tenure, promotion, and salary decisions are based on an assessment of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The standards by which excellence is judged are stipulated separately for each school (Appendix: School-Specific Personnel Policies and Procedures). Generally, excellence in teaching shall be evidenced by a faculty member's command of the developing subject matter, the ability to organize and present it effectively, and the utilization of effective teaching methods and strategies. Consideration may be given to the effective mentoring of student academic work outside of the classroom. Excellence in research/scholarship shall be evidenced (with documentation) by professional growth through original research, study,

publication, performance (in the fine arts), or other significant professional activities. Excellence in service shall be evidenced by effective academic advising and effective participation in the affairs of the faculty and University community, particularly through committee activities. Consideration may be given to service to professional communities beyond the University.

Tenure and promotion procedures are not standardized over the several schools and faculties. Tenure decisions shall be made solely on the basis of the merits of the candidates and the needs of programs, without regard to quotas and within the context of existing tenure policy (Appendix: School-Specific Personnel Policies and Procedures). Other factors affecting personnel decisions include the economic or budgetary situation of the University. Certain degrees or certifications (appropriate to the division and discipline) are usually considered necessary for tenure and for the rank of Assistant Professor and above.

2. General Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

Successive reviews and recommendations for tenure and promotion decisions are made through a route that involves the department and/or a faculty committee, the respective Dean, the Provost, and the President. All tenure and promotion decisions are made by the Board of Trustees only on the positive recommendation of the President.

An individual may stand for tenure only once.

Each person involved in the process is expected to be familiar with the criteria on which recommendations respecting tenure and promotion are based and exercise great care that inappropriate criteria play no part. It is the policy of the University of Richmond not to discriminate on the basis of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, disability, status as a veteran or any classification protected by local, state or federal law, in tenure or promotion considerations or any other matters.

Inasmuch as the University has adopted a policy recognizing that the tenure and promotion process may differ among the five academic divisions, it is the responsibility of each Dean to make individual faculty members aware of the University's policies regarding non-discrimination and to be certain that discriminatory factors are not a part of the evaluation leading to a tenure or promotion recommendation nor a part of the official file on which such decisions are made.

The party making a recommendation in a tenure or promotion case will notify the candidate of the recommendation. The basis on which a negative recommendation was made will be summarized in writing for the candidate. The written summary may include relevant information contained in confidential reports, but must not violate the confidence in which information was given by individual faculty colleagues, students, or outside experts. The written summary should be given to the candidate at approximately the time the party transmits the negative recommendation to the next successive level of review.

While some of the above statements are intended to clarify the candidate's access to the bases on which negative tenure and promotion recommendations are made, it is not their purpose to make the process overly burdensome or legalistic nor to create adversarial relationships in which one's best professional judgment, subjective as it may be, or the department's, division's, or University's long-range needs, are compromised. The evaluation of teaching, advising,

scholarship, and service to the University is by its nature subjective, and final judgments must be made holistically. Fair-minded and reasonable people can disagree. Since the needs of various departments and faculties may differ and may change from time to time, the overall needs of the University as a whole, as determined by the Board of Trustees, shall come first.

Although many of the policies and procedures specified in this document are similar to those recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and other similar organizations, the University of Richmond declares that it is not bound by the interpretations given them by such external organizations.

C. Termination of Appointment by the Faculty Member

A faculty member may terminate his/her appointment effective at the end of an academic year, provided that he/she gives notice in writing to the Provost at the earliest possible opportunity, but not later than 30 days after receiving notification of the terms of his/her appointment for the coming year. The faculty member may properly request a waiver of this requirement of notice in case of hardship or in a situation where he/she would otherwise be denied substantial professional advancement or other opportunity. The institution may properly deny waiver if it would cause a substantial hardship on its academic program.

D. Procedures for the Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program of Instruction Involving Possible Dismissal of Tenured Faculty

1. Whatever the source of the original recommendation to discontinue a department, the official process to discontinue must be initiated by the Provost, at his or her discretion, after consultation with the appropriate dean(s) and being convinced that there is a prima facie case for discontinuance.
2. The process should follow these steps:
 - a. The Provost will consult with the University Faculty Senate about procedures not enumerated here that are deemed appropriate for the particular case.
 - b. The Provost will announce to the Department involved his or her intention to open a discontinuance proceeding. There will follow a period of 60 days (within the academic year) during which the Department involved may try to negotiate another remedy.
 - c. If such negotiations fail, the merits of (including the good faith of) the recommendation to discontinue will be studied by an External Review Panel (see number 3 below), which will file a report with the Internal Review Panel.
 - d. The merits of the recommendation will then be studied by an Internal Review Panel (see number 4 below), whose recommendation and supporting case will be forwarded in turn to the affected school(s), the University Senate, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees. Each body leading up to the Board of Trustees will make its own recommendation, supplying reasons for it. The faculty

and Dean of a school may choose to file separate recommendations.

- e. In the event a department or program is discontinued, a Reassignment Panel (see number 5 below) will recommend either appropriate reassignments or full dismissal of affected tenured faculty to the President, who will forward a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.
 - f. Steps (a) through (d) should be completed within an academic year; step (e) by the end of the following academic year.
3. The External Review panel will consist of three experts with no connection to the University, one chosen by the Provost, one by the Department involved, and one by the University Faculty Senate, subject to review and approval by the Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees. The panel will visit the campus and remain on campus so long as is necessary to complete a thorough review.
 4. The Internal Review Panel will consist of five faculty members, chosen by the University Senate from its body or the larger University faculty according to procedures it deems appropriate for the particular case. Faculty members with a personal interest in the matter should not sit on the Panel.
 5. The Reassignment Panel will consist of the Provost, the relevant dean(s), and two faculty members appointed by University Faculty Senate.

E. Termination by the Institution of Continuous Tenure or Termination of an Appointment Before the End of the Specified Contractual Term

Termination of an appointment with continuous tenure, or of a special, term or probationary appointment before the end of the specified contractual term, may be effected by the institution only for adequate cause. Adequate cause will consist of demonstrated:

- a. financial exigency of the institution;
- b. bona fide discontinuance or substantial modification, by the Trustees (after consulting with the faculty and administration), of an academic program or department of instruction resulting in significantly diminished personnel requirements;
- c. medical evidence that the faculty member cannot continue to fulfill the terms and conditions of the appointment.
- d. moral turpitude;
- e. academic incompetence;
- f. continued and unremedied inadequacy in professional performance of properly assigned duties.

1. Terminations Under Adequate Causes (a, b, and c)

Where termination of appointment is based upon financial exigency, or bona fide discontinuance or modification of an academic program or department of instruction resulting in significantly diminished personnel requirements, the dismissal procedure in Item 2 following will not apply. In lieu of the dismissal procedures, the faculty members shall be able to have the issues reviewed by the University Faculty Senate with ultimate review of all controverted issues by the Board of Trustees. In all such cases the faculty member concerned shall be given notice as soon as possible, and never less than twelve months notice, or, in lieu thereof, he/she will be given severance salary for twelve months. The released faculty member's place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of three years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment without loss of seniority and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it. Before terminating an appointment because of abandonment or modification of a program or department of instruction resulting in significantly diminished personnel requirements, the institution will make every effort to place affected faculty members in other suitable positions.

University Faculty Senate shall determine the appropriate review process to be utilized and may request information from the faculty member(s) and the administrators involved for purposes of review. The Senate will issue a written determination after review which will be forwarded to the affected faculty member(s), the Provost, the President and the Board of Trustees. The Senate may go into executive session during the review process. The Senate shall make every effort to complete the review process in time for controverted issues, if any, to be reviewed by the Board of Trustees during the academic year in which the review was requested.

Termination before the end of the period of appointment, for medical reasons, will be based upon clear and convincing medical evidence which shall be reviewed by the University Faculty Senate, if requested by the faculty member, before a final decision is made by the Dean, in consultation with the Provost.

2. Dismissals and Procedures for Dismissal Under Adequate Causes (d, e, and f)

Note: "Dismissal" in this document refers to termination of continuous tenured faculty or termination "before the end of the specified contractual term." "Dismissal procedures" do not apply to termination of probationary appointments at the end of a contractual period which are covered in Probationary Appointments.

The term dismissal shall refer to a termination under adequate causes d, e or f as noted above, and any dismissal shall be effected pursuant to the procedure specified in the following:

Adequate cause for a dismissal will be related, directly and substantially, to the fitness of the faculty member in his/her professional capacity as a teacher or researcher. Dismissal will not be used to restrain faculty members in their exercise of academic freedom or other rights of American citizens.

Any dismissal of a faculty member with continuous tenure or with a special, term or probationary appointment before the end of the specified term, will be preceded by (1)

discussions between the faculty member and appropriate administrative officers looking toward a mutual settlement; (2) informal inquiry by the duly constituted University Faculty Senate which may, failing to effect an adjustment, determine whether in its opinion dismissal proceedings should be undertaken, without its opinion being binding upon the President; (3) a statement of charges framed with reasonable particularity by the President or his delegate. The informal inquiry by the Senate shall take place before the end of the term of appointment with the intent of effecting adjustment. If no adjustment is reached, the Senate will inform the President of its determination regarding whether formal procedures should be undertaken. The informal inquiry shall be undertaken by approximately one-half of the Senate with the rest of the Senate being reserved for the formal proceedings if needed. Thus the formal and informal proceedings will be conducted before different constituencies.

A dismissal under adequate cause, as defined above, will be preceded by a statement of reasons, and the individual concerned will have the right to be heard initially by the University Faculty Senate. A member of the Senate will remove himself/herself from the case, either at the request of a party or on his/her own initiative if he/she deems himself/herself disqualified for bias or interest. Each party will have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause.

- Service of notice of hearing with specific charges in writing will be made at least 20 days prior to the hearing. The faculty member may waive a hearing or may respond to the charges in writing at any time before the hearing. If the faculty member waives a hearing but denies the charges against him/her or asserts that the charges do not support a finding of adequate cause, the Senate hearing the case will evaluate all available evidence and rest its recommendation upon the evidence in the record.
- The Senate hearing the case, in consultation with the President and the faculty member, will exercise its judgment as to whether the hearing should be public or private. In all cases, however, it is the prerogative of the faculty member to have a private hearing upon his/her request.
- During the proceedings the faculty member will be permitted to have an academic advisor as well as counsel of his/her own choice.
- At the request of either party or of the Senate hearing the case, and with the approval of the Provost, a representative of a responsible educational association shall be permitted to attend the proceedings as an observer.
- A verbatim record of the hearing or hearings will be taken and a typewritten copy will be made available to the faculty member without cost to him/her, at his/her request.
- The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the institution, and shall be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole.
- The Senate hearing the case will grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence to which a valid claim of surprise is made.
- The faculty member will be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence, and the administration of the institution will, insofar as it is possible to do so, secure the cooperation of such witnesses and make available necessary documents and other evidence within its control. Also, the faculty member will be served notice of the names and nature of the testimony of any potential witnesses.
- The faculty member and the administration will have the right to confront and cross-

examine all witnesses. Where a witness cannot or will not appear, but the Senate determines that the interests of justice require admission of a statement by the witness, the Senate will identify the witness, disclose the statement, and if possible provide for interrogatories.

- In the hearing of charges of incompetence or unremedied inadequacy, the testimony will include that of qualified faculty members from this or other institutions of higher education.
- The Senate hearing the case will not be bound by strict rules of legal evidence, and may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues involved. Every possible effort will be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available.
- The findings of fact and the decision will be based solely on the hearing record.
- Except for such simple announcements as may be required, covering the time of the hearing and similar matters, public statements and publicity about the case by either the faculty members or administrative officers will be avoided so far as possible until the proceedings have been completed, including consideration by the Board of Trustees. The Provost and the faculty member will be notified of the decision in writing and will be given a copy of the record of the hearing.
- If the Senate hearing the case concludes that adequate cause for dismissal has not been established by the evidence in the record, it will so report to the Provost. If the Provost rejects the report, he/she will promptly state his/her reasons for doing so in writing, to the Senate and to the faculty member, and provide a reasonable opportunity for response before transmitting the case to the President and Board of Trustees.
- If the Senate hearing the case concludes that adequate cause for dismissal has been established, but that an academic penalty less than dismissal would be more appropriate, it will so recommend, with supporting reasons.
- If dismissal or other penalty is recommended, the President will, on request of the faculty member, transmit the record of the case to the Board of Trustees for review.
- The Board of Trustees' review will be based on the record of the Senate, and it will provide opportunities for argument, oral or written or both, by the principals at the hearing or by their representatives. The decision of the Senate will either be sustained, or the proceeding returned to the Senate with specific objections. The Senate will then reconsider, taking into account the stated objections and receiving new evidence if necessary (the record of any new hearing being made available to the faculty member). The Board of Trustees will make a final decision only after study of the Senate's reconsideration.

3. Interim Suspensions

Until the final decision on termination of an appointment has been reached, the faculty member will be suspended, or assigned to other duties in lieu of interim suspension, only if immediate harm to himself/herself or others is threatened by continuance. Before suspending a faculty member, pending an ultimate determination of his/her status through the institution's dismissal procedures, the administration will consult with the University Faculty Senate. Interim suspension is appropriate only pending a hearing; a suspension which is intended to be final is a dismissal and will be dealt with as such. Salary will continue during any period of interim suspension.

4. Payment of Salary Upon Dismissal for Cause

In cases of dismissal for cause, the faculty member may receive his/her salary for the duration of his/her contract period, as provided for the schedule of notice to which he/she is entitled under Probationary Appointments, if he/she has tenure, for at least one year. However, since these dismissals are for cause, the Board of Trustees shall (upon recommendation of the University Faculty Senate and/or the President) review whether this pay schedule is apt or just.

F. Academic Freedom

All members of the faculty, whether tenured or not, are entitled to academic freedom as set forth in the "[1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](#)," formulated by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors.

1. Academic Freedom of Non-Tenured Faculty

If a faculty member on probationary or other non-tenured appointment alleges that considerations violative of academic freedom significantly contributed to a decision not to reappoint him/her, his/her allegation will be given preliminary consideration by the University Faculty Senate, which will seek to settle the matter by informal methods. The allegation shall be accompanied by a statement that the faculty member agrees to the presentation of such reasons and evidence as the institution may allege in support of its decision. If the difficulty is unresolved at this point, and if the University Faculty Senate so recommends, the matter will be heard in the manner set forth in Dismissals and Procedures for Dismissal under Adequate Causes and Interim Suspensions of this chapter, except that the faculty member making the complaint is responsible for stating the grounds upon which his/her allegations are based, and the burden of proof shall rest upon the faculty member. If, in the view of the University Faculty Senate, he/she succeeds in establishing a *prima facie* case, it is incumbent upon those who made the decision not to reappoint him/her to come forward with evidence in support of their decision.

2. Administrative Personnel

The foregoing regulations apply to administrative personnel who hold academic rank, but only in their capacity as faculty members. Where an administrator alleges that a consideration violative of academic freedom significantly contributed to a decision to terminate his/her appointment to his/her administrative post, or not to reappoint him/her, he/she is entitled to the procedures set forth in item Academic Freedom of Non-Tenured Faculty of this chapter.

3. Political Activities of Faculty Members

Faculty members, as citizens, are free to engage in political activities. When so doing, however, they must speak as individuals and in no way consciously represent the University. Where necessary, leaves of absence may be given for the duration of an election campaign or a term of office, on timely application, and for a reasonable period of time. The terms of such a leave of absence shall be set forth in writing, and the leave will not affect unfavorably the tenure status of

a faculty member, except that time spent on such leave will not count as probationary service unless otherwise mutually agreed to.

G. Grievance Procedures

Grievance procedures are used for all grievances by members of the faculty, except those concerning dismissal proceedings. Grievances relating to reappointment, tenure, or promotion follow the procedures discussed in Item (1) below. Other grievances follow the procedures discussed in Item (2). Dismissal proceedings are addressed in Termination by the University of Continuous Tenure or Termination of an Appointment before the End of the Specified Contractual Term above.

Grievance procedures are intended to provide fairness, foster communication and solve problems within the University community. They permit differences of opinion to be addressed with respect and civility, while recognizing that reasonable people may not agree on the proper course of action. To the extent permitted by University policy and applicable law, all documents and other information provided to the committee, and all deliberations of the committee, will remain confidential. The Grievance Committee has the power to address procedural violations only, and the final authority for action resides with the President and the Board of Trustees.

The Grievance Committee is composed of full-time tenured faculty members and is elected by the faculty. Deans, associate deans, and assistant deans are not eligible to sit on the Grievance Committee. Where the Grievance Committee determines that a conflict of interest exists for a member of the committee with respect to a particular case, that person will withdraw from the case. If practical, a replacement will be selected by the Committee on Committees.

The Provost will call a meeting of the Grievance Committee yearly within the first four weeks of the fall semester to select the committee's chair and to have an orientation to review the tenure and promotion procedures for each school.

1. Grievance Procedures Relating to Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions

Faculty who are not recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion may petition the Grievance Committee for review of the process involved in such an adverse recommendation. By way of example, but not limitation, each of the following is a separate adverse recommendation that a faculty member may challenge:

(1) Any initial recommendation to deny reappointment, tenure or promotion by a department, committee, dean or provost.

(2) Any recommendation to deny reappointment, tenure or promotion on appeal or reconsideration of an initial recommendation.

To initiate a grievance, the faculty member must submit a written petition to the chair of the Grievance Committee and the Provost within fourteen (14) calendar days of his or her actual receipt of the first formal written notice of the adverse recommendation he or she wishes to

challenge. Before initiating a grievance, the faculty member may, but does not have to, pursue any appeal of the adverse recommendation available under University procedures. The grievance petition must state in detail the factual basis for the claim that the process involved in the challenged adverse recommendation failed to substantially comply with established University procedures and/or the University's written faculty employment policies, such as equal employment opportunity policies, as defined in the Faculty Handbook. The faculty member may amend the petition and provide supporting materials during the ten (10) calendar days following the submission of the petition, but may not do so after that time unless the Grievance Committee so assents. The chair of the Grievance Committee shall give notice of the petition, its contents, and any amendments or supporting materials to the individual or committee who made the adverse recommendation.

The Grievance Committee shall limit its consideration to whether the process failed to substantially comply with established University procedure and the University's written faculty employment policies, such as equal employment opportunity policies, as defined in the Faculty Handbook. It will not substitute its judgment on the substance of the recommendation for that made at any of the various levels of review. In grievances alleging illegal discrimination, the committee's responsibility will be to consider whether adequate non-discriminatory professional criteria were used in reaching the contested recommendation or action.

The Grievance Committee will confer with the appropriate committees and individuals, compile and review relevant information, and complete its review within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of receipt of the grievance petition unless unusual circumstances dictate otherwise. If in the course of reviewing the procedural errors alleged in the petition, the Grievance Committee discovers other procedural errors relating to the same reappointment, tenure, or promotion decision, it may consider and act on them as well. In the course of its deliberations, the Grievance Committee will confer with the Provost and with other relevant individuals or committees as appropriate. All individuals in the community are expected to cooperate fully with the Grievance Committee and to maintain confidentiality regarding the case. While the grievance is under consideration, the reappointment, tenure, or promotion decision-making process will be suspended until the Grievance Committee makes its recommendation.

If the Grievance Committee concludes that there has been substantial compliance with University policies and procedures, it will so notify in writing the faculty member who filed the petition and other appropriate parties as specified above. No further review of the petition will be made by the Grievance Committee, but the petition and the committee's written conclusions will be included in the reappointment, tenure, or promotion file prior to any subsequent levels of review for consideration by further reviewers.

If the Grievance Committee concludes that there has not been substantial compliance with established University procedures or policies, it will so notify in writing the faculty member who filed the petition, the individual or committee responsible for the violation, and the Provost. The Committee will also notify any person or entity that the grievant's petition claimed was responsible for a violation, but has been found by the report not to have committed a violation. The notice to non-responsible persons may be a summary that omits information and conclusions not relevant to them. It has the authority to mandate, at its discretion, and with the written

consent of the candidate, the reconsideration of a case from the point of a procedural violation. The Grievance Committee's order mandating reconsideration may contain conditions that the Grievance Committee deems necessary to guide the reconsideration process. During reconsideration, the Grievance Committee may confer with the Provost and with other relevant individuals or committees, as appropriate, to facilitate compliance by the department, tenure committee, dean or provost with the order.

The file for any subsequent levels of review will include the petition and any amendments or supporting materials, the Grievance Committee order, and any response following reconsideration.

The grievance procedure should be completed within the regular reappointment and tenure review calendar, and normally no later than the conclusion of the academic year in which the petition was submitted. For purposes of this policy and terminal year notification only, the conclusion of the academic year will be May 31st. The Grievance Committee should issue two reports in cases brought before it:

1. The standard confidential review of the particular case to the candidate, which is included in the portfolio prior to any subsequent levels of review.
2. A report to the Provost delineating any general lessons learned and possible recommendations for process clarification or change.

Each spring after all tenure and promotion decisions are complete, the Provost will identify issues and concerns relating to the process and refer those issues to the school(s) involved for study.

2. Procedures for Other Grievances

Faculty may submit grievances on matters other than dismissal, reappointment, tenure, or promotion. A faculty member with such a grievance must submit a written petition to the chair of the Grievance Committee and the Provost within fourteen (14) calendar days of learning of the event at issue in the grievance. The petition must state in detail the nature of the grievance, the person(s) against whom the grievance is directed, the factual or other information pertinent to the grievance, and the relief requested. The chair of the Grievance Committee shall give notice of the petition and its contents to the individual and/or committee against whom the grievance is directed.

The Grievance Committee will review the petition and decide whether or not it merits a detailed investigation. Submission of a petition will not automatically initiate investigation or detailed consideration.

The Grievance Committee will be concerned with the fairness of the procedures which were used in the aggrieved matter. It will not, normally, attempt to adjudicate the differences of opinion involved in the substance of the matter of the decision. The committee may pursue a resolution

of the grievance satisfactory to both parties. If in the opinion of the Grievance Committee a mutually agreeable resolution is not possible, or is not appropriate, the committee will report its recommendations to all parties directly involved, the Provost, and the President. In cases where the grievance is directed to actions of the President, the full report shall also be forwarded to the Rector of the Board of Trustees.

IV. Policies Applicable to All Employees

Human Resources maintains a central web page (*in progress*) referencing policies in many areas that are of interest to both faculty and staff. Most policies are set by various administrative offices on campus, but a few are set by the Board of Trustees.

Policies of particular interest to faculty include:

- A. Harassment and Discrimination Policy (including Sexual Harassment)
- B. Intellectual Property Policy
- C. Policy on Research Misconduct
- D. Policy on Conflict of Interest
- E. Computer Account Expirations

V. Other Policies for Faculty

- A. Summer School Contracts
- B. Extra Compensation for Full-Time Faculty
- C. Sabbatical Leave
- D. Leave of Absence
- E. Faculty External Consulting Policy
- F. Reinstatement of Tenured Faculty on Long-Term Disability

A. Summer School Contracts

Separate contracts with the faculty for teaching in the summer session are made by the President upon recommendation of the Provost and the Dean and the appropriate department or school.

(This section does not require Trustee approval to modify.)

B. Extra Compensation for Full-Time Faculty

Full-time faculty and staff will be permitted to receive extra compensation from the University of Richmond for the performance of services to the University in the form of teaching or instructional assignments to special conferences and seminar groups composed primarily of individuals outside the University community. Such activities must be performed on the

individual's personal time, i.e., weekends, vacation or holiday time, and may not conflict with normal, ongoing job responsibilities. The performance of such services must be approved in advance by the appropriate Dean, Vice President, or the President. Any such service must be clearly outside the normal job responsibilities and expectations of the University.

It is expected that this type of activity will be coordinated by Executive Education or the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, and that Executive Education or the School of Continuing Studies will negotiate with the individual regarding compensation for services rendered.

C. Sabbatical Leave

The sabbatical leave program is provided by the University for the enrichment of the teaching capabilities and professional growth of its faculty members. The program is administered by the Provost, with the approval of the President and the Board of Trustees. Application forms for sabbatical leaves may be obtained from the office of the Dean for each division.

Sabbatical leaves for study or research are granted to members of the faculty subject to the following:

1. Eligibility

Full-time tenured faculty members become eligible for sabbatical leaves after each six years of service at the University of Richmond, with the sabbatical taken in the seventh year. Newly tenured professors become eligible to apply in their seventh year. Periods of leave do not count toward the six years of faculty service in determining eligibility. Work done on a sabbatical leave may be part of the fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree, but it is the responsibility of the faculty member to present a case that such a sabbatical is in the best interests of the University.

The time between sabbaticals normally will be six years. Under unusual circumstances when a faculty member is asked to delay a sabbatical leave for the benefit of the department, school or University, less than six years may be required for the subsequent sabbatical.

2. Compensation

One-half salary will be granted for a leave of one academic year (two semesters), or full salary for a leave of one semester. Medical and life insurance, disability, workman's and unemployment compensation are continued in full as usual and are based on the salary the faculty member would have received from the University had he or she not been on sabbatical. Payments to the retirement program are based on actual salary received from the University. Individuals taking a full year sabbatical at half pay may wish to make extra contributions to their retirement program at their own expense. All faculty members taking a sabbatical leave should contact Human Resources Services to discuss their benefit coverage.

Members of the faculty going on sabbatical leave must repay the University the amount of leave compensation (salary and benefits) if they do not return to the University for the fall and spring semesters of the following academic year.

In addition to the compensation outlined above, the University encourages the faculty member to apply for additional grant monies to cover travel, research costs, displacement costs, or any other expense connected with the leave and which he/she would not normally encounter in a normal teaching year. Such non-salary funds will not be deducted from the University's compensation. Any grant funds above these expenses, however, will reduce the University's participation dollar for dollar, in order that its limited funds may be used for the benefit of those unable to obtain grant monies. The Office of Foundation, Corporate and Government Relations offers help in obtaining grant funds. Sabbatical compensation paid by the University is not affected by extra income (e.g. consultation fees, investment returns) earned by the faculty during the regular teaching year.

3. Submission Deadline for Applications

The leave request should be initiated by the faculty member with the department chair's support and submitted to the Dean. The request must be filed in the first week of September in the fall semester preceding the session for which the leave is requested. Applications approved internally are submitted by the Provost through the President to the Board of Trustees at its Fall meeting.

4. Contents of Application

Applications for sabbatical leaves should contain the following information and supporting materials:

- A statement of purpose and an outline of the proposed program.
- A statement relating the program to the faculty member's teaching and research effectiveness, to the aims of the department, and to the needs of the University.
- A statement of places where the work is to be accomplished.
- A statement indicating whether remunerative employment is to be accepted during the period of leave and stating how this would be consonant with the program. The presumption is that the leave would preclude such employment.
- A statement by the department chair supporting the application and indicating how teaching adjustments will be made in the department.

5. Bases for Consideration of the Application by the Board of Trustees

- Will the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher and scholar at the University of Richmond be directly enhanced?
- Will the leave help to enhance the faculty member's professional status through publishing, research, study, or service?
- What contribution will the program make to the needs of the department and the

University?

- What is the faculty member's seniority in service since being hired or since the last sabbatical leave?
- Will the teaching program of the division be seriously impaired by the absence of the person on leave?

6. Post-Sabbatical Report

A full report on all sabbaticals, spelling out the benefits of the leave to the individual and the University, must be filed with the appropriate department chair and dean within the first month of the semester that the faculty member returns.

D. Leave of Absence

A faculty member (including faculty of practice) may apply for a leave of absence without pay for a period of up to one year for either personal or professional reasons. Individuals who wish to apply for a leave of absence must discuss the application with the Dean of their school, who will then make a recommendation to the Provost. All leaves must be approved by the Provost.

Faculty members on a leave of absence ordinarily do not receive a salary. Therefore, the University will not continue making contributions to the retirement program during an unpaid leave of absence since these benefits are tied to salary payments. Health Benefits for personal and professional leaves of absence are discussed below. A faculty member requesting a leave of absence is advised to contact the Office of Human Resource Services to discuss benefits available during the leave.

1. Unpaid Personal Leave:

Unpaid personal leave of absence may be granted for circumstances such as care-giving for family members, personal or family medical needs. Faculty on an unpaid personal leave of absence may arrange to have their benefits continued at their own expense. The University will comply with the legal requirements for benefits continuation for leaves covered by the Family Medical Leave Act. Faculty on parental leave and short term disability will receive salary and benefits as set forth in Chapter II, Compensation and Benefits, of the Faculty Handbook.

Time on an unpaid personal leave of absence is not considered time spent in service to the University and will not count toward a faculty member's years of service. Therefore, a year-long personal leave of absence will extend the eligibility time period of the tenure decision for an untenured faculty member and the date for a sabbatical leave. However, a leave of absence for up to one full semester will not ordinarily change the date of the tenure decision nor the eligibility date for a sabbatical leave.

2. Professional Leave:

Leave may be granted for professional reasons such as pursuing scholarly or artistic work under a grant or fellowship. For a leave to be considered professional, its primary purpose must be to

enhance the scholarly and teaching skills of the faculty member. If the purpose of the leave of absence is unclear, a decision will be made by the Provost. In exceptional circumstances, such leaves may be extended beyond one year.

The University will continue to pay its portion of benefits (medical, long term disability and life insurance) for faculty members on unpaid professional leave with no outside funding. The faculty member must make arrangements with the Office of Human Resource Services to continue to pay his or her share of the monthly premiums. The University will not, however, provide benefits for faculty members on unpaid leave who have outside income from a grant or employer who pays benefits. In these cases, the grant or employer will be expected to assume the cost of the faculty member's employee benefits.

In unusual circumstances, leaves for professional reasons, depending on their nature, may be counted as service to the University and thus towards the years required for tenure and sabbatical. The Provost will consult with the appropriate Dean and will decide whether the leave time will count.

See Chapter III, Probationary Appointments (Tenure-Track), for "stop the clock" leaves.

Individuals who wish to apply for a leave of absence should discuss the application with the Dean of their school. All leaves must be approved by the Provost.

E. Faculty External Consulting Policy

PURPOSE

The University of Richmond recognizes that faculty may occasionally contribute their time and talents to activities performed in the service of outside entities. To the extent that they are both valuable to the faculty member's continuing skill acquisition and refinement, and do not conflict with the faculty member's primary responsibilities of employment, the University is supportive of external consulting relationships. This policy provides guidance for and establishes reasonable limits on the consulting activities faculty may undertake while remaining under the employ of the University of Richmond.

DEFINITIONS

For these purposes, consulting is defined as professional activity related to a faculty member's field or academic discipline, in which the faculty member receives a fee-for-service or other valuable consideration from a third party. The guiding principle of consulting is that a person agrees to use his or her professional capabilities to further the interests of a third party, in return for an immediate or prospective personal gain. There are a variety of consulting relationships and fee arrangements, some of which may also be governed by other University of Richmond policies (see: University of Richmond Policies on Conflict of Interest in Research and Intellectual Property).

Several categories of faculty activity fall outside of work performed for the institution, but are not considered consulting. They include:

Lectures, Publications and Journals:

Scholarly communications in the form of lectures, books, articles, movies, television productions, art works, etc., though frequently earning financial profit for a faculty member and for another party (e.g., publisher), are not viewed as consultation. Reviewing or editing scholarly publications and books is not considered consulting, even when the faculty member is compensated for these services.

Professional Service:

The fundamental distinction between these activities and consulting is that they are either public or part of University service. This category includes service on national commissions, governmental agencies and boards, granting agency peer-group review panels, conference boards, visiting committees or advisory groups to other universities, and similar entities. Although an honorarium or equivalent is sometimes provided, these professional service activities are not undertaken for personal financial gain.

Outside Business Interests:

Faculty members may pursue a variety of endeavors for financial profit that are not directly related to their field or discipline. However, faculty are expected to fulfill their full-time commitment to the University of Richmond regardless of the nature of their outside business interests.

University of Richmond Outreach:

Executive Education through the Reynolds Graduate School of Business and leadership training or curriculum development through the Jepson School of Leadership Studies, and non-credit continuing education offered through the SPCS are activities sponsored by the University of Richmond and are outside the purview of this policy.

GUIDELINES

The following guidance is provided to assist faculty in ensuring their external consulting activities adhere to the University of Richmond's policies and procedures.

Time and Effort:

- A conflict of commitment exists when the external activities of a faculty member are so substantial or demanding of the faculty member's time and effort as to interfere with the faculty member's primary responsibilities to his or her department or school, to students, or to the University.
- Faculty must obtain approval from the dean or the dean's designee before agreeing to a

consulting arrangement. A denial by the dean or dean's designee of a request for prior approval to engage in outside consulting is appealable to the Grievance Committee. Deans will maintain records of denied requests.

- Faculty members are ordinarily limited to the equivalent of one day per work week serving as consultants in fields related to their academic discipline and employment at the University of Richmond.
- Nine-month faculty: Individuals without a full summer supplement (2/9ths salary) are not subject to these limits during periods of time when they are not receiving compensation from or administered by the University.
- Faculty members will ordinarily consult outside of their regularly-scheduled class room teaching hours. Consulting must not conflict with the full-time employment and academic obligations of the faculty member.
- Faculty members must disclose the names of companies for whom they consult, the general nature of each consulting agreement, and the number of days committed per consulting agreement.

Use of University Affiliation and Facilities:

- University facilities and equipment, such as copy machines and printers, may not be used for private consulting purposes without reimbursing the University.
- Staff support time may not be used for private consulting purposes.
- Use of faculty offices or email, and other non-expense incurring use of University equipment and facilities, is permissible.
- When consulting, faculty members may not represent themselves as agents of the University of Richmond.

Compensation:

- Twelve-month faculty may not receive additional compensation through the institution by serving as consultants on projects funded by University-administered grants.

EXCEPTIONS AND PRIOR APPROVAL

Faculty members seeking an exception to the University's Faculty Consulting Policy must seek written approval from their academic dean, as well as the Provost.

Individuals who have questions about this policy or wish to pursue a consulting role that falls outside of these guidelines should consult with their respective dean, the Provost, or University Counsel for guidance.

G. Reinstatement of Tenured Faculty on Long-Term Disability

After short-term disability is exhausted, a covered faculty member may be eligible for long-term disability (LTD). Once a faculty member is approved for long-term disability he or she is no longer considered an active employee. (See Chapter III, Section F) Their employment will end effective the day before the LTD effective date.

When a tenured faculty member goes on long-term disability (LTD), he/she may return to his/her tenured position provided that all of the following conditions have been met: 1) he/she is no longer receiving LTD benefits from the university's insurance provider, 2) the university has received appropriate medical certification that he/she is able to return to work full-time in his/her previous position; and 3) no more than six full semesters have passed since he/she was placed on LTD. The individual on LTD may choose to relinquish the right to return to his/her tenured position in a letter to the provost at any time before the six-semester limit.

VI. CHANGES TO THE FACULTY HANDBOOK

This Handbook and the University policies referenced herein may be modified or amended from time to time.

The specific procedures for modifying or amending this Handbook, excluding the Appendices, is set forth below. And while the Board of Trustees has the authority to change all stated policies and procedures, it is expected that, in the tradition of shared governance under which the University has operated for decades and which was codified in the Faculty Senate Charter, the Board of Trustees will facilitate faculty input on any proposed change and ultimately inform the faculty of any adopted changes. Changes to the Handbook, except for those to the section on summer school contracts in Chapter V, may be proposed by a majority vote of the University Faculty or, in the case of minor changes and subject to its Charter, by the University Faculty Senate. Such proposed changes will be transmitted to the Provost and then to the President for presentation to the Board of Trustees. All changes to Handbook, except for those to the section on summer school contracts in Chapter V, must be approved by the Board of Trustees.

The appendices to the Faculty Handbook include specific sections detailing their individual revision process. Changes to an appendix is therefore governed by that appendix's revision process.

VII. Appendix I: School-Specific Personnel Policies and Procedures

A. Notification of Revision Process

This Appendix in its entirety must be consistent with University principles stipulated under "Evaluation for Personnel Decisions" (Chapter III, Section C). Revisions to a school's section of this Appendix may be proposed by a majority vote of the particular school's faculty, and transmitted by the Dean for separate majority vote by the University Faculty. The Provost and President then transmit the proposed revisions for vote by the Board of Trustees.

B. School of Arts and Sciences Personnel Policies and Procedures

C. The Robins School of Business Personnel Policies and Procedures

D. The School of Professional and Continuing Studies Standards and Processes for Promotion

E. The Jepson School of Leadership Studies Criteria, Guidelines and Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Tenure and Promotion

F. The School of Law Personnel Policies and Procedures

VII.B. School of Arts & Sciences Personnel Policies and Procedures

This Appendix in its entirety must be consistent with University principles stipulated under "Evaluation for Personnel Decisions" (Chapter III, Section C). Revisions to a school's section of this Appendix may be proposed by a majority vote of the particular school's faculty, and transmitted by the Dean for separate majority vote by the University Faculty. The Provost and President then transmit the proposed revisions for vote by the Board of Trustees.

In addition to the following criteria and procedures for Arts and Sciences faculty, candidates should read the Faculty Handbook, Chapter III, "Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures."

A. Criteria for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Reviews

B. Tenure and Promotion Process and Procedures

A. Criteria for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Reviews

The following guidelines describe the criteria that departments, the Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Dean in the School of Arts and Sciences follow in making

recommendations concerning tenure and promotion.

Faculty members are expected to show that their performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service each meets the standards set forth below.

1. Teaching

In keeping with the mission of the University of Richmond, teaching is the most important area of faculty performance. The School of Arts and Sciences seeks a faculty committed to excellence in teaching, and expects successful candidates for tenure and promotion to have demonstrated a high level of performance in teaching. Such things as measures of student achievement, student evaluations, and reviews conducted by other teachers can be used to demonstrate the quality of teaching. Excellent teaching stimulates students' interest, increases their knowledge, and requires them to engage in critical analysis. Generally, excellent teaching is the result of the instructor's mastery of the subject, clear organization and presentation, use of appropriately up-to-date materials and methodologies, respect for and fair treatment of students, thoughtful advising, and willingness to engage with them in open dialogue.

2. Scholarship

If teaching is our primary mission, scholarship is virtually as important. Through scholarship, School of Arts and Sciences faculty members remain current in their academic disciplines and work toward the University of Richmond's goal of advancing knowledge. Scholarship supports the university's commitment to teaching. The university recognizes that scholarly and other kinds of creative activity can take a variety of forms. It also recognizes that scholarship, to reach its potential, must be shared and tested publicly. Typically, this means that the university faculty's scholarly and creative projects are expected to produce publications, presentations, and works of the creative imagination that are open to scrutiny by professional peers. The quality of such work is more significant than the quantity, but candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to demonstrate that they are involved in ongoing scholarly and/or creative work and that they have the ability to complete work of high quality.

3. Service

The University of Richmond and its School of Arts and Science rely upon the involvement of its faculty in service to the university community, such as participating in committee work and the life of the university. Every candidate for tenure and promotion is expected to demonstrate that he or she has effectively served his or her department and the School of Arts and Sciences and/or the university.

A faculty member's activity in professional organizations, depending on its nature and extent, can count as significant service, but cannot substitute for service at the University of Richmond.

Service with community organizations is also noted insofar as it involves the exercise of the faculty member's professional knowledge or abilities.

B. Tenure and Promotion Process and Procedures

This section describes the process and procedures for three decisions within a tenure-stream faculty member's career: mid-course review, tenure and promotion to associate professor, and promotion to full professor. Decisions at all three stages are based on the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The tenured members of an untenured faculty member's department and the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences participate in the mid-course review. At the time for tenure and/or promotion, the tenured members of the candidate's department, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Dean are responsible for making recommendations. Positive recommendations at these stages do not mean that the Board of Trustees will grant tenure and/or promotion, nor that individuals at higher levels who are involved in the process will necessarily support those recommendations. Specifically, after hearing from the department, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Dean, the Provost makes a recommendation to the President, and the President decides whether to nominate a candidate to the Board. The Board of Trustees is the only university body that awards tenure and/or promotion to a member of the faculty.

The timetable for the various stages in the mid-course review and the tenure and/or promotion processes is established annually by the Dean. The Dean, in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Committee, provides the candidate and the department chair a memorandum of instruction detailing the timetable and the preparation of the portfolio. It is the responsibility of the candidate to include in his or her portfolio all required information and any additional information the candidate believes pertinent to the review process. The candidate delivers the mid-course review, tenure, or promotion portfolio to the department chair to meet the deadline set in the Dean's memorandum. The deadline is generally in the spring for the mid-course review and early in the fall for the tenure and/or promotion process.

1. Career Profiles, Reviews, and Timing of Tenure and Promotions

a. Departmental Career Profiles

Departments are urged to establish clear, written, discipline-specific career profiles for teacher scholars at the University of Richmond. Following consultation with the Dean, these profiles should be made available to all faculty members. Thoughtfully prepared profiles may offer a rough outline of expected progress, but should not be considered a checklist for tenure and promotion. They should be consistent with the School of Arts and Sciences' mission as an institution dedicated to both teaching and scholarship.

b. Annual and Mid-course Reviews for Untenured Faculty

Untenured faculty members are reviewed annually. Tenured members of departments should participate in the annual evaluation of untenured faculty, offering guidance and assessment. The chair's annual evaluation will reflect the views of these participants. Consultation may take different forms depending on the size of the department.

Tenure candidates will also have a mid-course review by the department and the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences during the pre-tenure period. This review is developmental in nature, but an additional goal is to determine whether the candidate is on track toward a favorable tenure decision. The review is designed to provide early warning signals to the candidate if there are significant problems in the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or service

contributions. It is possible for the review to result in a recommendation that the candidate be given a terminal contract for the following year if, following the process described below, the Dean concludes that there is a low likelihood that the candidate's present and future efforts will be sufficient to meet the standards for tenure and promotion.

During the semester of the mid-course review, usually the candidate's third year, the candidate will submit a package of materials for review. This package contains relevant information, specified by the Dean in a letter of instruction to the candidate, about the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service activities. Tenured members of the candidate's department review the candidate's materials, meet to discuss the candidate's performance, and provide a thorough critical evaluation regarding the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion.

The department chair writes a mid-course departmental report that offers an evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship or creative work, and service. This report analyzes the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and expresses the range of opinion in the department, especially with respect to the question of whether the candidate's teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service to date indicate that he or she, at the current point in time, is on course for a favorable tenure review. The departmental report is circulated to all tenured members of the department, revised as necessary to reflect the tenured faculty's deliberations, and the final version signed by all tenured members of the department. Signature only means agreement that the letter fairly represents the departmental discussion.

The departmental report, after vetting by the Dean for legal and procedural issues, is shared with the candidate. The candidate then meets with the chair to discuss his or her progress. The report is then sent to the Dean following the Dean's timetable. The Dean reviews all relevant material in the candidate's portfolio and the report from the candidate's department. The Dean then holds a meeting with the candidate to discuss results of the mid-course review process. In an instance where the candidate is to be given a terminal contract for the fourth year, the Dean will meet with the candidate's department chair to discuss the case before making a final decision. The Dean informs the candidate and the candidate's chair in writing of the results of his or her evaluation.

c. Timeline for Tenure

At the time of appointment the untenured faculty member is provided with the year of his or her tenure decision. The untenured faculty member may elect to stand for tenure at an earlier date, but once the tenure review process is initiated, the process must be completed and the outcome of that decision is final. (For more information, see the University Faculty Handbook, III.B.2, and III.C.2.)

d. The Conjunction of Tenure and Promotion Tenure and promotion to associate professor are almost always granted at the same time. In the exceptional case of tenure without promotion, subsequent promotion requires completion of the promotion process.

Faculty may be promoted prior to receiving tenure and new faculty appointments may be made with or without tenure at the associate or full professor rank.

e. Timeline and Review for Promotion to Full Professor

Normally faculty will seek promotion to full professor approximately six to ten years after the tenure decision, but candidates should submit a portfolio for a promotion decision only after consultation with the department chair and the Dean. The key determinant is a record of sustained achievement since the last promotion decision and continued promise of professional accomplishment and contribution to the university's mission. Chairs should include a discussion of progress towards promotion as part (formal or informal) of each associate professor's annual review.

The candidate, any member of the candidate's department (including the chair), or the Dean may initiate a discussion about whether the candidate is ready to begin the promotion process.

2. Tenure and Promotion Procedures

a. Composition and Election of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee

The Tenure and Promotion Committee is composed of seven Arts and Sciences faculty members who have been tenured at the University of Richmond for at least two years: two active members elected from each of the School of Arts and Sciences' tripartite divisions and one at-large member, or in cases of recusal, their reserved substitutes (see explanation below). Committee members will be elected to staggered, three-year terms by the Arts and Sciences faculty and in such a way that representatives from one division are not members of the same department.

The Tenure and Promotion Committee elects its chair from among its faculty members. Committee members must recuse themselves as necessary, for example, on cases involving members of their home departments and/or families. After a three-year term, committee members become emeriti committee members, available as reserve committee members for up to three additional years. The chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will call in reserve committee members to replace active members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee who must recuse themselves from a specific case. The reserve members substitute by division.

The Tenure and Promotion Committee includes the Dean of Arts and Sciences as a full participating but non-voting member. The Dean serves as administrative coordinator and works closely with the chair in scheduling meetings. The Dean meets with the Committee to participate in the full discussion of each case, but does not vote on the candidates.

b. The Role of the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair

The Committee Chair is responsible for coordinating the meetings of the Tenure and Promotion Committee with the Dean's and other committee members' schedules, and for ensuring that the work of the committee proceeds both fairly and efficiently. The Chair will be available to address concerns brought forth by the candidate, a departmental colleague, or another member of the Committee, regarding procedural violations or any inappropriate or illegal bias. The Chair may consult with anyone in the process, including candidate, department chair, Dean, and fellow Tenure and Promotion Committee members, to resolve concerns of bias or violation of procedure. If the Committee Chair cannot resolve the question, she or he may refer the candidate to the University Grievance Committee.

c. The Role of the Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion

In preparation for a tenure and/or promotion review, the candidate and his or her department chair will consult to identify the candidate's field of scholarship. The candidate shall then offer his or her chair the names of four or five people outside the university who are recognized as experts in that field. These experts should be chosen carefully from among those unlikely to have an undue interest in the outcome of the review. The candidate should not contact these suggested reviewers about their willingness to serve in this capacity. The candidate may also name potential referees who, for good reasons, should not be invited to comment on his or her work.

The candidate may submit a list of up to five students whom she or he wants the chair to contact and up to five whom she or he does not want the chair to contact. The candidate should not contact the suggested student reviewers about their willingness to serve in this capacity.

The candidate for tenure is responsible for submitting his or her portfolio to the department in accordance with the Dean's timetable and memorandum of instruction. This portfolio should include the candidate's curriculum vitae; statements on teaching, scholarship, and service; annual personnel reports and annual reviews; mid-course review; and evidence of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Once the candidate submits the portfolio, no materials may be added, other than 1) notification of the receipt of a major award, prize, or grant, or 2) status updates on a submission that was included in the original portfolio and that was already out for review when the portfolio was submitted.

At each stage of review, the candidate will be notified of a positive or negative recommendation but the actual vote at any stage will never be included or alluded to in any report to the candidate.

The candidate will receive the departmental report, the Tenure and Promotion Committee report, and the Dean's report. In each case, the candidate will have a week to file a written response if he or she desires. This response will be returned to the point of origin (to the body whose opinion is being addressed) for review and a re-vote. If the original recommendation stands, the point of origin body may choose to write an explanation and attach that as an addendum to the original report. If the point of origin body changes its recommendation, that body must write an explanation for the change and that explanation will be attached as an addendum to the original report. In either event, once the response has been reviewed and a new vote taken, the original report, the candidate's response, and any subsequent re-vote and/or explanation will be included in the portfolio as it moves forward.

The candidate has the right to file a grievance following the procedures defined in the Faculty Handbook, (see III.H.), should he or she believe there has been a violation of the university's established procedures. The candidate must act in a timely manner to file a grievance and should not postpone action until the end of the process.

d. The Role of the Department and the Department Chair

The department chair consults tenured members of the candidate's department and outside experts to identify at least five qualified external reviewers from the candidate's field. At least two of the final five committed referees will be chosen from the candidate's list, and at least two will come from the chair's list. Every possible effort should be made to ensure that the number of outside reviewers drawn from the candidate's recommended list does not exceed the number independently identified by the department. The department will not inform the candidate of the identity of any of the persons invited to serve as external referees. Following the Dean's guidelines, the department chair is responsible for soliciting letters from a minimum of 80 students randomly selected from courses that the candidate has taught.

The chair is also responsible for soliciting letters from the heads of committees or groups familiar with the candidate's service to the university.

Tenured members of the candidate's department should prepare for the department's assessment by reviewing the candidate's portfolio and supporting materials.

Tenured departmental faculty then meet to discuss the tenure and/or promotion case, reviewing and assessing the portfolio submitted by the candidate, the external review letters, and the candidate's performance in relation to the criteria above. At this meeting, the tenured faculty vote on the candidate's tenure and promotion through a confidential ballot. The result of the vote is kept separate from the departmental report.

Based on this meeting, the chair of the department forwards a written report and the departmental vote to the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Dean. The departmental report is to be a fair and balanced assessment of both the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. The report should express the range of opinion in the department, the presence of any dissenting views, and the strength of any consensus, but it should not resemble in any way a transcript of the department's confidential deliberations. Before being forwarded to the Tenure and Promotion Committee and Dean, the departmental report is circulated, revised as necessary, and the final version signed by all tenured members of the department. Signature only means agreement that the letter fairly represents the departmental discussion, and is by itself not a vote on the case.

The Department Report, after vetting by the Dean for legal and procedural issues, is shared with the candidate. If the report includes quotations from easily identifiable sources, the confidential information must be redacted before transmission to the candidate.

Normally, drafting the departmental report is the responsibility of the department chair, but in unusual circumstances this responsibility may be designated to another member of the department. In such circumstances, unless the Dean has approved an exception, the chair retains the responsibility of submitting the report to the Dean, indicating his or her role in preparing the document.

In departments with a small number of tenured faculty members (fewer than four) the Dean consults with the department chair and the candidate regarding the appointment of additional tenured faculty to the department mid-course review committee and the department tenure review committee. The candidate, the Dean, the chair, and other tenured departmental faculty

members develop a mutually agreeable list of suitable tenured faculty, from whom the Dean selects members in order to bring the committee membership up to four. When possible this process is initiated at the mid-course review with the anticipation that the same outside members are available to serve on the department tenure review committee.

e. The Role of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Dean

Before external letters and departmental reports are incorporated into the portfolio, the Dean reviews them for legal and procedural acceptability and consults counsel as might be necessary.

The Tenure and Promotion Committee including the Dean evaluates the credentials of each candidate through the examination of the candidate's portfolio, the department report, student letters, and external review letters. The Tenure and Promotion Committee including the Dean, as well as the Provost, and/or President may ask the candidate to provide documented evidence about the status of manuscripts, grant applications, etc., that are included as "submitted" or "pending" in the portfolio. However, no additional documents or outside reviews may be added or taken into consideration when reviewing a candidate's portfolio. In rare cases, relevant additional information may be requested of anyone, but only with the consent of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. In such cases, the candidate must be informed of these requests.

After thorough deliberations, the Tenure and Promotion Committee decides by confidential majority vote to recommend that the candidate be granted or denied tenure and/or promotion. The dean is part of these deliberations but does not vote. For each candidate, one faculty member from the Tenure and Promotion Committee is selected during deliberations to draft a committee report that reflects their deliberations and provides a fair and balanced assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. The report should express the range of perspectives among committee members, the presence and nature of any dissenting views, and the strength of any consensus, but it should not resemble a transcript of the committee's confidential deliberations. This report is reviewed, revised as necessary, approved in final form, and signed by all members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, including the Dean, before being added to the portfolio.

The committee report, after vetting by the Dean for legal and procedural issues, is then shared with the candidate. If the report includes quotations from easily identifiable sources, the confidential information must be redacted before transmission to the candidate.

After meeting with the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean writes an independent report to be shared with the Tenure and Promotion Committee before transmission to the Provost. This report may simply say, "I agree with the committee's recommendation." In cases where the Dean's final assessment differs from the recommendation of the committee, any substantive disagreements are discussed and this discussion summarized by the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee for inclusion in the portfolio. The Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Dean's reports are then added to the portfolio and the entire dossier transmitted to the Provost for the next stage in the review process.

The Dean shares his or her report with the candidate.

3. Confidentiality

a. Confidential Meetings

Department chairs and the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will remind everyone, every year, that frank, honest discussion and deliberation are only possible when participants maintain absolute confidentiality.

b. Confidential Letters

Confidential letters from outside evaluators, colleagues, and students submitted as part of the tenure and/or promotion portfolio will be sequestered before the portfolio is returned to the candidate and not used for any other purpose unless legally necessary. After a period of seven years from the final decision on tenure and/or promotion, all such letters will be destroyed.

*Changes to The Role of the Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion section
and other minor revisions*

*Approved by Arts & Sciences on April 21, 2011,
University Faculty on May 9, 2011, and
Board of Trustees on June 16, 2011*

Change to Confidentiality section

*Approved by Arts & Sciences faculty on March 25, 2010
Approved by University Faculty on May 10, 2010
Approved by Board of Trustees' Executive Committee on May 19, 2010*

#####

*This version approved by Arts & Sciences faculty on October 22, 2007
Approved by University Faculty on November 7, 2007
Approved by Board of Trustees on March 7, 2008*

VII.C. The Robins School of Business Personnel Policies and Procedures

This Appendix in its entirety must be consistent with University principles stipulated under "Evaluation for Personnel Decisions" (Chapter III, Section C). Revisions to a school's section of this Appendix may be proposed by a majority vote of the particular school's faculty, and transmitted by the Dean for separate majority vote by the University Faculty. The Provost and President then transmit the proposed revisions for vote by the Board of Trustees.

A. Introduction

- B. Standards for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Reviews
 - C. Tenure and Promotion Process and Procedures
-

A. Introduction

The mission of the Robins School of Business is "to prepare leaders for the global business environment by engaging them in an active learning community, where excellent teaching, scholarship and service are integrated within a liberal arts university." Faculty standards are guidelines that give meaning to the teaching, scholarship, and service parts of the mission statement. These standards are for the faculty as a whole and for individuals subject to tenure, promotion, and periodic performance reviews. These standards help frame accurate expectations about the quality and quantity of faculty contributions necessary for the Robins School of Business to meet its mission.

B. Standards for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Reviews

The tenure and promotion process in the School of Business supports faculty development in two ways. First, it seeks to encourage the individual faculty member to improve skills and grow professionally. Second, it attempts to guarantee that faculty members are of high quality and demonstrably dedicated to teaching, scholarship, and service. The overall standard for the Robins School of Business is excellence in teaching, intellectual contributions, and service. Structured guidelines are provided in this section to help define what is meant by "excellence" for each of these component parts of the School's mission.

1. Standards for Excellence

Faculty members are expected to show that their performance as teachers, scholars, and citizens of the University has reached a level of excellence. The standards of excellence described below are derived from the mission of the Robins School of Business.

a. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is characterized by a consistent pattern of challenging course standards, a high degree of rigor, activities requiring critical thinking, extensive classroom preparation, enthusiasm, and a high degree of student interaction. These characteristics of excellent teaching are expected to be shown consistently from course to course and over a sustained period.

b. Scholarship

Excellence in scholarship is characterized by a strong and ongoing commitment to scholarly activities leading to high-quality publications. Faculty members are expected to engage in meaningful research that leads to the creation of new knowledge and that enhances the scholarly reputation of the School and the University.

c. Service

Excellence in service involves participation in and meaningful contribution to the life of the University, School and profession. Such service is meant to improve the academic experience for students, advance the profession, and guide the future direction of the school.

2. Evidence of Excellence

a. Teaching

All faculty are expected to offer students a challenging educational experience. Because teaching has many dimensions, different individuals may be effective teachers for different reasons. As such, it is not possible to define a single, universal measure of teaching excellence. Nevertheless, individual faculty members subject to tenure and promotion reviews are responsible for offering evidence that they have achieved teaching excellence consistent with the faculty member's career stage and objectives of the department, the Robins School, and the University of Richmond. Faculty members who joined the Robins School in 2014-2015 or after are expected to provide a Teaching Philosophy Statement as part of their packet of materials (not to exceed either 1000 words or two pages in length).

Teaching evaluation measures may be derived from three separate sources: faculty peers, students, and department or committee reviews of one's teaching materials. The philosophy of the Robins School of Business is to use student evaluations in all classes, but to recognize the limitations of student responses. Student perceptions of a teacher offer valuable information about the teacher's availability, enthusiasm, clarity, and quality of instruction, level of interest, impact on learning, and ability to motivate students' critical and analytical thinking. Faculty peers offer valuable information on technical rigor, grading standards, course workload, teacher knowledge, pedagogical fit, currency of materials, course design, and departmental expectations of the teacher and the course.

Excellent teaching implies more than effective classroom presentation and high student evaluations. Important aspects of excellent teaching are outlined below. Individual faculty members are responsible for providing evidence that they have achieved a high level of performance in each of the following activities.

(1) Functions Supporting Teaching

An excellent teaching institution must have a coordinated curriculum of study and course offerings orchestrated to be current, rigorous, and stimulating.

Excellent teaching implies that faculty members work through their departments and the Robins School of Business to structure an appropriate curriculum of study and constantly improve course offerings. This dimension of excellent teaching is measured by colleagues and Department Chairs.

Evidence of excellence in activities supporting teaching may be provided by effectively teaching a variety of courses, developing new courses, authorship of published materials on teaching, development of original course materials, active participation in the department's curriculum development, active

participation in teaching conferences, and specific written support by departmental peers.

(2) Course Specific Standards and Rigor

In a course assigned to a specific faculty member, excellent teaching is represented by the teacher's appropriate degree of rigor, design of graded assignments, and currency of teaching materials. A faculty member's syllabus, writing exercises, problem sets, grading standards, and other relevant material are the sources of information that may be used to judge the quality of teaching in a specific course. Faculty members who joined the Robins School in 2014-2015 or after must include course specific grade distributions, available from the Registrar's office, for each semester they have taught at the University of Richmond.

Departmental evaluations of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness are structured around course objectives and the role of the course in the curriculum. For example, some courses may have more of a textbook orientation with lecture formats. For such courses, defined in terms of topical coverage, the major considerations may be clarity, organization, preparation, rigor, structured exercises, and measurable evidence of student learning. Other courses, such as a case analysis course, may place a higher priority on a learning process as the objective. Excellence in teaching must be evaluated against the course objective in the context of the department and School curriculum.

(3) Student Evaluations of Teaching Performance

Standardized teaching evaluations are administered in every course. A major use of the evaluations is self-improvement; faculty members are responsible for interpreting evaluations and adjusting their courses if necessary. Department Chairs and mentors of untenured faculty members actively work with newer faculty to interpret the evaluations and to consider adjustments to classroom activities. Student opinions are solicited and respected, but the information provided by students is judged in the context of departmental and the Robins School of Business standards and expectations. Nevertheless, consistently weak student evaluations will jeopardize a candidate's case for tenure or promotion unless a very strong case of teaching excellence is made from other evidence on teaching ability. Candidates who joined the Robins School in 2014-2015 or after must include all open-ended comments from course evaluations and their Summary of Student Evaluations table for each course taught.

(4) Teaching Materials

An individual may support claims of teaching excellence through publication of teaching articles in peer-reviewed outlets, class exercises,

textbooks, or cases. These publications may demonstrate competence and concentrated efforts in teaching beyond in-class performance.

b. Scholarship

Scholarship is necessary for the fulfillment of the University of Richmond's goal of advancing knowledge. Scholarship supplements and strengthens the University's commitment to the highest possible quality of teaching. Scholarship of high quality advances the body of knowledge in the various business disciplines, signifies faculty quality in the disciplines, enhances the University's academic prestige, and provides direction for intellectual activity.

The University recognizes that evidence of excellence in scholarship can take a variety of forms. It also recognizes that any form of scholarship, to reach its fullest potential, must be shared and tested publicly. Typically, the primary form of such evidence is in publications that are open to scrutiny by professional peers. In addition, excellence in scholarship is also judged by its focus and whether it represents a sustained level of intellectual inquiry. Faculty members who joined the Robins School in 2014-2015 or after are expected to include a Research Statement in their portfolio of materials that provides a summary of their intellectual contributions and research focus (not to exceed either 1000 words or two pages in length).

(1) Scholarly Publications

The quality of a candidate's publications is the primary focus of the scholarship review. Evidence of quality may be found in the acceptance rates, impact ratings and rank of the journals in which publications appear, the frequency of citations (in other journal articles and textbooks) to the specific articles authored by the candidate and to the journal in which the articles appear, and the reputation or visibility of the journal, which can be gleaned in part by the size of its readership. Also, a faculty member's department and external reviewers may be used to document research quality.

(2) Research Focus

A faculty member's intellectual activity and academic reputation is strengthened by a well-defined research focus. Generally, faculty members are expected to pursue intellectual activity in the areas where they teach and for which they were hired. This dimension of quality scholarship is especially important for untenured faculty members early in their careers, when evidence of contributions to the discipline is sought. Evidence of research focus is provided by the theme and subject matter of a candidate's research, the type of journals in which publications appear, and the nature of conferences in which presentations are made.

(3) Sustained Intellectual Inquiry

Sustained research activity is also an important consideration in any evaluation of a faculty member's scholarship excellence. A faculty member should demonstrate on-going intellectual activities by regular

publication in quality peer-reviewed journals, presentations at academic conferences, and support for colleagues in their research efforts. Sustained research activity signifies a long-term commitment to scholarship and lifelong learning.

(4) Exceptional Cases

The University recognizes that there may be rare cases where a publication of high quality appears in a professional journal that does not follow a peer review process. In such cases, the faculty member is obliged to present other evidence that the research is of high quality. Examples of such evidence would be the extent to which the research has been referenced in other works or the impact the research product has made in theory or practice. Papers appearing in highly recognized trade journals may also qualify as quality scholarship. In all cases the quality of the journal and the publication will be taken into account when assessing excellence in scholarship. Also, as noted above, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to pursue a research agenda within a particular area of focus. Occasionally, a candidate may collaborate with colleagues in other disciplines on a research project. Interdisciplinary work is encouraged to the extent that the faculty member applies specific discipline skills to a broader question.

c. Service

The University of Richmond and the Robins School rely on active and regular involvement of faculty. Hence, service duties, such as advising, committee work, and extracurricular activities supporting the school's mission, are an essential responsibility of the faculty. Every candidate for tenure and promotion is expected to demonstrate that he or she has played an effective part in the affairs of his or her department, the Robins School and/or the University. Faculty members who joined the Robins School in 2014-2015 or after are expected to include a Service Statement in their portfolio of materials that provides a summary of their service contributions (not to exceed either 1000 words or two pages in length).

Excellence in service implies a high level of collegiality where faculty work together to accomplish the service mission. Evaluations of service and teamwork may be solicited from Department Chairs, Committee Chairs, and colleagues as part of any tenure or promotion review. Service excellence is achieved through regular, effective, and active participation in the affairs of the University, School, and department. A faculty member's service to the business discipline and the external community is also evidence of service contributions.

3. Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The standard for tenure in the Robins School of Business is excellence in total contributions with an emphasis on teaching and scholarship. Service contributions are not given as much emphasis for the tenure decision as for the decision to promote to Full Professor. There may be cases where truly exceptional performance in either teaching or intellectual contributions may be

weighed against performance in other areas. Nevertheless, truly exceptional contributions in any one area will not make up for performance that does not meet the standards of excellence in either teaching or scholarship. Overall, a successful candidate for tenure must demonstrate a level of performance consistent with the Robins School of Business mission statement.

Normally, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is concurrent with a favorable tenure decision. In rare cases where there is considerable prior experience, but the faculty member was hired as an Assistant Professor, the faculty member may come up for promotion prior to the tenure decision. In such cases, the candidate must demonstrate excellent performance in both teaching and scholarship. A favorable decision for promotion prior to tenure does not guarantee a favorable tenure decision at a later date. As a necessary, but not sufficient condition for tenure, the faculty member must continue to demonstrate excellence in teaching and intellectual contributions after promotion and demonstrate long-term plans to continue to perform at these levels.

In some cases an experienced faculty member may be hired with the rank of Associate Professor without tenure. The judgment of the relevant department, with the approval of the administration, is used to determine the necessary time period before the tenure decision and whether the rank of Associate Professor is appropriate.

4. Standards for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor requires significant and sustained contributions to the mission of the Robins School of Business and the University, and evidence of continued promise for future significant contributions. Normally, faculty may seek promotion to Full Professor no earlier than five years after being granted the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Richmond. Excellence in teaching, intellectual contributions, and service while the faculty member is an Associate Professor is a requirement for promotion to Full Professor. Promotion to Full Professor also requires that the candidate's contributions to scholarship are well known by other scholars working in the same or closely related areas of inquiry. In addition, candidates for Full Professor must demonstrate continued promise for leadership within the department, school, and university to achieve common goals such as curriculum development, student advising, hiring and retention, and enhanced student placement.

*Section B.4. revised and approved by the University Faculty on January 24, 2013
and by the Board of Trustees on February 22, 2013*

C. Tenure and Promotion Process and Procedures

This section describes the process and procedures for three decisions within a tenure-line faculty member's career: mid-term review, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Full Professor. Decisions at all three stages are based on the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Within the Robins School of Business, the tenured members of an untenured faculty member's department and the Dean participate in the mid-term review. The Dean, the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, and the candidate's department are responsible for making recommendations for tenure and promotion to Associate

Professor based on the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Dean and the Full Professor Committee (a committee made up of all Full Professors in the Robins School of Business) are responsible for making recommendations for promotion to Full Professor. Positive recommendations at these stages do not mean that the Board of Trustees will grant tenure and/or promotion, or that individuals at higher levels who are involved in the process will necessarily support those recommendations. Specifically, the Provost makes a recommendation to the President and the President decides whether to nominate a candidate to the Board. The Board of Trustees is the only university body that awards tenure and/or promotion to a member of the faculty.

The timetable for the various stages in the mid-term review, tenure, and/or promotion processes is established annually by the Dean. The Dean provides a memorandum of instruction detailing the timetable and the preparation of the portfolio to the candidate and the Department Chair in the spring semester prior to the review year. It is the responsibility of the candidate to include in his or her portfolio all required information and any additional information the candidate believes pertinent to the review process. The candidate delivers the mid-term review, tenure, or promotion portfolio to the Dean's Office to meet the deadline set in the Dean's memorandum, which is generally early in the fall semester.

1. Mid-Term Review

Tenure candidates will have a mid-term review, which normally begins in the fall semester of the candidate's third year and is completed early in the spring semester of the same academic year. (Faculty could not seek nor be subject to a mid-term review at any other time unless explicitly noted in their contract.) While developmental in nature, an additional goal of the review is to determine if the candidate is on track toward a favorable tenure decision. The review is designed to provide early warning signals to the candidate if there are significant problems in the candidate's teaching, research, or service contributions. It is possible for the review to result in a recommendation that the candidate be given a terminal contract for the following year if, following the process described below, the Dean concludes that there is a low likelihood that the candidate's present and future efforts will be sufficient to meet the standards for tenure and promotion.

In the fall semester of a tenure candidate's third year, the Dean sets a timetable for completion of the candidate's mid-term review package. At the beginning of the spring semester of the candidate's third year, the candidate must submit a package of materials for review. This package contains relevant information about the candidate's teaching, research, and service activities. The candidate's package is an early draft form of what the candidate presents at the tenure review. Tenured members of the candidate's department review the candidate's materials and meet to discuss the candidate's performance.

The department forwards a letter to the Dean and the candidate providing an in-depth analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, a discussion of how the candidate's position is related to the current and future needs of the department, and the reasoning supporting the analysis of the candidate's work. Tenured members of the department who participated in the discussions sign the letter. The report is forwarded to the Dean following the Dean's timetable, which must

allow at least 15 business days from the due date of the candidate's materials.

The Dean reviews all relevant material in the candidate's package and all reports from the candidate's department. The Dean then meets with the candidate and the candidate's Department Chair to discuss results of the mid-term review process. In an instance where the candidate is to be given a terminal contract for the following year, the Dean will meet with the candidate's Department Chair to discuss the case before making a final decision. The Dean informs the candidate and the candidate's Chair of the results of the review in a letter. The letter is sent normally within five business days of the meeting with the candidate and the candidate's Chair or with the candidate's Department Chair in the case of a negative decision. The Dean's letter is also forwarded to the Provost along with the annual performance and merit review for the candidate.

2. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

a. Composition and Election of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee

The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee is composed of five persons with one member from each department (Accounting, Economics, Finance, Management, and Marketing). Although a member of all school committees, the Dean normally does not participate in the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee's deliberations concerning specific tenure candidates. Members of Academic Council are not eligible to serve on the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. Committee members are elected by their respective departments for three-year terms, staggered so that one or two members' terms expire each year. Members of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee are not permitted to vote or participate in any tenure deliberations held by their respective departments. The committee elects its Chair at its final meeting in the spring semester. Early in the fall semester, the Committee Chair notifies the members of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee of the availability of tenure and promotion portfolios and the expected completion date for the committee's work.

The tenured faculty members of each department elect one of their members to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. Each department gives consideration to sabbatical, professional, and personal conflicts in deciding on its member. Near the end of each academic year, any department that needs to replace a member of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, either because a term has ended or because a member cannot serve for some other reason, holds an election.

b. Tenure and Promotion: External Letters

In tenure cases, the faculty member's Department Chair provides the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee Chair with a list of six names of individuals who might submit external review letters. The candidate proposes three names, and the tenured members of the faculty from the candidate's department also propose three names. The Department Chair must contact the reviewers in advance to make sure they are willing to provide a timely review. Outside reviewers should be selected carefully to make sure reviewers are respected members of the candidate's discipline who have an arm's-length relationship with the candidate and can objectively evaluate the candidate's intellectual contributions.

After the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee receives these names, the Chair sends a standard cover letter to each of the reviewers soliciting a written review of the quality of the candidate's scholarship. The cover letter requests external reviewers to summarize their relationship with the candidate as well as evaluate a sample of the candidate's scholarship and the candidate's overall contributions in scholarship based on the candidate's vita. Materials sent out for review include the candidate's vita, scholarship products selected by the candidate, a copy of the "Standards, Procedures, and Process for Tenure, Promotion, and Ongoing Faculty Performance Reviews in the Robins School of Business", and for faculty members who joined the Robins School in 2014-2015 or after a research statement prepared by the candidate (not to exceed 1000 words or two pages in length). The cover letter also requests that each reviewer attach his or her vita to the review. External reviews received by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee become part of the candidate's materials. All external reviews and vitae are treated as confidential and are removed before the materials are returned to the candidate.

c. Tenure and Promotion: Department's Role

In the case of tenure, which normally includes promotion to Associate Professor, the tenured members of the candidate's department (excluding that department's member of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee) meet to evaluate the candidate's performance. The department discusses the portfolio submitted by the candidate, the external review letters, and the candidate's performance in relation to the standards of excellence. Based on this meeting, the Chair of the department forwards a written recommendation to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and the Dean following the Dean's timetable, which must allow no less than 15 business days from the due date of the tenure portfolio. This recommendation should be a summary of the committee's discussion and include a critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, a discussion of how the candidate's position relates to the current and future needs of the department, and the reasoning and evidence that supports the majority and any dissenting opinion. The written recommendation is signed by each tenured member of the department and includes the departmental vote. Tenured members of the department with dissenting votes may also forward a written analysis to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and the Dean. The Department Chair notifies the candidate of the department's vote count in writing, normally within two business days after the report is forwarded to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. In the event of a negative recommendation, the written notification will include summary of the rationale behind the recommendation.

d. Tenure and Promotion: Tenure and Promotion Review Committee's Role

The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee then evaluates the credentials of each tenure candidate through the examination of the tenure portfolio, the departmental recommendation and external review letters. As part of its deliberations, the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will ask the candidate to submit an up-to-date curriculum vitae. The committee may request additional information about the candidate relevant to the Business School's current mission and standards from sources it deems appropriate.

After thorough deliberations, the committee decides by majority vote to recommend that the candidate be granted or denied tenure. The committee prepares a written report that includes a critical analysis of the information reviewed by the committee, as well as the reasoning and evidence that supports the majority and any dissenting opinion. The report indicates the committee vote count and is signed by all committee members. In the case of one or more committee members abstaining from the vote, it is possible to have a tie vote. In such a case, the report should indicate whether abstentions reflect true ambivalence or some other technical reason.

The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee's report is completed according to the Dean's timetable, which must allow no less than 60 days from the due date of the department's recommendation. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee forwards the committee's written report and recommendation, including the vote count, to the Dean. The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee Chair orally informs the Department Chair and the candidate of the recommendation and vote count normally within two business days after the report is forwarded to the Dean. The Chair of the committee also informs the candidate and the tenured members of the faculty by confidential memo of its recommendation and the vote count, normally within two business days after forwarding the report. In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate will receive a written notification that includes a summary of the rationale behind the recommendation.

e. Tenure and Promotion: Dean's Role

The Dean evaluates the full set of materials and prepares a written report that presents the rationale for his or her recommendation. The Dean's recommendation and report is normally completed within 20 days after the due date of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee's report. During this time, the Dean may ask the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (through its Chair) for clarification and/or an interpretation of the evidence collected to date, assuming that the Committee's report has not fully covered the issue presented by the Dean. Should the need arise for additional information, only the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee has the authority to seek such information. The Dean forwards the full set of materials, including all written recommendations, to the Provost. The Dean informs the candidate, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, and the Chair of the candidate's department in writing of his or her recommendation, normally within two business days after submitting the recommendation. In the event of a negative recommendation, the Dean's written notification to the candidate will include a summary of the rationale behind the recommendation.

f. Promotion to Associate Professor when Tenure and Promotion are not Linked

In the case of promotion to Associate Professor when tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are not jointly considered, the process will follow the same procedures used in the tenure process.

3. Promotion to Full Professor and the Full Professor Committee

a. Promotion to Full Professor: External Letters

The candidate and the candidate's department provide the Full Professor Committee Chair with a list of at least six names for external review letters. Three reviewers are selected by the candidate, and three reviewers are selected by the Department Chair, with the advice of tenured members of the department. The Department Chair must contact the reviewers to make sure they are willing to provide a timely review. Outside reviewers should be selected carefully to make sure reviewers are respected members of the candidate's discipline who have an arm's-length relationship with the candidate and can objectively evaluate the candidate's intellectual contributions.

As soon as reviewer names are forwarded to the Chair of the Full Professor Committee, a standard cover letter is sent by the Full Professor Committee Chair to each of the reviewers soliciting a written review of the candidate's scholarship. The cover letter requests external reviewers to summarize their relationship with the candidate as well as evaluate a sample of the candidate's scholarship and the candidate's impact on the literature in a specific area of specialization. Materials sent out for review include the candidate's vita, scholarship products selected by the candidate, a copy of the "Standards, Procedures, and Process for Tenure, Promotion, and Ongoing Faculty Performance Reviews in the Robins School of Business", and for faculty members who joined the Robins School in 2014-2015 or after a research statement prepared by the candidate (not to exceed 1000 words or two pages in length). The cover letter also requests that each reviewer attach his or her vita to the review. External letters received by the Full Professor Committee become part of the candidate's materials to be reviewed at higher levels. All external letters and vitae are confidential and are removed before the materials are returned to the candidate.

b. Promotion to Full Professor: Department's Role

In the case of promotion to Full Professor, the Full Professor Committee will act to review and evaluate a candidate. There will be no formal departmental review and evaluation in this process. Instead, the Full Professor Committee may request, through its Chair, additional information from the Chair of the candidate's department if such information is likely to be helpful to the review process.

c. Promotion to Full Professor: Full Professor Committee's Role

The Full Professor Committee, is charged with the responsibility of reviewing all candidates for Full Professor. Normally, subcommittees are chosen from this group to conduct an in-depth analysis of a candidate's teaching, research, and service and report back to the committee as a whole with their findings. Normally, each subcommittee has no more than one member from the candidate's department. Each subcommittee selects a Chair, who presents its findings to the Full Professor Committee. The subcommittees follow the same general procedures used by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate for Full Professor.

Each subcommittee presents its analysis of the candidate's materials to the committee of the whole for discussion and a vote. The vote count of all Full Professors is included in a letter written by the Full Professor Committee Chair with a summary of the key arguments presented for discussion by the committee of the whole. The committee's work should be completed according to the Dean's timetable, which must allow no less than 60 days from the due date of the candidate's materials.

The Chair of the Full Professor Committee forwards the committee's letter to the Dean and orally informs the Department Chair of the recommendation and vote count. The Chair of the Full Professor Committee also informs the candidate in writing of the vote count and committee recommendation. Both the Department Chair and the candidate are informed (orally or in writing) normally within two business days after the committee report is sent to the Dean. In the event of a negative recommendation, the written notification to the candidate will include a summary of the rationale behind the recommendation.

d. Promotion to Full Professor: Dean's Role

The Dean evaluates the full set of materials and prepares a written report presenting the rationale for his or her recommendation. The Dean's recommendation and report is normally completed within 20 days after the due date of the Full Professor Committee's report. The Dean forwards the full set of materials, including all written recommendations, to the Provost. The Dean informs the candidate, the Chair of the Full Professor Committee, and the Chair of the candidate's department in writing of his or her recommendation, normally within two business days after submitting the recommendation. In the event of a negative recommendation, the Dean's written notification to the candidate will include a summary of the rationale behind the recommendation.

4. Tenure and Promotion for Outside Candidates as Part of the Hiring Process

In cases where rank and tenure are part of the hiring process, faculty involvement in the process occurs initially in the search committee and in the department where the candidate's appointment occurs. Candidates for these positions are informed in a timely manner that evidence of effective teaching, scholarly activity and service is required when they apply for the position. All candidates invited to campus are expected to submit such evidence in the form of a dossier; if such evidence is not provided at the time they apply for the position, candidates will be provided no more than 3 weeks after the invitation to campus to prepare the dossier. Suggestions for the types of materials to be included as evidence are described elsewhere in this document. A summary listing will be provided to the candidate. Tenure and promotion process information will be communicated to outside candidates by the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and, in the case where the rank of Full Professor is being considered, the Full Professor Committee is then asked to review the candidate. The Tenure and Promotion and Full Professor committees will have no less than 2 weeks to review

documents after they are received and make their recommendation to the appropriate decision maker (the Dean, Provost, or President). Reviews by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee are conducted in a short time frame without data comparable to the reviews conducted for internal candidates. Nonetheless, the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee reserves the right to evaluate all candidates for tenure and rank and make the recommendation it deems to be appropriate.

Section C.4. revised and approved by University Faculty on December 10, 2009 and by the Board of Trustees on February 12, 2010

*This version approved by Robins School of Business Faculty on February 27, 2015
Approved by the Board of Trustees on October 2, 2015
contingent on approval by University Faculty
Approved by University Faculty on May 11, 2015*

VII.D. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Standards and Processes for Promotion

Standards and Process for Promotion for SPCS Full-Time Faculty

From the University Faculty Handbook: full-time faculty members are appointed in a department or school where their responsibilities include full-time teaching, advising, scholarship, and service to the University.

Full-time faculty members as well as administrators with faculty rank in the SPCS are eligible for promotion in rank without tenure through the rank of full professor. Full-time staff members who have separate contracts as part-time adjunct faculty are promoted using the adjunct promotion process detailed in the Adjunct Faculty Handbook.

The promotion process for full-time faculty and administrators with faculty rank begins with an initial probationary appointment of up to three (3) years, with subsequent appointments of up to five (5) years. Eligibility for promotion from assistant to associate professor commences with the second appointment (first 5-year appointment). Eligibility for promotion from associate to full professor commences with the third appointment (second 5-year appointment).

The primary criteria to be used in making promotion decisions include teaching, scholarship, service, and program development. Candidates are expected to have a record of accomplishments in each area – teaching, scholarship, service, and program development.

It is important to recognize, however, that each faculty member in the SPCS is charged annually with specific objectives in each of the criteria. Those objectives, articulated in a letter from the Dean to the faculty member and specific to that individual, should form the basis for any assessment for promotion. The letters from the Dean should address each of the standards relevant for that individual for that year and it is therefore possible that variations across the criteria will exist between candidates for promotion.

1.Promotion Expectations - Teaching

The standard to be used is excellence in teaching. Numerous criteria are available for use in judging teaching effectiveness:

- ability to design courses and present material effectively
- level of preparation
- effectiveness of teaching methods
- quality of interaction with students both inside and outside the classroom
- adequacy of exams and other testing material
- adequacy of comments on student work
- timeliness of feedback on student work
- interest in and involvement with student welfare

The instruments available to help evaluate teaching effectiveness include but are not limited to those listed below. Staff evaluations will not be considered. Circumstances such as teaching load, proportion of required and elective courses, number of contact hours, class size, subject matter, methodologies, and preparation of teaching materials will be considered when evaluating teaching and the candidate's overall performance.

- student evaluations
- peer reviews
- letters from past students
- personnel evaluations from the Dean
- course materials, including syllabi, exams, class assignments
- online courseware
- student work products, including papers, projects and exams
- statements of past activities and future plans to enhance teaching effectiveness
- innovations in instructional methods
- self-evaluation
- teaching awards
- grade distribution statistics (compared against student evaluations)

1.Promotion Expectations - Scholarship

Scholarship generally involves the generation, transmission, application or preservation of knowledge. In the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, it may include the investigation of both theory and practice of an academic discipline or in the field of continuing education. The criteria used to assess scholarship include peer-reviewed journal articles, books, presentations at professional conferences, book chapters, media broadcasts, op ed pieces, and published instructional materials (videos, assessment instruments, etc.).

Information used to evaluate a candidate's achievements as a scholar include but are not limited to those listed below.

- copies of published work (or works in progress)

- curriculum vitae
- copies of instructional materials
- copies of professional presentations
- candidate's statement of future research plans
- letters from outside reviewers regarding the quality of published work
- letters indicating acceptance of manuscripts for publication

1.Promotion Expectations - Service

Service to both the campus community and the community-at-large plays a unique and critical role in the mission of the School of Professional and Continuing Studies. Specifically, the School is charged with providing “exemplary credit and non-credit programs” to meet community needs. Additionally, the School is charged with supporting the missions of both the University and other units across campus.

Faculty members are expected to engage with both communities and play effective roles in the affairs of the School and the University.

Faculty are expected to serve on committees on campus, to advise and counsel students, and generally to participate in the non-curricular life of the School and the University. Externally, faculty members are encouraged to serve as advocates for and representatives of the School and University through service in professional, civic or community organizations. Consulting, public speaking engagements, non-credit teaching, and other activities involving the faculty member's professional expertise are also expected and should be included in assessing faculty performance in this area.

The evidence used to document service may include but is not limited to the items listed below.

- curriculum vitae listing committee and other service assignments, consulting, speaking engagements, memberships and service to external organizations
- candidate statement regarding contributions in these areas
- letters from committee chairs, advisees, or anyone to whom the candidate has provided service

1.Promotion Expectations – Academic Program Development

Each full-time faculty member also has administrative responsibilities and is therefore responsible for the overall wellbeing of the program under his or her charge.

The criteria available to assess academic programmatic development may include those listed below.

- curricular reviews and enhancements
- faculty recruitment, support and development
- new academic program development
- marketing and student recruitment activities
- cross-school collaboration

- collaboration with external agencies
- grants and contracts

Candidates can demonstrate their role in program development through a variety of means, including but not limited to those listed below.

- statement of program development activities
- course/program proposals
- letters from faculty
- marketing proposals and activities

Note: Whenever external letters are included as part of the supporting documentation for any of the above criteria, the Promotion committee chair on the SPCS Academic Senate is asked to seek sources independent of those used by the candidate.

Promotion Calendar

Candidates for promotion must request review from the Dean by September 1 and submit a portfolio documenting how they have met the standards. The Dean is charged with convening the Promotion Committee and delivering (presenting) the candidate's portfolio to the committee for its independent consideration. The committee meets, selects a chair, reviews the portfolio, and makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Dean reviews the recommendation and notes his or her own recommendation to the Provost. Promotion recommendations are made once each year and are due to the Provost by December.

September 1 Candidate notifies Dean of intention to seek promotion.
Dean notifies Promotion Committee.

October 1 Candidate submits portfolio.

October 1 -
December 1 Dean convenes Promotion Committee of the Academic Council.

December 1 Recommendations of Promotion Committee sent to Dean.
Chair notifies candidate of committee's decision.

December 15 Recommendations from Dean and Promotion Committee due to Provost.
Dean notifies candidate of dean's recommendation.

This Appendix in its entirety must be consistent with University principles stipulated under "Evaluation for Personnel Decisions" (Chapter III, Section C). Revisions to a school's section of this Appendix may be proposed by a majority vote of the particular school's faculty, and transmitted by the Dean for separate majority vote by the University Faculty. The Provost and President then transmit the proposed revisions for vote by the Board of Trustees.

VII.E. The Jepson School of Leadership Studies Criteria, Guidelines and Procedures for Evaluating Candidates for Tenure and Promotion

This Appendix in its entirety must be consistent with University principles stipulated under "Evaluation for Personnel Decisions" (Chapter III, Section C). Revisions to a school's section of this Appendix may be proposed by a majority vote of the particular school's faculty, and transmitted by the Dean for separate majority vote by the University Faculty. The Provost and President then transmit the proposed revisions for vote by the Board of Trustees.

- A. Teaching
 - B. Scholarship
 - C. Service
 - D. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
 - E. Promotion to Full Professor
-

A. Teaching

1. Standard:

A faculty member's teaching should demonstrate excellence in advancing students' understanding of leadership.

2. Guidelines:

The following attributes are among those that will be considered when evaluating a candidate's excellence in teaching:

- a. *Expertise*: has mastered his or her field, with respect to its currency, scope, and depth;
- b. *Design and preparation*: thoughtfully and creatively organizes both individual class sessions and overall course content;
- c. *Teaching methods*: uses effective instructional techniques and materials;
- d. *Stimulation*: motivates students to learn and seek knowledge independently;
- e. *Assessment*: devises and rigorously applies appropriate methods of determining a student's progress and achievement;
- f. *Engagement and challenge*: motivates students to do intellectually challenging

- and creative work;
- g. *Student learning*: helps students achieve the learning goals of the course;
- h. *Mentoring*: directs student work inside and outside the classroom.

Circumstances such as teaching load, proportion of required and elective courses, number of contact hours, class size, subject matter, methodologies, and preparation of teaching materials will be considered when evaluating teaching and the candidate's overall performance.

3. Evidence:

Judgments about excellence in teaching are based on a review of materials in the candidate's core and teaching portfolios, which include the candidate's curriculum vitae, a personal statement about his or her teaching, and items such as the following: student evaluations; letters from former students; syllabi; samples of class assignments; samples of student work such as graded papers, projects, or exams; audiovisual recordings of classes; classroom visits; grade distributions; and descriptions of courses newly developed or substantially changed.

B. Scholarship

1. Standard:

A faculty member's scholarship should demonstrate excellence in advancing the understanding of leadership for scholars and, in some cases, practitioners or educators. It may include interdisciplinary work in addition to work in the candidate's discipline. Research should exhibit originality, creativity, and rigor.

2. Guidelines:

The University of Richmond expects that the faculty in the Jepson School will influence the understanding of leadership at national and international levels. The expectation, therefore, is that members of the faculty will produce and disseminate high-quality research, establishing a record of sustained and sustainable scholarly activity. Such scholarship may include journal articles, books or book chapters, textbooks, formal participation in scholarly conferences, and instructional materials. In the evaluation process, the tenure and promotion committee should also consider any scholarly work by the candidate on subjects other than leadership. The committee should consider any scholarly work produced before the candidate's arrival at the University of Richmond insofar as this work serves as evidence of sustained and sustainable scholarly activity.

3. Evidence:

Judgments about excellence in scholarship are based on a review of materials in the candidate's core and scholarship portfolios, which include the following: the candidate's curriculum vitae; personal statement about his or her scholarship; plans for future research; copies of work that is published, in press, or under review, or has been presented at professional conferences. In addition, outside reviews by scholars with expertise related to the candidate's research will be used to inform the evaluation of the quality of scholarly accomplishment and future potential.

C. Service

1. Standard:

A faculty member is expected to play an effective role in the work of the Jepson School, the University, and his or her profession.

2. Guidelines:

Jepson School: A faculty member is expected to serve the School by performing committee assignments within the School; by contributing to curriculum development; by assisting and advising student organizations and individual students; by showing interest and involvement in students' welfare; and by helping improve the quality of the academic environment. Inherent in a faculty member's professional and academic responsibility are mutual respect; collegiality; courtesy to colleagues, students, and staff; and professional conduct in all aspects of his or her work. A faculty member is expected to attend faculty and committee meetings and to assume responsibility for improving the School.

University: A faculty member is expected to contribute to the University through service on committees, participation in programs and interdisciplinary projects, and activities such as advising and mentoring students outside the major.

Profession: A faculty member is expected to use his or her expertise to contribute to the work of professional associations and to serve as a referee or reviewer for journal articles, book manuscripts, and conference presentations. Service to community organizations will be taken into account insofar as it involves the exercise of the faculty member's professional knowledge or abilities.

Service activities will be measured by the extent and quality of a faculty member's contributions to the School, University, and profession.

3. Evidence:

Evaluation of service will be based on a review of materials in the candidate's core and service portfolios, which include the candidate's curriculum vitae; a personal statement about his or her service; and a list of all relevant committees and other service appointments. Together, these materials should specify positions related to program development, student advising/mentoring, and consulting. In addition, the committee may solicit letters from faculty and other persons inside or outside the University.

D. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In the year that a candidate is considered for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, a variety of materials must be submitted by the candidate as detailed in a memo of instruction from the Dean. The candidate is expected to show evidence of strength in teaching through the submission of supporting materials such as syllabi, assignments, examinations, handouts, and student evaluations; of strength in scholarship through the submission of conference papers, publications, and other scholarly work; and of strength in service through the submission of a record of contribution to and participation in the life and governance of the School, University, and profession.

The Dean will name the chair of the candidate's tenure and promotion committee. The chair is responsible for gathering such additional evidence as letters of evaluation from former students, outside scholars with expertise related to the candidate's research, and colleagues from within the School and University. All of this evidence is used to create portfolios that provide the basis for an assessment and recommendation with regard to tenure and/or promotion.

For candidates being considered for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, this committee includes all tenured members of the Jepson School and, ordinarily, two additional members of the University faculty. The Dean will appoint these additional members of the committee in consultation with the chair and the Jepson faculty on the committee. The non-Jepson members of the committee should have expertise related to the candidate's research; customarily, the additional members will be from different departments in the University.

After receiving the candidate's portfolio, the candidate's tenure and promotion committee makes a recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion to the Dean of the Jepson School. The letter of recommendation should report the views of each and every faculty member on the committee. The Dean then sends a written recommendation to the Provost. The Provost then makes a recommendation to the President. Tenure and promotion decisions are made by the Board of Trustees only on the positive recommendation of the President. The candidate will be notified of tenure and/or promotion recommendations in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will generally be considered at the same time. Tenured Assistant Professors who wish to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor are required to initiate this process through the Dean.

E. Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor is dependent on the quality of a candidate's record of scholarship, teaching, and service. Full Professors are expected to be nationally recognized contributors to the study and teaching of leadership. To merit promotion to the rank of Full Professor, the candidate will be expected to have sustained, over an extended period of time, a record of high quality scholarship, teaching, and service. The Dean will name the chair of the candidate's tenure and promotion committee. The chair is responsible for gathering such additional evidence as letters of evaluation from former students, outside scholars with expertise related to the candidate's research, and colleagues from within the School and University. All of this evidence is used to create portfolios that provide the basis for an assessment and recommendation with regard to promotion to Full Professor.

For candidates being considered for promotion to the rank of Full Professor, the tenure and promotion committee includes all tenured Full Professors of the Jepson School and, ordinarily, two additional members of the University faculty. The non-Jepson members of the committee should have expertise related to the candidate's research; customarily, the additional members will be from different departments in the University.

After receiving the candidate's portfolios, the candidate's tenure and promotion committee makes

a recommendation regarding promotion to the Dean of the Jepson School. The letter of recommendation should report the views of each and every faculty member on the committee. The Dean then sends a written recommendation to the Provost. The Provost then makes a recommendation to the President. Promotion decisions are made by the Board of Trustees only on the positive recommendation of the President. The candidate will be notified of promotion recommendations in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Candidacy for promotion to Full Professor will normally be initiated by the faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion.

This version approved by the Jepson faculty on November 3, 2007

Approved by University faculty on January 24, 2008

Approved by the Board of Trustees on March 7, 2008

VII.F. School of Law Personnel Policies and Procedures

This Appendix in its entirety must be consistent with University principles stipulated under "Evaluation for Personnel Decisions" (Chapter III, Section C). Revisions to a school's section of this Appendix may be proposed by a majority vote of the particular school's faculty, and transmitted by the Dean for separate majority vote by the University Faculty. The Provost and President then transmit the proposed revisions for vote by the Board of Trustees.

-
- A. Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure
 - B. Standards and Procedures for Faculty Subject to Reappointment, Promotion, and Long-Term Appointment
 - C. Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Long-Term Appointment for Clinical Faculty
 - D. Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Long-Term Appointments for Law Library Director as a Faculty Member
-

A. Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

As members of a law school faculty, we are committed to our continuing professional growth and development. To assist us in that process, evaluations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are necessary. They help us continue to progress as professionals, and they advance the law school in its pursuit of excellence.

A law professor should continue to develop teaching skills and scholarship over an entire career. To determine whether a faculty member is meeting, and is likely to continue to meet, these primary expectations of professional development, evaluations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure will be conducted according to the following standards and procedures:

1. Standards for Evaluation

a. Teaching

Teaching and scholarship are inseparable. Teaching should reflect depth of research, high standards of accuracy and creativity, precision in analysis, clarity in language and organization, and a spirit of healthy inquiry into the values and assumptions that underpin law and society.

Different individuals are effective teachers for different reasons; it is not possible to define each of the essential components of teaching effectiveness. The following factors, however, shall be considered when we evaluate a candidate's teaching: ability to communicate, enthusiasm for teaching and for interaction with students, degree of preparation for class, breadth and depth of relevant knowledge, thoughtful and creative organization of both individual class sessions and overall course content, ability to stimulate students to learn and to seek further knowledge independently, capacity to direct student work inside and outside the classroom, ability to devise methods of determining a student's progress and achievement appropriate to the courses taught, ability to stimulate students to engage in creative work, accessibility to students, and demonstrated interest and involvement in students' welfare. Circumstances such as teaching load, number of contact hours, class size, subject matter, methodologies, preparation of teaching materials, and years of experience will be considered in the evaluation.

b. Scholarship

In any law school, the expectation is that a member of the faculty will engage in disseminating the results of current research in law and legal institutions. Research is important both to advance knowledge and to improve teaching. Scholarship is an important part of every law professor's professional activity throughout an entire career. In the evaluation process, we seek to determine the promise that the faculty member has in scholarship. The evaluation process itself is not to be the impetus for the scholarship. Scholarship must be self-initiated and self-sustained.

Activity showing a career-long commitment to scholarship should begin early. As part of the application for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the applicant must submit at least one published scholarly work of high quality and at least a draft of another scholarly work which promises to be of high quality. As part of the application for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor and for the award of tenure, the applicant must submit at least four published scholarly works of high quality (which may include published scholarly works previously submitted as part of the application for promotion to Associate Professor). Co-authored works will be considered to the extent that authorship can be attributed to the applicant.

As used in this context, a scholarly work typically will mean a work which reflects originality, creativity, intellectual inquiry, and which advances the knowledge and understanding of legal

matters. It must be published in a law journal of an ABA-approved law school, as a chapter in a book, as a book, in a peer-reviewed academic journal, or in a peer-reviewed academic monograph.

Among the works not considered within the minimum necessary for promotion or tenure are casebooks, course books, contributions to annual surveys of the law, articles in association or committee journals and newsletters, case notes, student comments, CLE outlines, simulation exercises, video- or audio-tapes, and computer software. However, published or widely distributed materials of these types will be considered in the overall evaluation of scholarship.

c. Service

A law faculty member should be involved in the affairs of the law school, the University, the legal profession, and the community to a degree commensurate with the demands of teaching and scholarship.

A faculty member is expected to serve the law school by performing committee assignments within the school, by assisting and advising student organizations and individual students, and by helping to improve the quality of the academic environment. Inherent in a law professor's professional and academic responsibility are mutual respect, collegiality, and courtesy to colleagues, students, and staff, as well as professional conduct in all aspects of a law professor's service. A faculty member is expected to attend faculty and committee meetings and to assume responsibilities for improving the law school. A law faculty member is also expected to contribute to the University at large through, for example, service on committees and in programs or interdisciplinary projects. A faculty member is expected to contribute publicly and professionally to the legal profession and the community. When we consider activities outside the University, we will look only at those which draw on professional ability. These may be in connection with a bar association or other professional, governmental, or community organization. They may also be bono representation, amicus brief preparation, or similar uncompensated service.

What is important in measuring such activities in relation to reappointment, promotion, and tenure is the quality of service and the depth of involvement. Organizational membership itself or peripheral involvement will not be significant in our assessment.

2. Procedures for Annual Review of Non-Tenured Members of the Faculty and Recommendations Regarding Reappointment

The professional development of each member of the full-time faculty who is not tenured will be assessed every year. Additional procedures for the evaluation of applicants for promotion and/or tenure are set out in Section 3 of this document. The provisions of Section 3 supersede the provisions of this Section only if they explicitly and expressly require other procedures.

If the faculty member is not an applicant for promotion and/or tenure, the purpose of the annual review will be to provide the non-tenured faculty member with feedback on her or his progress

toward meeting the standards for promotion and tenure stated in this document, and to provide supportive guidance and direction toward the successful completion of the promotion and tenure process. Except for the years in which the faculty member is an applicant for promotion and/or tenure, the annual review will not ordinarily result in any recommendation regarding the faculty member's reappointment or future status, although at the request of the Dean, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, or the faculty member, such a recommendation will be made.

The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will appoint a subcommittee of three tenured faculty members for each non-tenured faculty member. Ordinarily, at least one member of a subcommittee will be changed each year. Each member of a sub-committee will: 1) attend classes taught by the faculty member; 2) review the faculty member's scholarly works while in progress and when published; and 3) otherwise monitor the faculty member's professional development. The subcommittee may review student evaluations and discuss the faculty member's work with others in the faculty member's field.

The subcommittee shall meet with the faculty member at least once each academic year to discuss the faculty member's professional development and to counsel the faculty member. If the faculty member is on a tenure track, the subcommittee will discuss the degree to which her or his performance meets the standards for promotion and tenure stated in this document. However, no statements made by any member of the sub-committee will control the Promotion and Tenure Committee's decision as to promotion and/or tenure.

Each subcommittee will make a prompt and concise report to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. All members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee who are not members of the subcommittee are encouraged to make their own annual evaluations of the professional development of each non-tenured faculty member, to share their evaluations with the faculty member, and to provide assessments to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will annually evaluate each non-tenured faculty member, communicate to each non-tenured faculty member the report of the subcommittee, and provide a written assessment to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The subcommittee will, at the request of the faculty member, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, or the Dean, make a recommendation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee regarding the faculty member's reappointment. Any other person may make a recommendation to the Dean and/or the Promotion and Tenure Committee regarding the faculty member's reappointment, and such recommendations will be considered.

3. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

a. Responsibilities of the Applicant

The faculty member who is an applicant for promotion and/or tenure should revise and update a curriculum vita. The applicant should also prepare information that may be used by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President of the University to evaluate teaching effectiveness. This information should include a list of courses taught at the law school and elsewhere, syllabi, supplementary materials prepared by the applicant, reading lists and reserve reading assignments, final examinations and practical exercises (including any

analysis prepared by the applicant), other materials developed by the applicant which indicate a creative approach to the curriculum or to teaching methods, a list of any conferences, workshops, or other professional meetings, and any plans developed by the applicant for continued growth as a teacher. Student course evaluations, including written comments by students, will be considered by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean. The applicant may also provide her or his own interpretation of course evaluations.

The applicant should also prepare information on achievements as a legal scholar. The package of materials submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean should include copies of scholarly works and other evidence of scholarly pursuits. The applicant is invited to nominate three or more experts in her or his field or fields for assessment of the applicant's scholarly work. Because others in the applicant's field may also be contacted, the applicant is invited to identify those whom he or she does not want to be approached for evaluation. The applicant is invited to submit a concise statement about each item of scholarship which outlines its goals and/or achievements. This statement may also be transmitted to outside assessors. The applicant should also outline research and scholarship plans for the next three to five years.

The applicant is encouraged to submit any additional information that he or she deems relevant to the promotion or tenure decision.

b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Process

During evaluation for promotion and/or tenure, members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are encouraged to visit the classes of the applicant to assess teaching effectiveness. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will acquaint itself with the applicant's scholarly works. A subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be appointed for each applicant. That subcommittee will have the responsibility for a more in-depth evaluation and to prepare a draft report for the Promotion and Tenure Committee. In addition to their personal judgments on the applicant's scholarly works, the subcommittee may rely on written evaluations by outside experts in formulating a judgment on the applicant's scholarly achievements and potential. The subcommittee will also review the activities of the applicant to form a judgment on her or his teaching and service to the law school, the University, the profession, and the community. The subcommittee will submit a draft report to the Promotion and Tenure Committee embodying a written recommendation on the applicant for consideration by the full Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will submit a written report and recommendation to the Dean for delivery to the Provost.

The applicant's application for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated solely on the standards in this document, regardless of: 1) any prior discussions with, statements made by, or promises made by any member of the faculty or any other person, or 2) any failure by the subcommittee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, or any other person to follow the procedural rules contained in this document.

c. Procedures to be Followed by the Dean of the Law School

The Dean will prepare a separate evaluation of the applicant's teaching, scholarship, and service.

In making a recommendation regarding promotion or tenure, the Dean will rely on both her or his independent evaluation and the written report and recommendation prepared by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Dean will not ordinarily make a recommendation contrary to that of a substantial majority of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4. Confidentiality

Except as provided in this paragraph, or as required by University policy or law, the information obtained by, and the written reports, written assessments, and oral deliberations of, any subcommittee or the Promotion and Tenure Committee will not be released to any person who is not a member of Promotion and Tenure Committee. At the request of the faculty member, the Promotion and Tenure Committee may, at its option, release any or all of the information and reports unless such release would violate University policy or law. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will release any information, reports and assessments necessary for the promotion and/or tenure process. The faculty member will be given a copy of any report made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. To the extent permitted by University policy, the faculty member will be given a copy of any written information or assessment regarding her or him unless the person who provided the information or assessment requested that the information or assessment remain confidential. All deliberations of a subcommittee or the Promotion and Tenure Committee will remain confidential.

5. Effective Date

This document, and the standards and procedures contained herein, become effective on January 1, 1991.

*Adopted by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Law School
on November 30, 1990, revised by the same body on April 20, 1994,
and approved by the Board of Trustees on May 20, 1994*

B. Standards and Procedures for Faculty Subject to Reappointment, Promotion, and Long-Term Appointment

As members of a law school faculty, we are committed to our continuing professional growth and development. To assist us in that process, evaluations for reappointment, promotion, and long-term appointment are necessary. They help us continue to progress as professionals, they advance the law school in its pursuit of excellence.

A law professor should continue to develop professional skills over an entire career. To determine whether a faculty member is meeting, and is likely to continue to meet, these primary expectations of professional development, evaluations for faculty subject to reappointment, promotion, and long-term appointment will be conducted according to the following standards and procedures.

1. Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Long-Term Appointment for Academic Success Program Faculty

a. Academic success program faculty members typically will begin their service as assistant professors for academic success and will serve a three-year probationary period during which they will receive renewable one-year appointments. Each year they will be reviewed for reappointment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude making an offer of employment to a qualified individual at the associate or full professor for academic success levels. Faculty appointed at these levels may request early consideration, based on their prior experience, for three or five year appointments. Denial of an early award of a long-term appointment shall not preclude subsequent application.

b. During the fall of the third year of the probationary period, academic success program faculty members will be eligible to be considered for a three-year appointment and promotion to associate professor for academic success. The review process by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean will parallel the review process for tenure-track faculty members contained in the Faculty Handbook. The standards for promotion and long-term appointment status will be the following: (1) the Law School's need for the faculty member's services; (2) excellence in program administration, including the quality of the program offerings, the effectiveness of the program, the contributions of the program to quality of student life at the law school, and the effectiveness of the program faculty member's interaction with faculty, staff, students, administrators, and alumni; (3) excellence in teaching; and (4) excellence in service. Once an academic success program faculty member has received a long-term appointment, annual reappointment reviews will be unnecessary.

c. At the beginning of the sixth year of service, an associate professor for academic success will be eligible to be considered for a five-year term and promotion to professor for academic success. The review process and the standards described in paragraph b also will apply at this stage.

d. Every five years thereafter, a professor for academic success will be eligible for a presumptively renewable five-year appointment. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean will apply the standards outlined in paragraph b in making their recommendation. There will be a presumption in favor of appointment renewal.

e. During any appointment period, the appointment may be terminated only pursuant to the policies set forth in the University Faculty Handbook. Any decision not to grant or renew an appointment shall also be governed by the policies set forth in the University Faculty Handbook for such decisions.

f. Academic success program faculty members shall have the same voting privileges as tenured and tenure track faculty on initial appointments to the faculty, except that they do not vote on tenured and tenure track faculty appointments. Academic success faculty members who have reached the full professor level may participate in promotion and reappointment reviews of academic success faculty, clinical faculty, the law library director, and legal writing faculty

members at the assistant, associate, and full professor levels, including voting on those decisions. Academic success program faculty members do not participate in promotion or tenure reviews of tenure track or tenured faculty, and do not vote on those decisions. All other prerequisites of employment for academic success program faculty, except for sabbatical leave, will be the same as for tenure track and tenured faculty.

*Draft by Law School July 6, 2001;
approved by the Board of Trustees on October 12, 2001*

*Section B. revised and approved by the Law Faculty on May 6, 2009,
by University Faculty on May 9, 2011,
and by the Board of Trustees on June 16, 2011*

2. Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Long-Term Appointment for Clinical Faculty

a. Clinical faculty members will typically begin their service as assistant clinical professors and will serve a three-year probationary period during which they will receive renewable one-year appointments. Each year they will be reviewed for reappointment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude making an offer of employment to a qualified individual at the associate clinical or full clinical professor levels. Faculty appointed at these levels may request early consideration, based on their prior experience, for three- or five-year appointments. Denial of an early award of a long-term appointment shall not preclude subsequent application.

b. During the fall of the third year of the probationary period, clinical faculty members will be eligible to be considered for a three-year appointment and promotion to associate clinical professor. The review process by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean will parallel the review process for tenure-track faculty members. The standards for promotion and long-term appointment status will be the following: (1) the Law School's need for the faculty member's services; (2) excellence in teaching; and (3) excellence in service. Once a clinical faculty member has received a long-term appointment, annual reappointment reviews will be unnecessary.

c. At the beginning of the sixth year of service, an associate clinical professor will be eligible to be considered for a five-year term and promotion to clinical professor. The review process and the standards described in paragraph b also will apply at this stage.

d. Every five years thereafter, a clinical professor will be eligible for a presumptively renewable five-year appointment. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean will apply the standards outlined in paragraph b in making their recommendation. There will be a presumption in favor of appointment renewal.

e. During any appointment period, the appointment may be terminated only pursuant to the policies set forth in the University Faculty Handbook. Any decision not to grant or renew an appointment shall also be governed by the policies set forth in the University Faculty Handbook for such decisions.

f. Clinical faculty members, shall have the same voting privileges as tenured and tenure track faculty, on initial appointments to the faculty, except that clinical faculty do not vote on tenured and tenure track faculty appointments. A clinical faculty member who has reached the full professor level, may participate in promotion and reappointment reviews of clinical faculty, academic success faculty, the law library director, and legal writing faculty members at the assistant, associate and full professor levels, including voting on those decisions. Clinical faculty members do not participate in promotion or tenure reviews of tenure track or tenured faculty, and do not vote on those decisions. All other prerequisites of employment for clinical faculty, except for sabbatical leave, will be the same as for tenure track and tenured faculty.

*Draft by Law School July 6, 2001;
approved by the Board of Trustees on October 12, 2001*

*Section C. revised and approved by the Law Faculty on May 6, 2009,
by University Faculty on May 9, 2011,
and by the Board of Trustees on June 16, 2011*

3. Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Long-Term Appointments for Law Library Director as a Faculty Member

a. Faculty Rank

The Director of the Law Library is eligible for appointment to the faculty with faculty rank as well as faculty status. The Director may be appointed to the faculty as an Assistant Professor of Law, Associate Professor of Law, or Professor of Law, depending on his or her qualifications.

b. Promotion

If the Law Library Director is initially appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, he or she may apply for promotion during or after the third full year of service, or at such earlier time as was agreed to with the Dean. He or she may apply for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor at any time during or after the third full year following the promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. If the Director is initially appointed at the rank of Associate Professor, he or she may apply for promotion to professor during or after the third full year following the date of hire, or at such other time as is agreed to with the Dean.

The procedures used to evaluate an application by the Law Library Director for promotion will

be the same as those used to evaluate applications for promotion by tenure-track faculty members. The criteria for promotion are as follows:

1. Excellence in administration of the library, including without limitation the following:

- (i) Quality of library operations;
- (ii) Effectiveness of library administration;
- (iii) Development of the library collection, including non-traditional resources;
- (iv) Development of access to off-campus library resources;
- (v) Effectiveness in supervising and directing library personnel;
- (vi) Effectiveness in utilizing available financial resources; and
- (vii) Effective interaction with faculty, students, staff and administrators.

2. Excellence in carrying out any assigned teaching responsibilities. While the Library Director is not required to teach in order to be eligible for promotion, the Law Library Director should demonstrate competence in carrying out any teaching responsibilities assigned. Teaching should reflect depth of research, high standards of accuracy and creativity, precision in analysis, clarity in language and organization, and a spirit of healthy inquiry into the values and assumptions that underpin law and society. Different individuals are effective teachers for different reasons; it is not possible to define each of the essential components of teaching effectiveness. The following factors, however, shall be considered in evaluating a candidate's teaching: ability to communicate, enthusiasm for teaching and for interaction with students, degree of preparation for class, breadth and depth of relevant knowledge, thoughtful and creative organization of both individual class sessions and overall course content, ability to stimulate students to learn and to seek further knowledge independently, capacity to direct student work inside and outside the classroom, ability to devise methods of determining a student's progress and achievement appropriate to the courses taught, ability to stimulate students to engage in creative work, accessibility to students, and demonstrated interest and involvement in students' welfare. Circumstances such as teaching load, number of contact hours, class size, subject matter, methodologies, preparation of teaching materials, and years of experience will be considered in the evaluation.

3. Excellence in contributions to the Law School, the University, and the legal profession, including contributions to scholarship. As a member of the faculty, the Law Library Director is expected to be an active member of the Law School and the University community. The Director is also expected to be professionally active outside the University, especially with regard to matters involving legal education, law libraries, and information technologies. Inherent in the Director's professional and academic responsibilities are collegiality and courtesy to colleagues, students, and staff, as well as professional conduct in all aspects of the Director's service. The Director is expected to attend faculty and committee meetings and to assume responsibilities for improving the Law School. Although not required for promotion, contributions to the body of scholarly literature and the production of instructional materials will be viewed favorably in the promotion decision.

c. Appointments

The Law Library Director holds two kinds of appointments. His or her administrative appointment as Director is continuing in nature and is terminable at will by the University. His or her faculty appointment is for fixed terms of one or more years, as specified in the Director's annual reappointment letter setting his or her salary for the next academic year.

The first three years of the Library Director's appointment as a faculty member typically will serve as the probationary period during which he or she will be eligible for renewable one-year terms as a faculty member. Each year he or she will be reviewed for reappointment as a faculty member by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean. Reappointment will be based on performance and the Law School's needs. If the Director's initial appointment is at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, however, he or she may request early consideration for a three-year term, or a five-year term, based on his or her prior experience. Denial of an early award of a multi-year term shall not preclude subsequent application.

After the probationary period, the Director will be eligible for a three-year term as a faculty member. Consideration for such term should normally coincide with consideration for promotion, and the criteria shall be the same as those for promotion. At the beginning of the sixth year of employment and every five years thereafter, the Director will be eligible for a presumptively renewable appointment to a five-year term as a faculty member. Reappointment to a five-year term shall be determined according to the same criteria that govern applications for promotion. There will be a presumption in favor of appointment renewal.

During any one-, three- or five-year term, the Director's appointment as a faculty member may be terminated only pursuant to the policies set forth in the University Faculty Handbook. Any decision not to grant or renew the Director's faculty appointment shall also be governed by the policies set forth in the University Faculty Handbook for such decisions.

The Law Library Director shall have the same voting privileges as tenured and tenure-track faculty on initial appointments to the faculty. The Director does not serve as a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and does not vote on promotion and tenure matters of tenured and tenure track faculty. Once the Law Library Director has reached the full professor level, he or she may participate in promotion and reappointment reviews of clinical faculty, academic success faculty, and legal writing faculty members at the assistant, associate, and full professor levels, including voting on those decisions. All other perquisites of employment for the Director, except for sabbatical leave, will be the same as for tenure-track and tenured faculty.

*Draft by Law School July 11, 2001;
approved by the Board of Trustees on October 12, 2001*

*Section B.3.c revised and approved by the University Faculty on January 29, 2009
and the Board of Trustees on March 6, 2009*

4. Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Long-Term Appointment for Legal Writing Faculty

a. Legal writing faculty members will typically begin their service as assistant legal writing professors and will serve a three-year probationary period during which they will receive renewable one-year appointments. Each year they will be reviewed for reappointment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude making an offer of employment to a qualified individual at the associate or full professor levels. Faculty appointed at these levels may request early consideration, based on their prior experience, for three- or five-year appointments. Denial of an early award of a long-term appointment shall not preclude subsequent application.

b. During the fall of the third year of the probationary period, legal writing faculty members will be eligible to be considered for a three-year appointment and promotion to associate legal writing professor. The review process by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean will parallel the review process for tenure-track faculty members. The standards for promotion and long-term appointment status will be the following: (1) the Law School's need for the faculty member's services; (2) excellence in teaching; and (3) excellence in service. Once a legal writing faculty member has received a long-term appointment, annual reappointment reviews will be unnecessary.

c. At the beginning of the sixth year of service, an associate legal writing professor will be eligible to be considered for a five-year term and promotion to legal writing professor. The review process and the standards described in paragraph b also will apply at this stage.

d. Every five years thereafter, a legal writing professor will be eligible for a presumptively renewable five-year appointment. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean will apply the standards outlined in paragraph b in making their recommendation. There will be a presumption in favor of appointment renewal.

e. During any appointment period, the appointment may be terminated only pursuant to the policies set forth in the University Faculty Handbook. Any decision not to grant or renew an appointment shall also be governed by the policies set forth in the University Faculty Handbook for such decisions.

f. Legal writing faculty members shall have the same voting privileges as tenured and tenure track faculty on initial appointments to the faculty, except that legal writing faculty do not vote on tenured and tenure track faculty appointments. A legal writing faculty member who has reached the full professor level may participate in promotion and reappointment reviews of legal writing faculty, the law library director, academic success faculty, and clinical faculty members at the assistant, associate, and full professor level, including voting on those decisions. Legal writing faculty members do not participate in promotion or tenure reviews of tenure track or tenured faculty, and do not vote on those decisions. All other prerequisites of employment for legal writing faculty, except for sabbatical leave, will be the same as for tenure track and tenured faculty.

Revisions to Section B. 1.2.3. and the addition of 4. were approved by the University Faculty on March 19, 2013 and by the Board of Trustees on April 25, 2013

*Section B.4. Proposed by P&T Committee, April 6, 2012
as amended on February 18, 2013 and
approved by the law faculty on February 20, 2013*

VIII. Appendix II: School Specific Academic Organization, Policies, and Procedures

A. Notification of Revision Process

Changes to this Guide may be proposed as recommendations to the Provost by vote of the appropriate faculty body. Information linked to web pages in other units, e.g. school committees, is maintained by those units and the Provost's Office should be notified of any changes therein. Changes to Section VIII, Appendix II shall be reported by the Provost to the President and Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees.²

- B. School of Arts and Sciences Academic Organization
- C. School of Art and Sciences Academic Approvals
- D. Robins School of Business Academic Organization
- E. Robins School of Business Academic Approvals
- F. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic Organization
- G. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic Approvals
- H. Jepson School of Leadership Studies Academic Approvals
- I. School of Law Academic Approvals

VIII.B. School of Arts and Sciences Academic Organization

1. Chairs of Departments

Department chairs are responsible for the normal operations of their departments, including scheduling of classes, assignment of instructors, preparation of annual budgets, and recommendation of employment, promotion, tenure and salary increases of faculty members in their departments. Chairs represent their departments to the administration as well as in the Academic Council and the University Senate and are expected to keep their departments informed of actions of both of these bodies.

All department chairs are appointed and removed by the President of the University. In practice, however, and in the spirit of shared governance, the President delegates to the

² This language initiating a reporting requirement was not included in the Handbook revisions reviewed and approved by the Senate. The Senate leadership is aware, however, that the Board may wish to add such a reporting requirement for this section, as changes to the section do not require Board approval.

Provost, deans, and departments the responsibility of appointing and removing chairs in the manner prescribed below.

Department chairs (and their interim replacements) in the School of Arts and Sciences and the Robins School of Business ordinarily are nominated by the regular full-time department faculty acting as a collective and deliberative body and voting ordinarily by secret ballot. The person nominated will have the approval of at least half of the department's members. The department's nomination will be in the form of a letter to the Dean of their school that explains the department's choice of a chair. Although individual members of the department should be informed that they have the right to send a confidential letter of their own to the Dean, such letters should not be required or even solicited meets with the department to explain his or her reasons for not supporting the nomination. The department will then reevaluate its nomination and consider the Dean's objections. Subsequently, the department will communicate its choice of candidate for chair to the Dean.

The Dean and the department will remain in consultation until a mutually agreeable candidate has been selected and has agreed to serve as chair. A mutually agreeable candidate is a person who has the support of both the Dean and at least 50% of the regular full-time department faculty. The consensus candidate's name is forwarded to the Provost and then to the President as a recommendation for appointment. In rare instances when a consensus is not attained in a timely manner after protracted effort, the record of consultations and reasoning on all sides will be communicated to the Provost for resolution and recommendation to the President. Chairs are appointed for a term of a specified number of years and normally are eligible for reappointment for additional terms.

A department chair may be removed before the end of her/his term, but removal should be a last resort to be used only if the chair is unwilling to modify her/his problematic behavior. With two exceptions, explained below, a chair may not be removed unless both the Dean and a majority of the department's regular, full-time faculty agree to the removal. Removing a chair can be initiated by either the Dean or by a majority of the department's regular, full-time faculty, but before any such attempt is made, the chair must be notified in writing by the concerned party (Dean or department faculty) of the problematic behavior and be given an opportunity to explain, defend, and/or modify it. If the concerned party is not satisfied with the chair's response, it should request the chair to resign. If the chair refuses to resign, the concerned party should meet with the other party (Dean or department faculty) to secure its support for removing the chair. If such support is not secured, the chair may not be removed, except in the following two situations.

First, when the alleged grounds for removing a chair are the chair's failure and likely continued failure to perform the officially prescribed duties of a chair, the party (Dean or department faculty) making the allegation may appeal to the Provost, who, after hearing the arguments and evidence presented by the Dean, department faculty, and the chair, will decide whether the chair should be removed on the grounds of failing to perform officially prescribed duties. The second exception is when the Dean has clear and credible evidence that the chair, in the exercise of her/his authority as chair, has engaged in illegal activity. In such a case, the Dean, with the concurrence of the Provost, may remove a chair without

consulting with the department's faculty or making public the reasons for the removal. Whenever a decision has been made to remove a chair, for whatever reason, the chair will be given the option of resigning prior to being removed, except when that option is not allowed by law.

2. Academic Councils

In each school, except for the Jepson School of Leadership Studies and the Law School, there is an Academic Council. The functions of the several Academic Councils are similar in that they provide an avenue for faculty expression and influence. Among their duties each Council may (1) advise the Dean; (2) interpret faculty policy and consider any variations from requirements as listed in the catalogue; (3) recommend approval of new courses, majors, minors, and programs to the faculty; (4) consider certain recommendations of the Deans before they are presented to the faculty; (5) serve as a line of communication (each faculty member may request that a matter be brought to the attention of the Council); (6) recommend changes in academic policy to the faculty. Membership of the various Academic Councils is described below

(1). Academic Council, School of Arts and Sciences

The Arts and Sciences Academic Council is composed of the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Associate Deans, the chairs of the departments, directors of programs at the Dean's discretion, the Deans of Richmond College and Westhampton College, the University Registrar, and the University Librarian. The Dean presides as chair of the Council. Meetings are held on a regularly scheduled basis. Other than interpretation of policies and degree requirements, all actions are voted on by the faculty.

VIII.C. School of Arts and Sciences Academic Approvals

Educational Program Approvals

Educational program is taken to include majors as well as degree and certificate programs. Changes to requirements for existing programs are handled the same way as new programs. *New majors that impact only a single school need not go to the Senate for action.*

- a. New educational programs or revisions to existing programs are proposed initially in a number of possible ways: by a faculty committee, by a department(s), or by an existing academic program(s). The proposal comes to the Arts & Sciences Academic Council for approval and endorsement.
- b. If approved by Academic Council, the proposal comes to the Arts & Sciences faculty for action.
- c. Once approved by the Arts & Sciences faculty, the proposal is then presented to the University Senate for approval.
- d. If the Senate acts on the proposal and approves it, it goes as a recommendation to the Provost for final approval, except in the case of new degree programs, which require approval by the Board of Trustees. The Provost also notifies the Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees of the creation of new majors and certificate programs and the modification to requirements for an existing

program.³

New Course Approvals

- a. New courses are proposed using a standard form. Courses must initially be approved by the department or program.
- b. The department chair or program coordinator presents the course proposal to Academic Council for action (or Graduate Council if a graduate course). If approved it goes to the entire Arts & Sciences faculty.
- c. The Arts & Sciences faculty is asked to approve the actions of Academic Council. If approved the course becomes part of the regular offerings.

VIII.D. Robins School of Business Academic Organization

1. Chairs of Departments

Department chairs are responsible for the normal operations of their departments, including scheduling of classes, assignment of instructors, preparation of annual budgets, and recommendation of employment, promotion, tenure and salary increases of faculty members in their departments. Chairs represent their departments to the administration as well as in the Academic Council and the University Senate and are expected to keep their departments informed of actions of both of these bodies.

All department chairs are appointed and removed by the President of the University. In practice, however, and in the spirit of shared governance, the President delegates to the Provost, deans, and departments the responsibility of appointing and removing chairs in the manner prescribed below.

Department chairs (and their interim replacements) in the School of Arts and Sciences and the Robins School of Business ordinarily are nominated by the regular full-time department faculty acting as a collective and deliberative body and voting ordinarily by secret ballot. The person nominated will have the approval of at least half of the department's members. The department's nomination will be in the form of a letter to the Dean of their school that explains the department's choice of a chair. Although individual members of the department should be informed that they have the right to send a confidential letter of their own to the Dean, such letters should not be required or even solicited meets with the department to explain his or her reasons for not supporting the nomination. The department will then reevaluate its nomination and consider the Dean's objections. Subsequently, the department will communicate its choice of candidate for chair to the

³ These changes to VII.C.D. were not included in the Handbook draft reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate. The Senate Leadership, however, is aware a) that the existing language in the academic approval sections for each school does not accurately reflect the requirement established in the Bylaws that the Board approve new degree programs, and b) that the Board approval to Section VIII would include amending the relevant language to reflect the longstanding practice and requirement.

Dean.

The Dean and the department will remain in consultation until a mutually agreeable candidate has been selected and has agreed to serve as chair. A mutually agreeable candidate is a person who has the support of both the Dean and at least 50% of the regular full-time department faculty. The consensus candidate's name is forwarded to the Provost and then to the President as a recommendation for appointment. In rare instances when a consensus is not attained in a timely manner after protracted effort, the record of consultations and reasoning on all sides will be communicated to the Provost for resolution and recommendation to the President. Chairs are appointed for a term of a specified number of years and normally are eligible for reappointment for additional terms.

A department chair may be removed before the end of her/his term, but removal should be a last resort to be used only if the chair is unwilling to modify her/his problematic behavior. With two exceptions, explained below, a chair may not be removed unless both the Dean and a majority of the department's regular, full-time faculty agree to the removal. Removing a chair can be initiated by either the Dean or by a majority of the department's regular, full-time faculty, but before any such attempt is made, the chair must be notified in writing by the concerned party (Dean or department faculty) of the problematic behavior and be given an opportunity to explain, defend, and/or modify it. If the concerned party is not satisfied with the chair's response, it should request the chair to resign. If the chair refuses to resign, the concerned party should meet with the other party (Dean or department faculty) to secure its support for removing the chair. If such support is not secured, the chair may not be removed, except in the following two situations.

First, when the alleged grounds for removing a chair are the chair's failure and likely continued failure to perform the officially prescribed duties of a chair, the party (Dean or department faculty) making the allegation may appeal to the Provost, who, after hearing the arguments and evidence presented by the Dean, department faculty, and the chair, will decide whether the chair should be removed on the grounds of failing to perform officially prescribed duties. The second exception is when the Dean has clear and credible evidence that the chair, in the exercise of her/his authority as chair, has engaged in illegal activity. In such a case, the Dean, with the concurrence of the Provost, may remove a chair without consulting with the department's faculty or making public the reasons for the removal. Whenever a decision has been made to remove a chair, for whatever reason, the chair will be given the option of resigning prior to being removed, except when that option is not allowed by law.

2. Academic Councils

In each school, except for the Jepson School of Leadership Studies and the Law School, there is an Academic Council. The functions of the several Academic Councils are similar in that they provide an avenue for faculty expression and influence. Among their duties each Council may (1) advise the Dean; (2) interpret faculty policy and consider any variations from requirements as listed in the catalogue; (3) recommend approval of new courses, majors, minors, and programs to the faculty; (4) consider certain recommendations of the Deans before they are presented to the faculty; (5) serve as a line of communication (each faculty member may request that a matter be brought to the attention of the Council); (6) recommend changes in academic policy to the faculty. Membership of the various

(2). Academic Council, The Robins School of Business

In The Robins School of Business, the Academic Council is composed of the Dean, the chairs of the departments, the Associate Deans, and the Director of Assessment and Accreditation. Others are invited to meet with the Academic Council as non-voting ex officio members at the Dean's discretion. The Dean presides as chair of the Academic Council. The meetings are held monthly.

(5). Graduate Council, The Robins School of Business

The Graduate Council functions for the Richard S. Reynolds Graduate School of The Robins School of Business in a manner similar to an academic council. The Graduate Council is composed of a faculty member from each of the academic departments, the Dean as an ex officio member, and the Director of The Richard S. Reynolds Graduate School as chair. The Council studies and recommends actions related to the establishment of new graduate courses, new degree programs, any exceptions to be made to the policies stated in the Graduate School Catalog, and rules on suspended and terminated students.

VIII.E. Robins School of Business Academic Approvals

Educational Program Approvals

Educational program is taken to include majors as well as degree and certificate programs. Changes to requirements for existing programs are handled the same way as new programs. *New majors that impact only a single school need not go to the Senate for action.*

- a. Proposals for new academic programs, certificates, degrees, and degree requirements might be initiated by a department, by the RSB Dean, or by the director of the associated program (Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, Associate Dean for International Business, or the Director of Executive Business Programs).
- b. Since planning demands broad consideration, an ad hoc planning committee typically is formed with representation from all affected programs. The charge for this committee is to assess the full benefits and costs of the proposal. A primary consideration is a best estimate of the effective demand for the program, certificate, or degree. On the cost side, the committee assesses staffing implications as well as the impacts of the proposal on existing programs.
- c. Ordinarily, the relevant curriculum committee (Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, or Executive Management Advisory Committee) is consulted before the proposal is presented to the RSB faculty. This consultation may be in the form of representation on the ad hoc planning committee or through the review of a completed proposal.
- d. Approved proposals are submitted to the RSB faculty for their consideration. Proposals should be detailed with respect to curriculum (if relevant) as well as the proposal's benefits and costs.
- e. Once approved by the Robins School faculty, the proposal is then presented to the University Senate for approval.

- f. If the Senate acts on the proposal and approves it, it goes as a recommendation to the Provost for final approval, except in the case of degree programs, which require approval by the Board of Trustees. The Provost also notifies the Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees of the creation of new majors and certificate programs and the modification to requirements for an existing program.⁴

New Course Approvals

- a. The addition of a course as a permanent offering in the undergraduate catalog must be approved initially by the department responsible for the course.
- b. Generally, the course is offered as a Special Topics course for one or two years to demonstrate adequate interest in the course by students.
- c. The department forwards its request to the chair of the RSB Curriculum Committee for consideration. (Note that the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies serves as an *ex officio* member of this committee.) The request should include the following information: course number, full course title, a catalog description, prerequisites, hours of credit, estimated student enrollment (which might be based on its offering as a special topics course), the faculty member who will teach the course, staffing implications, the need for additional specialized resources (if any), relation to the existing courses and curriculum, a brief outline of the course, and an indication of departmental approval.
- d. New course requests that are not approved by the Curriculum Committee are returned to the department with an explanation for their denial. The department may revise the proposal and resubmit it to the committee.
- e. New course requests that are approved by the Curriculum Committee are presented to the RSB faculty by the chair of the Curriculum Committee for approval. If approved, the course is added to the UR Undergraduate Catalog among the department's permanent offerings.

III.F. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic Organization

Academic Councils

In each school, except for the Jepson School of Leadership Studies and the Law School, there is an Academic Council. The functions of the several Academic Councils are similar in that they provide an avenue for faculty expression and influence. Among their duties each Council may (1) advise the Dean; (2) interpret faculty policy and consider any variations from requirements as listed in the catalogue; (3) recommend approval of new courses, majors, minors, and programs to the faculty; (4) consider certain recommendations of the Deans before they are presented to the faculty; (5) serve as a line of communication (each faculty member may request that a matter be brought to the attention of the Council); (6) recommend changes in academic policy to the faculty. Membership of the various Academic Councils is described below.

(3). Academic Council, School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic policies and oversight of the curriculum rest with the SPCS Academic Council. Upon review and recommendation of the SPCS Faculty, the SPCS Academic Council approves courses,

⁴ See note 7, p.81 for explanation of change.

curriculum and degree requirements, and admission policies. The council also approves the creation, suspension and elimination of programs.

Membership shall come from the Academic Councils of Arts and Sciences (3), the E. Claiborne Robins School of Business (1), and the Jepson School of Leadership Studies (1), along with one faculty representative from the School of Law. The associate deans with faculty status, plus all full-time SPCS faculty members of the School of Professional and Continuing Studies shall also be included. The dean is both a member and Chair of the Council. The Provost and the Registrar are *ex officio* members.

The Academic Council shall recommend to the Provost the approval of all new credit and degree offerings of the School, shall conduct periodic reviews of its various programs and report its findings and recommendations to the Provost.

The Academic Council shall meet regularly and report relevant actions to the faculties of the University for information or approval as appropriate.

The Promotion Sub-Committee of the SPCS Academic Council reviews and approves the promotion of full-time faculty in the SPCS. The Promotion Committee of the Academic Council includes the council representatives from Arts & Sciences, the Jepson School of Leadership Studies, the Robins School of Business, and the School of Law, plus any full-time SPCS faculty members who have achieved the rank being sought by the candidate under consideration. The candidate may request an outside reviewer from the candidate's discipline

VIII.G. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic Approvals

Educational Program Approvals

Educational program is taken to include majors as well as degree and certificate programs. Changes to requirements for existing programs are handled the same way as new programs. *New majors that impact only a single school need not go to the Senate for action.*

- a. After consultation with appropriate individuals (dean, associate dean, key faculty), a proposal is submitted to the Academic Council of the school using a standard form available in the Dean's Office.
- b. The Academic Council acts on the proposal. The Academic Council includes all full-time faculty members/program directors of the school plus representatives from other school faculties.
- c. If approved by the Academic Council, the Dean must endorse the program and then

submit it to the University Senate for action if it is new degree program. If it is simply a new major within an existing degree program, then there is no need for it to go to the Senate.

- d. If the Senate acts on the proposal and approves it, it goes as a recommendation to the Provost for final approval, except in the case of new degree programs, which require approval by the Board of Trustees. The Provost also notifies the Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees of the creation of new majors and certificate programs and the modification to requirements for an existing program.⁵

New Course Approvals

- a. After consultation with appropriate individuals (dean, associate dean, key faculty), a proposal is submitted to the Academic Council of the school using a standard form available in the Dean's Office.
- b. The Academic Council acts on the proposal. The Academic council includes all full-time faculty members of the school plus representatives from other school faculties.
- c. If approved by the Academic Council, the course becomes part of the school's curriculum.

VIII.H. Jepson School of Leadership Studies

Academic Approvals

Educational Program Approvals

Educational program is taken to include majors as well as degree and certificate programs. Changes to requirements for existing programs are handled the same way as new programs. *New majors that impact only a single school need not go to the Senate for action.*

- a. Proposals are submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee of the school. This committee has many of the functions of the academic councils in Arts and Sciences, Continuing Studies, and Business.
- b. Upon the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee, the entire faculty acts on the proposal.
- c. If approved by the Leadership Studies faculty, the Dean must endorse the program and then submit it to the Provost for final approval, except in the case of new degree programs, which require approval by the Board of Trustees. The Provost also notifies the Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees of the creation of new majors and certificate programs and the modification to requirements for an existing program.⁶

New Course Approvals

- a. A new course proposal is presented to the Academic Affairs Committee for approval.
- b. If approved by the Academic Affairs Committee, the proposal goes to the entire faculty for approval.
- c. If approved by the faculty, the course becomes part of the curriculum of the school.

⁵ See note 7, p. 81 for explanation of revision.

⁶ See note 7, p. 81 for explanation of revision.

VIII.I. School of Law Academic Approvals

Educational Program Approvals

Educational program includes degree and certificate programs. Changes to requirements for existing programs are handled the same way as new programs. *New programs or requirements that impact only a single school need not go to the Senate for action.*

- a. New Programs, Certificates, Degrees or Degree Requirement Approval: New programs, certificates, degrees or degree requirements are initially discussed by the proposing party with both the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Dean.
- b. The Law School's standing Curriculum Committee will review the new course proposal and make a non-binding recommendation to faculty.
- c. A new program, certificate, degree or degree requirement then requires the affirmative vote of a simple majority of the faculty voting at the faculty meeting.
- d. A new program, certificate, degree or degree requirement is then presented to the University Senate for approval.
- e. If the Senate acts on the proposal and approves it, it goes as a recommendation to the Provost for final approval, except in the case of new degree programs, which require approval by the Board of Trustees. The Provost also notifies the Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees of the creation of other new programs or the modification to requirements for an existing program.⁷

New Course Approvals

- a. New course proposals are initiated by faculty members, who must first discuss the proposal with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.
- b. The Law School's standing Curriculum Committee will review the new course proposal and make a non-binding recommendation to the faculty.
- c. The course proposal then requires the approval of a simple majority of the faculty voting at the faculty meeting.
- d. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Curriculum Committee can approve a new course on an interim basis for one term, without approval from the law school faculty.

⁷ See note 7, p.81 for explanation of this revision.