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Preamble

The University of Richmond Faculty Handbook is a guide to benefits, policies, requirements, and procedures that affect faculty employees.

For completeness the Handbook references a number of University policies that apply to all employees. University policies are available in the University Policy Library. Faculty members are expected to comply with all applicable 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 contract, this Handbook is published 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 Provost is charged with maintaining as PDF files on the Provost’s Office 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.

General Organizational Structure of the University

The University’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and information about the Board of Trustees may be accessed on the President’s Office 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 Office 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 Bylaws, the dean of each school reports to the Executive Vice President and Provost. Academic Leadership Positions may be found on the Academic Organization Chart on the Provost’s Office website. The University Faculty Senate provides voice
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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 Faculty 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. The University Faculty – Appointments, Roles, and Responsibilities

A. 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.

B. The Faculty of the University

The University faculty consists of the President, the Provost, the Deans of the schools, Tenured and Tenure-track/Probationary faculty, faculty with Continuing or Temporary and Restricted Term appointments, and others who have been granted faculty status in accordance with Article I, Section H of this Handbook.

C. 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 dean’s 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.

Faculty with teaching or research appointments of any kind will be informed each year in writing of their appointments. Any special conditions or terms that must be satisfied prior to consideration for tenure should be set forth in an Appointment Letter.

The terms of a faculty member’s appointment are set forth in the faculty member’s appointment letter and in this Handbook, as modified or amended from time to time. The Board of Trustees must approve the promotion of Tenured and Tenure-track/Probationary faculty, award of tenure, award of emeritus status, and appointment of a faculty member to an endowed chair or professorship.
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All members of the faculty with Tenure-Track/Probationary or Temporary and Restricted appointments must indicate their acceptance of the terms of their appointment by signing and returning a copy of the appointment letter.

D. Appointment Status Categories

Faculty appointments fall into one of the following four status categories, which are described more fully in Sections D(1)-(4), below:

- **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. The appointment of Tenured faculty does not have a specified end date. Tenured faculty may hold the rank of professor or associate professor.

- **Tenure-Track/Probationary faculty** members are those persons who are appointed for an initial term of one academic year and whose appointment may be renewed on an annual basis subject to the limits and terms of Article I, Section D(2) of this Handbook. These appointments carry the possibility of tenure at a future date. Tenure-Track/Probationary faculty may hold the rank of instructor (if they do not hold a terminal degree), or the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor.

- **Continuing Appointment** faculty members are those persons whose primary responsibilities include teaching, research, advising, and scholarship, and who have been appointed to one of the two sub-categories described below.
  
  a. **Continuing Appointment Without Fixed Term**. Faculty members appointed in this sub-category may be employed on a full-time or part-time basis and their appointment does not have a specified end date. This category includes faculty affiliated with a school or academic department of a school who teach and may have job descriptions that comprise both teaching and administrative responsibilities, such as faculty of practice in the School of Arts & Sciences, and including those who hold school-specific titles, such as directors in the School of Arts & Sciences. This category does not include staff with the title of directors.

  b. **Continuing Appointment With Fixed Term**. Faculty members appointed in this sub-category shall be employed on a full-time basis. The appointment shall be for: (i) an initial term of at least one academic year with the potential for renewal for up to two subsequent academic years; or (ii) a term of three or more academic years. The term and any options for renewal shall be specified in the faculty member’s appointment letter. Appointments in this subcategory may be renewed or extended contingent upon on satisfactory service, continued University need, and/or such additional terms as may be specified in a school-specific appendix to this Handbook. If not renewed or extended, the appointment terminates at the end of the then-current contract term. If renewed or extended, the appointment terminates at the end of the last renewal or extension term. Visiting or adjunct faculty shall
not be appointed in this category.

Faculty with Continuing Appointments are not eligible for tenure.

- **Temporary and Restricted Term** faculty members are those persons whose primary responsibilities are teaching and/or research and who have been appointed, either on a full-time or part-time basis, for one semester or up to three academic years. These appointments are not renewable except by subsequent and separate appointment letter. Visiting and adjunct faculty appointments fall in this category. Faculty with Temporary and Restricted Term Appointments are not eligible for tenure.

1. **Tenured Appointments**

   Faculty members with tenure shall have permanent or continuous appointments and their service shall be terminated only as set forth in Article IV, Section D, E, or H of this Handbook.

   Changes to the terms of a Tenured faculty member’s appointment for the following academic year that require Board of Trustees approval will be given to the faculty member in writing no later than three weeks after the Board of Trustees has met to approve such terms. All other changes to the terms of a Tenured faculty member’s appointment, including salary changes, will be provided in writing annually.

   The awarding of tenure status to faculty members shall in every case be made only 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 and/or school involved. Recommendations for tenure are based on the criteria described in Article IV, Section B of this Handbook and in the school-specific appendices to this Handbook. 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 procedures set forth in Article IV, Section B and the school-specific appendices of this Handbook. Tenure is associated with faculty appointment, not with an administrative position.

   Faculty members with tenure have a right to voice and vote in University faculty meetings and, subject to the provisions of Article IV, Section A of the [University Faculty Senate Charter](#), may serve on the University Faculty Senate. Subject to the [University Faculty Senate Committee Policy Document](#), faculty members with tenure may also serve on University Faculty Committees. The rights of Faculty members with tenure to voice and vote in school faculty meetings, to serve in leadership roles in a school governance structure, or to serve on school committees shall be specified in the school-specific appendices to this Handbook or in school-specific policies.

2. **Tenure-Track/Probationary Appointments**
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Tenure-Track/Probationary appointments are made for one academic year and may be renewed for subsequent, one-academic year terms, subject to the limits set forth herein. The total period of full-time service at the University prior to the acquisition of tenure will not exceed seven academic years, except as permitted under Article IV, Section A of this Handbook. 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-academic year probationary period at the University of Richmond.

In only exceptional cases will the probationary period be less than three years. Reappointment to a probationary position is made annually following review and contingent upon 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 and reappointment will not be made beyond that year.

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; and (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. Changes to the terms of a Tenure-track/Probationary faculty member’s appointment for the following academic year that require Board of Trustees approval will be given to the faculty member in writing no later than three weeks after the Board of Trustees has met to approve such terms. All other changes to the terms of a Tenure-track/Probationary faculty member’s appointment, including salary changes, will be provided in writing annually.

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 non-renewal of contract must be given before Commencement of the academic year preceding the terminal contract.

The appointment of a Tenure-Track/Probationary faculty member may be terminated prior to the end of the then-current contract term only as set forth in Article IV, Section E or H of this Handbook and the notice provisions set forth above shall not apply to termination under these sections.
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Tenure-Track/Probationary faculty members have a right to voice and vote in University faculty meetings and, subject to the provisions of Article IV, Section A of the University Faculty Senate Charter, may serve on the University Faculty Senate. Subject to the University Faculty Senate Committee Policy Document, Tenure-track/Probationary faculty members may also serve on University Faculty Committees. The rights of Tenure-track/Probationary faculty to voice and vote in school faculty meetings, to serve in leadership roles in a school governance structure, or to serve on school committees shall be specified in the school-specific appendices to this Handbook or in school-specific policies.

3. Continuing Appointments

Continuing faculty appointments are for faculty members whose primary responsibilities include teaching, research, advising, and scholarship and who have been appointed to one of the two subcategories described below.

a. Continuing Appointment Without Fixed Term. Faculty members appointed in this subcategory may be employed, either on a full-time or part-time basis, and whose appointment does not have a specified end-date. These individuals are employed under continuing appointments which adhere to the principles of employment-at-will and continued employment is contingent upon satisfactory performance and continued University need.

b. Continuing Appointment With Fixed Term. Faculty members appointed in this sub-category shall be employed on a full-time basis. The appointment shall be for: (i) an initial term of at least one academic year with the potential for renewal for up to two subsequent academic years; or (ii) a term of three or more academic years. The term and any options for renewal shall be specified in the faculty member’s appointment letter. Appointments in this subcategory may be renewed or extended contingent upon satisfactory service, continued University need, and/or such additional terms as may be specified in a school-specific appendix to this Handbook. If not renewed or extended, the appointment terminates at the end of the then-current contract term. If renewed or extended, the appointment terminates at the end of the last renewal or extension term. Visiting or adjunct faculty shall not be appointed in this category.

The appointment of a faculty member with a Continuing Appointment With Fixed Term may be terminated prior to the end of the then-current contract term only as only as set forth in Article IV, Section E or H of this Handbook.

Full-time faculty members on a Continuing Appointment have a right to voice and vote in University faculty meetings and, subject to the provisions of Article IV, Section A of the University Faculty Senate Charter and any school-specific appendix to this Handbook, may serve on the University Faculty Senate. Subject to the University Faculty Senate Committee Policy Document and the applicable school-specific appendix to this Handbook, full-time faculty members on a Continuing Appointment may also serve on University Faculty Committees. The rights of faculty members on a Continuing Appointment to voice and vote in school faculty meetings, to serve in leadership roles in a school governance structure, or to serve on school committees shall be specified in the school-specific appendices to this Handbook or in school-specific policies.
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Faculty on a Continuing Appointment are not eligible for tenure.

4. Temporary and Restricted Term Appointments

Temporary and Restricted Term faculty appointments are for faculty members whose primary responsibilities are teaching and/or research and who have been appointed, on either a full-time or a part-time basis, for one semester or up to three academic years. These appointments terminate on the date specified in the appointment letter. These appointments are not renewable unless there is a subsequent and separate appointment letter. The requirement of written due notice of non-renewal, applicable to Tenure-Track/Probationary faculty, does not apply to faculty with a Temporary and Restricted Term appointment. The appointment of a faculty member with a Temporary and Restricted Term Appointment may be terminated prior to the end of the then-current contract term as permitted by the terms of their appointment.

Faculty with a Temporary and Restricted Term appointment are not eligible for tenure.

Faculty with a Temporary and Restricted Term Appointment have a right to voice but not vote in University faculty meetings and are not eligible to serve on the University Faculty Senate or on Faculty Senate committees. The rights of faculty with a Temporary and Restricted Term Appointment to voice and vote in school faculty meetings, to serve in leadership roles in a school governance structure, or to serve on school committees shall be specified in the school-specific appendices to this Handbook or in school-specific policies.

E. Faculty of the Schools, Appointments, and Joint Appointments

1. The Faculty of the Schools

Each school of the University has a faculty. Each faculty shall consist of the President, the Provost, the Dean (as appropriate), and all faculty with Tenured, Tenure-Track/Probationary, and Continuing Appointments. The school-specific appendices to this Handbook may specify whether faculty with Temporary and Restricted Term Appointments, professional librarians, and staff with faculty status are deemed members of a school’s faculty.

The school faculties comprise faculty who have a primary appointment in the 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.

2. Appointment to a School Faculty

Faculty members are appointed in a department or school where their primary responsibilities include teaching, advising, scholarship, and service to the University (unless temporarily assigned other tasks approved by their dean or the Provost).
Faculty rank, as Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, is given in a specific department or school to those whose primary responsibilities are teaching, advising, and scholarship.

3. 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.

F. Duties and Responsibilities of the Faculty Members

Each faculty member is expected to maintain the highest professional 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, by April 15th of the preceding academic year.

Each faculty member is expected to comply with the Faculty Handbook, the policies and procedures of the faculty and Faculty Senate, and the policies of the University.

G. 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 and approval 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.

H. Staff with Faculty Status

The following University staff members are granted faculty status at large within the University and may be granted faculty status by the faculty of a school of the University accordance with the school-specific appendices of this Handbook:

- Professional librarians, provided they are serving in such capacity; and

- Upon approval of by the Faculty Status and Faculty Credentials Committee of the Faculty Senate, other University staff members awarded faculty status by virtue of holding position that requires regular involvement in, and significant responsibility for, teaching or research at the University.

The schools of the University may grant faculty status to University staff members in accordance with the school-specific Appendices of the Faculty Handbook, but such individuals shall not be deemed to have faculty status at the University level unless granted such status by the Faculty Status and Faculty Credentials Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Any University staff member who was granted University faculty status prior to August 13, 2020,
shall retain such status notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary.

University staff granted faculty status at the University level have the right to: (i) voice and vote in University faculty meetings to the extent permitted by Article III(C)(6) of the Faculty Senate Charter; (ii) vote for faculty senators, subject to the provision of the Faculty Senate Charter and any applicable school-specific appendix to this Handbook; (iii) serve on the Faculty Senate, subject to the provisions of the Faculty Senate Charter and any applicable school-specific appendix to this Handbook; (iv) serve as members of faculty committees, subject to the provisions of the Faculty Senate Charter, the Faculty Senate Committee Policy Document, and applicable school-specific appendices. Staff granted faculty status are eligible for those benefits generally available to University staff and are subject to the policies and procedures that apply to University staff.

II. Compensation and Benefits

Preface

In a tradition of shared governance, members of the Administration, particularly the Senior Associate Vice President for Human Resources, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer 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

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
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B. Benefits Available to Faculty

The benefits offered by the University to eligible faculty are described on the Human Resources Benefits web page or the Risk Management web page and, as of the effective date of this Handbook, include the following:

- Health Benefits Plans;
- Life Insurance;
- Disability Plans;
- 403(b) Retirement Plan;
- Early Retirement Plan;
- Phased Retirement Plan;
- Legal Services Plan;
- Employee Assistance Program;
- Leave Plans, including FMLA leave;
- Post-Retirement Health Insurance (Medicare Advantage Plan);
- Flexible Spending Accounts; and
- Business Travel 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.

C. Faculty Parental Leave Policy

Refer to the Human Resources web page for information on faculty parental leave.

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.

Audited Classes: The same provisions apply as for classes taken for credit.
Special Fees: The student is responsible for any special fees, such as music fees, late registration fees, drop-add fees, or overload charges.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Appeals: The Provost shall have the power to review individual cases, upon appeal.

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.

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.

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.

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.) Approval consistent with the policies of the department or division must be given. The individual's enrollment does not cause a class to be held which would otherwise have been cancelled.

D. Summer School Contracts

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

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

E. Extra Compensation for Full-Time Faculty

Full-time faculty 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, Provost, 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.

F. 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 they 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 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 two semesters immediately following their sabbatical leave.

In addition to the compensation outlined above, the University encourages faculty members to apply for additional grant monies to cover travel, research costs, displacement costs, or any other expense connected with the leave and which they 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 seeking 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
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.

G. 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 Resources 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 and Medical Leave Act. Faculty on parental leave and short-term disability will receive salary and benefits as set forth in Article 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. Article IV, Section A of this Handbook, “Stop the Clock Requests” specifies the process for seeking a delay in consideration for tenure for certain types of 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 Resources 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.

Article IV, Section A of this Handbook, “Stop the Clock Requests” specifies the process for seeking a delay in consideration for tenure for certain types of leave.

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.

H. 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. Their employment will end effective the day before the LTD effective date.

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

III. Policies Applicable to All Employees

The University of Richmond prohibits discrimination against applicants, students, faculty, or staff on the basis of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, status as a veteran or any classification protected by local, state, or federal law. The University also prohibits any form of harassment based on race, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, status as a veteran or any classification protected by local, state, or federal law. The University prohibits such harassment by all students, faculty and staff, and affiliates of the University. These prohibitions against discrimination and harassment extend to admissions and employment. As a recipient of federal funds, the University complies with federal laws prohibiting discrimination, including Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX). Title IX provides that: “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.”

For questions about discrimination in education, including sex discrimination, please contact the University’s Director of Compliance and Title IX Coordinator, Kristine Henderson Fountain Hall, Suite 101, (804) 289-8186, khender3@richmond.edu or the University’s Senior Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Deputy Title IX Coordinator. Further information about Title IX and sexual discrimination in education is available from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC, 20202-1100; 800-421-3481; OCR@ed.gov; or at the website: http://www.ed.gov/ocr.

The University maintains a policy library for policies in many areas that are applicable 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. Members of the faculty must comply with University policies.

Policies of particular interest to faculty include, but are not limited to the following:

- Policy Prohibiting Discrimination
- Policy on Preventing and Responding to Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Involving Faculty or Staff
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IV. Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures

Preface

The following provisions describe employment policies specific to the faculty and are designed to enable the University of Richmond to protect academic freedom through tenure and the requirements of academic due process. 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. Extension of Consideration for Tenure and Mid-Course Review

1. "Stop the Clock" Requests.

A faculty member with a Tenure-Track/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 their 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 as a result of a “stop the clock” request 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.

2. Extension Caused by COVID-19 Pandemic.

A faculty member with a Tenure-Track/Probationary appointment may request a delay in consideration of their mid-course (third year) review or a delay in consideration for tenure for up to one (1) year due to the disruption in teaching, scholarship, and service caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The timetable for requesting this extension will be set by the Dean of each of the schools. Faculty who are scheduled for their mid-course (third year) review or to stand for tenure in the 2020-2021 academic year shall have until at least April 15, 2020 to decide if they wish to extend the time for consideration for the mid-course (third year) review or tenure by one year. All other faculty with a Tenure-Track/Probationary appointment scheduled for a mid-course (third-year) review or to stand for tenure in the 2021-2022 academic year or later and who were employed at the University as of August 24, 2020, shall have until January 15 of the academic year before they would normally be considered to decide if they wish to extend the time for consideration for the mid-course (third year) review or tenure by one year. Faculty opting for an extension in their tenure-clock under this policy will still remain eligible for “stop-the-clock” requests, as outlined in Article IV, Section A(1), above, and may extend the tenure-clock by one-year due to COVID-19 so that the maximum pre-tenure period will be a total of eight (8) years.

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 in the school-specific appendices to this Handbook. 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 participation in the affairs of the faculty and University community, particularly through committee activities. The school-specific appendices shall designate for each school whether advising is considered as service or teaching. 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 set forth in this section of the Handbook and in the school-specific appendices to this Handbook. 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. The University of Richmond prohibits discrimination and harassment against applicants, students, faculty, or staff on the basis of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, status as a veteran, or any classification protected by local, state, or federal law.

Inasmuch as the University has adopted a policy recognizing that the tenure and promotion process may differ among the five schools, 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 their appointment effective at the end of an academic year, provided that they give notice in writing to the Provost at the earliest possible opportunity, but not later than 30 days after receiving notification of the terms of their 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 they 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 their 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 described in Article IV, Section D(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 described in Article IV, Section D(4), below, whose recommendation and rationale 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 described in Article IV, Section D(5), below, will recommend either appropriate reassignments or full
Effective August 17, 2022

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 Faculty 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

1. Adequate Cause

Termination of a Tenured faculty member or termination of a faculty member with a Tenure-Track/Probationary Appointment or a Continuing Appointment with Fixed Term before the end of then-current contract term, may be effected by the University 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, pursuant to the process set forth in Article IV D of this Handbook, resulting in significantly diminished personnel requirements;

c. medical evidence that the faculty member cannot continue to fulfill the terms and conditions of the appointment even with reasonable accommodations for a qualified disability; or

d. finding of misconduct and the imposition of a sanction of dismissal pursuant to process specified in Article IV, Section H of this Handbook.

2. Terminations Under Adequate Causes (1 a, b, and c)
Where termination of appointment is based upon the criteria specified in Article IV, Section E(1)(a) or (b), the dismissal procedure described in Article IV, Section E(3), below, 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, they will be given severance salary for twelve months. The released faculty member's position 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 based upon the criteria specified in Article IV, Section E(1)(c) 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.

3. Dismissals and Procedures for Dismissal Under Adequate Causes (1d)

The dismissal of a Tenured faculty member or the dismissal of a faculty member with a Tenure-Track/Probationary Appointment or a Continuing Appointment With Fixed Term before the end of the then-current contract term based on the criteria specified in Article VI, Section E(1)(d) shall be subject to the procedures set forth in Article IV, Section H of the Handbook. Such procedures do not apply to a decision not to renew the appointment of a faculty member with Tenure-Track/Probationary Appointment or a Continuing Appointment with Fixed Term at the end of the then-current contract term or to the dismissal of a faculty member with a Continuing Appointment Without Fixed Term.

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/Tenure Track Appointment or a Continuing Appointment alleges that considerations violative of academic freedom significantly contributed to a decision
not to reappoint them, their 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 Article IV, Section E(2) of this Handbook, 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, they succeed in establishing a \textit{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 Article IV, Section F(1) of this Handbook.

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. When engaging in political activity on campus or seeking to use University resources, faculty members must comply with the University’s Policy on Political Campaign Activities on Campus.

G. Grievance Procedures

Grievance procedures are used for all grievances by members of the faculty, except those concerning dismissal proceedings subject to Article IV, Section E(2) of this Handbook. Grievances relating to reappointment, tenure, promotion, or disciplinary action under Article IV, Section H of this Handbook follow the procedures described in Article IV, Section G(1), below. Other grievances follow the procedures described in Article IV, Section G(2) of this Handbook.

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.
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The Grievance Committee is composed of full-time Tenured faculty members appointed in accordance with the University Faculty Senate Committee Policy Document. 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 and Disciplinary Procedures

Faculty who are not recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion may petition the Grievance Committee for review of the process involved in an adverse recommendation or decision. 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; or

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

Faculty members who are subject to the disciplinary process set forth in Article IV, Section H of the Handbook may petition the Faculty Grievance Committee for review of the process involved as specified in Article IV, Section H(8)(a).

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 non-discrimination policies. 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 comply substantially with established University policy or procedure and the University's written faculty employment policies, such as non-discrimination policies, or with 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 discrimination, the committee's responsibility will be to consider whether adequate non-discriminatory professional criteria were used in reaching the contested recommendation or action.

Upon receipt of a grievance petition, the Grievance Committee will assess whether the petition alleges one or more failures to comply with established University policy or procedure or the Faculty Handbook and, thus, falls within the purview of the Grievance Committee. If the Grievance Committee finds that the petition does not allege one or more failures to comply with established University policy or procedure or the Faculty Handbook or the petition challenges the substantive basis for a recommendation, then the Grievance Committee will dismiss the petition after written notice to the faculty member who filed the petition. If the Grievance Committee finds that the petition does allege one or more failures to comply with established University policy or procedure or the Faculty Handbook, then the Grievance Committee shall initiate a thorough review of such petition. 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, promotion, or disciplinary 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 the Faculty Handbook or 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 the Faculty Handbook or 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. The Grievance Committee has the authority to mandate, at its discretion, and with the written consent of the petitioning faculty member, 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 involving a tenure or promotion decision 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 discipline, 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.

Upon receipt of a grievance petition, the Grievance Committee will assess whether the petition alleges one or more failures to comply with established University policy or procedure or the Faculty Handbook and, thus, falls within the purview of the Grievance Committee. If the Grievance Committee finds that petition does not allege one or more failures to comply with established University policy or procedure or the Faculty Handbook or the petition challenges the substantive basis for a recommendation, then the Grievance Committee will dismiss the petition after written notice to the faculty member who filed the petition. If Grievance Committee finds that the petition does allege one or more failures to comply with established University policy or procedure or the Faculty Handbook, then the Grievance Committee shall initiate a review of such petition. The Grievance Committee will determine the appropriate scope of such review based on the content of the petition. Submission of a petition will not automatically initiate investigation or detailed consideration.

The Grievance Committee will investigate 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.

H. Disciplinary Actions, Investigations, and Formal Faculty Hearings

The procedures set forth in this Article IV, Section H shall apply only to reports that a Tenured faculty member or a faculty member with a Tenure-Track/Probationary Appointment or a Continuing Appointment engaged in misconduct, as defined below, and to a faculty member with a Temporary and Restricted Appointment in the case of an allegation of sexual harassment under Title IX, as defined below. These procedures apply only to reports of alleged misconduct arising out of or related to an individual’s role as a faculty member. These procedures do not apply to conduct alleged to have occurred in a faculty member’s private life, unless such alleged conduct has or reasonably could have a direct impact on students or other members of the campus community, or to reports of alleged Misconduct arising out of or relating to an individual’s administrative role, including, but not limited to the role of President, Provost, or dean.

The University’s response to allegations of faculty Misconduct may vary according to the nature of the misconduct, its seriousness, its impact on the University or the well-being of other members of the University community, and any prior record of Misconduct.

The procedures set forth in this Article IV, Section H will not be used to restrain faculty members in their exercise of academic freedom or free expression.

The term “Misconduct” as used in this Handbook includes, but is not limited to, continued and material failure to perform properly assigned duties, sexual misconduct as defined in the University’s Policy on Preventing and Responding to Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Involving Faculty or Staff, discrimination, harassment, material violations of University policies, including but not limited to those set forth in this Handbook, research misconduct, violations of scholarly integrity, fraud, or conduct that meets the definition of a crime under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia or under federal law.

The term “sexual harassment under Title IX” as used in this Handbook is a form of sexual misconduct that involves conduct on the basis of sex that satisfies one or more of the following:

1) Conditioning the provision of an aid, benefit, or service of the University on an individual’s participation in unwelcome sexual conduct;

2) Unwelcome conduct determined by a reasonable person to be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively denies a person equal access to the recipients education program or activity; or

3) Sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking as defined in the University’s Policy Prohibiting Sexual Misconduct and University’s Policy on Preventing and Responding to Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Involving Faculty or Staff.

Effective August 17, 2022
Each step in the disciplinary process set forth herein shall be undertaken in a prompt and equitable manner consistent with the complexity of the matter at issue.

1. **Confidentiality and Disciplinary Actions, Investigations, and the Formal Hearing and Appeal Process**

   In all proceedings, it is essential that confidentiality be maintained. Thus, information concerning any investigation should be disclosed only to those with a right or a need to know or as otherwise required by law or applicable regulations.

2. **Reports of Alleged Misconduct**

   All members of the University community, including faculty, staff and students, who have a good faith concern regarding possible Misconduct are expected to report such concerns to the appropriate University official.

   A report of alleged Misconduct involving a faculty member may be made as set forth below.

   Reports alleging possible discrimination, harassment, or sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment under Title IX should be directed to the University’s Director of Compliance and Title IX Coordinator, Kristine Henderson Fountain Hall, Suite 101, (804) 289-8186, khender3@richmond.edu or the University’s Senior Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Deputy Title IX Coordinator.

   Reports alleging possible research misconduct should be directed to the University’s Research Integrity Officer. The Director of Compliance and Title IX Coordinator has been designated as the Research Integrity Officer.

   Reports alleging other forms of Misconduct should be directed to the appropriate school dean. If the subject of the report is the school dean, then the report should be made to the University’s Provost.

   The recipient of such a report shall notify the appropriate dean, but, in the case of an allegation of discrimination, harassment, or sexual misconduct, shall not disclose the name of the alleged Complainant of such conduct without consent.

3. **Retaliation is Prohibited**

   The University prohibits retaliation or retribution, in any form, against an individual who reports, in good faith, an actual, potential or suspected incidence of Misconduct. As used in this Article IV, Section H(3), reporting “in good faith” means the individual making the report has a reasonable basis to believe that there has been or may have been a violation of this policy. Individuals who make frivolous or false reports shall not be deemed to be acting in good faith.

   Anyone who engages in or attempts to engage in retaliation or retribution against an individual who reports, in good faith, an actual, potential or suspected incidence of Misconduct shall be subject to discipline in accordance with this Handbook or the applicable policies and procedures.
4. **Process for Addressing Reports of Misconduct**

A report alleging possible discrimination, harassment, or sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment under Title IX, shall be handled in accordance with the University’s Policy on Preventing and Responding to Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Involving Faculty or Staff, provided, however, the procedures for a hearing, an appeal, and the imposition of any sanctions shall be governed by this Article IV, Section H of the Handbook.

A report alleging possible research misconduct shall be handled in accordance with the University’s Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct, provided, however, the procedures for a hearing, an appeal, and the imposition of any sanctions shall be governed by this Article IV, Section H of the Handbook.

In case of a report alleging other forms of Misconduct, the appropriate dean or his/her designee will meet with the person making the report or on whose behalf the complaint or report is made (the “Complainant”), to review the Complainant’s concerns, explain the University’s procedures for handling the report, and discuss with the Complainant the options for formal and informal resolution. The appropriate dean or his/her designee shall then meet with the faculty member who is the subject of the report (the “Respondent”) to review the allegations in the report, listen to the Respondent’s perspective, explain the University’s procedures for handling the report, and discuss with the Respondent the options for formal and informal resolution.

Following these initial meetings, the dean shall determine whether the factual allegations contained in the report, if proven to be accurate, would constitute Misconduct, as defined in this Article IV, Section H. If not, the dean shall consult with the Provost before finalizing a decision and shall then notify the Complainant and Respondent, in writing, of such conclusion and the matter shall be closed. If the dean or his/her designee determines that the factual allegations contained in the report, if proven to be accurate, would constitute Misconduct, the dean or his/her designee shall determine whether to attempt to resolve the issue through an informal resolution process involving all parties to the issue, as described in Article IV, Section H(5) of this Handbook, or whether to commence a formal resolution, as described in Article IV, Section H(6) of this Handbook. The dean shall consult with the Provost before finalizing a decision and shall then notify the Respondent and the Complainant, in writing, of their determination.

5. **Informal Resolution**

Informal resolution provides an opportunity for the dean or their designee, the Complainant and the Respondent to discuss the incident which is the subject of the report of alleged Misconduct and their respective wishes and expectations regarding appropriate resolution of the incident. Neither the Complainant nor the Respondent shall be required to participate in an informal resolution process. The Complainant or the Respondent may, at any time prior to the conclusion of the informal resolution, elect to end their participation in such proceedings. If the Complainant elects to end their participation, the dean or their designee and the Respondent may continue to seek an acceptable resolution. If the Respondent elects to end the informal process, then: (i) the dean or their designee may make a finding regarding responsibility and impose a minor sanction,
as described below; or (ii) the matter shall be referred for formal resolution as described in Article IV, Section H(6) of this Handbook.

The dean or their designee shall structure the informal resolution process in a manner that they deem appropriate given the nature of the incident at issue. The dean or their designee shall have the discretion to engage a qualified third-party to serve as a facilitator or mediator for an informal resolution process, provided such third-party agrees, in writing, to keep confidential all information shared in the course of the informal resolution process.

If, during the course of the informal resolution, parties reach a mutually acceptable outcome, such outcome shall be documented in writing and the matter will be resolved without any further rights to a hearing or appeal.

If, during the course of the informal resolution, the Respondent elects to take responsibility for the alleged conduct, the dean or their designee shall propose a sanction to the Respondent. If the Respondent agrees to such proposed sanction, the matter will be resolved without any further rights to a hearing or appeal.

If the parties do not reach a mutually acceptable outcome or if the Respondent either does not take responsibility for the alleged conduct or objects to such proposed sanction, the dean or their designee may determine whether there is sufficient evidence to find that the Respondent engaged in Misconduct. If the dean or their designee finds sufficient evidence that the Respondent engaged in Misconduct, the dean or his/her designee may impose a minor sanction, as defined in Article IV, Section H(7), on the Respondent. For purposes of this policy, a minor sanction is a sanction that does not involve suspension or termination of employment and does not reduce the then current compensation of the Respondent. If the dean or their designee imposes a minor sanction, they shall notify the Respondent, in writing, of their conclusion, the rationale for such conclusion, and the specific minor sanction(s) imposed. The matter will then be closed and the Respondent shall have no further opportunity for hearing or appeal. The dean may not impose a major sanction, as defined in Article IV, Section H(7), on the Respondent during the informal resolution process without the consent of the Respondent.

The foregoing process shall not apply to reports of alleged sexual harassment under Title IX. The University’s Policy on Preventing and Responding to Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Involving Faculty or Staff shall govern any informal or alternative resolution of reports of sexual harassment under Title IX.

If the matter is not resolved through the informal resolution process, it will be handled in accordance with the formal resolution process outlined below.

6. **Formal Resolution**

   a. *Referral to the Provost.*

If the dean or their designee determines that a report of alleged Misconduct warrants a formal resolution process or if the informal resolution process does not resolve the matter, the dean or their designee shall provide written notice to the Respondent and the Provost of the alleged
Misconduct. The notice shall include a summary of the factual allegations in the report and the nature of the alleged Misconduct, including citing specific policies alleged to have been violated, where applicable.

The Provost or their designee shall review the notice and may seek additional information from the dean or their designee, the Respondent, or others who have knowledge of the matter.

If the matter has not been through the informal resolution process, the Provost or their designee may seek to resolve the matter through the informal resolution process described in Article IV, H(5) of this Handbook, with the Provost or their designee undertaking the responsibilities and assuming the authority of the dean or his/her designee.

The Provost or their designee may also refer the matter for formal investigation pursuant to Article IV, H(6)(c) of this Handbook.

b. **Administrative Leave**

Pending a decision through the formal resolution process, the Provost may impose an administrative leave on the Respondent. An administrative leave may be imposed only when the Provost has a reasonable basis to conclude that: (a) the continued presence of the Respondent on campus or in the classroom may create a risk to the health or safety of one or more members of the University community; or (b) the Respondent poses an ongoing threat of disruption of, or interference with, the educational functions of the University.

Before imposing an administrative leave, the Provost will consult with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate concerning the propriety, length, and other conditions of the leave (the faculty member may waive the right to have the Executive Committee consulted and accept the leave, but the waiver must be in writing). An administrative leave cannot continue indefinitely; should the leave continue beyond 120 days, the Provost shall justify the cause of the delay to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (in the unlikely event that the leave or reassignment continues beyond 240 days, the Provost must so justify the delay to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate at each subsequent 120-day interval).

An administrative leave shall be imposed with pay and the Respondent shall continue to be eligible for University benefits during the administrative leave.

c. **Formal Investigation**

If the Provost or his/her designee determines that a formal investigation is warranted, the Provost or his/her designee shall assign the matter to an appropriate investigator. The nature and extent of the investigation will vary based on the specific circumstances of the matter, but, in all cases, the investigation will be prompt, fair, and impartial.

The Provost may assign responsibility for the investigation to a faculty or staff member or to a qualified, independent third party, provided such third party agrees, in writing, to maintain the confidentiality of the investigation.
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The investigator will interview the Complainant, Respondent and other witnesses who may have information about the incident(s). The investigator may also conduct one or more follow-up interviews with the Complainant, Respondent, or other witnesses. The interviews will be recorded by the investigator for purposes of preparing the investigative report. The investigator has the discretion to determine what witnesses will be interviewed as part of the investigation. The investigator is not required, but may in their discretion, speak with character witnesses. The Respondent has the right to services of an advisor of their choice. The Respondent may have their advisor present for any interview with the investigator. The role of the advisor is to provide support, guidance, and advice to Respondent. However, the Respondent is responsible for presenting their own information during the interview. Advisors may ask questions regarding process but are not permitted to speak on behalf of the Respondent or object to interview questions.

The investigator will also gather relevant evidence, including, but not limited to documents, email messages, text messages, social media postings, video evidence, and other records and documents. At the conclusion of the investigation, the investigator shall prepare a written investigative report that will include a summary of key interviews and other evidence, copies of relevant documentary evidence, and an analysis of the evidence and findings of fact in the investigation. It is not the role of the investigator to draw a conclusion as to whether the Respondent engaged in Misconduct. The investigator will not make recommendations regarding the outcome of conduct or disciplinary process or the imposition of sanctions. The investigator will transmit the final investigative report to the Provost or their designee.

Upon receipt of the investigative report, the Provost or their designee shall provide Respondent with a copy of the investigative report. If the Respondent objects to the findings of fact in the investigative report, the Respondent shall have five (5) business days to submit a written statement to the Provost listing the objections, setting forth in detail the basis for the objections, and attaching any documentary evidence to support the objections.

The Provost or their designee shall review the investigative report and any objections filed by the Respondent. If the Provost or their designee has questions about the investigation, the findings of fact, or seeks additional information, they shall ask the investigator to follow up on the requests. The Provost or their designee may consult with other University officials regarding the investigative report.

The University’s Policy on Preventing and Responding to Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Involving Faculty or Staff shall govern the investigative process for reports of sexual harassment under Title IX.

In cases not involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Provost or their designee shall determine whether to refer the matter to a Faculty Hearing Committee. In making this determination, the Provost or their designee will consider whether the investigative report contains sufficient facts and evidence upon which a reasonable decision-maker could find, by clear and convincing evidence, that the Respondent engaged in Misconduct. The Provost’s decision must be based on the information gathered in the investigation. In cases involving reports of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Provost or their designee shall refer the matter to a Faculty Hearing Committee.
The decision to refer the matter to a Faculty Hearing Committee is not a final determination of responsibility and will not be used as evidence in any subsequent hearing or proceeding.

The Provost or their designee shall provide the Respondent and the President of the Faculty Senate with written notice of a decision to refer the matter to the Faculty Hearing Committee. The notice shall include a summary of the factual allegations in the report and the nature of the alleged Misconduct, including citing specific policies alleged to have been violated, where applicable.

If the Provost or their designee determines that the investigation does not result in sufficient facts or evidence upon which a reasonable decision-maker could find, by clear and convincing evidence, that the Respondent engaged in Misconduct, then the Provost or their designee shall close the investigation. The Provost or their designee shall provide written notice to the Respondent of the decision to close the investigation.

If the report of Misconduct at issue involves alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall be afforded the same rights outlined in this Article IV, Section H(6)(c).

d. Appointment of Faculty Hearing Board

Upon receipt of a notification from the Provost or his/her designee, pursuant to Article IV, Section H(6)(c) of this Handbook, the Faculty Senate President shall request that the chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee select five (5) members of the Faculty Hearing Committee to serve on a Faculty Hearing Board to consider the charges against the Respondent. The Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee shall also appoint a non-voting hearing officer, who shall be responsible for the orderly conduct of the hearing. The hearing officer may be a member of the Faculty Hearing Board or a qualified third-party who agrees, in writing to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings. The Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee should use reasonable efforts to ensure that the Faculty Hearing Board members and hearing officer have no conflict of interest or, in the case of a report of sexual harassment under Title IX, no bias for or against the Complainant or Respondent in the case at hand or complainants or respondents generally. The Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee shall also use reasonable efforts in the selection of the Faculty Hearing Board members and hearing officer to achieve a reasonably balanced representation with regard to the issues involved (e.g., gender or Respondent’s field of expertise). The Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee shall notify the Provost and the Respondent of the names of the proposed Faculty Hearing Board members and the hearing officer.

The Respondent has the right to petition that any member of the Faculty Hearing Board or the hearing officer be removed on the basis of bias or conflict of interest. The Respondent must submit a written petition to the Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee at least ninety-six (96) hours prior to the scheduled hearing seeking removal of a member of the Faculty Hearing Board or the hearing officer stating the reasons for such request. The Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee shall respond to such request, in writing, within forty-eight (48) hours of receipt of the request.

If the report of Misconduct at issue before the Faculty Hearing Board involves alleged sexual
harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall be afforded the same rights as the Respondent as to petition that any member of the Faculty Hearing Board or the hearing officer be removed on the basis of bias or conflict of interest.

e. Rights and Responsibilities of the Respondent

The Respondent shall be afforded the following rights and responsibilities throughout the hearing process:

i. Hearing. The Respondent has the right to a live hearing, conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in this Handbook. At the discretion of the hearing officer, the hearing may be conducted with all parties, advisors, and witnesses physically present in the same location or any or all parties, advisors, and witnesses may appear virtually with technology enabling participants to simultaneously see and hear each other. The hearing will be recorded and a transcript of the hearing shall be made available to the Respondent for inspection and review.

ii. Evidence. The Respondent has the right to a hearing based on reliable evidence presented during the hearing process, including reasonable inferences drawn from such evidence, and reasonable determinations by the fact finder as to the credibility of witness testimony. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the burden of proof and the burden of gathering evidence sufficient to reach a determination regarding responsibility shall rest with the University and not the parties to the hearing. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Faculty Hearing Board is not bound by formal rules of evidence and may consider any evidence or testimony that it deems reasonable reliable.

iii. Advisor. The Respondent has the right to the services of an advisor of their choice. The Respondent is responsible for presenting their own information, and therefore, advisors are not permitted to participate in any hearing before a Faculty Hearing Board, including, but not limited to making oral arguments or statements, questioning witnesses (except as permitted herein), or raising objections during a hearing. An advisor may request a brief recess of the proceedings to provide advice to the Respondent. The Respondent should select as an advisor a person whose schedule allows attendance at the scheduled date and time for the Faculty Hearing Board hearing, as delays will not normally be allowed due to the scheduling conflicts of an advisor. If, in cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Respondent does not have an advisor present at the hearing, the University will provide an advisor of the University’s choice, at no cost, to conduct cross-examination on behalf of the Respondent. Such advisor may be, but is not required to be an attorney.

iv. Right to Remain Silent. The Respondent has the right to remain silent and is advised that any statement they make may be used in evidence against them. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, if the Respondent does not submit to cross-examination at the hearing, the Hearing Board members must not rely on any statement of the Respondent in reaching a determination regarding responsibility, but the hearing board members must not draw an inference regarding responsibility based solely on the Respondent’s decision to remain silent and/or refusal to answer questions under cross-examination.
v. **Notice of Hearing.** The hearing officer shall prepare and deliver to the Respondent a notice of hearing. Such notice may be delivered to the Respondent in person, by electronic mail, by U.S. Mail, or by campus mail. The date of the hearing shall not be less than twenty (20) days from the date of such notice. The notice of hearing shall include:

   a. The name and address of the Respondent;
   b. The date, time, and location of the Faculty Hearing Board hearing;
   c. A description of the alleged Misconduct at issue;
   d. The date, and place of the alleged Misconduct (if known);
   e. The name of the Complainant and, if not the same, the name of the person who filed the complaint (if known);
   f. The name of the hearing officer;
   g. The names and titles of the voting members of the Faculty Hearing Board;
   h. A statement that the Respondent is presumed to be not responsible for the alleged Misconduct until a determination is made at the conclusion of the hearing and any appeal process that the Respondent is responsible;
   i. A statement that the Respondent may have an advisor present who may be, but is not required to be, an attorney;
   j. In cases involving an allegation of sexual harassment under Title IX, a statement that the Respondent have the right to inspect, review, and present at the hearing all evidence, exculpatory and exculpatory, gathered during the investigation; and
   k. Information regarding any policy or Handbook provision prohibiting knowingly making false statements or knowingly submitting false information during the investigation, hearing, or appeal process.

vi. **Written Objections to Factual Findings of Investigative Report.** The Respondent has the right, upon request, to review the investigative report at any time after it is delivered to the Provost and prior to the hearing before the Faculty Hearing Board. If the Respondent objects to the findings of fact in the investigative report, the Respondent may submit a written statement to the hearing officer listing the objections, setting forth in detail the basis for the objections, and attaching any documentary evidence to support the objections. The Respondent’s written statement of objections shall be included in the hearing record.

vii. **Witness List.** The Respondent has the right to receive the list of witnesses that the Faculty Hearing Board intends to call at a hearing in accordance with the timeframes set forth in Article IV, Section H(6)(g) of the Handbook. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Respondent has the right to receive the list of witnesses that the other party intends to call at hearing in accordance with the timeframes set forth in Article IV, Section H(6)(g) of the Handbook.

viii. **Witness Statements.** If a witness submits a written statement, the Respondent will
be provided an opportunity to review such statement in accordance with the timeframes set forth in Article IV, Section H(6)(g) of the Handbook. In order to ensure the confidentiality of the disciplinary hearing and to protect the privacy rights of the Respondent and other witnesses, the Respondent shall not copy, reproduce, disseminate, or disclose to anyone other than their advisor any such witness statements and shall return such witness statements to the hearing officer at the conclusion of the hearing. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Hearing Board members must not rely on any statement of a witness who does not submit to cross-examination at the hearing in reaching a determination regarding responsibility, but the hearing board members must not draw an inference regarding responsibility based solely on the witness’ refusal to answer questions under cross-examination. Following the hearing, the hearing officer shall permit the Respondent to have access to such witness statements to the extent needed for any appeal conducted under this Article IV, Section H of the Handbook.

ix. Documentary Evidence. Subject to applicable privacy laws, including FERPA, the Respondent has the right to all documentary evidence that the Faculty Hearing Board intends to present at the hearing in accordance with the timeframes set forth in Article IV, Section H(6)(g) of the Handbook. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Respondent has the right to all documentary evidence that the other party intends to present at the hearing in accordance with the timeframes set forth in Article IV, Section H(6)(g) of the Handbook. In order to ensure the confidentiality of the disciplinary hearing and to protect the privacy rights of the Respondent, Complainant, and other witnesses, the Respondent shall not copy, reproduce, disseminate, or disclose to anyone other than their advisor any such documentary evidence and shall return such documentary evidence to the hearing officer at the conclusion of the hearing. Following the hearing, the hearing officer shall permit the Respondent to have access to such documentary evidence to the extent needed for any appeal conducted under this Article IV, Section H of the Handbook.

x. Attendance at the Hearing. The Respondent and their advisor have the right to attend the entire Faculty Hearing Board hearing except for the deliberations of the Faculty Hearing Board. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Hearing Officer shall have the ability to arrange for the participation of the Respondent or the Complainant in all or part of the hearing by real-time video conferencing.

xi. Right to Offer Evidence and Witness Testimony. The Respondent has the right to offer evidence and oral testimony of witnesses that is relevant or reasonably related to the issues before the Faculty Hearing Board in accordance with the timeframes set forth in Article IV, Section H(6)(g) of the Handbook.

xii. Right to Offer Witnesses Statements. The Respondent has the right to offer written statements of witnesses that are relevant or reasonably related to the issues before the Faculty Hearing Board in accordance with the timeframes set forth in Article IV, Section H(6)(g) of the Handbook. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Hearing Board members must not rely on any statement of a witness who does not submit to cross-examination at the hearing in
reaching a determination regarding responsibility, but the hearing board members must not draw an inference regarding responsibility based solely on the witness’ refusal to answer questions under cross-examination.

xiii. Questions for Witnesses. The Respondent has the right to submit to the hearing officer a list of questions that the Respondent wishes the hearing officer to ask any witness who gives oral testimony. The Respondent must submit his/her initial list of questions to the hearing officer in accordance with the timeframes set forth in Article IV, Section H(6)(g). Notwithstanding the foregoing, in cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the advisor for the Respondent may, directly, orally, and in real time, ask the other party and any witnesses relevant questions and follow-up questions, including those challenging credibility. The hearing officer shall use their reasonable discretion in determining the relevance or appropriateness of any proposed question submitted by the Respondent or posed by an advisor for the Respondent or Complainant and the hearing officer shall not be obligated to ask or permit all of the questions proposed by the Respondent or Complainant. In cases involving alleged sexual misconduct under Title IX, the hearing officer shall comply with 34 C.F.R. §100.45(b)(6)(i) in determining the relevance of proposed questions and explaining any ruling on relevance. Where appropriate, the Respondent may request a brief recess of the hearing to prepare such questions. The hearing officer, in their reasonable discretion, may grant or deny such request.

dxiv. Closed Hearing. Faculty Hearing Board hearings are closed to the public. Admission of any person not a party to or witness in the hearing shall be at the sole discretion of the hearing officer. The Respondent shall have the right to attend the entire hearing, except for the deliberations of the Faculty Hearing Board.

dxv. Failure to Attend Hearing. The Respondent has the responsibility to attend the scheduled Faculty Hearing Board hearing. If the Respondent, without valid excuse or authorization from the hearing officer, fails to attend the hearing as scheduled, the Faculty Hearing Board may proceed in the Respondent’s absence to a determination of the matter, and if appropriate, impose sanctions.

dxvi. Notice of Outcome. The Respondent has the right to written notice of the outcome of the Faculty Hearing Board hearing, including a brief summary of the rationale for such outcome and sanctions (if any), by 5:00 PM on the fifth business day following the conclusion of the hearing. The hearing officer of the board at their discretion can extend this timeline for good cause and with written notice to the Respondent. The notice of outcome shall include a brief description of the appeal rights of the Respondent under the Handbook. The Respondent also has the right to written notice of any change in the outcome or sanctions imposed and notice as to when such outcome and sanctions shall be deemed final. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the content of the notice of outcome shall comply with 34 C.F.R. §100.45(b)(7)(ii) and the notice shall be provided to the Respondent and the Complainant simultaneously.

dxvii. Appeal. The Respondent has the right to appeal the decision of the Faculty Hearing Board, in accordance with the standards and procedures for appeal established in Article IV, Section H(8) of this Handbook. The determination regarding
responsibility shall become final either upon the date a final determination upon an appeal is issued or, if no appeal is filed, on the date of the deadline for filing an appeal.

xviii. Privacy of the Respondent. The Respondent has the right to preservation of privacy, to the extent reasonably possible and allowed by law. The Respondent has the right not to have irrelevant prior sexual or relationship history or physical or mental health history admitted as evidence in a Faculty Hearing Board hearing. The Respondent has the right not to have released to the public by University officials any personally identifiable information about the Respondent, without their consent, except to the extent such disclosure is required by applicable law, regulation, or court order.

f. Rights and Responsibilities of the Complainant.

If the report of Misconduct at issue before the Faculty Hearing Board involves an alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall be afforded the same rights as and shall have the same responsibilities of the Respondent as outlined in this Article IV, Section H(6)(e) of the Handbook.

g. Pre-Hearing Submission Deadlines.

i. Submission of Witness Lists and Witness Statements. The Respondent shall provide the hearing officer their respective lists of witnesses and copies of any witness statements by 5:00 p.m. on the fourth (4th) day before the hearing.

ii. Submission of Documentary, Electronic, and Other Evidence. The Respondent shall submit copies of all documentary, electronic, or other evidence to the hearing officer by 5:00 p.m. on the fourth (4th) day before the hearing.

iii. Statement of Objections to Investigative Report. The Respondent shall provide the hearing officer with their respective statements of objection to the investigative report, if any, by 5:00 p.m. on the third (3rd) day before the hearing.

iv. Access to Other Party’s Pre-Hearing Submissions. Upon receipt of a pre-hearing submission from either the Complainant or the Respondent, the hearing officer shall provide the other party with access to such submission as soon as reasonably possible and in no event, later than twenty-four (24) hours following the submission.

v. Faculty Hearing Board Witnesses, Documentary, Electronic, and Other Evidence. The hearing officer shall provide the Respondent with access to the list of witnesses to be called by the Faculty Hearing Board, any witness statements, and any documentary, electronic, or other evidence not included in the investigative report at least three (3) days prior to the hearing.
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vi. **Questions for Witnesses.** The Respondent shall submit their respective lists of questions for witnesses to the hearing officer or their designee at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the commencement of the hearing.

vii. **Extension of Submission Deadlines.** The hearing officer may extend the time frame for submitting evidence, witness statements, witness lists, and witness questions, at their sole discretion, and only for good cause. If timelines are extended, the Hearing Officer or their designee shall provide written notice to the Respondent.

viii. **Applicability of Time Frames to the Complainant.** If the report of Misconduct at issue before the Faculty Hearing Board involves an alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the rights afforded by and provisions of this Article IV, Section H(6)(g) shall apply equally to the Complainant and the Respondent.

h. **Pre-Hearing Procedures.**

   i. The Respondent shall be afforded the opportunity to meet (in person or by telephone or videoconference) with the hearing officer or their designee prior to the hearing. The purpose of this meeting is to advise the Respondent of the hearing procedures and their rights in connection with the hearing. The Respondent’s advisor is permitted to attend this meeting.

   ii. If the report of Misconduct at issue before the Faculty Hearing Board involves an alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall be afforded the opportunity to meet (in person or by telephone or videoconference) with the hearing officer prior to the hearing. The purpose of this meeting is to advise the Complainant of the hearing procedures and their rights in connection with the hearing. The Complainant’s advisor is permitted to attend this meeting.

   iii. The hearing officer shall review all written materials prior to submission to the Faculty Hearing Board to ensure that the hearing record does not contain irrelevant, unfairly prejudicial, or inadmissible information, as determined by the Hearing Officer in their reasonable discretion and, in cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, as specified in 34 C.F.R. §100.45(b)(6)(i).

i. **The Hearing Record.**

   i. The hearing officer shall create a hearing record comprising the following: (a) the hearing written notice to the Respondent; (b) the investigative report with its attachments; (c) witness statements submitted by the Faculty Hearing Board, the Complainant (if applicable), and the Respondent; (d) the documentary, electronic, and other evidence submitted by the Faculty Hearing Board, the Complainant (if applicable), and the Respondent; and (e)
the hearing transcript, following completion of the hearing.

ii. The hearing officer shall provide the Complainant (if applicable) and the Respondent with access to the hearing record at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the hearing.

iii. The hearing officer shall convene one or more pre-hearing meetings of the members of the Faculty Hearing Board to review the charge(s), to go over the contents of the hearing record, and to answer any procedural questions. This meeting shall be held at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the hearing.

iv. The hearing officer shall ensure that there are sufficient copies of the hearing record available during the hearing for all Faculty Hearing Board members, the Respondent, the Complainant (if applicable), for testifying witnesses to use during their testimony.

j. Authority and Other Duties of the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer shall preside over and conduct the hearing and has the authority described herein.

i. The hearing officer may appoint a recording secretary or other staff as needed. The hearing officer shall also arrange for the preparation of a transcript of the hearing, excluding the deliberations of the Faculty Hearing Board.

ii. The hearing officer may control the admission of persons to the hearing. The hearing officer may order any person in attendance that does not conduct themselves in an orderly and respectful manner to leave. Obstructive, contumacious, disruptive or noisy conduct in the presence of the hearing board by any person, including the Respondent, the Complainant (if applicable), a witness, or an advisor, may result in that person being removed from the hearing.

iii. The hearing officer may control the questioning of the Respondent, the Complainant, and any witnesses by Faculty Hearing Board members, the Respondent or their advisor, and the Complainant (if applicable) or their advisor to protect witnesses from improper questions, insulting treatment, and unnecessary inquiry into their private affairs.

iv. The hearing officer may exclude witnesses from the hearing room except when they are testifying.

k. General Procedural Rules of the Faculty Hearing Board.

i. All members of the Faculty Hearing Board must be present throughout the hearing.

ii. If a member of the Faculty Hearing Board must leave before the hearing is
complete with good cause, the hearing officer may at their sole discretion recess the hearing and reconvene the hearing within twenty-four (24) hours.

iii. If a voting member disqualifies themselves or for good cause must withdraw from the hearing, the hearing officer shall select a replacement from the Faculty Hearing Committee. The hearing officer shall, after consultation with the Respondent and the Complainant (if applicable) in open session, provide the replacement with a summary of all prior proceedings.

iv. No person shall address the Faculty Hearing Board or submit questions to the hearing officer for any witness (including the Respondent, the Complainant or an advisor) without first being recognized by the hearing officer.

1. Order of the Hearing.

i. The Hearing Officer shall read a summary of the alleged Misconduct at issue to the Respondent and the Respondent shall state whether they accept or deny responsibility for such alleged Misconduct. In the absence of a response, the Respondent shall be deemed not to have accepted responsibility for the alleged Misconduct.

ii. If the Respondent does not accept responsibility for the alleged Misconduct, evidence, witness testimony, and/or witness statements admitted by the hearing officer shall be presented that support or refute such allegation.

iii. If the Respondent accepts responsibility for the charge(s), evidence, witness testimony, and/or witness statements admitted by the hearing officer shall be presented that will assist the Faculty Hearing Board in determining a recommended sanction.

iv. The hearing officer shall remind all parties that the standard of evidence for cases other than those involving reports of sexual harassment under Title IX shall be clear and convincing evidence, meaning that in order to find the Respondent responsible, the Faculty Hearing Board must find clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent is responsible for the Misconduct alleged. In cases involving reports of sexual harassment under Title IX, the hearing officer shall remind all parties that the standard of evidence shall be the standard of evidence adopted by the University for reports of sexual harassment under Title IX, which shall be the same for reports involving faculty, students or staff, meaning that in order to find the Respondent responsible, the Faculty Hearing Board must find by the standard of evidence adopted by the University for reports of sexual harassment under Title IX that the Respondent is responsible for sexual harassment under Title IX.

v. The Respondent shall be provided an opportunity to make an opening statement.
vi. The Members of the Faculty Hearing Board shall direct the hearing officer to call witnesses and/or present evidence and witness statements.

vii. The Respondent shall have the opportunity to testify, present evidence, call witnesses, and present witness statements.

viii. Prior to the initial deliberations by the Faculty Hearing Board, the Respondent shall be given the opportunity to make a closing statement to the Faculty Hearing Board. This statement shall not address the impact of the incident, the investigation or the hearing, on the Respondent.

ix. The hearing officer will excuse all parties and witnesses so that the members of the Faculty Hearing Board may deliberate in private on the issue of responsibility for the charges at issue.

x. After deliberations on the issue of responsibility are completed, the hearing officer shall meet with the Respondent to notify them of the decision of the Faculty Hearing Board on the issue of responsibility.

xi. If the Faculty Hearing Board finds the Respondent responsible for the charges at issue, the hearing will be reconvened after the notice required herein. The Respondent will have an opportunity to make an additional statement to the Faculty Hearing Board regarding the issue of sanctions and the impact of the conduct on the Respondent.

xii. The Hearing Officer will excuse all parties and witnesses so that the members of the Faculty Hearing Board may deliberate in private on the issue of sanctions.

xiii. After deliberations on the issue of sanctions are completed, the Hearing Officer shall meet with the Respondent to notify the Respondent of the sanctions recommended by the Faculty Hearing Board and the effective date of such sanctions.

xiv. The Hearing Officer will also provide information to the Respondent related to written notification of the decision and appeal rights.

xv. The Hearing Officer will adjourn the hearing.

xvi. If the report of Misconduct at issue before the Faculty Hearing Board involves an alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall be afforded the rights set forth in subsections v, vii, and viii, x, xi, xiii above.

m. Procedure for Oral Testimony.

i. The investigator may be one of the witnesses called to testify.
ii. The Respondent, the Complainant (if applicable) and all witnesses shall testify under oath or affirmation.

iii. The members of the Faculty Hearing Board shall be given the opportunity to ask questions of the Respondent, Complainant (if applicable) and all witnesses.

iv. The hearing officer will ask questions submitted by the party calling the witness.

v. The hearing officer will ask questions submitted by a party as cross-examination of a witness. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the advisor for the Respondent and Complainant shall ask questions of the witnesses, as described in Article IV, Section H(6)(e)(xiii) of this Handbook.

vi. The members of the Faculty Hearing Board shall have the opportunity to ask questions of the witnesses.

vii. The Respondent shall have the opportunity to submit follow-up questions for the witnesses to the hearing officer. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, the advisor for the Respondent and the Complainant shall ask questions follow up questions of the witnesses, as described in Article IV, Section H(6)(e)(xiii) of this Handbook.

viii. Members of the Faculty Hearing Board shall have a final opportunity to ask questions of the Respondent.

ix. If the report of Misconduct at issue before the Faculty Hearing Board involves an alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall be afforded the rights and shall be subject to questions as set forth in subsections ii, iii, iv v, vi, vii, and viii above.

n. Deliberation of the Faculty Hearing Board.

i. The voting members of the Faculty Hearing Board shall deliberate in private and reach a decision based only upon the evidence introduced at the hearing. The hearing officer is present during the deliberation, but does not have a vote.

ii. The members of Faculty Hearing Board shall not make any finding of fact that is not supported by the evidence presented at the hearing. In making findings of fact in cases other than those involving reports of sexual harassment under Title IX, the members of the Faculty Hearing Board shall apply the clear and convincing standard of evidence. In cases involving reports of sexual harassment under Title IX, the members of the Faculty Hearing Board shall apply the standard of evidence adopted by the University for reports of sexual harassment under Title IX, which shall be the same for
reports involving faculty, students or staff.

iii. If a majority of Faculty Hearing Board members find the Respondent responsible for the alleged Misconduct, the recommendation of the Faculty Hearing Board shall be that the Respondent be found responsible.

iv. If the Respondent is found responsible, the recommended sanction generally shall be chosen from those listed in Article IV, Section H(7) of the Handbook.

v. The hearing officer shall write a brief statement outlining the rationale for the decision and sanction(s) after the Faculty Hearing Board has reached its decision. The members of the Faculty Hearing Board shall sign the statement, and the statement will be placed in the case file. The statement shall be furnished to the Respondent, consistent with the requirements of this Article IV, Section H, simultaneously to the Complainant in cases involved sexual harassment under Title IX, and to the Provost or his/her designee.

o. Advice and Assistance for the Hearing Officer and Faculty Hearing Board.

At any time during the formal resolution process, the hearing officer and the Faculty Hearing Board may seek advice and assistance from the Provost, the President of the Faculty Senate, or the University’s General Counsel, or their designee. Such advice and guidance shall generally be limited to procedural matters, interpretative matters, or legal matters and shall not go to the ultimate issues of responsibility or the appropriate sanction.

p. Review by the Provost.

Upon receipt of a recommendation by the Faculty Hearing Board to find the Respondent responsible for Misconduct and to impose sanctions, the Respondent shall have ten (10) business days to submit a statement to the Provost.

The Provost shall consider the report of the Faculty Hearing Board, the statement of the Respondent, if any, and shall have access to the entire hearing record, including any transcript of the proceeding. The Provost shall use reasonable efforts to complete their review within thirty (30) days of receipt of the Respondent’s statement, provided however, that such time frame may be extended for good cause.

Should the Provost agree with the Faculty Hearing Board’s findings and recommendation about sanctions, he/she shall so inform the faculty member, the Faculty Hearing Board, and the President in writing, formalizing what action, if any, is to be taken, subject to the Respondent’s right to appeal, as set forth in Article IV, Section H (8) of the Handbook.

If the Provost disagrees with the Faculty Hearing Board’s decision regarding responsibility and/or recommendation about sanctions, the Provost will determine the appropriate action to be taken only after consulting with the Faculty Hearing Board. The Provost shall then inform the Respondent, the Faculty Hearing Board, and the President in writing, of the action to be taken,
subject to the Respondent’s right to appeal, as set forth in Article IV, Section H (8) of the Handbook.

If the report of Misconduct at issue before the Faculty Hearing Board involves an alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall also have a right to submit a statement to the Provost and to receive notice of the Provost’s decision.

7. Remedies and Sanctions.

Remedies and sanctions for Misconduct may include, but are not limited to the minor and major sanctions listed below.

a. Minor Sanctions. Minor sanctions shall include, but shall not be limited to:

- A warning not to repeat the offending conduct and/or special monitoring of teaching or research;
- Separation of the parties involved, an order of “no contact” between the parties involved, or reasonable limitations on access to University facilities and events;
- Required participation in an educational program (for example, about discrimination); or
- A letter of reprimand.

b. Major Sanctions. Major sanctions shall include, but shall not be limited to:

- Removal from a research project (including long-term disbarment), suspension of access to laboratories, or other reassignment of duties;
- Loss of office, travel funds, research funds, etc.;
- Denial of a pay increase;
- Reduction in rank or salary or loss of endowed chair;
- Probation;
- Suspension with or without pay; or
- Dismissal.

As used in this Handbook, the term "dismissal" refers to termination of Tenured faculty member or a faculty member on a Tenure-Track or Continuing Appointment before the end of the specified contractual term. The term dismissal and the procedures set forth in this Article IV, Section H do not apply to termination of Tenure-Track/Probationary Appointment or Continuing Appointment With Fixed Term at the end of the then current contract period and
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do not apply to the termination of Temporary and Restricted Appointments.


a. Petition to Grievance Committee.

The Respondent may petition the Faculty Grievance Committee alleging that the process followed in Respondent’s case was conducted in a manner materially inconsistent with Article IV, Section H of the Handbook. Such a petition may be submitted at any of the following stages of the disciplinary process:

- Upon receipt of written notice of the imposition of a minor sanction against the Respondent by the Dean;
- Upon receipt of the investigative report;
- Upon receipt of written notice of the Faculty Hearing Board’s determination; or
- Upon receipt of written notice of the Provost’s determination following review of a Faculty Hearing Board recommendation.

Such petition shall be subject to the procedures set forth in Article IV, Section G(1) of the Handbook. To initiate a grievance, the Respondent must submit a written petition to the chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of written notice of the outcome of the stage of the disciplinary process about which the Respondent seeks to file a petition. While the grievance is under consideration by the Grievance Committee, the disciplinary process will be stayed until the Grievance Committee makes its recommendation.

In hearings that involved an alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall have the same rights as the Respondent to petition the Faculty Grievance Committee. While the grievance is under consideration by the Grievance Committee, the disciplinary process will be stayed until the Grievance Committee makes its recommendation.

b. Appeal to the President

In cases that do not involve allegations of sexual harassment under Title IX, when the decision of the Provost pursuant to Article IV, Section H(6)(p) of the Handbook involves the imposition of a major sanction, as defined Article IV, Section H(7) of the Handbook, and the Respondent is a Tenured faculty member or a faculty member on a Probationary/Tenure Track or Continuing Appointment With Fixed Term, the Respondent shall have the right to appeal to the President on the following grounds:

i. A witness at the Faculty Hearing Board hearing lied and the testimony was both material and adverse to the appealing party;

ii. New evidence of a material nature is available that was not available at the time of the Faculty Hearing Board hearing, unless such evidence was or could have been available prior to or at the time of Faculty Hearing Board hearing; or

iii. The sanction(s) approved by the Provost was disproportionate to the findings of fact.
In cases that involved alleged sexual harassment under Title IX, the Respondent and the Complainant shall each have the right to appeal the decision of the Provost on the following grounds:

i. A procedural irregularity that affected the outcome of the hearing, which shall be considered by the Grievance Committee;

ii. New evidence is available that was not available at the time of the Faculty Hearing Board hearing that could affect the outcome of the hearing, unless such evidence was or could have been available prior to or at the time of Faculty Hearing Board hearing; or

iii. The Title IX Coordinator, investigator, or a member or members of the Faculty Hearing Board had a conflict of interest or bias for or against the Respondent or Complainant, or respondents or complainants generally that affected the outcome of the matter.

An appeal to the President must be made in writing within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of notice of the decision of the Provost pursuant to Article IV, Section H(6)(p) of the Handbook.

Upon receipt of an appeal to the President, the Provost will transmit to the President the hearing record, any statement filed with the Provost, and a copy of the Provost’s decision in the case. The President’s review will be based on the records transmitted by the Provost and the written appeal of the Respondent and Complainant (where applicable).

While the appeal is under consideration by the President, the disciplinary process will be stayed until the President’s review is complete.

After the President’s review, the President may either sustain the decision of the Provost or return the proceeding to the Provost or the Faculty Hearing Board, depending on where the earliest disagreement occurs, with specific objections and/or instructions. In the event the proceeding is returned to the Provost or Faculty Hearing Board, the Provost or the Faculty Hearing Board will then reconsider, taking into account the President’s written objections and receiving new evidence if necessary. The President will make a final decision only after study of the report of reconsideration; the decision will be transmitted to the Respondent and simultaneously to the Complainant (if applicable) in writing.

c. Appeal to the Board of Trustees.

When the final decision of the President includes the sanction of dismissal, the Respondent may appeal the dismissal to the Board of Trustees of the University on the grounds that dismissal is disproportionate given the findings of fact in the case. In cases involving findings of sexual harassment under Title IX, the Complainant shall also have the right to submit a statement to the Board of Trustees in connection with the appeal.

Upon receipt of an appeal to the Board of Trustees, the President will transmit to the Rector of the Board of Trustees the hearing record, any statement filed with the Provost, a copy of the Provost’s
decision in the case, any appeal submitted to the President, the President’s written decision, any report of reconsideration from the Faculty Hearing Committee or Provost, and a copy of the President’s final decision.

The Board of Trustees may delegate responsibility for the appeal to a standing or an ad hoc committee of the Board of Trustees. The review by the Board of Trustees will be based on the records transmitted by the President and the written appeal of the Respondent and Complainant (if applicable).

While the appeal is under consideration by the Board of Trustees, the disciplinary process will be stayed until the Board of Trustees makes a decision.

The Board, or its designated committee, may sustain the decision of the President, reduce the sanction, or return the proceeding to the President, the Provost, or Faculty Hearing Board, with specific objections and/or instructions. The President, Provost, or Faculty Hearing Board will then reconsider, taking into account the Board of Trustees’ stated objections. The Board of Trustees, or its designated committee, will make a final decision only after study of the report of reconsideration by the President, Provost, or Faculty Hearing Board (as applicable). The Respondent and the Complainant (if applicable) will be notified in writing of the Board of Trustee’s decision.

I. Faculty External Consulting Policy

1. 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.

2. 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, e.g., 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.

3. 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 classroom 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.

4. 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.

J. Nepotism and Consensual Relationships with Students

1. Nepotism and Personal Relationship Policy

Faculty acting in a supervisory or hiring capacity for other faculty or staff shall comply with the University’s Nepotism and Personal Relationship Policy.
2. Consensual Dating and/or Sexual Relationships with Students

The relationships addressed by this Article IV, Section J(2) are romantic or sexual relationships in which the parties freely consent. Sexual harassment and non-consensual sexual conduct are addressed in the University’s Policy on Preventing and Responding to Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Involving Faculty or Staff.

For purposes of Article IV, Section J(2) of this Handbook, a dating relationship is defined as a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature. The existence of such a relationship will be determined based on the reporting party’s statement and with consideration of the length of the relationship, the type of relationship, and the frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relationship. A sexual relationship is defined as a relationship that involves one or more instances of sexual contact or sexual intercourse, both as defined in the University’s Policy Prohibiting Sexual Misconduct.

The University prohibits any faculty member, including part-time faculty, from knowingly engaging in a consensual dating and/or sexual relationship with any student with whom the faculty member has any direct or indirect supervisory, evaluative or collaborative relationship. The phrase “supervisory, evaluative, or collaborative relationship” refers to any relationship between a faculty member and a student, both within and outside the classroom, and in all university-sponsored academic, co-curricular, and extra-curricular activities, wherein the faculty member: (i) supervises the academic or non-academic work of a student; (ii) evaluates the academic work or non-academic work of a student, including assigning grades or contributing to performance evaluations; or (iii) collaborates with students on research, academic activities, or co-curricular activities. By way of example and not limitation, a supervisor, evaluative, or collaborative relationship includes teaching, research collaboration, employment of research assistants, academic advising, advising student activities and student organizations, service on evaluation committees that confer or recommend the conferral of awards, prizes and other forms of recognition, and thesis committees.

3. Supervisory, Evaluative, and Collaborative Relationships with Family Members

Faculty members are prohibited from engaging in a direct or indirect supervisory, evaluative or collaborative relationship with members of their immediate family who are students at the University.

4. Exemptions

The dean of the school where a faculty member has a primary appointment or the University’s Provost may grant an exemption from this policy for good cause shown, but only after the dean/Provost has ensured that the relationship does not impair the education of any student(s) and does not give rise to a conflict of interest. Any such exemption must be in writing and must specify any conditions the dean/Provost has imposed.

When determining whether there is good cause, the dean/Provost shall consider various factors including the actual or possible connection, if any, between the faculty member’s official duties...
and the student’s program of study, the feasibility of imposing conditions that prevent any conflict of interest or other detriment to the educational function, and whether the faculty member and student are in a marriage or involved in a committed relationship that predated the appointment of the faculty member and/or the enrollment of the student in the relevant degree-seeking program.

V. 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 II, 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 II, 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.

Approved by the Faculty on June 26, 2020
Approved by the Board of Trustees and Effective August 13, 2020
VI. 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

VI.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, I.D.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
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.

Effective August 17, 2022
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
VI.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
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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.
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VI.D School of Professional and Continuing Studies Standards and Processes for Promotion

In the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, (hereafter “SPCS”), we believe the process for promotion should support the decisions each faculty makes with the Dean to become a candidate for review. There are various paths to promotion in SPCS, all of which demonstrate a focus on and support for achieving the overall mission of the school. In keeping with the
approach of the AAUP, the faculty of SPCS embrace the importance of faculty’s role in shared governance of the institution, the school, individual programs and the curriculum within the school. Faculty in SPCS have administrative roles in their respective programs and exercise program-specific decision making within the parameters of overall school governance structure. In SPCS, our philosophy supports and encourages faculty to be promoted and to seek each level of advancement in their academic careers. The promotion process allows SPCS faculty members to demonstrate their continuous growth and development in the areas of teaching, program development and administration, service and scholarship over their entire career. This document outlines a blueprint for how the SPCS constitutes and applies that philosophy of promotion and supports its faculty in their professional advancement.

The SPCS Full-Time Faculty

As is the case with the other four schools, the responsibilities of faculty members in SPCS include teaching and advising, service to the University and scholarship. In SPCS, however, faculty also have academic program development and administration responsibilities. In the SPCS, contracts and expectations are specific to the unique needs of the SPCS and may vary from year to year. The SPCS embraces the importance of faculty’s ability to seek promotion of rank, which assesses a faculty member’s growth in their profession, their efforts to advance the mission of the school and the faculty member’s contributions to their field of expertise and to the University.

Full-time faculty in SPCS fall into two tracks: traditional track faculty and clinical track faculty. Full-time traditional faculty members are eligible for promotion in rank without tenure through the rank of full professor. Traditional track faculty in the SPCS consist of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Clinical track faculty in the SPCS consist of Instructor of Clinical Practice, Assistant Professor of Clinical Practice, Associate Professor of Clinical Practice, or Professor of Clinical Practice. Traditional track faculty roles are envisioned as teacher scholar-oriented in nature, with extensive discipline-specific academic and curricular expertise, while actively contributing to the scholarly discourse in their respective fields and incorporating their expertise into their teaching. Clinical track faculty roles are envisioned as practitioner-oriented in nature, with extensive practical field-based expertise and understanding of the pragmatic needs of their respective fields as well as community workforce needs, while actively incorporating their practical expertise into their teaching.

“Traditional Track Faculty” refers to a faculty member at any rank whose duties and responsibilities are focused on teaching, academic program development and administration, service, and scholarship. As a school of professional and continuing studies, SPCS traditional track faculty promotion expectations are differentiated from clinical track faculty by having a scholarship expectation including but not limited to Boyer’s (1997) scholarship of engagement. Traditional track faculty may hold a 9-month contract or a 12-month contract. Traditional track faculty on a 9-month contract are responsible for teaching, scholarship, and service, while traditional track faculty who hold a 12-month contract are responsible for teaching, scholarship, service, and academic program development and administration. Traditional track faculty may serve as academic program chairs.

“Clinical Track Faculty” refers to a faculty member at any rank whose duties and responsibilities are primarily focused on teaching, service, and academic program development...
and administration. Clinical track faculty promotion requirements are differentiated from traditional track faculty by the absence of a scholarship expectation and the presence in all cases of academic program development and administration expectations and service. Clinical track faculty are typically 12-month contract appointments due to their program administration expectations and/or additional teaching responsibilities (may include engagement and recruiting, advising, increased course load, responsibilities, additional administrative responsibilities). Clinical track faculty will not typically serve as academic program chairs, but can serve as assistant chairs.

Qualifications and Initial Rank

Basic degree qualifications are outlined in the University’s policy on the Academic and Professional Preparation Requirements for Faculty, and as required for the delivery of services, appropriate licensure, and professional experience may also be required. Faculty in SPCS who do not have a terminal degree hold the rank of Instructor. Upon completion of a terminal degree, promotion from the Instructor to the Assistant Professor level occurs at the beginning of the next academic year’s contract. Faculty with a terminal degree enter at the level of Assistant Professor or above. Change in rank from Instructor to Assistant Professor (Traditional and Clinical) is based on degree held and does not require review by the Promotion Committee. Terminal degrees are defined as the highest degree that can be attained in the field, and typically are a doctorate.

Adjunct Faculty and Staff with Faculty Status

This document applies to full-time faculty only; Staff with faculty status are not promotable in either track. Promotion policies and standards for adjunct faculty are defined in the Adjunct Faculty Achievement Portfolio.

Processes for Promotion for SPCS Full-Time Faculty

Appointments for all full-time faculty (traditional and clinical) begin with an initial probationary appointment of up to three (3) years. Thereafter, full-time faculty are eligible for recurring continuing appointments of up to five (5) years per appointment. Presumptive renewal of an appointment is based on Annual Reviews with the Dean. In both tracks, eligibility for promotion, pending productivity, begins after the initial probationary period. Eligibility for subsequent promotion typically begins five years after initial promotion.

In the traditional and clinical tracks, eligibility for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor commences with the first 5-year appointment following the initial probationary appointment. Eligibility for promotion from Associate to Professor commences with the second 5-year appointment. Promotion expectations for full-time faculty are differentiated across Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Professor levels. Promotion for faculty addresses effectiveness in the current position, as noted in Faculty Annual Reviews with the Dean.
Assistant Professors in the traditional and clinical tracks develop their skills and expertise across the core areas of teaching, service, academic program development and administration, and depending on appointment, scholarship (traditional track). Assistant Professors in the traditional track are distinct from the clinical track in that they are creating a scholarly body of knowledge in their field/discipline.

Associate Professors are established in their field in these respective areas of responsibility. Professors are leaders in their field in their respective areas of responsibility.

**Standards for Promotion for SPCS Full-Time Faculty**

Each faculty member in the SPCS is charged, through the annual faculty review process, with specific objectives in each assigned area of responsibility. When a faculty member is hired, general expectations and proportionality for teaching, service, and academic program development and administration, and/or scholarship are outlined in the appointment letter. Significant changes in the proportionality of teaching/service/administration/scholarship will be outlined in the annual review process. As promotion is considered, the standards in each category remain consistent, but the expectations for volume of accomplishment in each area will be calibrated to the proportional responsibilities of the faculty member documented in the appointment and annual Dean’s review letters. Based on the Dean-faculty agreement and letters, proportions of time and focus will vary among candidates, depending on appointment, field, and departmental and school needs. Annual review letters from the Dean will address the past academic year’s accomplishments and the agreed-upon expectations for the coming academic year.

Faculty will establish, annually with the Dean, agreement on each faculty member’s unique responsibilities and goals and will establish the value/proportionality of engagement in each of the four faculty responsibility categories, as appropriate to their role and the needs of the school. As such, an annual agreement between the faculty member and the Dean will delineate the faculty member’s percentage of effort in teaching, academic program development and administration, service, and, and/or scholarship. The Promotion Committee will judge the candidate on standards noted above and outlined in their annual review letters from the Dean. The Dean is obligated to provide reasonable support to faculty to obtain each year's individual goals, leading up to the candidate being considered for promotion.

**Teaching**

**Standards of Excellence in Teaching**

All faculty (traditional and clinical) in SPCS are expected to show excellence in teaching through their courses. Excellence in teaching is characterized by the development and implementation of challenging courses with high levels of rigor, and teaching strategies that encourage critical thinking and student interaction. Excellence in teaching also is exhibited through extensive course preparation and knowledge of course content, remaining current in the scholarly field and with pedagogical best practices.

**Evidence of Excellence in Teaching**
Teaching is a complex endeavor with many dimensions and teaching excellence cannot be evaluated with a universal template. Rather, faculty can illustrate their teaching excellence across time and with a variety of types of evidence. Faculty can illustrate their preparedness for teaching with clear and organized syllabi and teaching materials that illustrate innovative techniques and approaches, designing new courses which are rigorous and relevant, documentation of the continuous improvement of existing courses with up-to-date information and strategies, faculty-created course materials, and exhibiting consistent preparedness for class meetings and thoughtfully developed assessments with clearly communicated expectations.

Faculty may also exhibit excellence in teaching by teaching a variety of courses over time, assisting the department in curricular restructuring and development, participating in and/or presenting at pedagogy-focused conferences, engagement in teaching-focused professional development, and connecting courses to community or university-wide events or clinical experiences.

All teaching achievement should be appropriate to a faculty member’s career phase and proportional responsibilities per faculty appointment and role. Faculty can exhibit their teaching effectiveness by documenting their consistent use of teaching methods that encourage critical thinking; student interaction and career-focused connection to the course content; providing meaningful, timely and actionable feedback on student work; engaging in meaningful interaction with students both inside and outside the classroom; innovative use of online or hybrid teaching technologies; exhibiting concern and interest in student well-being; proactively addressing student concerns; and successful community- engaged course designations which may include field-trips and guest speakers. Faculty may provide evidence for excellence in teaching using numerous forms of documentation (see below).

In addition to samples of student evaluations, evidence for excellence in teaching may include, but is not limited to:

- peer reviews of teaching
- student letters
- personnel evaluations and/or annual faculty reviews
- samples of innovative instructional materials
- student work products, group projects, blogs/websites, community engaged projects
- student assessments
- self-evaluations and goal-setting
- teaching awards
- course data (grade distribution, teaching load, class sizes, new course development documentation, evidence of use of course data to adapt course contents),
- course development grants
- Implementation of novel teaching strategies
- Effective differentiation of between face to face, hybrid and online teaching strategies
- Training/professional development on teaching strategies/pedagogy/andragogy
- Community based learning, such as field trips and guest speakers
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Faculty should consider their explanation and rationale for use of evidence above that illustrates the relevance to: impact on student learning, student engagement, rigor, clarity, organization, interest and enthusiasm, content knowledge, career-focused application, pedagogical fit between teaching techniques and content, and student engagement and motivation.

**Teaching distinctions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor (clinical and traditional tracks)**

Teaching that qualifies a faculty member for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor would exemplify the faculty member’s growth in teaching, course design and student assessment in their department and program, within SPCS, and at the University of Richmond, the community, and in their profession. Teaching that qualifies a faculty member for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor would exemplify a faculty member’s success as a leader in pedagogy, course design and student assessment in their department and program, within SPCS, the University of Richmond, the community, and in their profession.

**Academic Program Development and Administration Standards of Excellence in Academic Program Development and Administration**

Full-time faculty members (traditional and clinical) have responsibilities for the overall well-being of the program under his or her charge. The standards to assess academic program development and administration may include: program enrollment, general program oversight including student advising and admissions, new academic program development, assessment and accreditation, participation in curricular reviews and enhancements, engagement with faculty recruitment, and student recruitment activities, cross-school collaboration, collaboration with external agencies, and involvement with grants and contracts. Depending on the faculty member’s appointment specifics, faculty are expected to show excellence in academic program development and administration. Excellence in academic program development and administration is characterized by developing and implementing innovative, career-relevant programs; program-specific student recruitment and retention efforts; new course development through school and university processes; strategic planning for program-specific needs; effective management of program including course scheduling; hiring, on-boarding and evaluating adjunct faculty; managing program staff; program accreditation facilitation; leading, facilitating and coordinating program meetings; and addressing student issues within courses and across the program; among others.

**Evidence of Excellence in Academic Program Development and Administration**

Candidates can demonstrate their role in program development through a variety of means, including but not limited to: a statement of program development activities; new course and/or program proposals; letters from faculty and/or students; admission, recruitment and retention data attributable to programmatic efforts; data or external validation of enhanced reputation of the program; partnership agreements and/or MOUs with community partners, or other entities and institutions; evaluation documentation of adjunct faculty in the program; accreditation documentation; grants and other funding to support program development. Candidates for promotion may also provide examples of the faculty member taking on a leadership role in administration and program development designed to advance the program’s reputation.

Effective August 17, 2022
Evidence for excellence in academic program development and administration may include but is not limited to:

- creation of new degree(s)
- revision of degree programs
- new course and program proposals
- curricular reviews and implementation of review outcomes
- Syllabus review and revision to ensure programmatic alignment and relevance
- accreditation and assessment documentation
- recruitment and retention of students
- recruitment and retention of instructional faculty
- staff and adjunct faculty review documentation and evaluation
- program meeting documentation and minutes
- recruitment materials
- community partnerships and MOU documentation
- planning and implementing program information sessions, recruiting events, and orientation sessions
- effectively engaging program alumni in collaboration with the school and University
- Leading and/or supporting alumni, employer, exit, etc. surveys
- Documentation of cross school collaboration designed to create program growth
- grant and contract documentation
- participating in the creation of media and social media placements for new programs
- media interviews or public appearances related to programs

**Administrative distinctions from Assistant to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor (clinical and traditional tracks)**

Academic program development and administration that qualifies a faculty member for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor would exemplify the faculty member’s growth as an established faculty member in their department and program and within SPCS through the effective administration of their respective programs and departments as evidenced by growth in program interest and enrollment. Performance that qualifies a faculty member for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor would exemplify a faculty member’s success as a leader in their field with regards to academic program development and administration. This can be demonstrated through development of innovative program components, course offerings, recruitment and retention of students and instructional faculty, program accreditation, and/or program expansion or adaptation. Professors with academic program development and administration components to their appointments serve as leaders to their programs and departments beyond the school/department, which may include collaboration with other entities, community partners, other institutions to develop or enhance program and course delivery, develop novel approaches to program development, establish collaborative efforts and/or program partnerships.

**Scholarship**

**Standards of Excellence in Scholarship**

Faculty in the traditional track are expected to show excellence in scholarship. Excellence in
scholarship is characterized by the generation, transmission, application, or preservation of knowledge through scholarly contributions, broadly defined. Excellence in scholarship for SPCS faculty can be exhibited in diverse ways, across a continuum from community-engaged scholarly output to more traditional, published scholarly output. Excellence in scholarship is further characterized by scholarly work that contributes to the school’s mission, and impacts faculty’s respective fields and disciplines at various forums, including local, regional, state, national, and international levels.

Evidence of Excellence in Scholarship

Scholarship generally involves the generation, transmission, application, or preservation of knowledge. Scholarship may be the investigation of both theory and practice of an academic discipline or in the field of continuing education. Scholarship also may reach across and connect teaching, research, creative activities, and service. As a school that serves the needs of communities (local, state, national, global), SPCS faculty scholarship may focus on the needs of the community and include the scholarship of engagement (as noted by Boyer, 1997) or community-engaged scholarship that results in the generation and application of knowledge that influences practice in a field. Through the University’s Center for Civic Engagement (CCE), the University of Richmond defines community-engaged scholarship as work that “emerges from a mutually beneficial partnership with a community and creates new knowledge that contributes to positive social change. Community-engaged research engages faculty expertise with the expertise of community stakeholders in order to co-create new knowledge that serves a public good extending beyond the academic purpose of the work.” As noted by the CCE (2021), “Community-engaged scholarship is characterized by its relevance to a faculty member’s expertise, its benefit to the external community, its visibility among community stakeholders, and its contribution to the University's mission.”

Depending on the desired rank, traditional track faculty will provide evidence of meaningful achievements as a scholar. All scholarly achievement should be appropriate to a faculty member’s career phase and proportional responsibilities per faculty appointment and role. Scholarship should be presented through the promotion process and fully represented on a curriculum vitae. Scholarship should demonstrate impact on the growth of the school and contribution to the respective field.

Evidence for excellence in scholarship may include, but is not limited to:

- copies of all published work, which may include but is not limited to publication in refereed journals, conference proceedings, book chapters in edited volumes, Op-Eds, and/or books
- Peer-reviewed publications such as journal articles, book chapters, books
- Artifacts of public and intellectual value that affirm peer collaboration and review. Such work may be published in disciplinary or community engagement publications, but also may exist in other public-facing forums such as professional media and field-related outlets, as well as mainstream news.
- Editing a collected works or edited volume
- Evidence of community engaged scholarly outcomes with community partners, including reports, white papers, letters from community partners or scholars in the
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field affirming the relevance and impact on the field of collaborative work led by the faculty member
- Presentations at academic or professional conferences that can include Invited or competitive presentations
- Evidence of accepted or ongoing work or works in progress
- Citation of candidate's work, including but not limited to published work, in others’ work
- Honors or recognitions for scholarly contributions
- Participating in student research, serving as scholarly resource for capstone projects
- Public exhibitions
- Presentations in panels or workshops
- Co-Publishing with students or mentoring students through published writing
- Internal or external grants awarded to support scholarly research or production
- Awards or special recognition for scholarly endeavors

Scholarship distinctions from Assistant to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor (traditional track only)

Scholarship that qualifies a traditional faculty member for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor would exemplify the faculty member’s growth in scholarly and creative contributions in their respective discipline and/or profession. Scholarship that qualifies a faculty member for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor would exemplify a faculty member’s shift to a higher level of contribution and leadership through a continued and deepened engagement in scholarly and creative work in their respective discipline.

Service

Standards of Excellence in Service

All faculty in SPCS (traditional and clinical) are expected to show excellence in service. Excellence in service is characterized by the faculty contributions to the respective programs and departments, the SPCS, the University of Richmond, the community and the fields and disciplines in which the faculty works. Excellence in service for SPCS faculty can be exhibited in diverse ways, including contributing to ad hoc or standing committees at various levels, community outreach and community service related to one’s field of expertise, participation and/or leadership in local, regional, state, national or international professional organizations, nonprofits, community organizations and collaboratives.

Evidence of Excellence in Service

Service for SPCS faculty is expectedly diverse due to the diversity of disciplinary expertise, department and program needs, as well as professional and community interface represented across SPCS programs. In general, service constitutes opportunities for faculty to serve as advocates for SPCS at the university and in the community, advocates for their respective departments and programs to SPCS, the university and the community, and to serve as advocates, leaders and experts in the community and in their respective fields. School-level committee work is also diverse, reflecting the diversity of programs and disciplines in SPCS, and due to the nature of that diversity school-level committees may include on-going standing committees, faculty governance work, school academic council as well as ad-hoc committees and projects that arise as needed. Department-level service work is similarly diverse, as the needs of the
varying disciplines dictate, and may include department-level standing committees related to ongoing program needs or ad-hoc committees or special department- or program-focused projects or initiatives. Community service varies disciplinarily in SPCS and may include a variety of participation and/or leadership in community initiatives, associations, committees, task forces or other community groups oriented toward community engagement and with connection to the specific faculty member’s disciplinary expertise and interests, as well as speaking engagements in the community. Professional service varies based on the diverse disciplines represented in SPCS but may include participation and/or leadership in professional associations or organizations, serving as reviewer for journals or conferences, participation and/or leadership in professional conference development, organization or implementation, serving on professional committees, task forces or other groups related to professional advocacy or other discipline-oriented work. Evidence includes a variety of documentation of these and other service work not specifically outlined here, reflection on the nature of this service work and the role of this service work in the professional career of the faculty member.

Evidence for excellence in service may include but is not limited to:

- Serving on or leading department, school, university committees
- Serving as a student academic advisor
- Developing and implementing advisory boards related to the school, University or one’s scholarly field
- Serving on a community board or task force related to the school, University or one’s scholarly field
- Serving in or leading a professional or academic organization in one’s scholarly field
- Serving on local, regional, national or international boards or collaboratives related to one’s scholarly field
- Serving on the board of a nonprofit based on one’s scholarly field of expertise
- Community activism and advocacy in respective field
- Serving as a journal reviewer in one’s scholarly field
- Serving as a journal editor in one’s scholarly field
- Serving as a grant reviewer in one’s scholarly field
- Receiving awards or special recognition for service to the school, University or in one’s scholarly field
- Developing and implementing workshops, panels or professional development related to one’s scholarly field
- Sponsoring, mentoring or advising student organizations
- Serving on a dissertation, master’s thesis, or senior thesis committee
- Mentoring a faculty or staff colleague

Service distinctions from Assistant to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor (clinical and traditional tracks)

All service achievement should be appropriate to a faculty member’s career phase and proportional responsibilities per faculty appointment and role. Service that qualifies a faculty member (traditional and clinical) for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor would exemplify the faculty member’s growth as an advocate, contributor, and decision-maker in their department and program, within SPCS, the University of Richmond, the community, and in their profession. Service that qualifies a faculty member for promotion from Associate
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Professor to Professor would exemplify a faculty member as a leader in their advocacy, contributions, and decision making at the various service levels in their department and program, within SPCS, the University of Richmond, in the community, and in their profession.

**Promotion Calendar**

In SPCS, a Promotion Committee is charged with determining the merits of a candidate’s ability to be promoted. The Dean has a part of the process in forming the Promotion Committee and determining whether to accept the Promotion Committee’s findings. As outlined in the calendar, it is the role of the Promotion Committee to conduct a thorough review and make a recommendation to the Dean. It is the role of the Dean to review the recommendation of the Promotion Committee. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost reviews the recommendation of the Dean and makes a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees. Promotions recommendations are made once each year.

May 1: Candidate notifies Dean of intention to seek promotion. Candidate includes updated curriculum vita and a list of references and outside reviewers to include names/contact information for:

- 5 - 10 former students, of which a minimum of 2 should be received and reviewed by the committee.
- 5 -10 campus or community professional references, of which a minimum of 2 should be received and reviewed by the committee.
- 3 - 5 scholarship reviewers are recommended to be comparable scholars with similar scholarship and institutional profiles, which must be faculty at or above the level to which the candidate is promoting or other informed professionals, of which 2 should be received and reviewed by the committee (for Traditional Track Faculty only).

June 1: Dean notifies the Promotion Committee and convenes initial meeting to occur by June 30. Executive Assistant to the Dean creates an electronic portfolio and shares it with the candidate.

July 1 - September 1: Promotion Committee organizes, selects chair, and works with Executive Assistant to the Dean to solicit references from the candidate’s submitted reference list.

July 1 - September 1: Candidate prepares electronic portfolio. Executive Assistant to the Dean assists candidate as much as possible in preparation of the electronic portfolio.

September 1: Candidate submits electronic portfolio to Executive Assistant to Dean.

September 1 - December 1: Promotion Committee reviews portfolio and related promotion materials. Executive Assistant to the Dean works with the Committee on any outstanding issues with regard to references or materials.

December 1: Letter outlining recommendations of the Promotion Committee sent to the
Dean. December: Recommendation letter from Dean due to Provost.

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.

Revisions to Chapter VI, Section D. School of Professional and Continuing Studies
Approved by University Faculty on May 12, 2022  Approved by the Board of Trustees on June 10, 2022

VI.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.
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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

VI.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 Professor of Law, Legal Practice

a. Legal Practice faculty members typically will begin their service as assistant professors of law, legal practice 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, legal practice 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 practice faculty members will be eligible to be considered for a three-year appointment and promotion to associate professor, legal practice. 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, Section VII.F. The standards for promotion and long-term appointment status will be the following: (1) the Law School's need for the faculty member's position; (2) excellence in teaching; and (3) excellence in service, including management and oversight of programs, if any, associated with the faculty member’s position. Once a legal practice 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 of law, legal practice will be eligible to be considered for a five-year term and promotion to professor of law, legal practice. The review process and the standards described in paragraph b also will apply at this stage.

d. Every five years thereafter, a professor of law, legal practice will be eligible for a presumptively renewable five-year appointment. The process for such renewal shall be as follows.

In the fall of the fifth year, the Dean and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consult and determine whether there is reasonable evidence to suggest that the standards specified in paragraph b are not met. If both the Dean and the Chair determine that there is not reasonable evidence, then the Dean would renew the contract. If either the Dean or the Chair conclude there is reasonable evidence, then the Chair will appoint a subcommittee to do a full review of the faculty member to assess whether the standards in paragraph b are met and present a report to the eligible faculty.

The faculty will make a recommendation to the Dean and will recommend renewal unless a majority of the eligible voting faculty vote not to renew the contract. In making this recommendation, the faculty will determine whether, consistent with academic freedom, there is substantial evidence that one or more of the standards in paragraph b are not met.
The Dean will ordinarily follow the recommendation of a substantial majority of eligible voting faculty and will not act contrary to the recommendation of the faculty without first informing the faculty.

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 practice 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. Legal practice faculty members who have reached the full professor level may participate in promotion and reappointment reviews of legal practice faculty members at the assistant, associate, and full professor levels, including voting on those decisions. Legal practice 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 perquisites of employment for legal practice 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 January 15, 2020,
by University Faculty on June 26, 2020,
and by the Board of Trustees on September 12, 2020

2. 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
VII Appendix II: School Specific Academic Organization, Policies, and Procedures

Subject to the Board’s ultimate authority, responsibility for curriculum and methods of instruction has been delegated to the faculty. This section outlines each school’s organization, policies and procedures for approving new programs (majors, minors, and concentrations) and new and modified courses including content, quality, and appropriate credit.

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 VII, Appendix II shall be reported by the Provost to the President and Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees.¹

B. School of Arts and Sciences Shared Governance Bylaws
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

¹ 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.
VII.B School of Arts and Sciences Shared Governance Bylaws

Passed by the A&S Faculty on March 1, 2019 with subsequent edits indicated by footnotes

Part I. Shared Governance
Part II. A&S Organization
Part III. The Place of A&S Committees in Shared Governance
Part IV. Interpreting Section VII.B

Part I. Shared Governance

As stated in the preamble to the University Faculty Senate Charter:

“The Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, jointly formulated in 1966 by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), calls for mutual understanding among all the members of a university community—the governing board, administrative officers, faculty, staff, and students—regarding the governance of the university. Such understanding, together with community members’ recognition of their interdependence, should result in a joint effort to promote the academic mission and welfare of the university and the well-being of its members by creating a unified voice for responding to external and internal challenges. The University of Richmond is committed to the principle and practice of shared governance, defined as the ethic that all members of the university community should work to align priorities in the governance of the university.

“The Board of Trustees of the University of Richmond has ultimate responsibility for the operation and affairs of the university, including the academic quality and direction of the university. The Board has delegated, subject to the Board’s ultimate authority, to the faculty primary responsibility for determining curriculum and methods of instruction; for conducting research and scholarly and creative work; for ensuring the quality of the faculty (selection, promotion, and tenure); and for recommending degrees to be offered by the university as well as degree requirements and degree recipients.

“Consistent with the university’s goals for shared governance, the faculty has a consultative role in certain areas overseen by the administration and the Board of Trustees that may have a direct impact on the academic quality of the university, including student admission qualifications, budgeting for various academic programs, and the configuration of academic and non-academic support programs.”

When matters relate to the School of Arts & Sciences (hereafter “A&S”), the A&S Dean (hereafter “the Dean”) and the A&S faculty shall work collaboratively in the spirit of shared governance according to the provisions laid out in this section (Section VII.B). The A&S faculty have primary responsibility for determining the curriculum of A&S majors and minors.
and methods of instruction; for conducting research and scholarly and creative work; and for ensuring the quality of the A&S faculty (selection, promotion, and tenure). It has a consultative role in the governance and operation of the school, and in the development and welfare of its faculty and students. When matters relate to two or more schools, the faculty’s role in shared governance is exercised by the University Faculty Senate according to the provisions laid out in its documents, including the Faculty Senate Charter.

Part II. A&S Organization

A. The Dean

The Dean is the executive officer of A&S and the leader of the A&S faculty, and reports to the Provost. The Dean’s responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the overall operations and strategic direction of A&S, implementation of the A&S curricula, the A&S budget, A&S faculty recruitment, appointment, and reappointment, and the general instructional excellence of the A&S faculty. The Dean also administers the policies of A&S and the University with respect to A&S, represents A&S to external constituencies, engages in activities designed to promote the development of A&S faculty, staff, and students, and consults with the A&S faculty or its designated representatives on matters as outlined in Part II.B.3.b below.

B. The A&S Faculty

1. Determinative Body of the A&S Faculty

A&S faculty meetings are the determinative body of the A&S faculty. The A&S faculty shall discuss in its meetings questions or information put to it by members of the A&S or University community and, on due deliberation, pass motions, create policies on matters for which it has primary responsibility, and convey recommendations to the Dean or other administrators. Its votes, online or floor, are expressive of the faculty’s determinations.

2. A&S Faculty Members

As outlined below, the A&S faculty consists of individuals with continuing faculty appointments within A&S, as well as librarians and other staff with faculty status in A&S.

a. Those with continuing faculty appointments within A&S, typically with the title of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Director (Faculty of Practice), including those on leave, have voice and vote in A&S faculty meetings and elections, and in the division that corresponds to their appointment.

b. Administrators (Dean, Provost, University President) who hold rank within A&S are part of the A&S faculty and have voice and vote in A&S faculty meetings and elections, and in the division that corresponds to their appointment.

c. Those with continuing faculty appointments within A&S and who either hold an
administrative position in the office of the Dean, Provost, or University President (for example, Associate and Assistant Provosts and Deans) and/or report directly to one of these administrators (excluding administrative committee chairs, department chairs, and interdisciplinary program coordinators) are considered A&S faculty with administrative status. Such individuals are part of the A&S faculty, and have voice and vote in A&S faculty meetings and elections, and in the division that corresponds to their appointment.

d. University Professors who hold rank within A&S are considered part of the University faculty and do not have voice or vote in A&S faculty meetings. As part of the University faculty with an appointment in A&S, University Professors may vote for A&S Senators that are at-large or represent the division that corresponds to their appointment.

e. Professional librarians affiliated with an A&S department or division are staff who hold faculty status in A&S by virtue of their position, which grants them voice and vote in A&S faculty meetings and elections. They are assigned a division by the A&S Steering Committee, granting them voice and vote in the assigned division.

f. Staff members are those individuals who hold non-faculty positions at the University. Staff members may hold faculty status as it relates to A&S according to the circumstances below.

   i. Individual staff members may hold faculty status in A&S by action of the A&S faculty. Faculty status in A&S grants staff members voice and vote in A&S faculty meetings and elections. They are assigned a division by the A&S Steering Committee, granting them voice and vote in the assigned division.

   ii. Individual staff members may hold faculty status at-large within the University by action of the University Faculty Senate or one of its committees. Assignment to A&S through this procedure grants these individuals the ability to vote in elections for at-large A&S Senators.

   iii. Staff members who report directly to the University President, Provost, or any rank of Vice President may hold faculty status at-large within the University, but not faculty status in A&S.

   a. Visiting, term, adjunct, exchange, and applied music faculty, as well as post-doctoral fellows and artists- and scholars-in residence are not considered faculty for the purposes of shared governance and may not hold faculty status in A&S.

See the Section I of the Faculty Handbook for more information on faculty status and rank and the duties and responsibilities of individual faculty members.

3. Responsibilities of the A&S Faculty

   a. Primary Responsibilities

   Consistent with the delegation of powers by the Board of Trustees to the faculty as outlined in Part I above and subject to the Faculty Handbook and the Faculty Senate Charter, the A&S faculty shall have primary responsibility for the following matters:

      i. the A&S curriculum, including the approval of new, and revision or termination
of existing, A&S courses, majors, and minors;

ii. recommendations to the appropriate bodies for all academic policies exclusive to A&S;

iii. all policies and procedures and setting the standards regarding tenure and promotion for faculty in A&S, and making recommendations regarding tenure and promotion for individual A&S faculty members; and

iv. subject to the terms of this section (Section VII.B), all policies and procedures that oversee A&S faculty governance.

On matters for which the Board of Trustees has delegated primary responsibility to the faculty, the Dean, and as appropriate, the Provost, shall thoughtfully deliberate and carefully consider the perspective of the faculty before making decisions that are contrary to the judgment of the A&S faculty. If reasons for such decisions are offered, they shall be communicated directly to the A&S faculty at its faculty meeting (or, in cases of confidentiality, to the committee designated to make recommendations on its behalf).

b. Consultative Responsibilities

Effective consultation includes the exchange of ideas, information, and questions, and, when needed, providing informal advice or formal recommendations to the person or body making the decision. Consistent with the role of the faculty in shared governance as outlined in Part I above and subject to the Faculty Handbook and Faculty Senate Charter, the A&S faculty or its designated representatives shall have a consultative role regarding the following matters as they relate to A&S:

i. the policies, procedures, and general principles exclusive to A&S governing faculty workload;

ii. the policies, procedures, and general principles governing the hiring of faculty exclusively in A&S, as well as the annual reports, annual performance reviews, and compensation policies exclusively related to the A&S faculty;

iii. the relative emphasis given to the various elements of educational, scholarly, and creative work, such as the weights given to and the methods, process, and instruments used to evaluate teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service in A&S merit reviews;

iv. the priorities and strategic plans of A&S, including the allocation of A&S resources, budgeting for A&S academic and academic support programs, and the School’s fundraising priorities;

v. the policies, procedures, and general principles governing A&S departmental and program reviews;

vi. the development and mentoring of A&S faculty, as well as the policies and procedures governing funds for professional development overseen by the Office of the Dean;

vii. the policies, procedures, and general principles governing faculty and student awards given by A&S, as well as the nomination of faculty or students by A&S
for University awards;

viii. the creating, joining, or splitting of academic departments and interdisciplinary programs exclusive to A&S;

ix. student activities and co-curricular policies and programs managed by A&S;

x. searches for the Dean by nominating faculty members for the search committee and offering feedback on candidates in those searches; and

xi. the structure and composition of all A&S administrative committees.

4. The A&S Steering Committee

The A&S Steering Committee (hereafter “Steering Committee”), including the Dean, is responsible for facilitating faculty governance in A&S, including overseeing A&S faculty meetings and all A&S faculty committees, as well as coordinating responses to issues raised by the A&S faculty. When needed, the Steering Committee works with the University Faculty Senate and University administrators to facilitate communication between the A&S faculty and these bodies.

C. Departments and Interdisciplinary Programs

Academic departments (hereafter “departments”) offer majors and minors, as well as courses that support interdisciplinary and cross-school programs and the general education curriculum. Department operations are administered by a department chair, but are the responsibility of all faculty and staff with appointments in the department.

Interdisciplinary programs (hereafter “programs”) offer courses, majors, and/or minors that draw on expertise from across the faculty. Their curricula include courses unique to the program and/or courses from two or more departments. Programs housed within A&S are administered by an interdisciplinary program coordinator (hereafter “program coordinator”) and are overseen by an interdepartmental program advisory board.

Departments and programs foster scholarship, design curricula, advise students, and provide a forum for academic discourse. The smooth and effective functioning of departments and programs depends upon the achievement of broadly shared goals and upon the cooperation of all faculty and staff members. Agreement about goals and cooperation in their implementation are to be achieved through regular meetings and continuing discussion among the department or program advisory board members. Traditions for making decisions and resolving disagreements within departments and programs vary, and no single procedure could possibly cover the wide range of cases that may arise. Some matters are best left to the discretion of the department chair or program coordinator, whereas others, such as those involving the interests of all members of the department or program advisory board, should be resolved through consultation, consensus, or majority vote.

Administrators (Dean, Provost, University President) shall not participate in department and program advisory board meetings or votes. A&S faculty members with administrative status (see Part II.B.2. above) may participate in departmental and program discussion and votes regarding the hiring, tenure, and promotion of faculty; they may participate in other matters as decided by a majority of the continuing faculty members of the department or program advisory board.
Departments and programs are strongly encouraged to keep policy documents, as well as easily accessible records of all votes and decisions.

1. **Hiring of Faculty**

   While the Dean has the ultimate responsibility for hiring faculty in A&S, in the spirit of collegiality and shared governance, consultation between the Dean and departments or search committees must occur in the hiring of faculty. While it is incumbent on the Dean’s office to work with the faculty to provide clear and consistent procedures at the start of the process, the faculty involved should follow the prescribed procedures to the best of its ability and act as a deliberative body to provide inclusive and well-reasoned hiring recommendations to the Dean. When making a final decision regarding to whom to make an offer, all parties (Dean and department and/or search committee) should communicate their positions clearly and sensitively consider the views of the other. If there is a divergence between the Dean and the recommendation(s) by the department or search committee regarding which candidate(s) to hire, the Dean shall articulate the reasons for the divergence to the department or search committee.

   In the case of interdisciplinary faculty searches, where the home department may vary from candidate to candidate, an interdisciplinary committee that crosses traditional department boundaries may be used to conduct the search. In such cases, the hiring committee will involve, for each candidate, the potential home department during the recruiting and hiring phases.

   When hiring faculty with tenure and/or at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, after the hiring decision has been made, there shall be an expedited tenure and promotion process, with the department, A&S Tenure and Promotion Committee, Dean, Provost, and University President each providing a recommendation on tenure and/or rank to the Board of Trustees.

2. **Department Chairs and Program Coordinators**

   a. **Responsibilities of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators**

      Department chairs and interdisciplinary program coordinators represent their departments and programs to the administration, and administer the operations of their respective department or program. Their responsibilities include, but are not limited to, scheduling, providing an agenda for, and presiding over department or program advisory board meetings, scheduling courses, overseeing departmental or program curricular changes, hiring, supervising, and evaluating staff, facilitating department or program relations, preparing and managing budgets, and assessing and making recommendations to the Dean regarding departmental or program resource needs.

      Department chairs have the added responsibilities of assigning faculty to courses and academic advising duties, mentoring, recommendation of salary increases for departmental faculty, requesting faculty lines, overseeing departmental recommendations for faculty hires and faculty promotion and tenure, and keeping their faculty informed of the actions of the administration.

      Program coordinators have the added responsibilities of working in collaboration with the Dean and faculty to assign faculty to programs, working with the Dean and, when
necessary, School(s) and the Provost’s Office on staffing the programs, and working with Deans, chairs, and faculty to cultivate learning, teaching, and multi-disciplinary perspectives. Program coordinators shall keep their stakeholders informed of the actions of their program.

In order to properly accomplish their administrative duties, department chairs and program coordinators are granted reassigned time, stipends, professional development funds, and/or other forms of compensation as set forth in policies established and overseen by the Dean, in consultation with the A&S faculty.

b. Appointment of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators

All department chairs and interdisciplinary program coordinators are appointed by the President of the University. In practice, however, and in the spirit of shared governance, the University President delegates to the Provost, Dean, and departments/programs the responsibility of appointing chairs and program coordinators in the manner prescribed below.

Department chairs and program coordinators (and their interim replacements) should normally be chosen from the tenured members of the department or those involved in the program. They are normally nominated for appointment to a three-year term by the department or program advisory board, voting by secret ballot. The person nominated will have the approval of a majority of the department or program advisory board members eligible to vote (usually all continuing faculty in the department or program advisory board unless decided otherwise by the department or program advisory board).

If there is a 50%:50% tie between candidates, a second election will be held after further discussion by the department or program advisory board. If the tie persists after two rounds of voting, the Dean will appoint the department chair or program coordinator after consultation with the department or program advisory board.

If the department or program makes a nomination that the Dean does not support, the Dean shall meet with the department or program advisory board to explain his or her reasons for not supporting the nomination. The department or the program advisory board will then reevaluate its nomination, consider the Dean’s objections, and communicate its choice for chair or coordinator to the Dean. The Dean and the department or the program advisory board will remain in consultation until a mutually agreeable candidate has been selected. A mutually agreeable candidate is a person who is willing to serve and has the support of both the Dean and a majority of the department or program advisory board members eligible to vote. 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.

The Dean may remove a department chair or program coordinator before the end of his or her term, but the Dean shall first consult with the said department chair or program coordinator and give him or her the option to resign.
D. Disagreements over Polices or Decisions

The Dean, department chairs, program coordinators, and A&S faculty members should all work hard to make transparent and collaborative recommendations and decisions. When disagreements over administrative policies or decisions arise, individuals and/or groups of individuals shall attempt to resolve the conflict through thoughtful and respectful communication. When a resolution is not attained in a timely manner after a good faith effort, the disagreement may be referred to the Dean for resolution (if the disagreement is between A&S faculty members, including a department chair or program coordinator). If the disagreement is between the Dean and any A&S faculty member(s), including departments or programs, the Provost may be consulted as part of the resolution process.

Part III. The Place of A&S Committees in Shared Governance

A. A&S and University Committees

A&S committees are formed by the A&S faculty or Dean, consist mainly of A&S faculty, staff, and/or students, and address matters relevant exclusively to A&S.

University committees are formed by the University Faculty Senate or University administrators, consist of faculty, staff, and/or students from across the University, and address matters relevant to at least two schools at the University.

B. Standing and Ad Hoc Committees

Standing committees work on a continuous basis until dissolved and normally include members with staggered terms of three years.

Ad hoc committees (including taskforces) are temporary and created for a specific task typically outside the charge of any standing committee. The charge of ad hoc committees shall also include a plan for the committee’s dissolution (for example, by a specific date and/or after completion of a specific work product). Members of an ad hoc committee are normally appointed for the duration of the committee.

C. A&S Faculty and Administrative Committees

1. A&S Faculty Committees

A&S faculty committees (standing or ad hoc) are created, altered, or dissolved by action of the A&S faculty and are used as a means to undertake the faculty responsibilities outlined in Part II.B.3 above. They are chaired by an A&S faculty member, have only A&S faculty (excluding administrators and those with administrative status) as voting members, include faculty from across all divisions of A&S, and report to the A&S faculty through the Steering Committee. Their charges may include responsibilities that are primary to the faculty and/or consultative with the Dean or other administrative units. Any A&S faculty member(s) or committee may initiate changes to the A&S faculty committee structure by submitting the proposal, in writing, to the Steering Committee for possible inclusion on the agenda of an A&S faculty meeting. Since A&S faculty committees include representatives from across A&S, department and localized cross-department/program committees are not considered A&S committees. The Dean’s office shall provide administrative assistance to the A&S faculty officers and committee chairs as related to their roles in faculty governance.
2. A&S Administrative Committees

A&S administrative committees (standing or ad hoc) are formed, altered, or dissolved by the Dean, in consultation with the Steering Committee and/or the A&S faculty. They report to the Dean and undertake matters of importance to the Dean. Typically, their charge will not include matters that overlap the charge of an existing A&S faculty committee. Any changes to A&S administrative committees made by the Dean shall be announced to the A&S faculty at the next A&S faculty meeting.

Part IV. Interpreting Section VII.B

A. Supremacy Clause

Nothing in Section VII.B of Appendix II of the Faculty Handbook shall contradict or override University-wide policies or the following University governing documents: the University Bylaws, the University Faculty Senate Charter, the policy documents of the University Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Handbook.

When the policies or guidelines in this section appear in conflict with the University governing documents, the members of the Steering Committee, the A&S Senators, and the Dean shall meet to resolve such disagreements. The Steering Committee shall inform the A&S faculty of the nature of the disagreement and the steps taken to bring this section into agreement with the University faculty governing documents. In those occasions where agreement cannot be reached, the disagreement shall be referred to the Provost for resolution. Once the Provost, in consultation with the Dean, the Steering Committee, and the A&S Senators, has resolved the disagreement, the faculty shall be informed of the resolution, which shall be recorded in the minutes of an A&S faculty meeting.

If this section requires amending, the changes will be proposed by the Steering Committee and brought to the A&S faculty for approval.

B. Interpretation of this Section

The Steering Committee, including the Dean, shall, in collaboration with University legal counsel when needed, rule on any question of interpretation of any policy in this section (Section VII.B). Any such rulings shall be reported to the A&S faculty at its next meeting. If this section requires amending, the changes will be proposed by the Steering Committee and brought to A&S faculty for approval.

VII.C School of Arts and Sciences Academic Approvals

Subject to the Board’s ultimate authority, responsibility for curriculum and methods of instruction has been delegated to the faculty. This section outlines the policies and procedures in A&S for creating, modifying, and eliminating academic programs (majors, minors, and concentrations), as well as creating and modifying courses, including content, quality, and appropriate credit.

A. Creating, Modifying and Eliminating Educational Programs in A&S
Educational programs include majors and minors, as well as degree and certificate programs. New educational programs or revisions to or elimination of existing educational programs in A&S are approved using the process below and subject to the University policies and SACS-COC rules related to the creation, modification, and elimination of academic programs.

1. A faculty committee, department, or program creates the proposal.
2. The proposal is submitted to the Dean, who brings it to A&S Academic Council for its recommendation.
3. If recommended by A&S Academic Council, the proposal goes before the A&S faculty at its meeting for action.
4. If the change is approved by the A&S faculty, the proposal is then presented as a recommendation to the Provost.
5. If approved by the Provost, the proposal is then routed through all subsequent review and approval steps as outlined in the University Policy on Creating, Suspending, or Eliminating Academic Programs.

B. Creating and Modifying Courses in A&S

New courses and revisions to existing courses in A&S are proposed using a standard form and approved using the process below.

1. Courses are proposed by A&S faculty members and approved by the relevant department and/or interdisciplinary program.
2. The proposal is submitted to the Dean, who brings it to the A&S Academic Council for its recommendation.
3. If recommended by A&S Academic Council, the proposal goes before the A&S faculty at its meeting for action.
4. Once approved by the A&S faculty, the course becomes part of the regular offerings.

VII.D Robins School of Business Academic Organization

Passed by the RSB Faculty on May 2, 2019

1. Chairs of Departments
Chairpersons of academic departments are vitally important in guaranteeing and enhancing the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service in the E. Claiborne Robins School of Business. They are responsible to the Dean for the normal operations of their respective departments, and they are expected to represent their departments in the School's Academic Council. Department Chairs are responsible for managing their departmental budget, scheduling, facilitating student advising, conducting annual reviews of departmental faculty and staff, making merit salary
recommendations, managing faculty searches, and coordinating the departmental process of promotion and tenure of departmental faculty.

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) are nominated by the tenure-track/tenured faculty within their department. The nomination occurs by secret ballot, with the nominated individual requiring the approval of more than 50% of the department's tenure-track/tenured faculty members. In cases where no candidate has the approval of more than 50% of the department's tenure-track/tenured faculty members, a run-off ballot occurs. In case of ties, the department meets to discuss and revote to resolve the tie.

Once determined, the department’s nomination is forwarded to the Dean for her/his support. In cases where the Dean supports the nomination, she/he forwards the nomination to the Provost and then to the President as a recommendation for appointment. While in cases where the Dean chooses to not support the department’s nomination, the Dean meets with the department to explain his or her reasons for not supporting the nomination. The department then reevaluates its nomination and considers the Dean’s objections. The Dean and the department will then remain in consultation until a mutually agreeable candidate has been selected. A mutually agreeable candidate is a person who has the support of both the Dean and more than 50% of the tenure-track/tenured faculty as determined by secret ballot. The consensus candidate's name is forwarded to the Provost and then to the President as a recommendation for appointment. In rare instances where a consensus cannot be attained in a timely manner, either within the department or between the Dean and the department, the record of consultations and reasoning on all sides are communicated to the Provost for resolution and recommendation to the President. Chairs are appointed for a term of three years and are normally eligible for reappointment for additional terms.

The Dean, or the tenured/tenure-track faculty members of the department by a majority vote of no-confidence (via secret ballot), may recommend removing the department chair before the end of her/his term. Before such a step is taken by either the Dean and/or tenured/tenure-track faculty members they must first consult with each other. Furthermore, in all cases the department chair should be given the opportunity to give their opinion in writing and should also always be given the option to resign in place of being removed, except when these options are not allowed by law.

2. Robins School of Business Academic Council

There is an Academic Council in the E. Claiborne Robins School of Business. The main function of the Academic Council is to provide an avenue for faculty expression and influence. The duties of the Academic Council may include: (1) advising the Dean; (2) interpreting faculty policy and considering any variations from requirements as listed in the Catalog; (3) recommending approval of new courses, majors, minors, and programs to the faculty; (4) considering certain recommendations of the Deans before they are presented to the faculty; (5) serving as a line of
communication (each faculty member may request that a matter be brought to the attention of
the Council); (6) recommending changes in academic policy to the faculty.

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.

3. Robins School of Business Graduate Council
The Graduate Council functions for the Richard S. Reynolds Graduate School of The Robins
School of Business in a manner similar to the Academic Council. 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.

The Graduate Council is composed of a faculty member from each department, the Associate
Dean for International Business Programs, the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, and the
Dean of the Robins School of Business. The Associate Deans and Dean have voice but no vote.
The Associate Dean for Graduate Programs presides as the chair of the Graduate Council.
VII.E Robins School of Business Academic Approvals

1. Undergraduate Catalog Changes

Any individual or group of faculty members, including the Dean, may propose changes to the Undergraduate Catalog. All changes to the Undergraduate Catalog, even if they are considered minor, must be approved using the procedures outlined below. Once approved, these changes are forwarded to the Office of the Dean to seek any further required approvals from the Faculty Senate, Board of Trustees, Provost, President, etc. and for forwarding to the Registrar’s office for incorporation into the Undergraduate Catalog. Furthermore, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is required to maintain a list of all changes to the Undergraduate Catalog that is accessible to the faculty.

Approving a proposal to change the Undergraduate Catalog is a three-step procedure:

1. **Initial Review:** Submission of the appropriate new course proposal, new program proposal, and/or undergraduate catalog change form(s) and an initial review of the proposal by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to ensure that the proposal is complete, understandable, and sufficiently addresses required faculty and facility resource needs that may arise if the proposal is approved. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee may require additional documentation before accepting the proposal as complete and understandable.

2. **Comments & Recommendations:** Once a proposal is deemed to be complete, understandable, and one that sufficiently addresses required faculty and facility resource needs, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee should gather comments and recommendations from individuals and groups that will be affected by the proposed change and should have the right to comment on the proposal. The group(s) asked for comments and recommendations at a minimum should include those with primary responsibility over the curriculum that is being proposed to be changed.

   Next, if a proposal includes adding (or significantly altering) a new major, minor, concentration or degree/certificate program, then both the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Academic Council must be allowed an opportunity to provide in writing their comments and recommendations on the proposal. Also, in such cases, the Academic Council or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, if they believe a more thorough

---

2 The committees, the Academic Council, and the Graduate Council referred to in subsections 1 & 2 of this section are those within the Robins School of Business.
3 Whereas a faculty member can propose changes to any part of the Undergraduate Catalog, it should be understood that the Robins School of Business does not retain the sole right to propose changes to certain parts of the University Undergraduate Catalog, such as those containing general university policies or information about courses and programs in other schools. This is most relevant with respect to the Economics A&S Major and Minor, both of which reside in the School of Arts and Sciences.
4 This includes changes to course pre-requisites.
review of the proposal is warranted, may require that a Curriculum Review Task Force also provide in writing their comments and recommendations on the proposal.

Finally, in all cases the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs has the right to provide in writing their own comments and recommendations on the proposal.

All recommendations and comments must include a vote count, which includes the number of members that agreed, dissented, and abstained. Dissenting members may provide in writing their own recommendation and comments on the proposal. Furthermore, in case a group fails to provide comments and recommendations in a timely fashion, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee can decide to inform the proposer and the faculty of the delay and suspend the requirement for asking for that group’s comments and recommendations before proceeding.

In cases where primary responsibility for a course, curricular requirement, major, minor, concentration, or degree/certificate program has not yet been defined, such responsibility must be assigned before progressing with the catalog change.

3. Approval: Once all comments and recommendations have been received, if the proposal does not have a significant impact on the general business school student body and/or alter faculty resource allocations across departments, and no recommendations solicited in the previous step were negative, then the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee should request that the Office of the Dean put the proposal on the consent agenda for approval at the following faculty meeting. In all other cases, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee should make a request to the Office of the Dean for a place on the agenda at the next faculty meeting so that the proposer can present the proposal to the faculty for discussion and a vote of approval.

Proposals that involve changes to the required undergraduate curriculum (i.e. Pre-Business courses, Core courses, and curricular requirements), adding a new course, or adding/altering a major, minor, concentration or degree/certificate program may not be placed on the consent agenda and must be brought before the faculty for discussion and a vote of approval. Furthermore, a vote on major proposals, such as changing the required undergraduate curriculum (i.e. Pre-Business courses, Core courses, and curricular requirements) or adding a new major, minor, concentration or degree/certificate program, may only occur after the faculty has been given a chance to thoroughly discuss it across at least two different faculty meetings that occur at least two weeks apart from each other.

Also, before any faculty vote on the proposal, including via the consent agenda, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee must, in a timely fashion, provide the faculty with all comments and recommendations received in the previous step and the completed Undergraduate Catalog Change Checklist form.

For consideration during the Fall semester, catalog change requests should be submitted to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee by the end of September. For consideration during the Spring semester, they should be submitted by the end of February. The Undergraduate
Curriculum Committee is not required to, but can choose to, accept requests outside of these deadlines.

2. Graduate Catalog Changes
Any individual or group of faculty members, including the Dean, may propose changes to the Graduate Catalog. All changes to the Graduate Catalog, even if they are considered minor, must be approved using the procedures outlined below.\(^5\) Once approved, these changes are forwarded to the Office of the Dean to seek any further required approvals from the Faculty Senate, Board of Trustees, Provost, President, etc., and for forwarding to the Registrar’s office for incorporation into the Graduate Catalog. Furthermore, the Graduate Council is required to maintain a list of all changes to the Graduate Catalog that is accessible to the faculty.

Approving a proposal to change the Graduate Catalog is a three-step procedure that includes:

1. **Initial Review:** Submission of the appropriate new course proposal, new program proposal, and/or graduate catalog change form(s) and an initial review of the proposal by the Graduate Council to ensure that the proposal is complete, understandable, and sufficiently addresses required faculty and facility resource needs that may arise if the proposal is approved. The Graduate Council may require additional documentation before accepting the proposal as complete and understandable.

2. **Comments & Recommendations:** Once a proposal is deemed to be complete, understandable, and one that sufficiently addresses required faculty and facility resource needs, Graduate Council should gather comments and recommendations from individuals and groups that will be affected by the proposed change and should have the right to comment on the proposal. The group(s) asked for comments and recommendations at a minimum should include those with primary responsibility over the curriculum that is being proposed to be changed.

Next, if a proposal includes adding (or significantly altering) a degree/certificate program, then the Academic Council must be provided an opportunity to provide in writing their comments and recommendation on the proposal. Also, in such cases, the Academic Council, if they believe a more thorough review of the proposal is warranted, may require that a Curriculum Review Task Force also provide in writing their comments and recommendations on the proposal.

Finally, in all cases, both the Graduate Council and the Associate Dean of Graduate Programs have the right to provide in writing their own comments and recommendations on the proposal. However, before providing comments and recommendations on any proposal, faculty representatives on the Graduate Council should work to gather faculty input. Moreover, before the Graduate Council votes on any proposal that involves changes to the MBA program, voting members of the faculty who typically teach in the MBA program should be forwarded the proposal so that they can provide feedback to their Graduate Council faculty representatives.

---

\(^5\) This includes changes to course pre-requisites.
All recommendations and comments must include a vote count, which includes the number of members that agreed, dissented, and abstained. Dissenting members may provide in writing their own recommendation and comments on the proposal. Furthermore, in case a group fails to provide comments and recommendations in a timely fashion, the Graduate Council can decide to inform the proposer and the faculty of the delay and suspend the requirement for asking for that group’s comments and recommendation before proceeding.

In cases where primary responsibility for a course or degree/certificate program has not yet been defined, such responsibility must be assigned before progressing with the catalog change.

3. **Approval:** Once all comments and recommendations have been received, if the proposal does not have a significant impact on the graduate student body, the general business school student body, alter faculty resource allocations across departments, and no recommendations solicited in the previous step were negative, then the Graduate Council should request that the Office of the Dean put the proposal on the consent agenda for approval at the following faculty meeting. In all other cases, the Graduate Council should make a request to the Office of the Dean for a place on the agenda at the next faculty meeting so that the proposer can present the proposal to the faculty for discussion and a vote of approval.

Proposals that involve adding a new course or adding/altering a degree/certificate program may not be placed on the consent agenda and must be brought before the faculty for discussion and a vote of approval. Furthermore, a vote on major proposals, such as adding (or significantly altering) a degree/certificate program, may only occur after the faculty has been given a chance to thoroughly discuss the proposal across at least two different faculty meetings that occur at least two weeks apart from each other.

Also, before any faculty vote on the proposal, including via the consent agenda, the Graduate Council must, in a timely fashion, provide the faculty with all comments and recommendations received in the previous step and the completed Graduate Catalog Change Checklist form.

3. **University-Level Approvals:**

Once approved by the Robins School of Business Faculty, catalog changes that involve new programs (minors, majors, degrees, or certificates), or changes to existing programs, must further be approved at the University-Level as follows:

1. If the catalog change impacts other schools at the University, then the University Faculty Senate must approve the change.

2. Once approved by the Robins School of Business Faculty and, if required, the University Faculty Senate, the catalog change must be presented as a recommendation to the Provost for final approval, except in the case of proposals involving degree programs which also require the approval of the Board of Trustees.
Finally, the Provost is responsible for notifying the Academic and Enrollment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees of the creation of new programs and of modifications to requirements of an existing program.

**VII.F. School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic Organization**

The University of Richmond Faculty Handbook provides the definitions of faculty roles and responsibilities. These guidelines may be referenced at: [https://facultyhandbook.richmond.edu/](https://facultyhandbook.richmond.edu/).

In addition, the University Faculty Senate Charter addresses the faculty’s role in shared governance within the institution: [https://facultysenate.richmond.edu/charter/index.html](https://facultysenate.richmond.edu/charter/index.html).

The faculty of the University have a significant role in the governance of the institution. In keeping with the approach of the AAUP, the faculty of School of Professional and Continuing Studies embrace the importance of faculty’s role in shared governance of the institution, the school, individual programs and the curriculum within the school. As stated in the University of Richmond Faculty Handbook:

*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 purpose of this document is to describe the specific application of these overarching guidelines in the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, (hereafter “SPCS”).

**Membership in the SPCS Faculty**

In the SPCS, the faculty is composed of full-time SPCS faculty (traditional and clinical), plus staff who hold faculty status within SPCS.

The full-time SPCS faculty includes the following types of faculty, all of whom are faculty on Continuing Appointment with Fixed Term as defined in the University faculty handbook.

- **Traditional track faculty:** Instructor, Assistant, Associate, Professor
- **Clinical track faculty:** Instructor, Assistant, Associate, Professor

The full-time faculty in SPCS may grant faculty status at the school level to SPCS staff members. In accordance with the University’s Faculty Handbook, these individuals shall not be deemed to have faculty status at the University level unless granted such status by the Faculty Status and Faculty Credentials Committee of the Faculty Senate.

**Responsibilities of the SPCS Faculty - Shared Governance**
As stated in the preamble to the University Faculty Senate Charter, the role of governance is crucial in the academic mission of a university. When matters relate to the SPCS, the Dean and the faculty shall work collaboratively in the spirit of shared governance according to the provisions laid out in the Faculty Senate Charter. The SPCS faculty have primary responsibility for determining the SPCS majors and curriculum as well as the methods of instruction; showing excellence in scholarship and creative work; and for ensuring the quality of the SPCS faculty (selection and promotion). It has a consultative role in the governance and operation of the school, and in the development and welfare of its faculty and students. When matters relate to two or more schools, the faculty’s role in shared governance is exercised by the University Faculty Senate according to the provisions laid out in its documents, including the University Faculty Senate Charter.

The SPCS Governance Structure

SPCS is one of the five academic schools at the University of Richmond. Reporting to the Provost, the Dean of the SPCS is a member of the school’s faculty, serves as the chief executive officer of the school and is responsible for the overall management of the instructional program. Associate Deans are members of the school’s faculty and part of the governance structure. Each program in the school is overseen by a Program Chair, who reports to the Dean. Program Chairs are responsible for the academic program under their direction, including curricula and faculty.

The following groups have defined responsibilities in faculty governance in SPCS.

1. The SPCS Faculty

   Full-time SPCS faculty members (traditional and clinical) and staff members that have been granted faculty status in the school comprise the SPCS faculty. Full-time SPCS faculty members (traditional and clinical) and staff members that have been granted faculty status in the school have voice and vote in SPCS faculty meetings. Full-time SPCS faculty members are also expected to participate in the governance of the University. (Adjunct faculty members do not have voice and vote but do have a role in academic programs and in some school activities as described below.)

   Using guidance from the University Faculty Senate Charter, "The University of Richmond is committed to the principle and practice of shared governance, defined as the ethic that all members of the university community should work to align priorities in the governance of the university." To this end, the SPCS faculty meets monthly during the academic year, and as needed.

2. Associate Deans

   Associate Deans serve as school administrators and part of the SPCS governance structure. The Associate Dean’s titles are constituted by the Dean in consultation with
the SPCS faculty. Any Associate Dean over the academic affairs area of the school is required to be a full-time faculty member of the school.

3. The SPCS Academic Council

Voting membership of the SPCS Academic Council shall be comprised of: all full-time SPCS faculty (traditional and clinical) members, including those with administrative roles; SPCS staff with faculty status; and the SPCS Accreditation and Assessment Specialist. In addition, the Academic Council will also have non-voting membership from the tenured faculty at the associate professor or professor rank from the School of Arts and Sciences (up to 3), the E. Claiborne Robins School of Business (1), the Jepson School of Leadership Studies (1), and the T.C. Williams School of Law (1), a representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, a representative of the Registrar’s Office, and the Provost. The SPCS Dean is both a member and the Chair of the Council.

The SPCS Academic Council has responsibility for review and oversight of SPCS academic policies, SPCS admission policies, and the SPCS curriculum. Upon review and recommendation of the SPCS Faculty, the full SPCS Academic Council will discuss and advise on courses, curriculum and degree requirements, and admission policies. It is only the voting membership that approves courses, curriculum and degree requirements, and admission policies. The full Academic Council will also discuss and advise on the creation, suspension, modification or elimination of an academic program. Only the voting membership of the Academic Council can create, suspend, modify, or eliminate an academic program (See Appendix II, Section G for further information on creating, modifying, suspending or eliminating academic programs in SPCS).

The Academic Council shall meet at least once per fall and spring semester.

4. The Leadership Team

The SPCS Leadership Team is tasked with providing general administrative oversight of the day-to-day management of the operations of the school. The Leadership Team has an advisory role and does not independently make decisions on SPCS curriculum or other matters that are the primary responsibility of the faculty as detailed in the Faculty Handbook and University Faculty Senate Charter. The membership and responsibilities of the Leadership Team are determined by the Dean.

5. Program Chairs and Assistant Chairs

Each academic program in the SPCS is headed by a Program Chair who is a full-time, traditional track member of the SPCS Faculty. Program Chairs have primary
responsibility for adjunct faculty selection, adjunct faculty promotion, adjunct faculty evaluation, curriculum and course learning outcomes, course scheduling, and methods of instruction. Program Chairs also review and recommend the program budget in collaboration with the Dean's Office. Program Chairs also mentor and develop other full-time faculty and adjunct faculty in their program, with input from the Dean and Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs of the SPCS. Assistant Chairs serve in support of the Program Chair and can serve as Program Chair on a temporary basis. Clinical faculty may serve as Assistant Chairs but not as Program Chairs. Program Chairs will not typically hold an interim status nor be a part-time adjunct faculty member.

6. Council of Chairs

The Council of Chairs consists of the Chairs of all of the academic programs in SPCS and the Associate Dean responsible for academics. The Council considers issues that arise with regard to the operation and management of major/academic programs in SPCS when the decisions affect all programs. Meetings of the Council of Chairs and the Dean will occur throughout the academic year.

When students seek an exception to SPCS admission or degree requirements, the Council of Chairs divides into Undergraduate and Graduate Councils to review the exceptions. The Undergraduate and Graduate Councils consist of the chairs who have oversight of undergraduate or graduate programs respectively, programs plus the Associate Dean responsible for academics. The Academic Appeals Committee consists of a minimum of three program chairs plus the Associate Dean responsible for academics. This group is convened by the Dean as needed to review academic suspensions and other exceptions to graduation requirements.

7. Adjunct Faculty

SPCS adjunct faculty members are critical to the success of the SPCS, and thus their input is valued and sought by their respective chair and by the Office of the Dean. The views of the adjunct faculty are represented by the Adjunct Faculty Advisory Committee (AFAC), which typically includes at least one representative from each program. The Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs provides support for the AFAC and serves as liaison between the SPCS faculty and the AFAC. In addition, there are two general meetings of the full-time and adjunct faculty each year, one in the fall and one in the spring. These meetings include breakout sessions by program where adjunct faculty are updated on the status of programs, and are consulted on curriculum, scheduling issues, and other relevant program matters.

8. Promotion Committee
The Promotion Committee makes recommendations to the Dean for the promotion of full-time faculty (traditional and clinical) in the SPCS as outlined in Appendix I. The Promotion Committee is comprised of the full-time SPCS faculty (traditional and clinical) who have achieved the rank being sought by the candidate under consideration and may include Academic Council representatives chosen by the Dean from Arts & Sciences, the Jepson School of Leadership Studies, the Robins School of Business, and the School of Law who have achieved the rank being sought by the candidate under consideration.

9. Ad hoc Committees

The Dean may from time to time create ad hoc committees to address issues in the SPCS. These are committees that serve a specific purpose and complete their work within a specific time frame within the governance framework. These are not part of the long-term governance structure in the SPCS.

Faculty Role in Strategic Direction

The SPCS faculty play an important role in strategic planning which occurs at the school. In addition to the specific oversight in areas of curriculum and academic policy, the SPCS faculty should also be involved in the development of school strategic plans.

Resource Allocation at the Program Level

As the Dean’s office prepares the school budget, each Program Chair should collaborate in the preparation of the budget for their program and be informed about the school’s budget, including the allocation of new or vacant faculty lines. Each Program Chair makes recommendations about program needs and sets projections for enrollments (revenues) and expenses with the Dean.

Procedures for Discontinuance and Suspension of Academic Programs in the SPCS

Because of the need for coordination among multiple groups within the school, University, and accrediting organizations, the decision to create, modify or discontinue an academic program must follow careful planning, communications, and adherence to timetables (for further information, please see Appendix II, Section G.) The earliest possible collaboration with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is advised to ensure SACSCOC compliance. Once review and approval processes within SPCS are complete, the creation, suspension, modification or discontinuance of an academic program in SPCS must follow the University Policy on Creating, Modifying, Suspending or Eliminating Academic Programs.

VII.G School of Professional and Continuing Studies Academic Approvals

Effective August 17, 2022
Academic Program Approvals

Academic programs include majors, minors, and concentrations, as well as degree and certificate programs. Changes to requirements for existing programs and the suspension or elimination of existing programs are handled the same way as new programs. 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.

a. The Academic Council acts on the proposal.

b. If approved by the Academic Council, the Dean must consider and then submit a recommendation to the Provost.

c. Once the SPCS recommendation is submitted to the Provost, the remaining notification and approval processes are followed per the University Policy for Creating, Modifying, Suspending or Eliminating Academic Programs, including review by the Faculty Senate and/or the Board of Trustees, if required.

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.

c. If approved by the Academic Council, the school must notify the University Registrar for inclusion in the catalog and the course becomes part of the school's curriculum.

VII.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.

VII.I School of Law Academic Approvals

Creating, Modifying and Eliminating Educational Programs including creating or
eliminating degrees or modifying degree requirements.

a. Any proposal to create, modify or eliminate an educational program in the Law
   School is initially discussed by the proposing party with both the Associate Dean of
   Academic Affairs and the Dean.
b. The Dean then refers the proposal to the appropriate faculty committee which
   makes a recommendation to the faculty.
c. Approval of the proposal requires the affirmative vote of a simple majority of the
   faculty voting at the faculty meeting.
d. If the change is approved by the faculty, the proposal is then presented as a
   recommendation to the Provost.
e. Once submitted to the Provost, the proposal is then routed through all necessary
   review and approval steps, if any, as outlined in the University Policy on Creating,
   Suspending, Modifying or Eliminating Academic Programs.