Michigan Tech

Office Memo

Office of the Provost and
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Phone: (906) 487-2440
Fax: (906) 487-2935

TO: Richard Koubek, President

FROM: Andrew Storer, Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

DATE: May 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Senate Proposal 6-24

Attached is Senate proposal 6-24, "Proposal to Modify Sections 2.1 and Appendix L of the Faculty Handbook to Update Instructional Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion Review," and a memo stating the Senate passed this proposal at their March 20, 2024 meeting. We previously declined this proposal indicating we would provide additional feedback. If you concur with the revisions, which include wording that addresses the suggestions and concerns stated below, I will confer with the Senate regarding this feedback.

Section 2.1:
Replace
"Reappointment Review" refers to the formal process whereby a faculty member is reviewed by the unit Reappointment committee, chair, dean, and provost. "
With
"Reappointment Review" refers to the formal process whereby a faculty member is reviewed by the unit Tenure, Promotion and Review Committee or other review committee, chair, dean, and provost, which result in a recommendation to the President."

Paragraph 2 of section 2.1.2 Instructional-Track Faculty:
Replace
"Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, and Professors of Practice serve in continuing appointments with a three-year and five-year notification of termination respectively."
With
"Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, and Professors of Practice will receive a three-year contract, except when a department chair has requested a shorter term, and this has been approved by the dean and provost. Each year of the contract is dependent upon funding being available to support the position, and satisfactory performance as determined through the departmental annual formative evaluation process that occurs in the fall semester of each year. If an annual formative review identifies that performance is not satisfactory, a full reappointment review will be conducted in the Spring semester and results in either a continuation of the existing contract or a terminal year of employment. In the final year of a contract, a reappointment review will be conducted in addition to the annual formative review, and this results in either a new three-year contract under the terms outlined above, a shorter contract as described above, or a terminal year of employment."

Paragraph 2.1.2.2 Formative Performance Evaluation:
Replace
"All instructional-track faculty who are not required to participate in an annual reappointment review will participate in a formative performance evaluation that includes review by the unit committee, chair, dean, and provost at least once every four years."
With
"All instructional-track faculty will participate in a formative performance evaluation in the fall of each year independently of whether a reappointment review is being conducted."

Appendix L:
Special Faculty Category section:
Edit as follows (inserts underlined):

In certain cases, especially where an individual has significant industrial or professional experience, the ITF category will be Professor of Practice. Professors of Practice will be considered ITF and appointed on a continuing basis, similar to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor appointments<u>, but may have an appointment that is less than 0.75 FTE</u>. Faculty in the Teaching Professor ranks will generally not be eligible for promotion to this category, with the exception being Lecturers who were appointed during or prior to AY 2006-07 and whose qualifications are in keeping with appointment to this rank and for special cases where a person has achieved significant professional experience while serving as a, then, Lecturer or, now, Teaching Professor Rank. <u>Minimum qualifications for Professors of Practice will be a BS degree with significant professional experience.</u>

Employment Information, paragraph 1
Add
"In some cases, a search for a Teaching Professor rank could yield a candidate who is better qualified to serve as a Professor of Practice or vice versa. Adjustments to rank title are permitted in these cases without a new search." to the end of the paragraph that currently exists.

Add a section to the proposal as follows:
"Termination
Termination policies currently in place for Michigan Tech contractual employees will be in effect for ITF in all categories described previously. The termination policy currently in effect is found in the following paragraphs.
Termination Policy for Contractual Employees
The Employee is employed at the will of the University and this Agreement can be terminated at any time with or without cause by the University.

1. If the University terminates the employment other than for substantial failure as set forth below, or cause, it shall pay the Employee a post termination stipend in an amount equal to the Employee's salary for the remainder of the term of the agreement. The Employee shall not be entitled to any fringe or other employment benefits after notice of termination. As determined by the Dean of the College (those without departments)/Chair of the Department, the employee may or may not be required to continue to serve, with a continuation of benefits, in the same capacity as originally hired during the notice period.
2. In the event that the University terminates this Agreement due to cause or the substantial failure on the part of the Employee to comply with the obligations which determination shall be made solely by the University in its good faith discretion, the University shall have no further obligation to the Employee hereunder. In such event the Employee will be immediately terminated and will not be entitled to any further compensation, wages, stipends, post termination payments, fringe benefits or damages of any nature with the exception of wages actually earned prior to the date of termination."

Section in Appendix L: Reappointment and Promotion Procedures for Instructional-Track Faculty (ITF):
Paragraph 1: Add
"Promotion implies selectivity and choice, and is awarded for academic and professional merit, not merely for longevity". This is consistent with the narrative for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Paragraph 2: edit as follows:
"Annual ~~reappointment and performance~~ reviews of faculty members will help to ensure openness and provide feedback crucial to faculty development and growth."

Section 1.1 under Responsibilities of each academic unit.
Replace the subtitle Review Committee
With
Promotion and Reappointment Committee. Suggest relabeling section as a, b, c, etc. rather than 1.1, 1.2, etc. This is more consistent with Appendix I.

Section 1.4 – Remove
'Letters of will include as attachments copies of the procedures of the academic unit and the University promotion and reappointment procedures for ITF.' These could be included as links, and these procedures may change over time. Appendix I is outdated in this regard.

Section 1.5 Progress Evaluation – Before the last sentence add
'Candidates for promotion are reminded that satisfactory annual reviews do not imply that promotion will be granted.' This is consistent with Appendix I.

Section 3, paragraph 2
Replace
'financial exigencies of the university'
With
'availability of funding to support the position'.

Section 3.1.
Delete paragraph 2
Replace with
"Associate teaching professors and teaching professors are appointed to three-year terms, unless a shorter term is approved by the dean and provost. Each year of the contract is dependent upon funding being available to support the position, and satisfactory performance as determined through the departmental annual performance evaluation process that occurs in the fall semester of each year. If an annual formative review identifies that performance is not satisfactory, a full reappointment review will be conducted in the Spring semester and results in either a continuation of the existing contract or a terminal year of employment. In the final year of a contract, a reappointment review will be conducted in addition to the annual formative review, and this results in either a new three-year contract under the terms outlined above, a shorter contract as described above, or a terminal year of employment.

Section 3.2.3., paragraph 2
Replace
"The president will inform the provost of the recommendation"
With
"The president will inform the provost of their decision".

Section 4, paragraph 2
Replace the last sentence
With
"An unsuccessful promotion application may not be resubmitted in the promotion cycle that immediately follows that unsuccessful application".

Section 4.1
Replace
"…. considered for promotion will submit a teaching evaluation summary ……"
With
"……. considered for promotion will compile a promotion binder that includes a teaching evaluation summary ……".

Section 4.1. last paragraph
Remove the comma after the word 'timing'.

Section 4.1., point 2
Replace
"…in compliance with this document"
With
"…in compliance with the faculty handbook".

I concur___X___ do not concur_______ with the provost's recommendation as stated in this memo.

Richard J. Koubek Digitally signed by Richard J. Koubek
Date: 2024.06.03 16:51:38 -04'00'

Richard Koubek, President   Date

Michigan Tech

University Senate

DATE: March 21, 2024

TO: Richard Koubek, President

FROM: Robert Hutchinson
University Senate President

SUBJECT: Proposal 6-24

COPIES: Andrew Storer, Provost & Senior VP for Academic Affairs

---

At its meeting on March 20, 2024, the University Senate approved Proposal 6-24, "Proposal to Modify Sections 2.1 and Appendix L of the Faculty Handbook to Update Instructional Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion Review." Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

Proposal 6-24

Proposal to Modify Sections 2.1 and Appendix L of the Faculty Handbook to Update Instructional Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion Review

(Voting Units: Academic)

Submitted by Instructional Track Faculty Working Group

This proposal to revise the Faculty Handbook and associated supporting documentation is intended to clearly **outline the reappointment and promotion procedures** for Instructional-Track Faculty (ITF). It proposes that annual reappointment reviews not be required for ITF after promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, nor for Professors of Practice or newly hired Associate Teaching Professors or Teaching Professors after three positive reappointment reviews.

While the Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (T/TTF) procedures have long been established in the Faculty Handbook, the procedures for reappointment and promotion for ITF are currently fragmented, incomplete, and in some cases completely absent. To provide clarity to future ITF members, and the units in which they serve, it is suggested that the handbook section on ITF generally follow similar procedures as the well-known T/TTF procedures, with modifications to those provisions that do not apply to ITF.

Additionally, this proposal introduces a change to current reappointment review practices for Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, and Professors of Practice. We propose that annual reappointment reviews continue to be required for Assistant Teaching Professors and for new Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, and Professors of Practice during their first three years in such an appointment. However, we propose that such annual reappointment reviews not be required for ITF after they are promoted to Associate Teaching Professor, nor for Professors of Practice or newly hired Associate Teaching Professors or Teaching Professors after three positive reappointment reviews. This proposed change acknowledges the expertise and achievements of these ITF and lessens the workload for everyone involved in the annual reappointment review process; it is also consistent with practices for tenured faculty.

The proposed changes primarily occur in Section 2.1 Reappointment of the Faculty Handbook, where the reappointment process for ITF has been updated to clearly delineate the required procedures for each ITF rank (assistant, associate, and “full”) teaching professor and professor of practice. Additionally, Appendix L of the Faculty Handbook has been significantly expanded to include a similar structure and content as Appendix I for T/TTF faculty.

Faculty Handbook, Section 2.1

2.1 Reappointment

"Reappointment" is the offer of a new contract (other than a terminal-year contract) to a tenure-track or assistant instructional track faculty member.

“Reappointment Review” refers to the formal process whereby a faculty member is reviewed by the unit Reappointment committee, chair, dean, and provost.

“Annual Formative Performance Evaluation” refers to the process whereby a faculty member is reviewed by their unit leader for the purpose of feedback and continuous improvement.

2.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial probationary appointments for tenure-track faculty are for two academic years. Normally, successive appointment renewals, up to the mandatory time for tenure consideration, are for two academic years.

For untenured tenure-track faculty, annual reviews are required. The type of review (interim, major, and mandatory) required each year is based on the following schedule:

Interim reviews are done during the first year of each two-year appointment. The result of an interim review is an assessment of the record and evaluation of the suitability for a continuation of appointment.

Major reviews are conducted during the final year of each appointment up to the mandatory tenure review. The major review normally results in either a two-year appointment or a terminal one-year appointment.

Mandatory review is conducted during the year in which the faculty member is up for tenure. The mandatory review results in either tenure and/or promotion or a terminal one-year appointment.

The following example describes a typical review and reappointment process for a new tenure-track assistant professor starting in August of 2023, assuming positive outcomes at each decision point:

Appointments	**Dates**	**Review Type**
Initial 2-year appointment	2023-24	Interim Review
	2024-25	Major Review
Second 2-year appointment	2025-26	Interim Review
	2026-27	Major Review
Third 2-year appointment	2027-28	Interim Review
	2028-29	Mandatory Tenure Review
Effective	2029-30	Tenure as Associate Professor

2.1.2 Instructional-Track Faculty

Assistant Teaching Professors are appointed for two-year rolling terms; i.e., they will, upon favorable review and approval by the unit TPR committee, chair, dean, provost, and president, receive a two-year contract at the end of each year unless they are informed that their appointment is terminated. Effectively this means they will have a one-year notification period for non-reappointment.

Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors, and Professors of Practice serve in continuing appointments with a three-year and five-year notification of termination respectively.

2.1.2.1 Mandatory Reappointment Review

2.1.2.1.1 Assistant Teaching Professors

An annual reappointment review is required for all Assistant Teaching Professors 2.1.2.1.2 Associate Teaching Professors, Teaching Professors

Annual reappointment reviews are not required for teaching professor rank faculty after promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. Annual reappointment reviews are required, however, for newly hired Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors during their first three years in such an appointment.

2.1.2.1.3 Professors of Practice

Annual reappointment reviews are required for Professors of Practice during their first three years of employment.

.

2.1.2.2 Formative performance evaluation

All instructional-track faculty who are not required to participate in an annual reappointment review will participate in a formative performance evaluation that includes review by the unit committee, chair, dean, and provost at least once every four years.

Appendix L. Instructional-track faculty and instructor appointments

Instructional-track faculty (ITF, see Faculty Handbook 1.5.1) provide essential instruction for thousands of Michigan Tech students each year. They not only provide devoted teaching and specialized expertise, but also may contribute to the University's mission through scholarship or artistic creation. Furthermore, in certain disciplines, the need for faculty who have significant professional experience is critical to the success of our programs and to the preparation of our students. Instructional-track faculty provide a vital service in bringing the "real-world" into our classrooms and contribute to the university's mission of educational excellence.

Temporary Teaching Needs

There are many instances where a department/college may need to hire someone on a temporary basis to fill unmet teaching needs when a regular faculty member is on sabbatical or family leave. These temporary needs will continue and sometimes occur on a semester-by-semester basis. The title of "Instructor" will be reserved for cases such as these. Instructors will have no expectations placed on them other than teaching (and associated duties such as office hours), and their appointment could be for full-time or part-time work with contracts of no more than one year. Minimum qualifications for an Instructor are a master's degree, or a bachelor's degree and professional qualifications.

Continuing Teaching Needs

There are many cases where ITF serve on a continuing basis and/or where ITF lines may be an established part of the general fund budget. For ITF in these positions, a career path has been established to recognize their contributions and to reward them appropriately. The three titles for ITF in this category are 1) Assistant Teaching Professor, 2) Associate Teaching Professor, and 3) Teaching Professor. Teaching Professors at all ranks must be appointed for a minimum of 75% effort and will receive regular university benefits. Appointments of less than this will be made at the Instructor rank. Academic Rank Definitions for Instructional-Track Promotional Ranks can be found in Faculty Handbook 1.5.1.2.

Assistant Teaching Professors will be eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor based on criteria established within the academic units and the recommendations of relevant committees and administrators at the university. Likewise, Associate Teaching Professors will be eligible for promotion to Teaching Professor. A salary increment for promotion through the ranks will be awarded to the promoted faculty.

Special Faculty Category

In certain cases, especially where an individual has significant industrial or professional experience, the ITF category will be Professor of Practice. Professors of Practice will be considered ITF and appointed on a continuing basis, similar to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor appointments. Faculty in the Teaching Professor ranks will generally not be eligible for promotion to this category, with the exception being Lecturers who were appointed during or prior to AY 2006-07 and whose qualifications are in keeping with appointment to this rank and for special cases where a person has achieved significant professional experience while serving as a, then, Lecturer or, now, Teaching Professor Rank.

Employment Information

Individuals appointed to the Teaching Professor and Professor of Practice ranks are eligible for merit increases according to established university procedures. Regional searches (at a minimum) will be conducted for ITF in the Teaching Professor and Professor of Practice ranks; no search is required for Instructors since the expectation is that they will be serving on a limited, temporary basis. All policies in place for faculty searches, including EEO practices, will apply to Teaching Professor rank and Professor of Practice searches.

Reappointment and Promotion Procedures for Instructional-Track Faculty (ITF):

Faculty review for reappointment and promotion should contribute to academic excellence. An equitable review system ensures that considerations of academic quality will be the basis for academic personnel decisions.

Procedures must be explicit and well understood, give consideration to individual privacy of candidates, and be equitable. The general policies and procedures to be used should be widely known within departments and colleges. Annual reappointment and performance reviews of faculty members will help to ensure openness and provide feedback crucial to faculty development and growth.

A formal statement of the areas in which candidates for reappointment and promotion will be evaluated is necessary, but not sufficient. The wide variety of academic and professional fields, and the broad range of programs within Michigan Technological University ("the University"), make the development of detailed performance criteria that are applicable to all ITF an impossible task. Rather, general and broad guidelines will permit the exercise of skilled professional and academic judgment.

Faculty members and administrators share an important responsibility in providing evaluations of merit that guide decisions about reappointment and promotion. This responsibility involves the application of academic and professional judgment, in a framework of shared authority, among various levels of review and between faculty and administrative bodies. At each level of the review process, all recommendations from prior levels of review should be given serious consideration in reappointment and promotion recommendations. All persons involved in the reappointment and promotion processes should act in a professional manner and respect the candidate's rights to privacy.

It is likely that the specific expectations for reappointment and promotion will differ among academic units. Also, the University standards for ITF reappointment and promotion may change with time. Within an academic unit, expectations shall be consistent for contemporaneous cases.

1. Responsibilities of Each Academic Unit

Each academic unit (department or college) is responsible for defining the procedures it will use within the unit to formulate ITF reappointment and promotion recommendations. These procedures will form part of the unit's charter and must be consistent with the policies and procedures of the University.

The following issues must be addressed in the unit's procedures:

1.1 Review Committee. Each unit will assign a committee responsible for all ITF reappointment and promotion recommendations. This may be an existing committee that is also responsible for TPR recommendations for tenured/tenure-track faculty or it may be a separate committee focused only on ITF reappointment and promotion recommendations. The eligibility, terms of office, method of selection, and number of members must be defined. Department chairs, college deans, and those holding administrative appointments outside the department are not eligible for service on this review committee.

1.2 Role of the academic unit's chair or college dean and faculty in the recommendation process. The procedures must specify the roles of the committee and unit administrator in reappointment and promotion recommendations consistent with University procedures.

1.3 Areas for evaluation and guidelines for performance. Each academic unit will identify in its procedures the areas in which candidates for reappointment or promotion will be evaluated. The identified areas must include instructional quality and contribution to the Michigan Tech educational mission, and as applicable, independent research and other scholarly activities, professional service (both internal and external to the University), and the academic responsibility and academic citizenship required for these activities. Other areas consistent with the University mission may also be included. The procedures will give performance guidelines for reappointment and promotion to each academic rank and will list the types of accomplishments that will be considered in formulating recommendations in each area. The performance guidelines will not normally state specific criteria for performance.

1.4 Letters of Appointment. Letters of appointment address issues such as particular duties and expectations for performance, start dates in title, and the academic unit in which reappointment and promotion will be considered for those faculty having split appointments. Letters of appointment must be in accord with academic unit charters and with University policies and procedures concerning reappointment and promotion. Letters of appointment will include as attachments copies of the procedures of the academic unit and the University promotion and reappointment procedures for ITF. Letters will include the statement that no oral representations can modify the written letter of appointment or the written charter, policy, or procedures.

1.5 Progress Evaluations. The unit will define procedures for administering reappointment and promotion evaluations. It is essential that assistant teaching professors and associate teaching professors, teaching professors, and professors of practice in their first three years of employment receive a written, individual evaluation on at least an annual basis. This evaluation will be based, in part, on an assessment by the unit committee. It will be the responsibility of the chair or dean of the candidate's principal academic unit to provide the written evaluation. The faculty member being evaluated will be presented with the evaluation and asked to acknowledge its receipt by signing and dating the original. This acknowledgment does not imply agreement with the evaluation. If candidates refuse to sign the evaluation they will be informed that the evaluation will still form a part of their permanent record. Unit committees and chairs/deans are reminded that frank and evidence-based evaluation of progress will be most useful to candidates in achieving promotion.

2. Time Table

The provost will establish a timetable for Reappointment and Promotion reviews. This timetable will list deadlines for candidates to express their intention to be considered for promotion, for submission of the application packet by the candidate to the academic unit, for completion of academic unit reviews, and for recommendations by deans. Sufficient time will be allowed for each level of review.

3. Reappointment

Reappointment of Instructional-Track Faculty is described in Section 2.1.2 of the Faculty Handbook.

Reappointment is normally based on individual performance as defined by the academic unit. Offers of reappointment may be constrained by financial exigencies of the University, or major shifts in programmatic emphasis that diminish the faculty member's ability to contribute to the goals of the unit.

3.1. Lengths of Appointments and Reappointments

Assistant Teaching Professors are appointed for two-year rolling terms; i.e. they will, upon favorable reviews and approval by the concerned bodies receive a two-year contract at the end of each year unless they are informed that their appointment is terminated. Effectively this means they will have a one-year notification period for non-reappointment.

Associate teaching professors and teaching professors serve in continuing appointments with a three-year and five-year notification of termination respectively. This reflects the university commitment to students as well who have matriculated into existing programs that the teaching resources for said programs will continue through graduation. At the same time, this allows for flexibility should programs be shelved. N.B. 5 years is consistent with the shelving process, in which a program no longer accepts new students, but remains officially open for students already in the program to finish.

3.2. Academic Review

Consideration for reappointment begins with a review performed by the committee of the academic unit where the candidate's principal academic appointment resides (i.e., the department or college where the candidate holds an appointment of fifty percent or more of full-time). The committee will apply professional and scholarly judgment in evaluating the candidate's performance. The committee sends its written evaluation and recommendation to the chair or dean of the academic unit; the chair or dean also makes a written recommendation on reappointment of the candidate. All recommendations must indicate whether reappointment is recommended.

3.2.1. Colleges with departments

The department committee's recommendation and the department chair's recommendation go to the dean of the college. The dean formulates a separate written recommendation on reappointment for each candidate and sends it, along with the department committee's and chair's recommendations, to the provost. The dean's statement must indicate whether or not reappointment is recommended. Simultaneously, the dean is to inform the candidate, in writing, whether or not reappointment is recommended. In cases where the recommendation is against reappointment, the dean may, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative recommendation, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

3.2.2. Colleges without departments

The college committee's written recommendation and the dean's written recommendation on reappointment go to the provost. Simultaneously, the dean is to inform the candidate, in writing, whether or not reappointment is recommended. In cases where the recommendation is against reappointment, the dean may, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the negative recommendation, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

3.2.3. University Review

Following receipt of the dean's recommendation on reappointment, the provost recommends to the University president either a one-year (terminal) appointment, or reappointment.

The president will inform the provost of the recommendation. The provost will promptly notify the candidate of the recommendation. In cases where the recommendation is a one-year, terminal appointment, the provost may, upon the request of the candidate, provide a written statement of the reason(s) for the recommendation, specifying areas where the candidate's performance is deficient.

4. Promotion

Academic promotion refers to an elevation in academic rank, either from assistant teaching professor to associate teaching professor, or from associate teaching professor to teaching professor.

A faculty member may request promotion consideration by the unit's committee in any year. The decision to pursue consideration should be made by the faculty member, in consultation with the unit's committee and the department chair/college dean (those without departments). A faculty member is entitled to seek promotion review against the advice of the unit's committee and/or the chair/dean of the unit. However, neither the committee nor the chair/dean of the unit are under any obligation to endorse the case. The unit or department will define a time requirement to resubmit a promotion case when a promotion application is unsuccessful.

4.1 Promotion Process for Instructional-Track Faculty

Each academic unit will establish provisions for the promotion process through the teaching professor ranks, including promotion criteria and unit-level review procedures. Provisions will include the establishment of a unit-level committee, with committee membership parameters determined by the unit. ITF faculty in the rank of assistant or associate teaching professor who wish to be considered for promotion will submit a teaching evaluation summary, Faculty Activity Report (FAR), (including faculty narratives and teaching and professional statements), and other supporting documentation as applicable (e.g., CV, presentations, papers, etc.). The promotion process will be:

1. The department/college (those without departments) committee makes a written recommendation and forwards it with the documentation to the chair/dean.
2. The department chair/college dean (those without departments) makes a written recommendation and forwards it with the documentation to the college dean or provost as appropriate.
3. The college dean (as applicable) makes a written recommendation and forwards all documentation to the provost.
4. The provost reviews the documentation and makes a recommendation to the president.
5. The president makes the final promotion decision and notifies the provost.
6. Human Resources will notify the deans' offices and the provost will notify individual faculty (with a copy to the respective dean) of the outcome of the promotion review.

The provost will oversee the implementation, including timing, of the promotion process. Issues in implementation will include: 1) unit level development of promotion provisions for ITF; 2) adjustment of rank definitions so they are in compliance with this document; 3) establishment of the appropriate salary increments for promotions within the ITF ranks; and 4) review of cases of current faculty in the Teaching Professor ranks to make changes to appointments as necessary.

4.2 Appeals

Candidates who are not reappointed, or who are denied promotion, may appeal, in writing, to the Committee on Academic Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment. All appeals must be filed with the Committee within 30 calendar days following the date of notification by the Provost of a negative recommendation to the President. No other route of appeal is provided. Appeals must specifically list the basis for the appeal including the aspect of the policy or procedure that the candidate believes was violated. All such written appeals must be delivered to the Office of the Provost who will forward them to the committee.

The only grounds for appeals of negative recommendation for reappointment or promotion are the failure of a recommending party or parties to follow the promotion and reappointment Procedures.

Revisions and Amendments

Revision of these reappointment and promotion procedures may be initiated by any member of the faculty, including administrators holding faculty appointments. All proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing to the President of the University Senate. The proposed amendment(s) will be forwarded to the Academic Policy Committee of the University Senate for review and/or revision. The Academic Policy Committee will submit its recommendations to the University Senate.

Revisions to the above procedures must be in the form of a Senate proposal. Adoption of any revision shall require approval by the University Senate, followed by the approval of the Provost and the President. The Board of Trustees shall be informed of any revisions so approved.