

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, please call, send a memorandum, or E-mail immediately to Diane L. Maybon, ext 1-5693.

NOTE: Final revisions are noted in the following manner: additions underlined; deletions ~~over scored~~.

MINUTES
FACULTY COUNCIL
April 5, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m. by Mr. C. W. Miller, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Miller announced that the next regularly scheduled Faculty Council meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 3, 2005 in Room A103 Clark Building at 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Miller announced that Mr. Larry E. Penley, President, Colorado State University, will present the Administration/Faculty Council Dialogue on May 3, 2005.

Mr. Miller announced that the Current Issues Topic for the May 3, 2005 Faculty Council meeting will be announced at a later date.

Mr. Stephen Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance announced that the elections for Faculty Council University Benefits Committee will be held at the May 3, 2005 Faculty Council meeting. Mr. Davies also announced that revisions to the Manual, Code, Sections C.2.1.9.5.c - Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, and C.2.1.3.2 - Ex-Officio Members will be action items at the May 3, 2005 Faculty Council meeting.

Mr. Miller asked for unanimous consent to add an announcement to the Faculty Council agenda. There were no objections. Mr. Davies announced that Section C.2.1.3.3 - Officers will be an action item at the May 3, 2005 Faculty Council meeting.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

A. FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - MARCH 1, 2005

Mr. Richard Eykholt, MOVED TO APPROVE THE FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 2005.

THE MARCH 1, 2005 FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES WERE APPROVED.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

A. BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING - MARCH 4, 2005 - MR. PAUL KUGRENS, FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. Kugrens to present his report on the March 4, 2005 Board of Governors meeting.

Mr. Kugrens noted that a written report can be found on page 24 of the April 5, 2005 Faculty Council agenda. Mr. Kugrens noted that the Board of Governors met this morning in Denver to discuss the mission and vision statements for Colorado State University. The following is the CSU System Vision, Mission, Values Statements and the CSU and CSU-Pueblo Mission Statements adopted at the April 5, 2005 Special Board of Governors meeting.

CSU System Vision

The Colorado State University System will be the premier system of public higher education in the nation.

CSU System Mission

The Colorado State University System is committed to excellence, setting the standard for public higher education in teaching, research, and service for the benefit of the citizens of Colorado, the United States and the world.

CSU System Values

Be ACCOUNTABLE
Promote CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY
Employ a CUSTOMER FOCUS
Promote FREEDOM of EXPRESSION
Demonstrate INCLUSIVENESS and DIVERSITY
Encourage and reward INNOVATION
Act with INTEGRITY and MUTUAL RESPECT
Provide OPPORTUNITY and ACCESS
Support excellence in TEACHING and RESEARCH

CSU Mission

Inspired by its land-grant heritage, Colorado State University is committed to excellence, setting the standard for public research universities in teaching, research, service and extension for the benefit of the citizens of Colorado, the United States, and the world.

CSU-Pueblo Mission

Colorado State University-Pueblo is committed to excellence in setting the standard in teaching, research and service for regional comprehensive universities by providing leadership, service and access for southern Colorado while maintaining its commitment to diversity.

Mr. Raymond "Steve" Robinson requested that a copy of this information be emailed to the Faculty Council members.

MR. KUGRENS' REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

B. SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST REPORT - MR. TONY FRANK, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND INTERIM PROVOST

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. Tony Frank, Senior Vice President and Interim Provost to present his report.

Mr. Frank presented an update on the ongoing searches in the Provost office. He announced that the Dean of Engineering Search Committee has identified four candidates who will begin on-campus visits next week. The candidates that were selected are: Mr. Lex Akers, James C. Dowell Professor and Chair of ECE, University of Missouri-Columbia; Mr. Steven Abt, Professor of Civil Engineering and Interim Dean, Colorado State University; Mr. Oliver McGee, Professor and Chair, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science, Ohio State University - Columbus; Mr. Tony Ambler, B N Gafford Endowed Professor and Chair of ECE, University of Texas-Austin.

Mr. Frank reported that the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies announcements have been posted and applications are now being accepted. Mr. Frank noted that the search committee for the Director of International Programs is reviewing applications received.

Mr. Frank reported that the Joint Budget Committee has set the revenue authority with footnotes on the tuition. He noted that the budget picture is still unclear and discussions are ongoing with the Joint Budget Committee and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education staff. The cabinet has constructed two different scenarios but the University must wait for more information before it can finalize the FY05-06 budget. Mr. Frank reported that regarding fee for service monies the University is waiting for contact from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

MR. FRANK'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED

C. *UNIVERSITY BENEFITS COMMITTEE REPORT TO FACULTY COUNCIL - MS. VICKIE BAJTELSMIT, CHAIR, UNIVERSITY BENEFITS COMMITTEE*

Mr. Miller recognized Ms. Vickie Bajtelsmit, Chair University Benefits Committee to present the University Benefits Committee report to Faculty Council. Ms. Bajtelsmit noted that the written report can be found on pages 25-27 of the April 5, 2005 Faculty Council agenda materials.

Ms. Bajtelsmit presented an overview of her written report. She also noted new legislation that will affect faculty members who are now collecting their PERA retirement benefits and are no longer contributing to PERA, but are in a DCP plan. She explained that the University must make contributions to PERA on these employees beginning July 2005. However, these contributions will not increase the retirees' annuity but will go directly into PERA funds.

Mr. Miller thanked Ms. Bajtelsmit for her work as Chair of the University Benefits Committee.

MS. BAJTELSMIT'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

D. *STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING REPORT - MR. KIRK HALLAHAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING*

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. Kirk Hallahan, Chair, Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning to present the Strategic and Financial Planning report to Faculty Council. Mr. Hallahan noted that a written report can be found on pages 28-29 of the April 5, 2005 Faculty Council agenda materials.

Mr. Hallahan presented an overview of his written report. Mr. Frank added that there will be two open fora scheduled for budget presentations.

MR. HALLAHAN'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

SPECIAL ACTIONS

A. *CHANGES IN CURRICULUM TO BE APPROVED: UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES: FEBRUARY 11, 18 AND 25, 2005*

Mr. Jim Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, MOVED THAT THE FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE ACTION ITEMS IN THE FEBRUARY 11, 18, AND 25, 2005 UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES CHANGES IN CURRICULUM.

Mr. Lindsay noted the following exemptions:

February 11, 2005:

Proposal for B.S. Degree Program in Applied Computing Technology
Review Courses for the Major in Applied Computing Technology

February 18, 2005:

Category 2A3 Additional Communication - Second Language - All-University Core Curriculum

February 25, 2005:

Revisions to the Policy on Second Bachelor's Degree

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

Mr. Miller asked Faculty Council members if there were any objections to changing the order of the agenda to allow the Curricular items, H., I., J., K., and L., to items B., C., D. E. and F. to facilitate Mr. Lindsay as he teaches a class at 5:00 p.m.

There were no objections and the order of the agenda was changed.

B. *REQUEST FOR NEW MAJOR IN APPLIED COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE*

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE REQUEST FOR A NEW MAJOR IN APPLIED COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY TO BE EFFECTIVE FALL SEMESTER 2005 AS FOLLOWS:

A major in Applied Computing Technology (B.S. Degree Program) be established in the Department of Computer Science effective Fall Semester 2005.

Mr. Lindsay explained that this proposal has been reviewed across campus and endorsed by the Council of Deans and the President's Cabinet. The curricular request also includes a concentration in computing technology, which was approved by the University Curriculum Committee at its February 11, 2005 meeting. Mr. Lindsay noted that according to documentation provided by the department, the Applied Computing Technology (ACT) program serves three critical needs: Improved retention of information technology students; supplying Colorado high schools with qualified computer science and educational technology instructors; and providing Colorado organizations and businesses with professionals who combine information technology skills with organizational acumen.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

C. *REQUEST TO REVISE THE 2004-06 GENERAL CATALOG - REVIEW COURSE STATEMENT FOR MAJOR IN APPLIED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE*

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE REQUEST TO REVISE THE 2004-06 GENERAL CATALOG, REVIEW COURSE STATEMENT FOR THE MAJOR IN APPLIED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY TO BE EFFECTIVE FALL SEMESTER 2005 OR THE SEMESTER THE PROPOSED MAJOR IN APPLIED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY IS APPROVED TO BEGIN AS FOLLOWS:

For all concentrations of the applied computing technology degree, the Department considers pre-calculus mathematics (M CC 177, M CC 118, M CC 120A-B, M CC 121, M CC 124, M CC 125, and M CC 126) to be review courses. They may be taken as electives in the program.

Mr. Lindsay explained that according to the department, it is expected that students entering the Applied Computing Technology major as newly admitted freshmen or internal or external transfers, shall be prepared to enter either upper division statistics or calculus courses, in accordance with the Colorado State University admissions policies.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

D. *REQUEST TO REVISE THE 2004-06 GENERAL CATALOG - CATALOG COPY - AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE*

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE REQUEST TO REVISE THE 2004-06 GENERAL CATALOG COPY FOR THE AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES TO BE EFFECTIVE FALL SEMESTER 2005 AS FOLLOWS:

Additions - Underlined Deletions - ~~Overscored~~

~~For a bachelor's degree, a minimum of 15 credits must be earned from Colorado State University's College of Agricultural Sciences. More restrictive requirements may be established by departments.~~

Mr. Lindsay explained that this statement is not needed as all programs in the College of Agricultural Sciences require more than 15 credits so the statement is redundant.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

E. *REQUEST TO REVISE THE 2004-06 GENERAL CATALOG - ALL-UNIVERSITY CORE CURRICULUM CATEGORY 2A3 - CORE COMPETENCIES, ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATION, SECOND LANGUAGE - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE*

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE REQUEST TO REVISE THE 2004-06 GENERAL CATALOG COPY FOR THE ALL UNIVERSITY CORE CURRICULUM CATEGORY 2A3 - CORE COMPETENCIES, ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATION - SECOND LANGUAGE TO BE EFFECTIVE FALL SEMESTER 2005 AS FOLLOWS:

Additions - Underlined Deletions - ~~Overscored~~

Category 2. Core Competencies

A. Additional Communication

3. *Second Language* - enhancement of communication competencies in a second, or alternative language.

~~Students may satisfy this option with L CC 200, L CC 201 or L CC 300 or if they reach an equivalent level of competence as measured by an examination.~~

Mr. Lindsay explained that the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures currently is not equipped to offer competency exams. It is only equipped to offer placement examinations by which students are placed into a specific level of a course. In addition, the elimination of the competency examination language from the University General Catalog ensures that those students who wish to use a second language to fulfill Category 2A will indeed complete an actual course in Additional Communication.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

F. *PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE 2004-06 GENERAL CATALOG - SECOND BACHELOR'S DEGREE - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE*

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE 2004-06 GENERAL CATALOG COPY ON SECOND BACHELOR'S DEGREES TO BE EFFECTIVE FALL SEMESTER 2005 AS FOLLOWS:

Additions - Underlined Deletions - ~~Overscored~~

For Those Seeking Second Bachelor's Degree (last paragraph in the section)

~~Students seeking second bachelor's degrees cannot declare second majors.~~

Mr. Lindsay explained that students should be able to declare a second major when they are seeking a second bachelor's degree.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

G. FACULTY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE ELECTION - COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

Mr. Stephen Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, was recognized to present the Committee on Faculty Governance nominations for Faculty Council Standing Committees.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on Faculty Governance:

Committee on Faculty Governance

Victor Baez	Applied Human Sciences	2008
Alexandra Bernasek	Liberal Arts	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Mr. Victor Baez and Ms. Alexandra Bernasek were elected to the Committee on Faculty Governance for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics:

Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

Jackie Hartman	Business	2008
Dawn Bastain	University Libraries	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Ms. Jackie Hartman and Ms. Dawn Bastain were elected to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on Libraries:

Committee on Libraries

Dan H. Smith	Agricultural Sciences	2008
Katharine Leigh	Applied Human Sciences	2008
Evan Vlachos	Liberal Arts	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Mr. Dan H. Smith, Ms. Katharine Leigh, and Mr. Evan Vlachos were elected to the Committee on Libraries for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty:

Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of the Academic Faculty		
Mona Schatz	Applied Human Sciences	2008
Colin Clay	Vet. Med. & Bio. Sci.	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Ms. Mona Schatz and Mr. Colin Clay were elected to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education:

Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education		
Robert Gotshall	Applied Human Sciences	2008
Eric Prince	Liberal Arts	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Ms. Sally Sutton nominated Mr. William Sanford to serve as the faculty representative from the College of Natural Resources on the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education. There were no other nominations, and the nominations were closed.

Mr. Robert Gotshall, Mr. Eric Prince and Mr. William Sanford were elected to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Awards:

Committee on Scholastic Standards and Awards		
Claudia Gentry-Weeks	Vet. Med. & Bio. Sci.	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Ms. Claudia Gentry-Weeks was elected to the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Awards for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning:

Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning		
Rajinder Ranu	Agricultural Sciences	2008
Harvey Cutler	Liberal Arts	2008
Pat Smith	University Libraries	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Mr. Rajinder Ranu, Mr. Harvey Cutler and Ms. Pat Smith were elected to the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on Teaching and Learning:

Committee on Teaching and Learning		
Tom Keefe	Vet. Med. & Bio. Sci.	2008
Naomi Lederer	University Libraries	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Mr. Tom Keefe and Ms Naomi Lederer were elected to the Committee on Teaching and Learning for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the Committee on University Programs:

Committee on University Programs		
Laura Jones	Liberal Arts	2008
William Horne	Vet. Med. & Bio. Sci.	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Ms. Laura Jones and Mr. William Horne were elected to the Committee on University Programs for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on the University Curriculum Committee:

University Curriculum Committee		
Marshall Frasier	Agricultural Sciences	2008
Donna Rouner	Liberal Arts	2008
C. W. Miller	Vet. Med. & Bio. Sci.	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Mr. Marshall Frasier, Ms. Donna Rouner and Mr. C. W. Miller were elected to the University Curriculum Committee for the term July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

H. *FACULTY COUNCIL UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE PANEL ELECTION - COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE*

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, was recognized to present the Committee on Faculty Governance nominations for the Grievance Panel.

The following nominations were made by the Committee on Faculty Governance:

Kim Bundy-Fazioli	Applied Human Sciences	2008
Katharine Leigh	Applied Human Sciences	2008
Raymond H. Yang	Vet. Med. & Biomedical Sciences	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor for the University Grievance Panel. Hearing no nominations, the nominations were closed.

The nominations as presented were elected to serve a three-year term (2005-2008) on the University Grievance Panel.

I. *FACULTY COUNCIL UNIVERSITY SEXUAL HARASSMENT PANEL ELECTION - COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE*

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, was recognized to present the Committee on Faculty Governance nominations for the Sexual Harassment Panel.

The following nominations were made by the Committee on Faculty Governance:

Lynn Safarik	Applied Human Sciences	2008
Alexandra Bernasek	Liberal Arts	2008
Gene Gloeckner	Applied Human Sciences	2008
William H. Hanneman	Vet. Med. & Biomedical Sciences	2008

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor for the University Sexual Harassment Panel. Hearing no nominations, the nominations were closed.

The nominations as presented were elected to serve a three-year term (2005-2008) on the University Sexual Harassment Panel.

J. *PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTIONS E.13 - ADVANCEMENT IN RANK (PROMOTION); E.10.5 - PROCEDURES FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE AND; E.10.4 - POLICIES ON CONFERRING TENURE - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY*

Mr. Richard Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTIONS E.13 - ADVANCEMENT IN RANK (PROMOTION), E.10.5 - PROCEDURES FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE AND E.10.4 POLICIES ON CONFERRING TENURE TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS.

Mr. Eykholt, MOVED THAT SECTIONS E.13, E.10.5 AND E.10.4 BE DISCUSSED INDIVIDUALLY AD SERIATIM IN INFORMAL DISCUSSION BEGINNING WITH SECTION E.13.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION TO GO INTO INFORMAL DISCUSSION WAS ADOPTED.

Mr. Eykholt noted the proposed revisions to Section E.13 - Advancement in Rank (Promotion)

Additions - Underlined Strikeouts - ~~Overscored~~

E.13 Advancement in Rank (Promotion)

Except in unusual circumstances noted in the statement of reasons given for the promotion recommendation, when tenure is granted to an assistant professor, the individual shall be promoted concurrently to associate professor.

Faculty are normally eligible for consideration for promotion from associate professor to professor after five years in rank. Advancement from associate professor to professor may occur prior to five years in those cases in which the faculty member's performance clearly exceeds the standards for promotion to professor established pursuant to the performance expectations stipulated in Section E.11.

Service at other academic institutions may or may not count toward time in rank. The appointment letter shall state unambiguously whether or not service at other institutions shall count towards time in rank at Colorado State University and state specifically the exact number of years of prior service credit being granted. The department head and dean are responsible for apprising the candidate of this possibility.

E.13.1 Origin and Processing of Recommendations

The head of the department shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of promotion. Because this recommendation is primarily a faculty responsibility, the department head shall ask the promotion committee to vote by ballot for or against promotion of the faculty member being considered. A promotion recommendation shall be by a majority vote of the promotion committee. The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. The recommendation shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the dean of the college, the Provost, and the President for review and either endorsement or ~~reversal~~ opposition. The Board has delegated the final decision to the President.

All reviews are to be exercised expeditiously at each level. After each review, the reviewing administrator shall make a recommendation in writing and send copies to the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation.

The promotion committee must have at least three members and ~~it shall consist of all tenured~~ all eligible department faculty ~~of higher rank than the faculty member under consideration~~, or, if so specified in the department code, a duly elected committee thereof. The department head, college dean, Provost, and President are not eligible to serve on the promotion committee. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in Section K.12.a) of more than half time is not eligible to serve on the promotion committee, unless the department code specifies otherwise. If a faculty member holding an administrative appointment does serve on the promotion committee, it is expected that he or she will not participate in discussions of the case at higher administrative levels. The eligible department faculty are all other tenured department faculty of higher rank than the faculty member under consideration, excepting those who are allowed by the University Grievance Officer to recuse themselves. If a committee of at least three tenured faculty of higher rank cannot be constituted, then additional members shall be selected from other departments within the college so as to produce a committee of three members. ~~These additional members shall be drawn~~ The department head shall draw these additional members by lot from faculty of higher rank on promotion committees within the college. A department may specify in its code a procedure for narrowing the selection of additional members to faculty in disciplines similar to that of the candidate. In the absence of such a procedure, the selection will be from all faculty of higher rank on the promotion committees from all departments within the college.

After a recommendation is received from the promotion committee, ~~it shall be reversed~~ a contrary recommendation shall be issued at a higher administrative level below the President only for compelling reasons that shall be stated in writing to the faculty member, ~~and the promotion committee, and all administrators who have previously supported or opposed the recommendation.~~ If such a ~~reversal occurs~~ contrary recommendation is issued, the faculty member, the promotion committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed

the recommendation shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the ~~reversal~~ contrary recommendation to respond in writing to the administrator's reasons for ~~the reversal~~ opposition, and the ~~reversal~~ contrary recommendation may be ~~overturned~~ opposed at an even higher administrative level. The responses from the faculty member, the promotion committee, and the administrators shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation and rationale for ~~reversal~~ the contrary recommendation.

In the event of a committee ~~vote to recommend denial of~~ recommendation to deny promotion or a ~~reversal~~ opposition by an administrative officer below the President of a recommendation to grant promotion, the recommendation of the committee and the reasons for any ~~reversal~~ contrary recommendation shall be made available promptly to the faculty member under consideration. If the faculty member believes that the committee's recommendation to deny promotion violated University policy or state or federal law, he or she shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the recommendation to submit a written statement detailing this violation. This statement shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation from the promotion committee. If the faculty member believes that ~~the committee's recommendation to deny promotion or an administrator's reversal~~ opposition to a recommendation to grant promotion violated University policy or state or federal law, and the Provost has upheld the recommendation of the committee or administrator not to grant promotion, then the faculty member may appeal the decision through the grievance procedure. ~~If a promotion committee's recommendation to deny promotion is reversed by an administrative officer below the President, and the Provost has upheld this reversal, the committee may appeal the decision through the grievance procedure.~~ In any grievance proceeding, the department and/or the promotion committee shall be represented by a member of the promotion committee selected by the prevailing side of the committee. Although a grievance may not be filed until the Provost has made his or her recommendation to the President, the grievance shall be against the ~~committee or administrator~~ whose action is being grieved. However, the effective date of notification of the grievant shall be the date of notification of the Provost's recommendation.

When the department head is under consideration for promotion, the successive forwarding of the promotion committee's recommendation shall begin with the dean of the college, rather than the department head.

E.13.2 Notification of Presidential Action on Advancement in Rank

When the President has ruled on a recommendation relating to promotion for a faculty member, the faculty member shall be notified promptly in writing of the action taken.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the original wording allowed the promotion committee to file a grievance if its recommendation were reversed. Having a committee, rather than an individual, file a grievance is awkward. The new wording gives the promotion committee the opportunity to respond in writing to the reversal. The consideration of this response by higher-level administrators will serve a similar purpose to the consideration by higher-level administrators of the results of a grievance.

The earlier change in wording allowed the faculty member to file a grievance against the promotion committee. Again, it is awkward to file a grievance against a committee, rather than an individual. Also, this sets a bad precedent of allowing a faculty member to grieve against other faculty members, rather than just administrators. Thus, this earlier change has been revoked.

It has been made clear that the department head, college dean, Provost, and President cannot be members of the promotion committee, since they have the authority to reverse the committee's recommendation later. Also, in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest, faculty members holding administrative appointments of more than half time at the level of assistant/associate dean or above have been excluded from the promotion committee, unless the department code specifically allows them to be members.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the first paragraph of Section E.13.1 - Origin and Processing of Recommendations.

E.13.1 Origin and Processing of Recommendations

The head of the department shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of promotion. Because this recommendation is primarily a faculty responsibility, the department head shall ask the promotion committee to vote by ballot for or against promotion of the faculty member being considered. A promotion recommendation shall be by a majority vote of the promotion committee. The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. The recommendation shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the dean of the college, the Provost, and the President for review and either endorsement or ~~reversal~~ opposition. The Board has delegated the final decision to the President.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the second paragraph of Section E.13.1.

All reviews are to be exercised expeditiously at each level. After each review, the reviewing administrator shall make a recommendation in writing and send copies to the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the third paragraph of Section E.13.1.

The promotion committee must have at least three members and it shall consist of ~~all tenured~~ all eligible department faculty ~~of higher rank than the faculty member under consideration~~, or, if so specified in the department code, a duly elected committee thereof. The department head, college dean, Provost, and President are not eligible to serve on the promotion committee. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in Section K.12.a) of more than half time is not eligible to serve on the promotion committee, unless the department code specifies otherwise. If a faculty member holding an administrative appointment does serve on the promotion committee, it is expected that he or she will not participate in discussions of the case at higher administrative levels. The eligible department faculty are all other tenured department faculty of higher rank than the faculty member under consideration, excepting those who are allowed by the University Grievance Officer to recuse themselves. If a committee of at least three tenured faculty of higher rank cannot be constituted, then additional members shall be selected from other departments within the college so as to produce a committee of three members. ~~These additional members shall be drawn~~ The department head shall draw these additional members by lot from faculty of higher rank on promotion committees within the college. A department may specify in its code a procedure for narrowing the selection of additional members to faculty in disciplines similar to that of the candidate. In the absence of such a procedure, the selection will be from all faculty of higher rank on the promotion committees from all departments within the college.

Mr. Eykholt explained in the third paragraph of Section E.13.1 it is required that the appointment letter state unambiguously how much prior service in being granted (this is also addressed in Section E.10.4). In addition, it is required that all members of the promotion committee have higher rank than the applicant. Currently, this is not the case if the department has too few faculty members of higher rank. The members of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty believed that it is better to go outside the department to add faculty members of higher rank than to include faculty members within the department who are not of higher rank. The current policy could allow associate professors within a department having almost no full professors to decide to promote each other.

A question was asked why the department heads were deleted from the process. Mr. Eykholt responded that if department heads are involved in the promotion committee processes it is a clear conflict of interest and could cause grievances. Mr. David Macphee asked if departments are the same as schools. Mr. Eykholt referred to Ms. Diane Maybon. Ms. Maybon noted that in the *Manual, Code*, Section C.2.1.2 - Powers and Responsibilities, a footnote appears as follows: "Throughout the *Code* the term "departments" shall include The Schools of Education and Social Work."

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the fourth paragraph of Section E.13.1.

~~After a recommendation is received from the promotion committee, it shall be reversed a contrary recommendation shall be issued at a higher administrative level below the President only for compelling reasons that shall be stated in writing to the faculty member, and the promotion committee, and all administrators who have previously supported or opposed the recommendation. If such a reversal occurs contrary recommendation is issued, the faculty member, the promotion committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the reversal contrary recommendation to respond in writing to the administrator's reasons for the reversal opposition, and the reversal contrary recommendation may be overturned opposed at an even higher administrative level. The responses from the faculty member, the promotion committee, and the administrators shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation and rationale for reversal the contrary recommendation.~~

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the fifth paragraph of Section E.13.1.

~~In the event of a committee vote to recommend denial of recommendation to deny promotion or a reversal opposition by an administrative officer below the President of a recommendation to grant promotion, the recommendation of the committee and the reasons for any reversal contrary recommendation shall be made available promptly to the faculty member under consideration. If the faculty member believes that the committee's recommendation to deny promotion violated University policy or state or federal law, he or she shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the recommendation to submit a written statement detailing this violation. This statement shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation from the promotion committee. If the faculty member believes that the committee's recommendation to deny promotion or an administrator's reversal opposition to a recommendation to grant promotion violated University policy or state or federal law, and the Provost has upheld the recommendation of the committee or administrator not to grant promotion, then the faculty member may appeal the decision through the grievance procedure. If a promotion committee's recommendation to deny promotion is reversed by an administrative officer below the President, and the Provost has upheld this reversal, the committee may appeal the decision through the grievance procedure. In any grievance proceeding, the department and/or the promotion committee shall be represented by a member of the promotion committee selected by the prevailing side of the committee. Although a grievance may not be filed until the Provost has made his or~~

her recommendation to the President, the grievance shall be against the ~~committee or~~ administrator whose action is being grieved. However, the effective date of notification of the grievant shall be the date of notification of the Provost's recommendation.

When the department head is under consideration for promotion, the successive forwarding of the promotion committee's recommendation shall begin with the dean of the college, rather than the department head.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt noted the proposed revisions to Section E.10 - Academic Tenure Policy as follows:

Additions - Underlined Strikeouts - ~~Over scored~~

E.10 Academic Tenure Policy (last revised June 10, 1998)

E.10.5 Procedures for the Granting of Tenure

E.10.5.1 Origin and Processing of Tenure Recommendations

~~The process for considering tenure decisions requires the following steps:~~

- ~~a. A written recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure by the departmental tenured faculty or committee thereof.~~
- ~~b. A written review (either approval or reversal) by the department head.~~
- ~~c. A written review (either approval or reversal) by the college dean.~~
- ~~d. A written review (either approval or reversal) by the Provost.~~

~~All reviews are to be exercised expeditiously at each level. Copies of each of these decisions are to be distributed by the reviewing administrator immediately to all participants (the faculty member, the faculty committee, and/or administrators).~~

The head of the department shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure not later than the sixth year of service of a regular member of the faculty and not later than the final year of the probationary period of the faculty member. Because the recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure is primarily a faculty responsibility, the department head shall ask ~~all the tenured members of the faculty of the department, or a duly elected committee composed of tenured members of the faculty of the department, the members of the tenure committee~~ to vote by ballot to grant or deny for or against the granting of tenure to the faculty member being considered. A tenure recommendation shall be by a majority vote of the tenure committee.² The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. The recommendation shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the dean of the college, the Provost, and the President for review and either endorsement or opposition. The Board has delegated the final decision to the President.

²The use of the term; "majority", ~~as used~~ in this Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, shall be according to the definition provided in Robert's Rules of Order, that is, more than half of the votes cast, ignoring blanks.

All reviews are to be exercised expeditiously at each level. After each review, the reviewing administrator shall make a recommendation in writing and send copies to the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation.

The tenure committee must have at least three members and shall consist of all eligible department faculty, or, if so specified in the department code, a duly elected committee thereof. The department head, college dean, Provost, and President are not eligible to serve on the tenure committee. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in Section K.12.a) of more than half time is not eligible to serve on the tenure committee, unless the department code specifies otherwise. If a faculty member holding an administrative appointment does serve on the tenure committee, it is expected that he or she will not participate in discussions of the case at higher administrative levels. The eligible department faculty are all other tenured department faculty, except for those faculty members who are allowed by the University Grievance Officer to recuse themselves. If a committee of at least three tenured faculty cannot be constituted, then additional members shall be selected from other departments within the college so as to produce a committee of three members. The department head shall draw these additional members by lot from faculty on tenure committees within the college. A department may specify in its code a procedure for narrowing the selection of additional members to faculty in disciplines similar to that of the candidate. In the absence of such a procedure, the selection will be from all faculty on the tenure committees from all departments within the college.

After a recommendation is received from the ~~tenured faculty~~ tenure committee, the department head, dean of the college, or Provost a contrary recommendation shall be issued ~~reverse a recommendation~~ at a higher administrative level below the President only for compelling reasons, which shall be stated in writing to the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation and the recommending body. In the event of disapproval, the recommendation of the faculty of the department, including the vote summary and the statements of the committee, shall be submitted to higher administrative levels for consideration at those levels. If such a contrary recommendation is issued, the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the contrary recommendation to respond in writing to the administrator's reasons for opposition, and the contrary recommendation may be opposed at an even higher administrative level. The responses from the faculty member, the tenure committee, and the administrators shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation and rationale for the contrary recommendation.

In the event of a ~~faculty vote~~ committee recommendation to deny tenure, or a ~~reversal~~ opposition by an administrative officer below the President to of a recommendation to grant tenure, the ~~vote summary and statements~~ recommendation of the committee and the reasons for any contrary recommendation shall be made available promptly to the faculty member under consideration. If the faculty member believes that the committee's recommendation to deny tenure violated University policy or state or federal law, he or she shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the recommendation to submit a written statement detailing this violation. This statement shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation from the tenure committee. If the faculty

~~member believes that an administrator's decision to recommend denial of opposition to a recommendation to grant tenure violated University policy or state or federal law, and the Provost has endorsed the recommendation of the administrator not to grant tenure, then the faculty member he or she may appeal the decision through the grievance procedure. If a tenure committee recommendation to deny tenure is reversed by an administrative officer, the committee may appeal the decision through the grievance procedure. In any grievance proceeding, the department and/or the tenure committee shall be represented by a member of the tenure committee selected by the prevailing side of the committee. Although a grievance may not be filed until the Provost has made his or her recommendation to the President, the grievance shall be against the administrator whose action is being grieved. However, the effective date of notification of the grievant shall be the date of notification of the Provost's recommendation.~~

~~When a department head is under consideration for tenure, the successive forwarding of the tenure committee's recommendation, including a vote summary and statements of the committee, shall begin with be reported to the dean of the college, rather than the department head and to the Provost, who shall reverse the recommendation only for compelling reasons which shall be in writing. In any grievance proceedings, the department will be represented by a member of the tenure committee selected by the prevailing side of the committee.~~

The department head, the college dean, or the Provost may elect to postpone consideration of a faculty member for tenure, without prejudice, if a recommendation is made in a year earlier than the final year of the probationary period. The decision to postpone and the reasons for postponement shall be communicated immediately in writing to the faculty member and the recommending body ~~tenure committee, providing reasons for postponement.~~ Nonetheless, the faculty member must be granted tenure or her^t or his contract terminated by the end of the seventh year of regular or regular part-time service (except when there is an extension beyond this as described in Sections E.10.4.c and E.10.4.d). Once a faculty member is on a regular tenure track appointment, the use of special or temporary appointments to extend the probationary period for tenure is not permitted.

E.10.5.2 Notification of ~~Board~~ Presidential Action on Tenure Recommendations

~~When the Board President has passed upon ruled on a recommendation relating to tenure for a faculty member, the Secretary of the Board shall notify the faculty member shall be notified promptly immediately in writing of the action taken. The Board and President should, on questions of faculty status as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgement except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which shall be stated in writing.~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that the original wording allowed a grievance to be filed as soon as an administrator made a reversal of a recommendation. The new wording postpones any grievance until the Provost has made his or her recommendation to the President. If the original reversal has been reversed again, a grievance is not necessary. Also, filing a grievance before the process is complete creates a conflict of interest with the higher administrators who must review both the tenure recommendation and the grievance.

The original wording allowed the tenure committee to file a grievance if its recommendation were reversed. Having a committee, rather than an individual, file a grievance is awkward. The new wording gives the tenure committee the opportunity to respond in writing to the reversal. The consideration of this response

by higher-level administrators will serve a similar purpose to the consideration by higher-level administrators of the results of a grievance.

The new wording specifies that a tenure committee must have at least three members. If there are fewer than three tenured faculty within the department, procedures are specified for selecting other members from the college to fill out the tenure committee.

It has been made clear that the department head, college dean, Provost, and President cannot be members of the tenure committee, since they have the authority to reverse the committee's recommendation later, and neither can the faculty member under consideration. Also, in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest, faculty members holding administrative appointments of more than half time at the level of assistant/associate dean or above have been excluded from the tenure committee, unless the department code specifically allows them to be members.

Finally, changes have been made to reflect the fact that the Board has delegated the final decision on tenure to the President.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the first deleted section of Section E.10.5.1.

E.10.5.1 Origin and Processing of Tenure Recommendations

~~The process for considering tenure decisions requires the following steps:~~

- ~~a. A written recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure by the departmental tenured faculty or committee thereof.~~
- ~~b. A written review (either approval or reversal) by the department head.~~
- ~~c. A written review (either approval or reversal) by the college dean.~~
- ~~d. A written review (either approval or reversal) by the Provost.~~

~~All reviews are to be exercised expeditiously at each level. Copies of each of these decisions are to be distributed by the reviewing administrator immediately to all participants (the faculty member, the faculty committee, and/or administrators).~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that in Section E.10.5.1 the wording that is struck out at the beginning of this section has been placed elsewhere in Section E.10.5 in order to clarify the details of the process.

There was no further discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the next Section of E.10.5.1.

The head of the department shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure not later than the sixth year of service of a regular member of the faculty and not later than the final year of the probationary period of the faculty member. Because the recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure is primarily a faculty responsibility, the department head shall ask ~~all the tenured members of the faculty of the department, or a duly elected committee composed of tenured members of the faculty of the department, the members of the tenure committee~~ to vote by ballot to grant or deny for or against the granting of tenure to the faculty member being considered. A tenure recommendation shall be by a majority vote of the tenure

committee.² The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. The recommendation shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the dean of the college, the Provost, and the President for review and either endorsement or opposition. The Board has delegated the final decision to the President.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the next Section of E.10.5.1.

All reviews are to be exercised expeditiously at each level. After each review, the reviewing administrator shall make a recommendation in writing and send copies to the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the next Section of E.10.5.1.

The tenure committee must have at least three members and shall consist of all eligible department faculty, or, if so specified in the department code, a duly elected committee thereof. The department head, college dean, Provost, and President are not eligible to serve on the tenure committee. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in Section K.12.a) of more than half time is not eligible to serve on the tenure committee, unless the department code specifies otherwise. If a faculty member holding an administrative appointment does serve on the tenure committee, it is expected that he or she will not participate in discussions of the case at higher administrative levels. The eligible department faculty are all other tenured department faculty, except for those faculty members who are allowed by the University Grievance Officer to recuse themselves. If a committee of at least three tenured faculty cannot be constituted, then additional members shall be selected from other departments within the college so as to produce a committee of three members. The department head shall draw these additional members by lot from faculty on tenure committees within the college. A department may specify in its code a procedure for narrowing the selection of additional members to faculty in disciplines similar to that of the candidate. In the absence of such a procedure, the selection will be from all faculty on the tenure committees from all departments within the college.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the revisions to this paragraph of E.10.5.1 clarifies the makeup of the departmental tenure committee. It specifies that the department head, college dean, Provost, and President cannot be members of this committee, since each gets to make his or her own recommendation at a later stage. It specifies that other administrators (e.g., assistant and associate deans) cannot serve on the tenure committee unless the departmental code specifically allows them to do so, since they usually have input at higher administrative levels. It specifies that faculty members can recuse themselves from serving on the tenure committee if the University Grievance Officer feels that they have a valid reason to do so (this is to prevent faculty members from simply refusing their responsibility to serve, while also preserving confidentiality regarding the reason for the recusal). Finally, it specifies the procedure for adding members to the tenure committee from outside the department if there are not enough eligible faculty members within the department.

There was no discussion on this section.

²The use of the term; "majority", as used in this Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual; shall be according to the definition provided in Robert's Rules of Order, that is, more than half of the votes cast, ignoring blanks.

Mr. Eykholt asked for discussion on the next Section of E.10.5.1.

After a recommendation is received from the ~~tenured faculty tenure committee, the department head, dean of the college, or Provost~~ a contrary recommendation shall be issued reverse a recommendation at a higher administrative level below the President only for compelling reasons, which shall be stated in writing to the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation and the recommending body. In the event of disapproval, the recommendation of the faculty of the department, including the vote summary and the statements of the committee, shall be submitted to higher administrative levels for consideration at those levels. If such a contrary recommendation is issued, the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the contrary recommendation to respond in writing to the administrator's reasons for opposition, and the contrary recommendation may be opposed at an even higher administrative level. The responses from the faculty member, the tenure committee, and the administrators shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation and rationale for the contrary recommendation.

Mr. Eykholt explained that in this paragraph of Section E.10.5.1 language was added concerning the situation where an administrator may have a contrary recommendation coming from the previous administrative level. In this case, the faculty member and each person that made a recommendation at an earlier stage has a chance to submit a written rebuttal to the contrary recommendation. All of this information then goes up the line to the next administrator. This ensures that the next administrator is aware of all the relevant issues before making a recommendation. The intent of this change is to reduce the filing of grievances by ensuring that all parties had their say and all information was known before the final decision on tenure was made.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Ekyholt asked for informal discussion on the next Section of E.10.5.1.

In the event of a ~~faculty vote committee recommendation~~ to deny tenure, or a ~~reversal~~ ~~opposition~~ by an administrative officer ~~below the President to~~ of a recommendation to grant tenure, the ~~vote summary and statements~~ recommendation of the committee and the reasons for any contrary recommendation shall be made available promptly to the faculty member under consideration. If the faculty member believes that the committee's recommendation to deny tenure violated University policy or state or federal law, he or she shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the recommendation to submit a written statement detailing this violation. This statement shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation from the tenure committee. If the faculty member believes that an administrator's ~~decision to recommend denial of~~ opposition to a recommendation to grant tenure violated University policy or state or federal law, and the Provost has endorsed the recommendation of the administrator not to grant tenure, then the faculty member ~~he or she~~ may appeal the decision through the grievance procedure. ~~If a tenure committee recommendation to deny tenure is reversed by an administrative officer, the committee may appeal the decision through the grievance procedure.~~ In any grievance proceeding, the department and/or the tenure committee shall be represented by a member of the tenure committee selected by the prevailing side of the committee. Although a grievance may not be filed until the Provost has made his or her recommendation to the President, the grievance shall be against the administrator whose action is being grieved. However, the effective date of notification of the grievant shall be the date of notification of the Provost's recommendation.

Mr. Eykholt explained that in this paragraph of Section E.10.5.1 the situation was addressed where the faculty members feels that the tenure committee violated University policy or state or federal law in making a recommendation against tenure. In this case, the faculty members is allowed to submit a written statement to this effect, and this information goes up the line with everything else. The intent is to reduce the filing of grievances by making sure that administrators up the line are fully informed of the circumstances before make their recommendations.

In addition, the procedure for filing a grievance was modified. If an administrator reverses a positive recommendation for tenure, the faculty member is allowed to file a grievance. However, filing a grievance at this point delays the process, and such a delay may be unnecessary, since the negative recommendation may get reversed again at a higher administrative level. Also, having a higher-level administrator, such as the Provost, rule on a grievance before he or she has had a chance to make a recommendation on tenure creates a potential conflict of interest. Thus, it is required that the faculty member wait until the final recommendation has been made by the Provost before filing a grievance. The changes made in the previous two paragraphs ensure that the faculty member has been allowed to make his or her arguments immediately after the reversal, so filing a grievance is not necessary for informing the higher-level administrators of the relevant arguments.

Also, the right of the tenure committee to file a grievance if their recommendation is reversed at a higher administrative level was removed. This was necessary because having a committee file a grievance is awkward, and this is the only place in the Manual (along with promotions) where a committee is allowed to grieve. Due to the problems inherent in having a committee file a grievance, the revisions allow the committee to rebut any reversal and have this rebuttal sent up the line.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the next Section of E.10.5.1.

~~When a department head is under consideration for tenure, the successive forwarding of the tenure committee's recommendation, including a vote summary and statements of the committee, shall begin with be reported to the dean of the college, rather than the department head and to the Provost, who shall reverse the recommendation only for compelling reasons which shall be in writing. In any grievance proceedings, the department will be represented by a member of the tenure committee selected by the prevailing side of the committee.~~

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the next Section of E.10.5.1.

~~The department head, the college dean, or the Provost may elect to postpone consideration of a faculty member for tenure, without prejudice, if a recommendation is made in a year earlier than the final year of the probationary period. The decision to postpone and the reasons for postponement shall be communicated immediately in writing to the faculty member and the recommending body tenure committee, providing reasons for postponement. Nonetheless, the faculty member must be granted tenure or her/ or his contract terminated by the end of the seventh year of regular or regular part-time service (except when there is an extension beyond this as described in Sections E.10.4.c and E.10.4.d). Once a faculty member is on a regular tenure track appointment, the use of special or temporary appointments to extend the probationary period for tenure is not permitted.~~

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.10.5.2.

E.10.5.2 Notification of Board Presidential Action on Tenure Recommendations

When the ~~Board~~ President has ~~passed upon~~ ruled on a recommendation relating to tenure for a faculty member, ~~the Secretary of the Board shall notify~~ the faculty member shall be notified promptly ~~immediately~~ in writing of the action taken. ~~The Board and President should, on questions of faculty status as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgement except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which shall be stated in writing.~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that Section E.10.5.2 was revised to reflect the fact that the Board of Governors has delegated the final decision on tenure to the President.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt noted the proposed revisions to Section E.10.4 -Policies on Conferring Tenure as follows:

Additions - Underlined Strikeouts - ~~Overscored~~

E.10.4 Policies on Conferring Tenure

- a. *no change*
- b. The decision to award tenure may be made after two years from initial appointment. However, a normal probationary period before the award of tenure is six years of continuous employment for a faculty member initially appointed as an assistant professors, four years of employment for an associate professors, and three years of employment for a full professors. The length of the probationary period, the timing of the midpoint review (see Section E.14.2), and the time frame for the tenure application process shall all be stated unambiguously in the appointment letter. The total period of tenure track service at Colorado State University prior to the granting or denial of continuous tenure is limited to seven years (except when extended beyond this as described in Sections E.10.4.c and E.10.4.d), including all previous tenure track service at the University this institution with the rank of instructor or higher. ~~Time on sabbatical leave shall be included.~~ Since tenure is not granted to instructors, the seven-year limitation requires that an instructors on a regular appointment must be promoted or terminated not later than the completion of seven years of service. When a faculty member has held a temporary or special appointment as an instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at Colorado State University and is subsequently appointed to a regular faculty position (see Section E.4), up to three years of the earlier appointments may be considered, by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head, as part of the probationary period. The details of such credit for prior service, the length of the probationary period, the timing of the midpoint review (see Section E.14.2), and the time frame for the tenure application process shall all be stated unambiguously in the appointment letter. Faculty appointed as lecturers shall not acquire tenure, nor shall service in this rank apply at a later date toward tenure.
- c. Exceptional circumstances, including, but not limited to, cChildbirth, personal health issues, and care of immediate family members may be considered when determining whether the probationary period of a faculty member should be extended (this is separate from the issue of leaves, which are addressed in Section E.10.4.e). The faculty member must make the request for an extension of the probationary period in writing to the departmental ~~tenured faculty or~~

~~committee thereof (the tenure committee). Such a request should be made as early as possible, and must be made prior to the first day of the final academic year when the decision must be made of the probationary period.~~ The tenure committee may recommend up to two separate extensions of the probationary period, each for a period not to exceed one year. The recommendation of the tenure committee ~~will~~ shall be forwarded successively to the department head/~~chair~~, the college dean, and the Provost, each of whom shall recommend either acceptance or rejection ~~may recommend that the determination of the recommendation of the tenure committee be accepted or rejected.~~ Such recommendations shall not be made in an arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory manner. The final decision ~~as to~~ on such an extensions shall be made by the President. A probationary faculty member dissatisfied with a recommendation rejection at any level of a positive recommendation by the tenure committee has the right to appeal through formal grievance procedures.

d. ~~A~~ fFaculty members may request an extension of the probationary period under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Such a request, ~~identifying the nature of the disability, shall~~ must be made in writing to the departmental ~~tenured faculty or committee thereof (the tenure committee), and it must be shown to be~~ identify the nature of the disability and explain why an extension of the probationary period is necessary for purposes of reasonable accommodation. The faculty member requesting such an extension also must provide evidence of protected status under ADA to the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO), who shall ~~verify such~~ determine the validity of the protected status and inform the departmental tenure committee. ~~Such a request for an extension of the probationary period should be made as early as possible, and must be made prior to the first day of the final academic year when the tenure decision must be made of the probationary period.~~ ~~If approved, each extension of the probationary period shall be limited to~~ The tenure committee may recommend an extension of the probationary period for a period not to exceed one year (see Sections E.6.b and E.4). Any subsequent request to the tenure committee for an additional extension shall require reverification of the protected status by the OEO Director. ~~Each~~ The recommendation of the tenure committee shall be ~~submitted~~ forwarded successively to the department head, the college dean, and the Provost, ~~for their recommendations~~ each of whom shall recommend either acceptance or rejection of the recommendation of the tenure committee. The final decision on such an extension shall be made by the President. A probationary faculty member dissatisfied with a rejection at any level of a positive recommendation by the tenure committee has the right to appeal through formal grievance procedures.

e. Any leave for a period not exceeding one year shall normally count as part of the probationary period. However, if the leave is of such a nature that the individual's development as a faculty member while on leave cannot be judged, or if the leave is for purposes that are not scholarly, the faculty member may request that the leave not count as part of the probationary period. The faculty member must make such a request in writing to the departmental tenure committee prior to beginning the leave. The recommendation of the tenure committee shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the college dean, and the Provost, each of whom shall recommend either acceptance or rejection of the recommendation of the tenure committee. The final decision on the request shall be made by the President.

ef. ~~Where~~ If the newly appointed faculty member has been awarded tenure at another academic institution and has the rank of associate professor or professor, ~~he/she~~ he or she may be recommended for tenure immediately, in line with any

provisions stipulated in the code of the departmental codes involved. It is recommended that at least two-thirds of the eligible tenured faculty in the department ~~involved~~ approve. A faculty member who has not been awarded tenure at another academic institution may not be recommended for tenure prior to two years of continuous employment at Colorado State University unless the Provost agrees with the department that the circumstances are exceptional and waives this two-year restriction in writing. The written waiver shall state the exceptional circumstances, and copies of the waiver shall be sent to the faculty member, the tenure committee, the department head, and the college dean.

- fg. Service counted as part of the probationary period for acquiring tenure at other institutions may be counted at this institution. This will reduce the probationary period at this institution and alter the timing of the midpoint review (see Section E.14.2). The details of such credit for prior service, the resulting length of the probationary period, the timing of the midpoint review, and the time frame for the tenure application process shall all be stated unambiguously in the appointment letter. An application for tenure at the end of such a reduced probationary period shall not be considered an early application for tenure. The probationary period at this institution may extend to as much as seven years, even if the total tenure track service in the profession thereby exceeds seven years; the terms of such extension will be stated in writing at the time of initial appointment.

If a faculty member has been granted credit for prior service, thus reducing the normal probationary period, then, at a later date, by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Provost, such credit for prior service may be reduced, thus extending the probationary period. Before entering into such an agreement, the Provost shall consult with the tenure committee, the department head, and the dean of the college.

- ~~g. Any leave approved by the Board for a period not exceeding one year shall normally count as a part of the probationary period. However, when the leave is of such a nature that the individual's development as a faculty member while on leave cannot be judged, or when the leave is for purposes other than scholarly, the tenure decision may be postponed for a period equal to the length of the leave. The relation of the leave to the individual's probationary status shall be determined and recorded prior to the leave.~~

h. *no change*

I. *no change*

j. *no change*

Mr. Eykholt explained that the new language clarifies when a faculty member comes up for tenure, and it requires that this timing be stated in the appointment letter.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.10.4.b.

E.10.4 Policies on Conferring Tenure

- b. The decision to award tenure may be made after two years from initial appointment. However, a normal probationary period before the award of tenure is six years of continuous employment for a faculty member initially appointed as an assistant professors, four years of employment for an associate professors, and three years of employment for a full professors. The length of the

probationary period, the timing of the midpoint review (see Section E.14.2), and the time frame for the tenure application process shall all be stated unambiguously in the appointment letter. The total period of tenure track service at Colorado State University prior to the granting or denial of continuous tenure is limited to seven years (except when extended beyond this as described in Sections E.10.4.c and E.10.4.d), including all previous tenure track service at ~~the University~~ this institution with the rank of instructor or higher. ~~Time on sabbatical leave shall be included.~~ Since tenure is not granted to instructors, the seven-year limitation requires that an instructors on a regular appointment must be promoted or terminated not later than the completion of seven years of service. When a faculty member has held a temporary or special appointment as an instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at Colorado State University and is subsequently appointed to a regular faculty position (see Section E.4), up to three years of the earlier appointments may be considered, by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head, as part of the probationary period. The details of such credit for prior service, the length of the probationary period, the timing of the midpoint review (see Section E.14.2), and the time frame for the tenure application process shall all be stated unambiguously in the appointment letter. Faculty appointed as lecturers shall not acquire tenure, nor shall service in this rank apply at a later date toward tenure.

Mr. Eykholt explained that in Section E.10.4.b., it is required that the appointment letter state unambiguously the length of the probationary period, the timing of the midpoint review, and the time frame for the tenure application process. In addition, Section E.10.4.c and E.10.4.d, which explain how the probationary period can be extended for such things as childbirth and disability (such extensions are required by federal law), were referenced for clarity. Also, the reference to sabbatical leaves was removed since faculty members are not eligible for sabbatical leave until after they have received tenure.

Mr. Kugrens asked if the term "lecturer" is obsolete. Mr. Eykholt responded that the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty did not consider this. However, he agreed to research this and if a revision is needed concerning this issue it will be addressed.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.10.4.c.

- c. Exceptional circumstances, including, but not limited to, childbirth, personal health issues, and care of immediate family members may be considered when determining whether the probationary period of a faculty member should be extended (this is separate from the issue of leaves, which are addressed in Section E.10.4.e). The faculty member must make the request for an extension of the probationary period in writing to the departmental ~~tenured faculty or committee thereof (the tenure committee).~~ Such a requests should be made as early as possible, and must be made prior to the first day of the final academic year ~~when the decision must be made of the probationary period.~~ The tenure committee may recommend up to two separate extensions of the probationary period, each for a period not to exceed one year. The recommendation of the tenure committee ~~will~~ shall be forwarded successively to the department head/~~chair,~~ the college dean, and the Provost, each of whom shall recommend either acceptance or rejection ~~may recommend that the determination of the recommendation of the tenure committee be accepted or rejected.~~ Such recommendations shall not be made in an arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory manner. The final decision as to on such an extensions shall be made by the President. A probationary faculty member dissatisfied with a recommendation rejection at any level of a positive recommendation by the tenure committee has the right to appeal through formal grievance procedures.

Mr. Eykholt explained that in Section E.10.4.c allowance was made for the possibility of extending the probationary period due to exceptional circumstances other than childbirth or the care of immediate family members (e.g., for personal health issues). In addition, the procedure was clarified for applying for such an extension. Mr. Eykholt emphasized that such extensions are not automatic - it requires approval by the President after recommendations by the tenure committee, the department chair, the college dean, and the Provost.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.10.4.d.

- d. A faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Such a request, identifying the nature of the disability, shall must be made in writing to the departmental tenured faculty or committee thereof (the tenure committee), and it must be shown to be identify the nature of the disability and explain why an extension of the probationary period is necessary for purposes of reasonable accommodation. The faculty member requesting such an extension also must provide evidence of protected status under ADA to the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO), who shall verify such determine the validity of the protected status and inform the departmental tenure committee. Such a rRequests for an extension of the probationary period should be made as early as possible, and must be made prior to the first day of the final academic year when the tenure decision must be made of the probationary period. If approved, each extension of the probationary period shall be limited to The tenure committee may recommend an extension of the probationary period for a period not to exceed one year (see Sections E.6.b and E.4). Any subsequent request to the tenure committee for an additional extension shall require reverification of the protected status by the OEO Director. Each The recommendation of the tenure committee shall be submitted forwarded successively to the department head, the college dean, and the Provost, for their recommendations each of whom shall recommend either acceptance or rejection of the recommendation of the tenure committee. The final decision on such an extension shall be made by the President. A probationary faculty member dissatisfied with a rejection at any level of a positive recommendation by the tenure committee has the right to appeal through formal grievance procedures.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the procedure was clarified when applying for an extension of the probationary period due to a disability in this section.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.10.4.e.

- e. Any leave for a period not exceeding one year shall normally count as part of the probationary period. However, if the leave is of such a nature that the individual's development as a faculty member while on leave cannot be judged, or if the leave is for purposes that are not scholarly, the faculty member may request that the leave not count as part of the probationary period. The faculty member must make such a request in writing to the departmental tenure committee prior to beginning the leave. The recommendation of the tenure committee shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the college dean, and the Provost, each of whom shall recommend either acceptance or rejection of the recommendation of the tenure committee. The final decision on the request shall be made by the President.

Mr. Eykholt explained that Section E.10.4.g has been moved to a new Section E.10.4.e because this section, like the previous two sections, covers reasons for extending the probationary period. This extension is due to a leave, and it is clarified that the request for such an extension must be made prior to the leave.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.10.4. f.

- ef. ~~Where~~ If the newly appointed faculty member has been awarded tenure at another academic institution and has the rank of associate professor or professor, ~~he/she~~ he or she may be recommended for tenure immediately, in line with any provisions stipulated in the code of the departmental codes involved. It is recommended that at least two-thirds of the eligible tenured faculty in the department ~~involved~~ approve. A faculty member who has not been awarded tenure at another academic institution may not be recommended for tenure prior to two years of continuous employment at Colorado State University unless the Provost agrees with the department that the circumstances are exceptional and waives this two-year restriction in writing. The written waiver shall state the exceptional circumstances, and copies of the waiver shall be sent to the faculty member, the tenure committee, the department head, and the college dean.

Mr. Eykholt explained that in Section E.10.4.f wording was added that a faculty member who does not already have tenure at another academic institution must serve two years at Colorado State University before being awarded tenure here. However, we allow this restriction to be waived in exceptional circumstances if both the department and the Provost approve this waiver.

Mr. Kirk Hallahan asked if the college would have input regarding this issue. Mr. Eykholt explained that this decision would be between the department head and the Provost. The Provost can ask deans for consultation, but the Provost has the final decision in these matters.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.10.4.g.

- fg. Service counted as part of the probationary period for acquiring tenure at other institutions may be counted at this institution. This will reduce the probationary period at this institution and alter the timing of the midpoint review (see Section E.14.2). The details of such credit for prior service, the resulting length of the probationary period, the timing of the midpoint review, and the time frame for the tenure application process shall all be stated unambiguously in the appointment letter. An application for tenure at the end of such a reduced probationary period shall not be considered an early application for tenure. The probationary period at this institution may extend to as much as seven years, even if the total tenure track service in the profession thereby exceeds seven years; the terms of such extension will be stated in writing at the time of initial appointment.

If a faculty member has been granted credit for prior service, thus reducing the normal probationary period, then, at a later date, by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Provost, such credit for prior service may be reduced, thus extending the probationary period. Before entering into such an agreement, the Provost shall consult with the tenure committee, the department head, and the dean of the college.

- g. ~~Any leave approved by the Board for a period not exceeding one year shall normally count as a part of the probationary period. However, when the leave is of such a nature that the individual's development as a faculty member while on leave cannot be judged, or when the leave is for purposes other than scholarly, the tenure decision may be postponed for a period equal to the length of the leave. The relation of the leave to the individual's probationary status shall be determined and recorded prior to the leave.~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that in Section E.10.4.g it was clarified that it is required that the appointment letter state unambiguously how much credit is being given for prior service and the resulting length of the probationary period. It is also stated that an application for tenure at the end of the reduced probationary period will not be considered an early application. This prevents either the faculty member or the administration from renegeing on the agreement regarding credit for prior service. However, the policy does allow for such renegeing if there is mutual agreement to do so.

There was no discussion on this section.

There was no further informal discussion on Section E.13, E.10.5 and E.10.4

Mr. F. C. "Ted" Weston MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL GO INTO FORMAL DISCUSSION.

MR. WESTON'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

Mr. Miller asked for formal discussion or amendments to Sections E.13, E.10.5 and E.10.4.

There was no further formal discussion or amendments to Sections E.13, E.10.5 and E.10.4.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

K. *PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTION E.14 - PERFORMANCE REVIEWS - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY*

Mr. Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT REVISIONS OF *MANUAL* SECTION E.14 – PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

E.14 Performance Reviews

All faculty members, including department heads and deans, are subject to ~~annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance reviews.~~ These reviews include annual reviews, comprehensive reviews of tenure-track faculty, and comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty. Annual reviews and comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty shall be conducted by the academic supervisor for the faculty member's academic unit. For a faculty member who is not a department head, a dean, an associate dean or an assistant dean, the academic unit is his or her home department, and the academic supervisor is the department head. For a department head, an associate dean, or an assistant dean, the academic unit is the college, and the academic supervisor is the dean of that college. For a dean, the academic unit is the university, and the academic supervisor is the Provost.

Performance reviews are intended to assist faculty in achieving tenure or promotion, to facilitate continued professional development, to refocus professional efforts when appropriate, and to assure that faculty members are meeting their obligations to the University. These reviews must be conducted in such a way that they are consistent with the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, and other protected rights.

~~Annual reviews are for the purpose of evaluation for merit salary increases, for providing help to faculty members to improve their performance when needed, and for the early identification and correction of perceived weaknesses and deficiencies in performance. The department head shall work with the faculty member to develop specific actions to improve performance. Departmental requirements for annual performance evaluations are found in Section C.2.5.~~

Reviews of A performance review must take into account the individual faculty effort distribution (see Section E.9.1) and the individual faculty workload (see Section E.9.2), and it must consider be based upon the faculty member's effort distribution in each of the areas of responsibility. Furthermore, effort distributions in areas of responsibility should be established so as to best utilize the individual talents of all tenured faculty members, because having similar assignments for all faculty members in a department normally often is not an the most effective use of resources. Tenured faculty members should have the opportunity to work with the department head to adjust their professional responsibilities throughout their careers in a way that allows permits them to meet both institutional and individual goals.

At For each performance reviews, the faculty member shall receive a numerical performance rating. In addition, a written report shall be prepared, and this report shall identify strengths and any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance. The faculty member shall be given a copy of this report, and he or she shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report if he or she desires to do so. Both the report and the faculty member's response shall will be maintained in the faculty member's official Ppersonnel Efile.

E.14.1 Annual Reviews

Annual reviews are typically for the purpose of evaluation for merit salary increases, for providing assistance to faculty members to improve their performance when needed, and for the early identification and correction of preceived weaknesses and deficiencies in performance. When appropriate, the academic supervisor shall work with the faculty member to develop specific actions to improve performance. Requirements for annual performance reviews are found in Section C.2.5.

E.14.12 Comprehensive Reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty

A comprehensive performance review of each tenure-track faculty member shall be conducted at by the midpoint of the his or her probationary period at Colorado State University. For example, the normal probationary period for an assistant professor is six years, so the midpoint review would be conducted by the end of the third year. However, if the assistant professor were given one year of credit for prior service, then the probationary period at Colorado State University would be reduced to five years, so the midpoint review would be conducted by the middle of the third year.

This midpoint review shall be conducted by the tenured a Review Committee consisting of all eligible faculty of the department, or, if so specified in the department code, by a duly elected committee thereof, of such faculty as determined by the department code. The department head shall not be a member of this committee. The department head, college dean, Provost, and President are not eligible to serve on the Review Committee. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in Section K.12.a) of more than half time is not eligible to serve on the Review Committee, unless the department code specifies otherwise. The eligible faculty are all other tenured department faculty, except for the faculty member under review and those faculty members who are allowed by the University Grievance Officer to recuse themselves. Prior to conducting the review, the members of the Review Committee shall consult with the college dean to discuss the expectations for tenure at administrative levels higher than the department.

Upon completion of the review, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee shall be provided to the faculty member, the department head, the dean and the Provost/Academic Vice President. The report shall include oOne of the following possible three outcomes must be selected by a majority of the Review Committee:

1. The faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion, and sustained progress may result in a favorable recommendation from the department;
2. There are deficiencies, ~~that~~ but, if they are corrected satisfactorily, the faculty member will be making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion, corrected, may lead to a favorable recommendation for tenure, or;
3. The faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one or more areas of responsibility, and the tenure Review Ceommittee recommends against further contract renewals.

Upon completion of the midpoint review, the Review Committee shall prepare a written report. A copy of this report shall be given to the faculty member, who shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report if he or she desires to do so. Both the report and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the college dean, and the Provost (if one of these persons is the faculty member under review, they will be skipped in the forwarding). Each of the included administrators may add written comments, and copies of these comments will be given to the faculty member, the Review Committee, and each of the administrators. The report shall include any written comments provided by the department head, dean and Provost/Academic Vice President, as well as the faculty member. A final comprehensive performance review is also required prior to a recommendations concerning tenure (see Section E.10.4).

E.14.23 Periodic Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty

E.14.23.1 Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews

Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews of all tenured faculty members, except those on transitional appointments of fewer than five years, shall be conducted at five-year intervals, beginning five years after the granting of tenure. If a tenured faculty member receives a promotion in rank, this alters the schedule for Phase I Reviews, with the next review being conducted five years after the promotion. The schedule for Phase I Reviews may be shifted by up to two years in order to accommodate a sabbatical leave, a major health issue, having too many faculty scheduled for review in the same year, or some other compelling reason. However, such a shift requires the consent of both the faculty member and the academic supervisor. If two annual reviews since the last Phase I Review have identified deficiencies of sufficient magnitude to warrant a Phase I Review, then the schedule for Phase I Reviews will be altered, with the next review occurring immediately.

Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews of all tenured faculty shall be conducted by the department head at intervals of five years following the acquisition of tenure or if there are two unsatisfactory annual reviews within a five year period. A Phase I Review shall be based upon a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure or promotion; an updated curriculum vitae; a self-analysis by the faculty members, including both strengths and weaknesses; and a statement by the faculty member of professional goals and objectives. The ~~department head~~ academic supervisor shall provide an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance, and the faculty member shall be given a copy of this evaluation. The Evaluation must be based upon the faculty member's effort distribution and performance weighted in each area of responsibility (see Section E.12), and it must take into account the individual faculty effort distribution (see Section

E.9.1) and the individual faculty workload (see Section E.9.2). As part of the overall assessment of the faculty member's performance, the academic supervisor must select one of the following three outcomes:

1. the faculty member's performance is satisfactory, and no further action is necessary;
2. the faculty member has deficiencies which the academic supervisor believes can be remedied without implementing a Phase II Review; or
3. the faculty member's performance is sufficiently unsatisfactory that a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review shall be conducted.

~~The e~~Evaluations should identify strengths and any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance. If a faculty member has deficiencies that, in the opinion of the department head, may be corrected without implementing a Phase II Review, the department head, in consultation with the faculty member, should prepare the second outcome is selected, the academic supervisor shall design a specific professional development plan to assist the faculty member in meeting the departmental expectations. The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to work with the academic supervisor on the design of this plan, and the faculty member shall be given a copy of this plan. As part of this plan, the faculty member's effort distribution and/or workload in each of these areas of responsibility may be adjusted to focus on the faculty member's interests; and demonstrated performance, and as well as the needs of the department academic unit. This plan may shall include a time-frame for achieving the indicated goals, and it shall specify what resources, assistance, and opportunities to will be made available to the faculty member, and include a time frame by which the department head will monitor progress toward achieving the planned in order to help him or her achieve these goals. If the evaluation from a Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review is unsatisfactory, a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review shall be conducted.

E.14.23.2 Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews

A Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews are is initiated when the department head academic supervisor decides determines that a tenured faculty member's performance was unsatisfactory in the a Phase I Review was not satisfactory. The initiation of a Phase II Review is not grievable by the faculty member. A Phase II Review Committee of at least three tenured peers at the same or higher rank as the faculty member shall be selected to conduct a comprehensive performance review according to procedures specified in the department code of the academic unit. These peers shall be selected from the same academic unit as the faculty member, unless that academic unit is a department that is too small, in which case, some of the peers may be from other departments within the same college. The academic supervisor shall not be a member of the Review Committee, nor shall any other administrator at the same administrative level as the academic supervisor or higher. The procedure for the selection of these peers shall be specified in the code of the academic unit. If the selection procedures are not specified in the code of the academic unit, then a committee of three tenured peers shall be drawn by lot from the eligible faculty in the same academic unit as the faculty member. If the academic unit is a small department with fewer than three eligible faculty, then additional tenured peers shall be drawn by lot from the eligible faculty in the same college so as to increase the total number of committee members to three. The initiation of a Phase II Review is not grievable by the faculty member. This review shall be

~~conducted by peers within the department or by a group from the same college, as determined by the department code. The department head shall not be a member of this committee.~~

The ~~department~~ code of each academic unit shall specify:

1. ~~the method~~ procedure for the selection of ~~the peer~~ a Phase II Review Committee;
2. procedures for assuring impartiality and lack of bias among members of the Review Committee;
3. the criteria to be used by the Review Committee, including standards for evaluation which reflect the overall mission of the ~~department academic unit, as well as~~ and which permitting sufficient flexibility to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities, ~~and~~ effort distributions, and workloads;
4. the types of information to be submitted by the faculty member being reviewed; and
5. any additional information to be used in evaluations, such as peer evaluations and student opinions of teaching.

~~As a result of a Phase II Reviews, a majority of the committee must decide on one of the following four possible outcomes must be selected by a majority of the Review Committee. No further actions are necessary if:~~

1. the faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance, as identified by his or her ~~department~~ academic unit; ~~or~~
2. the deficiencies are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent.

~~Further action is required if:~~

- ~~3.~~ there are substantial and chronic or recurrent deficiencies that must be remedied; or
- ~~24.~~ ~~the committee concludes that the conditions set forth in Section E.10.7 appear to be present~~ disciplinary action is recommended (see Section E.10.7).

For either of the first two outcomes, no further action is necessary. For either of the last two outcomes, further action is required. Regardless of the outcome, the Review Committee shall prepare a written report and provide the faculty member with a copy. If either of the last two outcomes has been selected, then the written report shall explain what deficiencies led to that selection. The faculty member shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report. For informational purposes, both the report and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the academic supervisor, and, at successive steps, to each higher supervisor, ending with the Provost. If the Review Committee decides that deficiencies must be remedied, the academic supervisor. In cases where deficiencies are found that, in the opinion of the peer review committee, must be remedied, the department head and faculty member

~~will shall~~ design a specific professional development plan indicating how these deficiencies are to be remedied and setting time-lines for accomplishing each element of the plan. The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to work with the academic supervisor on the design of this plan. This development plan shall be submitted to the next higher administrative level for approval, and the faculty member shall be given a copy of the approved plan. ~~Such development plans must be approved by the dean of the college. In the event that conditions set forth in Section E.10.7 are present, the committee will recommend the initiation of procedures which may result in possible sanctions up to and including tenure revocation. For each outcome, the committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review, and the faculty member shall have a reasonable opportunity, as defined in the departmental code, to prepare a written response to the summary. Both the review and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the department head, and at successive steps, to the dean, and the Provost/Academic Vice President. Recommendations of the department head and dean will be sent concurrently to the faculty member. The Provost/Academic Vice President shall make the final decision regarding action.~~

E.14.34 Grievance

~~A~~ The ~~F~~faculty member shall have recourse to the provisions in Section K, except where otherwise prohibited (e.g., see Section E.10.7), once an adverse recommendation is made in any performance review. Any adverse recommendation or decision made by an administrator as a result of a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review may be the basis for complaint under Section K. A professional development plan is not grievable by the faculty member.

Mr. Eykholt noted that the new wording is intended to correct the following three oversights:

1. Department heads and deans are subject to comprehensive performance reviews. However, the original language did not take this into account.
2. When a faculty member is promoted in rank, he or she undergoes a thorough review that is at least as comprehensive as a Phase I Review. This should serve the purpose of a Phase I Review and reset the clock for future Phase I Reviews. Note that, if a request for promotion is denied, the clock is not reset.
3. The original wording did not guarantee that the faculty member would receive a copy of either a Phase I Review or a professional development plan designed to correct perceived deficiencies without proceeding to a Phase II Review. The stated intent of the review process is to help the faculty member improve, so he or she should be provided with copies of these items. Also, Paul Bell, the University Grievance Officer, has requested that the faculty member receive this information, since he feels that this would potentially reduce the number of grievances filed.

Also, the new wording exempts faculty members on transitional appointments of fewer than five years from five-year reviews, it excludes administrators at a higher level than the faculty member from being members of a Phase II Review Committee, and it allows the schedule for five-year reviews to be shifted to accommodate sabbatical leaves, health problems, or having too many faculty members scheduled for five-year reviews in the same year.

Finally, the criteria for membership of the Review Committee for midpoint reviews is made the same as the criteria for membership of the tenure committee that will later make the recommendation for or against tenure. Also, this committee must now consult with the college dean to ensure that there is input to the

review process from the higher administrative levels that have the authority to reverse the recommendation of the tenure committee.

Mr. Eykholt MOVED THAT THIS SECTION BE DISCUSSED AD SERIATIM IN INFORMAL DISCUSSION.

MR. EYKHOLT MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.14.

E.14 Performance Reviews

All faculty members, including department heads and deans, are subject to annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of performance reviews. These reviews include annual reviews, comprehensive reviews of tenure-track faculty, and comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty. Annual reviews and comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty shall be conducted by the academic supervisor for the faculty member's academic unit. For a faculty member who is not a department head, a dean, an associate dean or an assistant dean, the academic unit is his or her home department, and the academic supervisor is the department head. For a department head, an associate dean, or an assistant dean, the academic unit is the college, and the academic supervisor is the dean of that college. For a dean, the academic unit is the university, and the academic supervisor is the Provost.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the first paragraph was expanded to include department heads and college deans in the review process. Thus, reference to departments and department heads as the reviewers had to be changed to academic units and academic supervisors, and these new terms had to be defined.

There was no discussion on this section.

Performance reviews are intended to assist faculty in achieving tenure or promotion, to facilitate continued professional development, to refocus professional efforts when appropriate, and to assure that faculty members are meeting their obligations to the University. These reviews must be conducted in such a way that they are consistent with the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, and other protected rights.

Annual reviews are for the purpose of evaluation for merit salary increases, for providing help to faculty members to improve their performance when needed, and for the early identification and correction of perceived weaknesses and deficiencies in performance. The department head shall work with the faculty member to develop specific actions to improve performance. Departmental requirements for annual performance evaluations are found in Section C.2.5.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the third paragraph was moved to a new Section E.14.1.

There was no discussion on this section.

Reviews of A performance review must take into account the individual faculty effort distribution (see Section E.9.1) and the individual faculty workload (see Section E.9.2), and it must consider be based upon the faculty member's effort distribution in each of the areas of responsibility. Furthermore, effort distributions in areas of responsibility should be established so as to best utilize the individual talents of all tenured faculty members, because having similar assignments for all faculty members in a department normally often is not the most effective use of resources. Tenured faculty members should have the opportunity to work with the department head to adjust their professional responsibilities throughout their careers in a way that allows permits them to meet both institutional and individual goals.

Mr. Eykholt noted that the fourth paragraph was modified to emphasize that effort distribution and workload are two different issues.

There was no discussion on this section.

All For each performance reviews, the faculty member shall receive a numerical performance rating. In addition, a written report shall be prepared, and this report shall identify strengths and any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance. The faculty member shall be given a copy of this report, and he or she shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report if he or she desires to do so. Both the report and the faculty member's response shall will be maintained in the faculty member's official Ppersonnel Efile.

Mr. Eykholt explained that in the fifth paragraph, it was specified that any review shall be documented in writing that the faculty member shall receive a copy, that the faculty member shall have the opportunity to respond in writing, and that the written record shall be part of the faculty member's personnel file, which protects it from the open records act. In addition, it states that a numerical rating shall be produced, since the overall rating is subject to the open records act. This also facilitates the University to keep the majority of the review confidential.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.14.1.

E.14.1 Annual Reviews

Annual reviews are typically for the purpose of evaluation for merit salary increases, for providing assistance to faculty members to improve their performance when needed, and for the early identification and correction of preceived weaknesses and deficiencies in performance. When appropriate, the academic supervisor shall work with the faculty member to develop specific actions to improve performance. Requirements for annual performance reviews are found in Section C.2.5.

Mr. Eykholt explained that this is the language that was found in the third paragraph of Section E.14.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the first paragraph of Section E.14.2.

E.14.2 Comprehensive Reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty

A comprehensive performance review of each tenure-track faculty member shall be conducted at by the midpoint of the his or her probationary period at Colorado State University. For example, the normal probationary period for an assistant professor is six years, so the midpoint review would be conducted by the end of the third year. However, if the assistant professor were given one year of credit for prior service, then the probationary period at Colorado State University would be reduced to five years, so the midpoint review would be conducted by the middle of the third year.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the new language in the first paragraph of Section E.14.2 clarifies when the midpoint review occurs.

There was no discussion on this section.

This midpoint review shall be conducted by ~~the tenured~~ a Review Committee consisting of all eligible faculty of the department, or, if so specified in the department code, by a duly elected committee thereof, of such faculty as determined by the department code. The department head shall not be a member of this committee. The department head, college dean, Provost, and President are not eligible to serve on the Review Committee. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in Section K.12.a) of more than half time is not eligible to serve on the Review Committee, unless the department code specifies otherwise. The eligible faculty are all other tenured department faculty, except for the faculty member under review and those faculty members who are allowed by the University Grievance Officer to recuse themselves. Prior to conducting the review, the members of the Review Committee shall consult with the college dean to discuss the expectations for tenure at administrative levels higher than the department.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the second paragraph of Section E.14.2 makes the composition of the midpoint review committee the same as the tenure committee, since the purpose of the midpoint review is to give feedback on the progress toward tenure. It also states that this review committee should consult with the college dean as part of the review process to ensure that the committee understands the expectations for tenure at higher administrative levels than the department.

There was no discussion on this section.

Upon completion of the review, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee shall be provided to the faculty member, the department head, the dean and the Provost/Academic Vice President. The report shall include ~~o~~One of the following possible three outcomes must be selected by a majority of the Review Committee:

Mr. Eykholt explained that the language in the third paragraph that is struck out was place in the fifth paragraph of the opening section of Section E.14.

There was no discussion on this section.

1. The faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion, and sustained progress may result in a favorable recommendation from the department;
2. There are deficiencies, ~~that but~~, if they are corrected satisfactorily, the faculty member will be making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion, corrected, may lead to a favorable recommendation for tenure, or;

Mr. Eykholt explained that items 1 and 2 of this paragraph were reworded to remove the vagueness of the word "may" and make a more definite statement regarding the candidates progress toward tenure.

There was no discussion on this section.

3. The faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one or more areas of responsibility, and the ~~tenure~~ Review Committee recommends against further contract renewals.

Upon completion of the midpoint review, the Review Committee shall prepare a written report. A copy of this report shall be given to the faculty member, who shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report if he or she desires to do so. Both the report and the faculty member's response

shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the college dean, and the Provost (if one of these persons is the faculty member under review, they will be skipped in the forwarding). Each of the included administrators may add written comments, and copies of these comments will be given to the faculty member, the Review Committee, and each of the administrators. The report shall include any written comments provided by the department head, dean and Provost/Academic Vice President, as well as the faculty member. A final comprehensive performance review is also required prior to a recommendations concerning tenure (see Section E.10.4).

Mr. Eykholt explained that the fourth paragraph of this section was reworded to ensure that a written record of the midpoint review is produced, that the faculty member has a chance to respond in writing, and that the written record is given to everyone involved in the evaluation process and the later tenure process.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.14.3.1.

E.14.23 Periodic Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty

E.14.23.1 Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews

Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews of all tenured faculty members, except those on transitional appointments of fewer than five years, shall be conducted at five-year intervals, beginning five years after the granting of tenure. If a tenured faculty member receives a promotion in rank, this alters the schedule for Phase I Reviews, with the next review being conducted five years after the promotion. The schedule for Phase I Reviews may be shifted by up to two years in order to accommodate a sabbatical leave, a major health issue, having too many faculty scheduled for review in the same year, or some other compelling reason. However, such a shift requires the consent of both the faculty member and the academic supervisor. If two annual reviews since the last Phase I Review have identified deficiencies of sufficient magnitude to warrant a Phase I Review, then the schedule for Phase I Reviews will be altered, with the next review occurring immediately.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the first paragraph of Section E.14.3.1 was reworded to exempt faculty on transitional appointments of less than five years from five-year reviews, to restart the five-year clock when someone is promoted, and to allow shifts in the five-year review schedule by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the academic supervisor. Also, the language at the beginning of the second paragraph was moved to the end of this first paragraph

There was no discussion on this section.

~~Phase I Comprehensive Performance Reviews of all tenured faculty shall be conducted by the department head at intervals of five years following the acquisition of tenure or if there are two unsatisfactory annual reviews within a five year period. A Phase I Review shall be based upon a summary of all annual reviews since the last comprehensive review or the acquisition of tenure or promotion; an updated curriculum vitae; a self-analysis by the faculty members, including both strengths and weaknesses; and a statement by the faculty member of professional goals and objectives. The department head academic supervisor shall provide an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance, and the faculty member shall be given a copy of this evaluation. The Evaluation must be based upon the faculty member's effort distribution and performance weighted in each area of responsibility (see Section E.12), and~~

it must take into account the individual faculty effort distribution (see Section E.9.1) and the individual faculty workload (see Section E.9.2). As part of the overall assessment of the faculty member's performance, the academic supervisor must select one of the following three outcomes:

Mr. Eykholt explained that the second paragraph of this section was modified to ensure that the faculty member receives a copy of the five-year review, and to emphasize that the effort distribution and workload are two different things. Also, wording from the next paragraph was consolidated into a choice of three clearly distinct outcomes for the review process.

There was no discussion on this section.

1. the faculty member's performance is satisfactory, and no further action is necessary;
2. the faculty member has deficiencies which the academic supervisor believes can be remedied without implementing a Phase II Review; or
3. the faculty member's performance is sufficiently unsatisfactory that a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review shall be conducted.

~~The e~~Evaluations should identify strengths and any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance. ~~If a faculty member has deficiencies that, in the opinion of the department head, may be corrected without implementing a Phase II Review, the department head, in consultation with the faculty member, should prepare~~ the second outcome is selected, the academic supervisor shall design a specific professional development plan to assist the faculty member in meeting the departmental expectations. The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to work with the academic supervisor on the design of this plan, and the faculty member shall be given a copy of this plan. As part of this plan, the faculty member's effort distribution ~~and/or workload in each of these areas of responsibility~~ may be adjusted to focus on the faculty member's interests; and demonstrated performance, and as well as the needs of the department academic unit. This plan ~~may~~ shall include a time-frame for achieving the indicated goals, and it shall specify what resources, assistance, and opportunities to will be made available to the faculty member; ~~and include a time frame by which the department head will monitor progress toward achieving the planned in order to help him or her achieve these goals. If the evaluation from a Phase I Comprehensive Performance Review is unsatisfactory, a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review shall be conducted.~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that the third paragraph was modified to clarify that the professional development plan is prepared by the academic supervisor, since it is informational. The faculty member should be given the opportunity to participate in the plan, but he or she does not need to be in agreement with the final result.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on the first paragraph of Section E.14.3.2.

E.14.23.2 Phase II Comprehensive Performance Reviews

A Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review~~are~~ is initiated when the ~~department head~~ academic supervisor decides ~~determines~~ that a tenured faculty member's performance ~~was unsatisfactory in the a~~ Phase I Review was not satisfactory. The initiation of a Phase II Review is not grievable by the faculty

member. A Phase II Review Committee of at least three tenured peers at the same or higher rank as the faculty member shall be selected to conduct a comprehensive performance review according to procedures specified in the department code of the academic unit. These peers shall be selected from the same academic unit as the faculty member, unless that academic unit is a department that is too small, in which case, some of the peers may be from other departments within the same college. The academic supervisor shall not be a member of the Review Committee, nor shall any other administrator at the same administrative level as the academic supervisor or higher. The procedure for the selection of these peers shall be specified in the code of the academic unit. If the selection procedures are not specified in the code of the academic unit, then a committee of three tenured peers shall be drawn by lot from the eligible faculty in the same academic unit as the faculty member. If the academic unit is a small department with fewer than three eligible faculty, then additional tenured peers shall be drawn by lot from the eligible faculty in the same college so as to increase the total number of committee members to three. The initiation of a Phase II Review is not grievable by the faculty member. This review shall be conducted by peers within the department or by a group from the same college, as determined by the department code. ~~The department head shall not be a member of this committee.~~

The department code of each academic unit shall specify:

1. the ~~method~~ procedure for the selection of ~~the peer~~ a Phase II Review Committee;
2. procedures for assuring impartiality and lack of bias among members of the Review Committee;
3. the criteria to be used by the Review Committee, including standards for evaluation which reflect the overall mission of the ~~department academic unit~~, as well as and which permitting sufficient flexibility to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities, and effort distributions, and workloads;
4. the types of information to be submitted by the faculty member being reviewed; and
5. any additional information to be used in evaluations, such as peer evaluations and student opinions of teaching.

As a result of a Phase II Reviews, ~~a majority of the committee must decide on one of the following four possible outcomes must be selected by a majority of the Review Committee.~~ No further actions are necessary if:

1. the faculty member has met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance, as identified by his or her ~~department academic unit~~; or
2. the deficiencies are not judged to be substantial and chronic or recurrent.

~~Further action is required if:~~

- ~~3.~~ there are substantial and chronic or recurrent deficiencies that must be remedied; or

24. ~~the committee concludes that the conditions set forth in Section E.10.7 appear to be present disciplinary action is recommended (see Section E.10.7).~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that the first paragraph of Section E.14.3.2 was expanded to clarify the makeup of the review committee, especially in the case where the department is so small that members must be selected from outside of the department.

There was no discussion on this section.

~~For either of the first two outcomes, no further action is necessary. For either of the last two outcomes, further action is required. Regardless of the outcome, the Review Committee shall prepare a written report and provide the faculty member with a copy. If either of the last two outcomes has been selected, then the written report shall explain what deficiencies led to that selection. The faculty member shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report. For informational purposes, both the report and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the academic supervisor, and, at successive steps, to each higher supervisor, ending with the Provost. If the Review Committee decides that deficiencies must be remedied, the academic supervisor In cases where deficiencies are found that, in the opinion of the peer review committee, must be remedied, the department head and faculty member will shall design a specific professional development plan indicating how these deficiencies are to be remedied and setting time-lines for accomplishing each element of the plan. The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to work with the academic supervisor on the design of this plan. This development plan shall be submitted to the next higher administrative level for approval, and the faculty member shall be given a copy of the approved plan. Such development plans must be approved by the dean of the college. In the event that conditions set forth in Section E.10.7 are present, the committee will recommend the initiation of procedures which may result in possible sanctions up to and including tenure revocation. For each outcome, the committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review, and the faculty member shall have a reasonable opportunity, as defined in the departmental code, to prepare a written response to the summary. Both the review and the faculty member's response shall be forwarded to the department head, and at successive steps, to the dean, and the Provost/Academic Vice President. Recommendations of the department head and dean will be sent concurrently to the faculty member. The Provost/Academic Vice President shall make the final decision regarding action.~~

Mr. Eykholt noted that the final paragraph of this section was modified to make sure that written records are produced, that the faculty member has a chance to respond in writing, and that everyone involved receives a copy of the report. Also, it is again made clear that the academic supervisor prepares this plan, since it is informational. Also, language was removed from the end of this paragraph which sounded punitive, since the purpose of these reviews is supposed to be informational and constructive. Punitive action requires following the procedures discussed in Section E.10.7, so no punitive action can be specified in Section E.14.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Eykholt asked for informal discussion on Section E.14.4.

E.14.34 Grievance

A ~~The F~~ faculty member shall have recourse to the provisions in Section K, except where otherwise prohibited (e.g., see Section E.10.7), once an adverse recommendation is made in any performance review. Any adverse recommendation or decision made by an administrator as a result of a Phase II Comprehensive Performance Review may be the basis for complaint under Section K. A professional development plan is not grievable by the faculty member.

A sentence was added to the paragraph in Section E.14.4 to emphasize that a professional development plan is not grievable, since it is informational, rather than punitive.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Raymond “Steve” Robinson asked the basis for a numerical rating . Mr. Eykholt responded that a numerical rating is currently being done in the Provost office by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and added that the numerical rating is used for public disclosure for open records law. He explained that only the number is revealed, if disclosure is required, not all the paperwork involved in the evaluation. He added that the numerical rating is based on the evaluation forms from the department heads. Mr. Robert Jones added that the Colorado Commission on Higher Education Performance Contract also requires numerical ratings. Mr. Paul Bell, University Grievance Officer, pointed out that assigning numbers in the Provost office could affect the grievance procedures and when the clock begins on the grievance process. In addition, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs would be the responsible administrator in grievance processes.

Mr. Weston MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL GO INTO FORMAL DISCUSSION.

MR. WESTON’S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

Mr. Miller asked for formal discussion or amendments to Section E.14.

Mr. Robinson, MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

For each performance review, the faculty member shall ~~receive~~ be assigned a numerical performance rating by the Provost office. In addition, a written report shall be prepared, and this report shall identify strengths and any deficiencies in the faculty member's performance. The faculty member shall be given a copy of this report, and he or she shall then have ten (10) working days to prepare a written response to this report if he or she desires to do so. Both the report and the faculty member's response shall ~~will~~ be maintained in the faculty member's official Personnel File.

MR. ROBINSON’S MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION WAS NOT ADOPTED.

There was no further formal discussion or amendments to Section E.14.

MR. EYKHOLT’S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

Mr. Miller thanked Mr. Eykholt and all the members of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty for the patience and hard work they invested in revising these important sections of the *Manual*.

- L. *PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTION B.2.4 - COUNCIL OF DEANS - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY*

This item will be Unfinished Business at the May 3, 2005 Faculty Council meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

C. W. Miller, Chair
Robert Jones, Vice Chair
Diane L. Maybon, Recording Secretary

ATTENDANCE

BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING - UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

<u>Jerry Eckert</u>	<u>Agricultural and Resource Economics</u>
<u>J. Daryl Tatum</u>	<u>Animal Sciences</u>
Louis Bjosted	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management
Harrison Hughes	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture
Keith Paustian	Soil and Crop Sciences
Steve Newman	College-at-Large
Eric Schuck (for Dana Hoag Spring 2005)	College-at-Large
Phil Westra	College-at-Large

APPLIED HUMAN SCIENCES

Molly Eckman	Design, Merchandising, and Consumer Sciences
Robert Gotshall	Health and Exercise Science
David A. Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition
David Macphee	Human Development and Family Studies
Michael Nobe	Construction Management
David Greene	Occupational Therapy
Bill Timpson	School of Education
Robert Seiz	School of Social Work

BUSINESS

William Mister	Accounting
F.C. "Ted" Weston	Computer Information Systems
Timothy Gallagher	Finance and Real Estate
Jackie Hartman	Management
Kathleen Kelly	Marketing

ENGINEERING

Chris Kummerow	Atmospheric Science
A. Ted Watson	Chemical Engineering
Ramchand Oad	Civil Engineering
<u>H. J. Siegel</u>	<u>Electrical and Computer Engineering</u>
Azer Yalin	Mechanical Engineering
TBA	College-at-Large
Darrell Fontane	College-at-Large

LIBERAL ARTS

Michelle Glantz	Anthropology
<u>Gary Keimig</u>	<u>Art</u>
Steven J. Shulman	Economics
Pam Coke	English
<u>Michael Abeyta</u>	<u>Foreign Languages and Literatures</u>
Diane C. Margolf	History
Jamie Switzer	Journalism and Technical Communication
<u>William Davis</u>	<u>Music, Theater, and Dance</u>
<u>Michael Losonsky</u>	<u>Philosophy</u>
Brad MacDonald	Political Science
Evan C. Vlachos	Sociology
Eric Aoki	Speech Communication

LIBERAL ARTS (continued)

<u>Alexandra Bernasek</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
Jane Kneller	College-at-Large
<u>Donna Rouser</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>

NATURAL RESOURCES

<u>Barry Noon</u>	<u>Fishery and Wildlife Biology</u>
Douglas Rideout	Forest, Rangeland, and Watershed Stewardship
Sally Sutton	Geosciences
<u>Alan Bright</u>	<u>Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism</u>
TBA	College-at-Large

NATURAL SCIENCES

Jennifer Nyborg	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
Bruce Wunder	Biology
<u>Rich Finke</u>	<u>Chemistry</u>
Dale H. Grit	Computer Science
Kenneth Klopfenstein	Mathematics
R. "Steve" Robinson	Physics
Peter Chen	Psychology
Philip Lee Chapman	Statistics
<u>Norman Curthoys</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
<u>Donald Estep</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
Richard Eykholt	College-at-Large
Zinta Byrne	College-at-Large

VETERINARY MEDICINE AND BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

George Seidel	Biomedical Sciences
Chris Orton	Clinical Sciences
Susan LaRue	Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences
Julie Inamine	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology
<u>Gerald Callahan</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
<u>Tony Knight</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
<u>Edward Dudek</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
Carol Blair	College-at-Large
<u>Joel Bedford</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Donnice Cochenour	Libraries
Lou Anderson	At-Large
Michelle Wilde	At-Large

EX OFFICIO VOTING MEMBERS (*Indicates Member of Faculty Council)

Stephen Davies	Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance
Jackie Hartman*	Chair, Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
<u>Todd Queen</u>	<u>Chair, Committee on Libraries</u>
Richard Eykholt*	Chair, Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty
<u>Jerry Eckert*</u>	<u>Chair, Committee on Scholarship Research & Graduate Education</u>
<u>Boris Kondratieff</u>	<u>Chair, Committee on Scholastic Standards and Awards</u>
Kirk Hallahan	Chair, Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
<u>James Madl</u>	<u>Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning</u>
Philip Chapman*	Chair, Committee on University Programs
James Lindsay	Chair, University Curriculum Committee

OFFICERS OF FACULTY COUNCIL

C. W. Miller	Chair, Faculty Council
Robert Jones	Vice Chair, Faculty Council
Paul Kugrens	BOG Representative - Parliamentarian

NON-ELECTED NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Larry Edward Penley. Excused	President
Tony Frank	Senior Vice President and Interim Provost
<u>Hank Gardner</u>	<u>Interim Vice President for Research</u>
<u>Linda Kuk</u>	<u>Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Admissions</u>
<u>Marc Johnson</u>	<u>Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences and Vice Provost for Outreach</u>
<u>April Mason</u>	<u>Dean, College of Applied Human Sciences</u>
A. Lamborn for Heather Hardy	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
<u>Ajay Menon</u>	<u>Dean, College of Business</u>
<u>Steven Abt</u>	<u>Interim Dean, College of Engineering</u>
<u>Joyce Berry</u>	<u>Dean, College of Natural Resources</u>
<u>Rick Miranda</u>	<u>Dean, College of Natural Sciences</u>
<u>Lance Perryman</u>	<u>Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences</u>
<u>Catherine Murray-Rust</u>	<u>Dean, University Libraries</u>
Peter Dorhout	Interim Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Assistant Vice President for Research