In the March 18, 2014 meeting, Academic Council requested four changes to the draft revision of 3-7 Faculty Reviews and one change to the draft revision of 3-18 Faculty Salaries. All requested changes have been made and are detailed below but are subject to further approvals. The revised policies have been posted on the Policies Under review web page. Council requested the opportunity to ratify at least one of the changes, so they are sent for your approval.

3-7 Faculty Reviews

#1: Replace VII. Non-Tenure Track definition with Professional Faculty definition in Section 1. This was totally a mistake on my part, for which I apologize. On March 14, in the process of making other submitted revisions and renumbering, I copied and pasted the NTT section from a previous version and didn’t finish correcting it. The direction from Council was to define Continuing Status as well, but that was already in the draft (II. Continuing Status). I renumbered the section to retain alphabetical order of definitions, so the modified portion is not VIII. Here is the corrected section:

VIII. Professional Faculty – Faculty members appointed to full-time, ongoing positions, either within or outside of an academic department are not awarded academic rank but are given a position title. Professional faculty positions, which include all positions outside academic departments, are ineligible for rank advancement, continuing status, or tenure. The appointment letter for new faculty indicates if a position is Professional Faculty. Faculty in these positions who demonstrate excellence in fulfilling their role assignment and who exhibit a strong commitment to serving students, colleagues, their department, the institution, and the greater community can be awarded Non-Probationary Status after the appropriate probationary period and reviews. Professional faculty members are required to submit Intermediate Probationary, Final Probationary, and Post-Probation reviews according to the schedule outlined in this policy. Professional faculty members are not eligible for promotion in the form of rank advancement. Professional faculty members are required to undergo Post-Probation Review although they are not eligible for Post-Probation Review salary increases, which are reserved for tenured faculty.

#2: In Definitions, VII. Probation C., remove “previous tenured (not tenure-track)” . Although several members of Council said this was a significant or drastic change from the current policy, it is emphatically not. The current 3-7 Retention, Promotion, and Tenure policy states,

d. Reduced probationary period. At the time of hire, a candidate who has exceptional qualifications based on previous tenured experience may negotiate to have up to two years of prior equivalent professional service accepted towards completion of probationary period. This allows an experienced, exemplary faculty member to undergo tenure review in the fourth rather than the sixth year. Approval must be given in writing by the dean, vice president, and president.
However, that is just a clarification and doesn’t impact the request for a revision, which follows:

\[ C. \text{In specific circumstances and solely at the discretion of the University, a new faculty member who has both exceptional qualifications and previous tenured (not tenure-track) experience at a regionally accredited institution may be awarded a reduction in the probationary period.} \]

\#3: In the same subsection, add exception clause. Usually we recommend against exception clauses because an exception is just that, and exception to the policy, and typically should not need to be included in the policy, especially since in this case the approval process for the exception is exactly the same as for the rule and repetition often breeds confusion in policies. However, it has been inserted as requested. A separate subsection was requested, but the requested revision was added at the end of VII.C.i. as an editorial choice and the original Dean/VP approval note was moved to the main section to maintain clarity with the repetition.

\[ \text{i. A one (1) to two (2) year reduction is allowed based on the amount and quality of documented previous tenured experience. The maximum two (2) year credit allows an experienced, exemplary faculty member to undergo the required Intermediate Probationary Review in the second as opposed to third year and the required Final Probationary Review in the fourth rather than the sixth year. Any exception made in extraordinary circumstances must be approved in writing by the Dean, Vice President of Academic Services, and the President.} \]

Section 2: Review Criteria

\#4: Council revised general criteria list from “and” to “and/or”. Because the requested addition of OR made it possible that holding a faculty member accountable for fulfilling his/her role statement would be difficult, I opted to make a revision of the unnecessarily complicated first sentence, turning it into three sentences while accomplishing what I believe Council wanted. In addition, I removed the previously second sentence as duplicative. The section now reads:

\[ \text{I. The professional judgment of a faculty member’s peers and colleagues is a significant factor in faculty self-governance. Typically, faculty members are reviewed based on standard or additional criteria for teaching, service, and, as applicable, scholarly, research, or creative work. All faculty members are required to satisfactorily perform the duties and responsibilities detailed in the faculty member’s role statement in fulfillment of the University’s mission.} \]

3-18 Faculty Salaries

\#5: Council requested VI. Salary Equity & Overload be revised as follows:

\[ \text{A. Faculty salaries will remain at a level not less than 90% of market equity benchmarks based on rank and discipline insofar as budgetary restrictions allow.} \]