

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
University of Arkansas**

Approved by the Faculty: May 1, 2020

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, Annual and Post Tenure Review of Faculty, and Annual Review and Termination of Non-Classified Staff

**College of Engineering
University of Arkansas,
Fayetteville**

***Preamble:**

This document governs the College of Engineering in the selection, reappointment, promotion, granting of tenure, and annual and post-tenure review of faculty, and the annual evaluation of non-classified staff effective March 1, 2020. It has been approved by the College of Engineering faculty, the Dean of the College of Engineering, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas System, as indicated by the signatures below.

These College policies are supplemented by policies of the departments in the College of Engineering and are required to be consistent with the policies of the University and University of Arkansas System as set forth in the policies below:

- Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, Non-Reappointment and Dismissal of Faculty (Board of Trustees Policy 405.1),
- Termination of Appointment (Board of Trustees Policy 405.4)
- University and Distinguished Professorships (Board Policy 470.1)
- Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment; Including Outside Activity (Fayetteville Policy 404.0)
- Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards and Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure (Academic Policy 1405.11)
- Guidelines for University and Distinguished Professor Appointments, including Annex A and B (Academic Policy 1405.13)
- Faculty Ranks and Titles and Research Assistant and Research Associate Positions, (Academic Policy 1435.50)

In case of conflict, the Board policy, the Campus policy, the College of Engineering policy, and the department policy will have authority in that order. Copies of the campus and board policy documents are available on-line, as referenced in the Faculty Handbook, at the UA web site <https://provost.uark.edu/policies/index.php>. Care should be taken to consult the current document. A copy of the current Faculty Review

Checklist is available at <https://provost.uark.edu/documents/faculty-review-checklist-6-28-18-revised.pdf>.

The principal responsibility for implementing this personnel document and formulating department recommendations rests with the Department Heads and the Dean of the College of Engineering. However, Board of Trustees policy and campus personnel policies also assign important roles to the faculty of the College, including providing input through college and department-level personnel committees and development of a written department personnel document delineating specific criteria and procedures.

Faculty performance is evaluated each year by the departments in the University of Arkansas, College of Engineering (College), and recommendations for promotion and tenure originate in the departments and are reviewed by the college. College policies on faculty service are designed to recognize and reward meritorious performances by salary increases, promotion, and granting of tenure. Granting of tenure requires a high standard of performance in teaching, research and service.

All decisions in selection, reappointment, promotion, and termination of faculty shall be made on the basis of professional merit, the quality of performance of assigned duties, and the quality of or potential for contribution to the University. Exceptions are based on financial exigency as defined by Board of Trustee policy or elimination of programs.

It is the policy of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons; to prohibit discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, veteran's status, or disability, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program of affirmative action.*

APPROVALS

Dean

Date

Provost

Date

Chancellor

Date

President

Date

Table of Contents

I. Committees: Responsibilities and Service	1
II. Initial Appointment	5
A. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Below the Rank of Assistant Professor	5
B. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Above the Rank of Associate Professor.....	6
C. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure.....	9
D. Initial and Successive Appointments of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty	10
III. Successive Appointments, Annual Review, Peer Review, Third-Year Review, and Post-Tenure Review	12
A. Successive Appointments for Tenured, Tenured-Track, *and Non-Tenure Track Faculty*	12
B. Annual Review for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above	13
C. Peer Review for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above	18
D. Third Year Review for Tenure Track Faculty	19
E. Post-Tenure Review.....	19
F. Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above.....	20
IV. Promotion for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above	27
A. Criteria for Promotion.....	27
B. Procedures for Promotion.....	29
V. Tenure	39
A. Criteria for Awarding Tenure	39
B. Procedures for Awarding Tenure.....	39
C. Procedures for Suspending Probationary Period	39

D. Mandatory Sixth Year Review - Terminal Appointment.....	42
VI. Dismissal of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty.....	42
A. Preliminary Proceedings.....	42
B. Hearing Procedures.....	43
C. Suspension Pending Dismissal Proceedings.....	43
D. Hearing Committee.....	44
E. Committee Proceedings.....	44
F. Consideration by Hearing Committee.....	45
G. Consideration by Board of Trustees.....	45
VII. Dismissal of Multi-Year Appointed Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.....	46
A. Initial Proceedings and Determination.....	46
B. Appeals.....	46
VIII. *Annual Evaluation Procedures: Non-Classified Staff.....	47
A. Annual Review.....	47
B. Criteria and Procedures for Annual Review.....	47
C. Termination of Employment.....	48
IX. *Review of College Personnel Document.....	48
*Appendix A: Third Year Review Process.....	49
*Appendix B: Sample Requests for External Review Letters.....	2

The College of Engineering (COE) adopts APS 1405.11 and its subsequent revisions. The provisions of APS 1405.11 are repeated in this document for convenience. Unique COE criteria, procedures, and standards are detailed in relevant sections and are set off with an asterisk.

These criteria, procedures, and general standards, adopted by the Campus Faculty and approved by the Chancellor and President, apply to implementation on the Fayetteville campus of Board of Trustees Policy 405.1. They are also designed to reflect the following statement of the University's mission and vision:

The University of Arkansas is determined to build a better world by providing transformational opportunities and skills, promoting an inclusive and diverse culture, nurturing creativity, and solving problems through research and discovery, all in service to Arkansas. In pursuit of its mission, the University of Arkansas encourages all of its members to strive for excellence in public higher education, advancing Arkansas while building a better world.

I. Committees: Responsibilities and Service

A. Definitions

1. Unit and Department/Departmental are used interchangeably in this policy to refer to an academic department, administered by a head, chair, or director in which tenure may be granted.
 - * The First Year Experience Program is considered a separate, non-tenure initiating, unit with a director. Non-tenured faculty promotions can be granted in this unit in accordance with university, college and unit policies.
 - * The terms Head, Chair and Director may also be used interchangeably as they pertain to the actions described in this document.*
2. For purposes of this policy, school refers to the School of Architecture and Design and the School of Law.

B. Committees and Responsibilities

1. The Unit Peer Review Committee is the departmental committee established to conduct the (state-mandated) annual peer review of each full-time faculty member at the assistant professor or higher rank. This committee provides input to the Department Head/Chair/Director or Dean for consideration in the faculty member's Annual Review. Annual Review refers to the review and evaluation of unit faculty by the department head/chair or dean.
2. The Unit Tenured Faculty consists of all tenured faculty in a department, excluding those in administrative positions from the department head/chair

level and higher, unless specifically allowed by the college/school policy document. Such allowances, if made, must comply with the provisions of I.C.

3. The Unit Promoted Faculty consists of all faculty in a department holding the rank of associate professor or above, excluding those in administrative positions from the department chair/head level and higher, unless specifically allowed by the school/college policy document. Such allowances, if made, must comply with the provisions of I.C.
4. The Unit Personnel Committee is the departmental committee that evaluates candidates for purposes of promotion and tenure.

* Each academic unit will establish a single, elected Unit Personnel Committee for the purpose of evaluating and voting on all promotion and tenure (as appropriate) cases originating in the unit. This Unit Personnel Committee shall consider both tenure-track and non-tenure-track candidates. The unit personnel document shall specifically address the process for electing the Unit Personnel Committee.*

- a) When electing members of the Unit Personnel Committee, fulltime unit faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor are eligible to vote, with three exceptions: (1) department heads/directors (unless specifically allowed by the unit policy document), (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination, and (3) visiting faculty members. If appropriate to the size of the department and consistent with detailed consideration of matters by the committee, a unit may, through its approved policies and procedures, designate that its Unit Personnel Committee shall include all eligible tenured and non-tenure track faculty.
- b) Fulltime unit faculty members at or above the rank of associate professor are eligible to serve on the Unit Personnel Committee, with three exceptions: (1) department heads, (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination, and (3) visiting faculty members. The Unit Personnel Committee must have at least one non-tenure-track member, if the unit has at least two non-tenure-track faculty eligible to serve. Non-tenure-track Unit Personnel Committee members may participate in discussions, but shall not vote on the awarding of tenure or on the promotion of tenure-track candidates.
- c) Members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall not vote on any candidate for a rank higher than the committee member's rank, except that tenured and tenure-track professors shall be allowed to vote on candidates for University Professor and Distinguished Professor.
- d) The Unit Personnel Committee considering any candidate for promotion and/or tenure must consist of not less than three eligible and voting members. In any case where a minimum of three Unit Personnel Committee members are not both eligible and intending to vote on any candidate, the Unit Personnel Committee chair, the Unit head/director, and the Dean of the College shall, working together and with input from the candidate, select and secure one or more eligible members from within the

college to form a slate for election by the unit faculty described in I.B.5a. If a minimum of three eligible and intending to vote members cannot be found from within the college, one or more eligible members may be selected and secured from related disciplines outside the college to form a slate for election to the committee by the unit faculty described in I.B.5.a. The number of outside committee members appointed to the Unit Personnel Committee shall not exceed the number required to ensure three eligible and voting members for all candidates.

e) Each year, the members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall elect a chair from among the members to coordinate the work of the committee.*

5. The College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee is the committee charged with evaluating candidates from that college/school for purposes of promotion and tenure.

* The College Promotion and Tenure Committee also evaluates proposals for Off-Campus Duty Assignments. In both cases, the committee serves as a recommending body to the Dean. The elected College Promotion and Tenure Committee will serve to advise the Dean and, as necessary, the department heads, on personnel matters, including reconsideration of recommendations made at either the department level or the college level. The College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of one tenured faculty representative from each of the eight tenure initiating departments in the college. Each representative is elected by the entire faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor or above within his/her department and serves a three-year term. The committee shall have at least one non-tenure-track member, provided the college has at least two non-tenure-track faculty eligible to serve. The non-tenure-track faculty member will be elected by the college faculty, holding the rank of assistant professor or above, at the fall college faculty meeting and will serve a three-year term. The non-tenure-track member will fully participate in the review and voting for promotion cases involving non-tenure-track candidates. The non-tenure-track member may participate in discussions involving tenured/tenure-track candidates for promotion but will not vote in such cases. No one person will serve on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee for more than two successive three-year terms unless the incumbent is the only faculty member in the department who is eligible. Should a department have no faculty eligible to serve they may elect a faculty member from another department within the college. The chair of the committee will be elected from its membership for a one-year term with the election being conducted during the first meeting of the committee in each academic year. Members of this committee may only vote on promotion for ranks below or equal to the rank they hold.*

6. The University Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee is the elected university committee charged with making recommendations on policy and faculty status with regard to appointment, promotion, and tenure.
7. *The College Honors and Awards committee is the committee charged with evaluating candidates for promotion to the rank of University or Distinguished Professor. This committee also conducts periodic reviews for endowed position holders and evaluates candidates for college and university level awards. In all cases, the committee serves as a recommending body to the Dean. This committee shall consist of one elected member from each department holding the rank of Professor (with endowed chair or professorship), University Professor, or Distinguished Professor. Should a department have no faculty eligible to serve they may elect a faculty member from another department within the college. All departmental faculty holding the rank of assistant professor or above are eligible to vote for their department's representative to this committee.*

Note: Paragraph 8, below, is addressed in Paragraph III.C of the university personnel document. It is inserted here to group all committee definitions and responsibilities in one location.

8. *The Unit Peer Review Committee is the departmental committee established to conduct the (state-mandated) annual peer review of each full-time faculty member at the assistant professor or higher rank. This committee provides input to the Department Head/Director or Dean for consideration in the faculty member's Annual Review. The department personnel document shall specifically address the process for electing the Department Peer Review Committee. Units may choose to have the Unit Personnel Committee also serve as the Unit Peer Review Committee.
 - a) Units may also choose to establish an elected Peer Review Committee (separate from the Unit Personnel Committee) for the purpose of conducting annual peer reviews.
 - b) When a separate Peer Review Committee is established, all fulltime tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor may vote to elect the members of the committee, with two exceptions: (1) visiting faculty are not eligible to vote and (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination is not eligible to vote.
 - c) All fulltime tenure-track and non-tenure-track Unit faculty above the rank of assistant professor shall be eligible to serve on the Peer Review Committee. In addition, tenure-track and non-tenure track assistant professors, having successfully completed three academic years of service in the Unit, shall be eligible to serve.
 - d) Each year, the members of the Unit Peer Review Committee shall elect a chair from among the members to coordinate the work of the committee.*

C. No administrator in the appointment, promotion, or tenure recommendation chain shall serve on any unit/department or college/school or university committee described in 1405.11. All school/college policy documents shall comply with this provision.

* Unit personnel documents will address the eligibility of administrators, who are tenured in their department and not in the tenure and promotion review chain, to vote on tenure and promotion cases.*

II. Initial Appointment

Appointments of all faculty are subject to applicable policies of the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas, the University of Arkansas System, and of this campus. In particular, all appointments are subject to Board of Trustees Policy 405.1 and Board of Trustees Policy 405.4, including, but not limited to, with regard to the provisions on appointment periods.

The faculty and chairperson/head of each department or equivalent unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for the initial appointment of all faculty members in the unit. These criteria and procedures must be approved by the dean, the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (hereafter referred to as Provost), the Chancellor and the President. The criteria and procedures adopted by the faculty and chairperson/head shall be consistent with applicable Board and UA System policies and the following criteria and procedures.

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Below the Rank of Assistant Professor

1. An appropriate degree or professional experience is an essential qualification for appointment to positions at academic ranks.
2. Other important qualifications include experience in teaching, scholarship (research or creative activity), and educational service either at other colleges and universities and/or in non-academic settings.
3. *Assistant Professor
 - Appointment to an Assistant Professorship is based upon potential. A candidate for appointment to assistant professor should:
 - Possess the earned terminal degree for his/her field or its equivalent in professional accomplishments.
 - Have demonstrated a potential for initiative and leadership.
 - Have the personal qualities, intellectual interests, and the technical

competence required for effective teaching, creative research and distinguished service.

- Possess the enthusiasm and the capacity to motivate and inspire students.
- Have demonstrated the capacity for independent creative thinking.
- Indicate both the willingness and capability to exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks.*

4. *Process for Initial Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor

For candidates proposed for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, the Department Head shall submit to the Dean evidence of potential teaching quality, research, and the candidate's service record; at least three letters of reference; a complete vitae; and the department's Faculty Committee and his/her own recommendations. The Dean shall forward the recommendations of the department faculty and Department Head, after adding his/her recommendation, to the Provost. Upon authorization from the provost, the dean will send a letter of offer to the candidate.*

5. Tenure shall not be recommended at the rank of Assistant Professor.
6. The academic rank awarded at the initial appointment shall be consistent with prior professional experience as well as Board policies and criteria adopted by the faculty and chairperson/head of the appropriate unit.
7. Academic Policy 1435.50 provides detailed information about the criteria for faculty ranks and titles. Initial appointments of non-tenure-track faculty should be consistent with the criteria described therein.

B. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Above the Rank of Associate Professor

In addition to the criteria specified under II.A., the following process shall be followed in making all initial appointments at or above the rank of associate professor:

Before a new tenured or tenure-track faculty member shall be appointed at a rank at or above associate professor, the relevant Unit Personnel Committee and Unit Tenured Faculty Committee must review the candidate's curriculum vitae and other relevant supporting application materials and vote on appointment at the proposed rank. The results of both votes and a letter describing the Unit Personnel Committee's rationale shall be submitted to the Unit head/chair and the College/School Dean and are to be considered in the appointment recommendation.

The department/unit head will independently create a recommendation letter describing his or her rationale for their recommendation and forward it to the dean.

Within five working days after receiving the department's recommendation and supporting materials, the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee shall forward its recommendation to the Dean who shall in turn forward all recommendations, after adding his or her recommendation, to the Provost. Upon authorization from the provost, the dean will send a letter of offer to the candidate.

For appointment at the rank of Distinguished Professor, the College Honors and Awards Committee will serve as the college level review committee in lieu of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and will follow the same process.

In addition, consideration for appointment at a rank at or above associate professor may require a vote and letter of rationale from the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee if specified in the College or School policy document.

*Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon demonstrated performance and future potential. The Associate Professorship is a high academic rank and appointment to this rank carries no assurance of further promotion. Appointment is based on the premise that the candidate will, in all probability, attain a high level of distinction during his/her professional career. A critical evaluation of teaching and professional growth is made at this point. In addition, demonstration of the ability to develop and conduct a sustained research program of national prominence is expected. Examples of demonstrated ability will usually include the securing of externally funded grants and/or contracts, refereed publications, and effective mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students.

A candidate for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor should:

- Satisfy the criteria for appointment as an Assistant Professor.
- Have had demonstrated and significant professional accomplishments in teaching, research and service, indicating that the candidate has the potential of becoming a nationally/internationally recognized scholar in his/her field.
- Have obtained professional registration, if deemed appropriate by his/her academic department.
- Demonstrate continuing professional growth and effective activity toward achievement of college and university goals.*

***Professor**

Appointment to the rank of Professor is intended to recognize status as a mature, outstanding, and thoroughly productive scholar who has achieved a national/international reputation. A candidate for appointment to the rank of Professor should:

- Satisfy the criteria for appointment as an Associate Professor.
- Have had demonstrated and significant professional accomplishments in teaching, research and service, indicating that the candidate is a mature, outstanding, and thoroughly productive scholar with a national/international reputation.*

***University Professor**

Unless a candidate held a similar position at another institution initial appointment at the rank of University Professor will not be considered. Promotion to University Professor is a special honor conferred only upon active faculty in recognition of an extended period of exemplary service in a spirit of collegiality to the University of Arkansas and a combination of service in their profession and to the public through their professional activities. In order to achieve this distinction, faculty members must, in addition to having an extended period of documented exemplary service to the University of Arkansas, have gained wide recognition at the national or international level for their sustained excellence in service, teaching, research or creative activity germane to their respective disciplines and academic roles while serving as a member of the faculty of the University of Arkansas. Example criteria may be found in 1405.13 Annex A.

Eligibility for designation as University Professor is limited to active tenured faculty who hold the rank of Professor. Generally, a candidate is expected to have served in the rank of professor at the University of Arkansas for 10 years before nomination. Sitting administrators are not eligible to be nominated for appointment to University Professor. For the purpose of this policy individuals who have held, or are holding, positions that carry an administrative appointment that is greater than fifty percent (50%) are considered to be administrators and should be three years removed from that position before nomination. *

***Distinguished Professor**

A distinguished professorship at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, is to be reserved for those individuals who are recognized nationally and internationally as intellectual leaders in their academic disciplines as a result of extraordinary accomplishments in research, teaching, published works, creative activities or endeavors of similar merit in other venues. Individuals may have gained such distinction at this university, another university or other venues. Example criteria may be found in academic policy 1405.13 Annex B

Promotion to Distinguished Professor shall only occur when clear indication exists that an individual so appointed will continue to provide exemplary academic and intellectual leadership and continue his or her professional activities in such a way as to maintain national and international recognition and a commensurate level of accomplishment.

Eligibility for designation as Distinguished Professor is limited to active tenured faculty who hold the rank of Professor, the title University Professor, or incoming faculty who will be awarded tenure and who hold credentials of similar merit from another university or other venues.*

C. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure

An applicant for initial appointment with tenure must meet the requirements set forth in the criteria for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or higher and show evidence of the ability to sustain performance at a high level. The criteria for recommending tenure at initial appointment or after a period of service to the university are identical.

In addition to the criteria specified under II.A and II.B, the following process shall be followed in making all initial appointments where tenure is granted:

Before a new faculty member will be appointed with tenure, the relevant Unit Personnel Committee and Tenured Faculty Committee must review the candidate's curriculum vitae and other relevant supporting application materials and vote on the granting of tenure. The results of both votes and a letter describing the Unit Personnel Committee's rationale shall be submitted to the Unit head/chair and the College/School Dean and are to be considered in the tenure recommendation.

In addition, consideration for granting of tenure may require a vote and letter of rationale from the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee if specified in the College or School policy document.

*For candidates proposed for appointment with tenure, the Department Head shall submit to the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee materials evidencing teaching quality; the research record; the service record; letters of reference; complete vitae; the department's faculty (all tenured) recommendation; a recommendation from the department's personnel committee and his/her own recommendation.

Within five working days after receiving the department's recommendation and supporting materials, the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee shall forward its recommendation to the Dean who shall in turn

forward all recommendations, after adding his or her recommendation, to the Provost. Upon authorization from the provost, the dean will send a letter of offer to the candidate.

Tenure shall not be recommended at the rank of Assistant Professor.*

D. Initial and Successive Appointments of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Any appointment, extension or renewal of an appointment is at the sole discretion of the University.

Non-tenure track faculty are generally on appointments not to exceed one academic year. In some instances, multi-year appointments may be extended to instructors or non-tenure track faculty in professor ranks. Such appointments are generally intended for faculty hired in competitive searches or who have established a notable and consistently strong record of effective performance during their period of service to the University.

Multi-year appointments, to the extent they are utilized, must have satisfied a merit-based review process employing evaluative criteria and procedures established in this personnel document as supplemented in departmental personnel documents. These appointments require the review and recommendation of the departmental personnel committee and the department chair/head, and the approval of the Dean and the Provost. The first such merit-based appointment would usually be up to three years. If successfully completed, in accordance with the evaluation procedure set out herein, an initial merit-based term appointment may be considered for renewal for an additional appointment of up to three years. After successful completion of a second three-year term (or after a total of six years of appointment), appointments may be considered for renewal for faculty in professor ranks for periods of up to five years.

Any merit-based term appointment of more than one year shall only be recommended when the candidate has consistently demonstrated (or, for initial appointment, shown clear potential for) highly effective teaching and/or, as appropriate to the appointment, a record of highly effective research or service/administration, as well as the ability and willingness to work productively with colleagues. See APS 1405.111 for detailed procedures.

Lecturer. Appointment as a lecturer is usually part-time and on a semester-by-semester, or rarely, an academic year basis. These appointments may be renewed if successfully completed in accordance with department, college and university guidelines. *Candidates for appointment as a lecturer must meet the same criteria as those stated for instructors.*

Instructor. Appointment as an instructor may be part-time or full-time and is usually on an academic year basis, though the appointment may be for up to a three-year term. These appointments may be considered for renewal for periods of up to three years if successfully completed in accordance with approved college and department personnel documents.

*Criteria:

Masters Degree from a regionally accredited university in the discipline of appointment, or closely related discipline; or Baccalaureate Degree with a minimum of 18 credit hours of graduate level coursework in the discipline being taught and appropriate industrial experience. The individual must be qualified to receive graduate faculty status if hired to teach a graduate level class. These qualifications are expected for lecturer and instructor hires.*

Clinical, Teaching, Research, and Professor of Practice. Appointments of clinical, teaching, research, and professor of practice faculty may be part-time or full-time and may be multi-year appointments. The first such appointment would usually be for one year. If successfully completed, in accordance with approved college and department personnel documents, an initial appointment may be considered for renewal for an additional appointment of up to three years. After successful completion of a second three-year term (or after a total of six years of appointment), appointments may be considered for renewal for periods of up to five years.

*Criteria

- 1) Assistant Professor (Teaching, Clinical, Research, Visiting) -- Terminal degree in the specific or a closely related discipline of appointment.
- 2) Associate Professor with any modifier (Teaching, Clinical, Research, Visiting) – Show evidence of sustained performance in teaching and scholarship with recognition at the regional level, and college and university level service.
- 3) Professor with any modifier (Teaching, Clinical, Research, Visiting) – Show national or international recognition in the area of specialization and evidence of sustained scholarship.
- 4) Professor of Practice -- A combination of post baccalaureate education and progressive engineering/scientific experience commensurate with the rank of appointment.
 - i. Assistant – Five or more years of progressive experience.
 - ii. Associate – Ten or more years of progressive experience.
 - iii. Full – 15 or more years of progressive experience.*

Visiting. Appointments of visiting faculty may be for a term of up to three years and shall not extend beyond a total of three years. If a term of less than three years is successfully completed in accordance with approved college and department personnel documents, such appointments may be considered for

renewal, at the discretion of the University. Any renewal shall require a merit-based review by the department personnel committee and the department head or chair. Appointments in visiting faculty positions are not renewable beyond three total years of service.

* Criteria

Requires the same credentials as II.D.1-4.*

Executive in Residence Appointments of executives in residence faculty may be for up to three years and can be renewed with successful completion of the initial appointment. Colleges, schools, and departments shall specify policies for appointment, review, and reappointment of Executives in Residence, so long as such policies are consistent with Board and University policies.

*Criteria

Requires the same credentials as those for Professor of Practice.

Again, any term of appointment in excess of one year must be merit-based and meet all criteria and procedural requirements addressed above. Any appointment not fully satisfying all such requirements shall not exceed one year.

E. Required Notification

No later than 30 days after beginning employment in connection with a first appointment, each faculty member shall be advised in writing by their chairperson/head of the criteria, workload assignment, procedures, and instruments that are to be used in assessing their work.

III. Successive Appointments, Annual Review, Peer Review, Third-Year Review, and Post-Tenure Review

A. Successive Appointments for Tenured, Tenured-Track, *and Non-Tenure Track Faculty*

1. Tenured faculty members have a right to a next successive appointment except for the reasons for termination of a tenured appointment specified by the Board of Trustees.
2. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty do not have a right to a next successive appointment but may be offered an appointment after the expiration of a current appointment, provided it does not extend the time in probationary status beyond the limits set in Section IV.A.4 and IV.A.12 of Board Policy No. 405.1.

3. In the event that a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member is not recommended for reappointment, the procedure described in Section IV.B of Board Policy 405.1 shall be followed.
4. * All reappointments of non-tenure track faculty will be merit based. Any term of reappointment in excess of one year for non-tenure track faculty must meet all criteria and procedural requirements for multi-year reappointment addressed in II.D. above. Any appointment not fully satisfying all such requirements shall not exceed one year.*

B. Annual Review for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

Each continuing faculty member shall be evaluated by their chair/head, or other immediate supervisor on an annual basis in accordance with the following procedures as relevant to their assigned activities. This annual review contributes to personnel decisions such as reappointment and merit salary increases, and annual review results are also considered in making recommendations for promotion and/or tenure.

The annual review process for full-time non-tenure-track faculty at the rank of assistant professor and above should be consistent with that for tenured and non-tenured tenure-track faculty. All other non-tenure-track faculty should be evaluated in a manner consistent with College and Departmental policies.

1. The faculty and chairperson/head of each unit shall adopt criteria and procedures, including the use of appropriate metrics, for an annual review and evaluation of the work and status of each faculty member in the unit. These criteria and procedures must be approved by the dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President. The criteria and procedures adopted by the faculty and chairperson/head shall be consistent with Board policies and the following criteria and procedures.

* The faculty evaluation system in the College of Engineering at the University of Arkansas is designed to serve the following purposes:

- a. Development
 - To provide a means of encouraging excellence (teaching, research and other intellectual contributions, service, and other forms of scholarship) by recognizing, rewarding, and reinforcing meritorious performance .
 - To create an environment in which faculty exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks.
 - To provide information that can be used by the institution, the College, the Department, and the faculty member to improve performance.

- b. Evaluation
 - To serve as the basis for decisions about reappointments, merit salary increases, merit promotion, and tenure.
 - To serve as a means for providing feedback to faculty regarding their performance.
 - To provide a means whereby faculty assignments can be evaluated and equitably distributed.

- c. Fairness and Consistency
 - To provide a means for ensuring that decisions are made on a consistent basis reflecting faculty merit and productivity.
 - To document compliance with university policy and thus provide protection for the individual and the institution.

Evaluations shall be based on evidence of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service that is provided by each faculty member in their Annual Faculty Performance Reports and supporting materials. Department Head evaluations shall include a critique of the faculty member's performance and may also include observations of the faculty member's activities such as observing the impact of the scholarly work on the discipline, the learning response of students in the classroom, or the value added by service activities.

Performance in each area of Teaching, Research, and Service shall be rated as one of the following:

- Outstanding
- Good
- Acceptable
- Unsatisfactory

The specific criteria for each rating level will be defined by the department and will be used to assign a rating for teaching, research and service (and administration, if applicable).

An overall performance rating will be assigned, taking into consideration the ratings assigned in each of the areas above, weighted by the faculty member's work load, and overall contributions to the academic unit.

Performing at the level of "Good" should not be construed as sufficient for the purposes of awarding tenure or promotion.*

2. *Tenured and Non-tenured Tenure-Track Faculty Workload Assignments as the Basis for Annual Evaluations

a) In pursuing the Mission and Strategic Plan of the College of Engineering, the overall departmental faculty efforts will be evaluated in the following proportions: teaching - 40 percent; research - 40 percent; and service - 20 percent. As long as these general proportions are attained by each department, duties may vary among individual faculty members. A 40 percent teaching assignment is generally three to four courses per year, with undergraduate and graduate student advisement responsibilities consistent with the College of Engineering Strategic Plan. Annual evaluations should be based on performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service and weighted by the proportions in each area assigned to each faculty member's academic (non-administrative) duties.

b) Each year, during the annual evaluation process, the workload assignment of each faculty member for the forthcoming year will be developed by the Department Head with input from the faculty member, consistent with the College and Departmental Strategic Plans. In addition to stating the faculty member's assignments with respect to teaching, research and service duties, the workload assignment will reflect the development plan for the faculty member, to the extent possible, and will include the faculty member's written statement of his or her goals with regard to teaching, research, and service. Faculty members who disagree with their assigned workload, as determined by the Department Head, may seek a review by the Dean. If such a review is requested, the Dean's decision shall be final.

- Untenured Assistant Professors in tenure track positions normally shall be assigned duties with greater emphasis on teaching and research and less emphasis on service in order to make progress toward promotion and tenure. This policy recognizes that the service requirement for Assistant Professors should be lower than average while they are developing their expertise in teaching and establishing a funded research program but they should be encouraged to develop national visibility through their research and professional service endeavors.
- Tenured faculty may be assigned duties that encompass various combinations of teaching, research and service. It is recognized that circumstances may arise when a faculty member may be called upon to perform duties that will result in substantial deviations from the norm in the best interests of the unit. For example, an off-campus duty assignment or a full-time administrative, research or teaching assignment.
- Non-tenure track faculty at all ranks should be assigned duties that align with the modifier of their rank. For example, Teaching Professors should have assignments that are predominately teaching with limited service and scholarship assignments.

- Full-time or part-time instructors in non-tenure track positions normally shall be assigned duties that are primarily in the teaching area; however, their duties may include some service activities.*
3. No later than May 1 of each year, the chairperson/head shall inform each continuing faculty member in writing of their workload assignment and evaluation criteria for the next academic year, as well as evaluation procedures and instruments for the current calendar year. Each faculty member shall also be provided with any standard review forms upon which the faculty member is expected to submit information regarding professional activities.
 4. To fulfill the educational mission of the University and in the best interest of each unit, the chairperson/head may later modify a faculty member's workload assignment and evaluation criteria, if necessary. Whenever there is a change in criteria, procedures, or instruments, each faculty member shall be informed by the chairperson/head in writing within four weeks of the change.
 5. No later than March 30, each faculty member's annual review shall be conducted on the basis of the previous calendar year's workload assignment and assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures stated herein. The department head/chair shall consider the results of the faculty peer review when assessing annual performance.
 6. The performance of each faculty member shall be reviewed annually by their chairperson/head, provided that any faculty member on a terminal appointment will not be evaluated in their terminal year.
 7. As long as it is submitted by the deadline established by the faculty and chairperson/head of the unit, each faculty member has the right to submit any material documenting the quality of their professional performance in the annual review.
 8. The results of the annual peer evaluation shall be made fully available to the faculty member and those conducting the review.
 9. Student evaluations of teaching shall be made fully available to the faculty member. The numerical ratings from student evaluations of teaching shall be made fully available to any persons conducting the annual review. Students' narrative comments from evaluations shall be made fully available to the faculty member's unit chairperson/head. The unit chairperson/head shall complete training in the evaluation of these narrative comments prior to conducting the review.

10. Each annual review of faculty holding positions eligible for promotion should provide feedback on their progress towards promotion and include the remedial steps, if any, that are recommended.
11. The annual review forms, recommendations, associated narratives, and all other relevant materials used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member shall be maintained as long as the faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years thereafter. These materials shall be made available to the faculty member upon their request.
12. The responsibility for the initiation of the annual review of each faculty member, including recommendations regarding reappointment of each non-tenured faculty member, lies with the chairperson/head. The chairperson/head shall make a recommendation regarding reappointment (including non-reappointment) of each tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty member only after considering the written report of the unit committee conducting the annual peer review.
13. Prior to the chairperson's/head's completion of the annual evaluation (including any recommendations based on the evaluation) in any year, the chairperson/head shall meet with the faculty member to discuss all issues related to the review. A tenured faculty member receiving a satisfactory evaluation may waive this required meeting. A non-tenure-track faculty member at the rank of associate professor or above receiving a satisfactory evaluation may waive this required meeting. A copy of the chairperson's draft of the intended evaluation and recommendations to the dean shall be provided by the chairperson/head to the faculty member, who shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response before the chairperson/head prepares their final recommendation. A copy of the chairperson's/head's final recommendation to the dean shall also be provided to the faculty member, who shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review.
14. Except for non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, a faculty member claiming that an evaluation or recommendation resulting from the annual review process violates their rights under established University personnel regulations, policies, or practices, has recourse through written appeal to the dean. This written appeal may request reconsideration of the evaluation by the dean, based on specific, articulated concerns. The dean shall make the final determination on the annual review. For non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, other University policies and procedures are applicable.

C. Peer Review for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

The purpose of the required annual Peer Review is to (a) provide feedback to the faculty member concerning their performance during that calendar year, and (b) to provide input advisory to the Unit Head/Chair in performing each faculty member's annual review.

The peer review process for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at the rank of assistant professor and above should be consistent with that for tenured and tenure-track faculty. All other non-tenure-track faculty should be evaluated in a manner consistent with College and Departmental policies.

1. Units may choose to have the Unit Personnel Committee also serve as the Unit Peer Review Committee.
2. Units may also choose to establish one elected Peer Review Committee (separate from the Unit Personnel Committee) for the purpose of conducting annual peer reviews.
 1. When a separate Peer Review Committee is established, all fulltime tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor may vote to elect the members of the committee, with two exceptions: (1) visiting faculty are not eligible to vote and (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination is not eligible to vote.
 2. All fulltime tenure-track and non-tenure-track Unit faculty above the rank of assistant professor shall be eligible to serve on the Peer Review Committee. In addition, tenure-track and non-tenure track assistant professors, having successfully completed three academic years of service in the Unit, shall be eligible to serve.
3. Each year, the members of the Unit Peer Review Committee shall elect a chair from among the members to coordinate the work of the committee.
4. Members of the Unit Peer Review Committee may evaluate Unit faculty at any academic rank.
5. Members of the Peer Review Committee shall not participate in their own reviews or for any colleague where there is a personal conflict of interest as defined by University of Arkansas, Fayetteville Policies and Procedures 404.0.
6. The committee as a whole shall have the opportunity to provide input into each peer evaluation before it is forwarded to the Unit Head/Chair.

7. All Peer Review discussions shall remain confidential. Committee members shall not discuss deliberations outside of the meeting.
8. Operation of the Unit Peer Review Committee shall be governed by the criteria and procedures adopted by the unit and approved as provided for above, and must be consistent with all applicable University policies.

D. Third Year Review for Tenure Track Faculty

A written review of progress toward tenure shall be made of each faculty on the tenure track during their third year of the probationary period. As a reminder, promotion and tenure are not automatic based on years of service or performance that is merely satisfactory. Rather, in the pursuit of excellence, promotion and tenure are based on high levels of achievement and the trajectory toward sustained success over a career.

Third year review dossiers should utilize standard promotion and tenure packets. All dossiers should include material documenting the following:

1. Progress in teaching including student feedback (or progress in professional practice in the case of faculty with non-teaching titles)
2. Progress in all service activities
3. Progress in scholarship including external funding if appropriate

Third year reviews should be conducted by Chairs/Heads of the academic unit after input from the faculty of that academic unit.

Assessment of performance in the third-year review includes three options:

1. Currently making satisfactory progress - appointment is continued for 4th and 5th years, subject to all University policies;
2. Appointment is continued for 4th year, subject to all University policies and a required 4th year review. Department Chair/Head will address weaknesses;
3. Notice of non-reappointment, subject to procedures outlined in Board Policy 405.1.IV.B, with the 4th year as the terminal year.

The process of the Third Year Review is detailed in Appendix A of this document.

E. Post-Tenure Review

As described in Section V. A. of Board Policy 405.1, every year the performance of every tenured and tenure-track faculty member at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, is reviewed and evaluated by their academic unit. When the overall performance of a faculty member during the preceding calendar year is evaluated as unsatisfactory, the faculty member is informed by their department chair/head of this finding. Overall unsatisfactory performance means that the faculty member's performance as a whole is unsatisfactory, taking into consideration the

faculty member's assigned workload (teaching/professional practice, scholarship, service) and overall contributions to the academic unit. Before making a determination of overall unsatisfactory performance, chairs/heads shall consider evidence of relevant, documented efforts and outcomes within the context of the faculty member's assigned workload.

Effective July 1, 2019, campus procedures shall require that any tenured faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating be placed on a remediation plan. The remediation plan shall be developed by the faculty member's department chair/head and the academic unit Personnel Committee (or Peer Review Committee, if one has been established) in consultation with the faculty member and shall include remedial measures, including specific outcomes, designed to address the overall performance deficiencies, with the expectation that carrying out the plan will lead to an overall satisfactory performance rating. If, in the next annual review following an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, the faculty member fails either to attain an overall satisfactory performance rating or to demonstrate meaningful progress in remediating the overall performance deficiencies (as assessed in accordance with the outcomes specified in the remediation plan), the faculty member may be issued a notice of dismissal on twelve months' notice as provided for in this policy, and subject to the procedures contained in UA Board Policy 405.1.IV.C.

F. Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

Each faculty member shall be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of (a) teaching (or professional performance, in the case of the faculty members with non-teaching titles (e.g. in the Library, the Cooperative Extension Service, Instructional Development, or the Museum)), (b) scholarship and (c) academically related service. Each non-tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas consistent with their appointment.

Each faculty member should actively contribute to the life of the academic unit (e.g., department, school, college, university) and should exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks.

Each unit shall develop procedures for peer evaluation appropriate to its mission. The annual review of each faculty member with a teaching assignment shall include evaluation by students.

Units are responsible for developing evaluation criteria and processes for instructors and lecturers which may follow the criteria below for teaching and possibly service.

1. Evidence of Achievement in Teaching or Professional Performance

In every case for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, achievement in teaching or professional performance is essential.

Teaching:

Successful teaching at the university level includes the transmission of knowledge to learners and is marked by inspiring learners to inquire for themselves. Faculty members who excel in the transmission of knowledge, establish the importance of the material, have appropriate student learning outcomes, demonstrate command of subject matter and present ideas clearly and in an organized way. They foster intellectual curiosity and encourage learners to challenge and exchange ideas. They demonstrate concern and respect for the learners with whom they interact, both individually and in groups. They show and generate enthusiasm in subject matter and are recognized by their students and university colleagues as persons who guide and inspire the individuals whose lives they touch. Student-faculty contacts outside of the classroom, and guidance and supervision of graduate students are a valuable part of the educational experience. The transmission of knowledge includes instructional development such as textbooks, other instructional materials, use of technology, course development, and curriculum design. Furthermore, participation in education-focused conferences and forums and the securing of outside funding for laboratory and teaching enhancements are credited to the evaluation of teaching.

Evidence of achievement in teaching should take into account the level and type of courses taught, the course delivery method, and the percentage of faculty time devoted to teaching and/or advising. Faculty must provide item a.i from the list below and at least one additional item of evidence from a, b, *and* c below; however more items may be added.

Evidence from these sources may include:

- a. Students
 - i. Qualitative and quantitative data from all electronic course evaluations and any other evaluations completed by students as specific to the unit. Access to these materials is limited to those parties described in Section III.B.8.
 - ii. Evaluation from former students addressing the candidate's instructional performance and effectiveness in learning course material garnered by exit interviews, letters of recommendation, or other methods specific to the unit.
 - iii. Evidence of effectiveness in direction of scholarship of undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students including student completion, placement, achievements, and publications.

- iv. Evidence of effective participation in unit examination activities such as written and oral examinations for honors or graduate degree candidates.
 - v. Performance of students on uniform examinations or in standardized courses.
 - vi. Evidence of effective advising and mentoring, both formal academic advising and mentoring of individual students.
 - vii. Evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre- and post-testing or student work samples) that meet defined student learning outcomes.
- b. Other Faculty
- i. Evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, assignments, syllabi, and/or a teaching portfolio.
 - ii. In-class visitation and evaluation of instruction by peers and/or administrators.
 - iii. External evaluation of teaching by evaluators knowledgeable about teaching and/or scholarship in the faculty member's specific discipline either in-person or through recorded means.
- c. Instructor
- i. Self-assessment of teaching such as a teaching portfolio that includes but is not limited to teaching materials, instructional techniques, innovative assignments, course structures or pedagogy, teaching philosophy statements, and/or responses to student and peer evaluations. Although a teaching portfolio is recommended, other methods of self-assessment can be used as directed by the unit.
 - ii. Evidence of curriculum development and interdisciplinary program participation including but not limited to:
 - a.) Development and improvement of teaching laboratories.
 - b.) Continuous improvement of courses on a regular basis and/or the creation of new courses.
 - c.) Development and improvement of distance learning.
- iii. Design and implementation of individual study courses
- iv. Evidence of participation in the scholarship of teaching including but not limited to:
 - a.) Publications (textbooks, abstracts, articles, or reviews).
 - b.) Conference presentations.
 - c.) Grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities/course development.
 - d.) Participation in teaching conferences.
 - v. Other professional development activities that support teaching.

- vi. Recognition of teaching/advising including awards, election to offices, committee activities, and other service to professional associations as related to teaching.

Professional Performance (in the case of faculty with non-teaching titles):

Evidence of achievement in professional performance should take into account the level and type of professional responsibilities, the percentage of faculty time devoted to various professional responsibilities, and may include evidence from supervisors, peers, clients, and self-evaluation. Evidence may include, among other items:

- a) Annual ratings by supervisors.
 - b) Evidence of expertise in the area of professional responsibility and effectiveness in carrying out assigned duties.
 - c) Evidence of ability and willingness to accept additional responsibility and/or leadership.
 - d) Evidence of cooperation in dealing with personnel at all levels.
 - e) Evidence of efforts at self-improvement.
 - f) Evidence of innovations in program implementation.
 - g) Evidence of the development of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of duties.
 - h) Evidence of initiative and resourcefulness in solving unit problems.
 - i) Evidence of ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing.
 - j) Evaluations by clientele.
 - k) Self-evaluations.
- a. Evidence of Achievement in Scholarship

In every case for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, achievement in scholarship is essential, and quality and impact are of the essence. In every case it is the responsibility of the reviewers to arrive at a judgment of the importance, originality, influence, sustained, and future promise of the candidate's body of work. The University process utilizes evaluations by outside experts in the formation of this judgment.

*In the College of Engineering research and scholarship are synonymous and include the production and dissemination of knowledge. Research contributions are marked by the search for knowledge (including the discovery, re- conceptualization, synthesis, and application of knowledge) and the use of high standards of technical expertise, professional judgment, and intellectual honesty in the pursuit, creation, and application of knowledge. Faculty members who make research contributions of knowledge make original and useful contributions that are respected by their colleagues and peers, both within and outside of the university. Through their efforts, they foster or spark new research' and

have an impact on scholarship in their area of specialization. They are aware of new developments and strive to broaden and deepen their knowledge and understanding of their specialties and, where relevant, related fields. It includes both basic and applied research. Since the rating of each faculty member's intellectual contributions depends on measures of both quality and productivity, each department shall develop an evaluation system that encompasses both.

The College of Engineering Strategic Plan defines research scholarship broadly to also include entrepreneurial activities. Specifically, the College recognizes the unique role it plays in the economic development of Arkansas through technology innovation. Thus, Research Scholarship includes activities associated with development of intellectual property. Participation in Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) awards, Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) awards, and similar university-industry bridging activities are included if based upon the faculty member's own intellectual property. Patents and copyrighted products as measures of intellectual property instruments are as important a measure of the productivity of the College as peer-reviewed publications and other more traditional forms of scholarship.

The College of Engineering Strategic Plan also emphasizes the need for significant external funding from extramural competitive grants as necessary for building a successful research program. Since external funding can vary significantly from one field to another, the departments must consider this factor in making judgments regarding research productivity. The departments are encouraged to develop benchmarks by comparing their levels of funding with peer institutions.*

Assessments of scholarly contributions should consider the varying levels of depth, complexity, competitive rigor, and impact of achievements. Scholarly contributions that may be recognized include the following. This list is not exhaustive.

- a. Books, essays, articles, or bulletins reporting the results of original research.
- b. Novels, poetry, plays, exhibitions, or musical compositions.
- c. Musical performances, workshops, recitals, or theatrical productions.
- d. Visual arts, paintings, sculptures, videos or other media.
- e. Patents, processes, or instruments.
- f. Commercialization of discoveries or ideas.
- g. Scientific expeditions.
- h. Designs and built works.
- i. Technology development and applications.

Evidence and context used in judging the quality of scholarship include the following items. This list is not exhaustive.

- a. Publication by respected academic journals and publishing houses that accept work only after review and approval by experts.
 - b. Published reviews by experts.
 - c. Citations in research publications and other evidence of significance.
 - d. Awards for excellence, especially from national or international academic organizations.
 - e. Significance of completed performances, presentations, exhibitions, workshops, recitals, or lectures.
 - f. Awards of grants and contracts that indicate recognition of creative work and research achievement or capability.
 - g. Economically significant commercialized patents, ideas, or discoveries.
 - h. Impact on public policy or practice.
- b. Evidence of Academically-Related Service.

A faculty member's academic service to the community or to the profession beyond the campus may confirm stature in scholarship and teaching, may enliven the intellectual climate on campus, and may improve opportunities for students and faculty colleagues. Evaluations of high-quality contributions of service are valued and may have weight in decisions on appointment, reappointment, promotion, and advancement to tenure.

*Service encompasses institutional, public, and professional service. Institutional service pertains to contributions to the successful functioning of the university at all levels. In addition to responsibilities in the areas of the production, transmission, and application of knowledge, faculty members are frequently called upon to engage in a variety of activities necessary for maintaining institutional vitality. Faculty members who excel in institutional service participate effectively in faculty governance and in the formulation and implementation of department, college, and university policies. They take their service responsibilities seriously and apply their creative energies to the identification and solution of problems or institutional functioning at various levels. They work collaboratively and cooperate with other faculty and administrators and assume an appropriate share of the institutional work for which the faculty is responsible. They demonstrate leadership and initiative and express a spirit of helpfulness. Faculty members who excel at institutional service take on institutional tasks to further the collective good of the unit, department, college, or university. Advising students regarding curriculum and career matters is a responsibility that should be explicitly recognized as an integral part of institutional service.

Public service consists of those professional activities, consistent with the university and college's mission, that contribute to the public welfare or common good through the application of the expertise and skills of its faculty to solving real world problems. Public service activities include teaching non-credit courses; the analysis of problems, opportunities, or issues of demonstrable relevance to the mission of the College of Engineering or university; and consultation and technical assistance. It may also be demonstrated by contributions to the economic development of the state and region.

Professional service contributes to the advancement of the discipline and professional practice. It may take the form of participation and leadership in regional, national, or international academic or professional organizations. Professional service also includes extending the impact of the College of Engineering beyond the campus in other ways consistent with its mission.*

Academically related service that may be recognized follows. This list is not exhaustive.

- a. Membership and leadership in committee service for the department, college/school, or university.
- b. Membership and leadership in campus governance bodies.
- c. Membership and leadership in a professional organization.
- d. Editorship or editorial board membership.
- e. Refereeing or reviewing manuscripts or grant proposals.
- f. Participation in certification boards.
- g. Expert advice to professions, businesses, community organizations, or government agencies.
- h. Organization of conferences or other events.
- i. Appointments to governmental agencies.
- j. Appointments to administrative positions with service beyond duties with the university.
- k. Service as advisor to student organizations.
- l. Contributions toward professional development of faculty
- m. Judging student or professional competitions.
- n. Service rendered to a community as a part of courses taught.

Evidence and context used in judging the quality of service include the following; this list is not exhaustive.

- a. Significant service to the program, department, college/school, or university.

- b. Awards, honors or special recognition for service.
- c. Significant service to professional organizations.
- d. Significant academic related service to the community.
- e. Editorial board membership or manuscript reviewer.

IV. Promotion for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

Promotion shall be based primarily upon the accomplishments of the individual while in the most recent rank. Promotion is a distinct honor and is not based upon length of service. The University seeks to develop and sustain nationally and internationally prominent programs in teaching and scholarship. A faculty dedicated to high standards is essential to this effort. The University's standards for promotion reflect these high expectations.

No minimum time in rank is required before a faculty member is eligible for promotion.

In addition to any criteria established by the campus concerning scholarship, teaching and service, all candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to be in substantial compliance with applicable University policies and legal requirements.

The faculty and chairperson/head of each unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for promotion to each rank. These criteria and procedures must be approved by the dean, the Provost, the Chancellor and the President. Campus and unit criteria and procedures must be consistent with Board Policy 405.1 and other applicable University of Arkansas System policies.

A. Criteria for Promotion

Each faculty member at or above the rank of assistant professor who is being considered for promotion shall be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of (a) teaching (or professional performance, in the case of the faculty members with non-teaching titles in the Library, the Cooperative Extension Service, Instructional Development, or the Museum), (b) scholarship, and (c) academically-related service.

Each faculty member should actively contribute to the life of the academic unit (e.g., department, school, college, university) and should exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks.

Although the criteria for promotion are similar to those used in annual evaluations, the relative emphasis, levels of achievement, and cumulative impact required for promotion, as opposed to reappointment, differ.

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (with tenure, if applicable) including for faculty with titles of Teaching, Research, Clinical, or Professor of Practice.

In order to merit promotion from assistant professor to associate professor (and be granted tenure, if applicable), the candidate must document high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship as appropriate to the discipline and their appointment. In addition, the candidate must document satisfactory service to the university, discipline, profession, or public.

Tenured and tenure-track candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishments in scholarship that indicates progress toward a national or international reputation in their discipline.

Candidates should have obtained professional registration, if deemed appropriate by their academic unit.

Individual colleges or schools *and units* may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

No tenure-track faculty member shall be promoted to the rank of associate professor without also being granted tenure. (This does not preclude a faculty member from being hired into a tenure-track position with the rank of associate professor or full professor if they satisfy the applicable criteria.)

Non-tenure-track candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishments in scholarship that indicates progress toward a state-wide, regional, national or international reputation in their discipline. Individual colleges or schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

2. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor including for faculty with titles of Teaching, Research, Clinical, or Professor of Practice

Promotion to the rank of Professor is intended to recognize status as a mature, excellent, and thoroughly productive scholar. This rank requires that the individual be of such stature as to be recognized by professional peers as an authority in his/her field of specialization.

In order to merit promotion to full professor, the candidate must document continuous and high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship as appropriate to the discipline and their appointment. In addition, the candidate

must document satisfactory academic service to the university, discipline, profession, or public.

Tenured and tenure-track candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and demonstrate a pattern of distinguished accomplishments in scholarship that indicates achievement of a national or international reputation in their discipline. Individual Colleges or Schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

Non-tenure-track candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and demonstrate a pattern of distinguished accomplishments in scholarship that indicates achievement of a regional, national or international reputation in their discipline. Individual Colleges or Schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

3. Promotion from Professor to University Professor or Distinguished Professor

Specific criteria for promotion to University Professor or Distinguished Professor are contained in Board Policy 470.1 and Academic Policy 1405.13.

Nominations for promotion to University and Distinguished Professor will follow the applicable policies in Board Policy 405.1 and Academic Policy 1405.11 as well as the established timeline for promotion identified in Academic Policy 1405.101

B. Procedures for Promotion

1. No later than 30 days after beginning employment in connection with a first appointment, each faculty member at or above the rank of assistant professor shall be advised in writing by their chairperson/unit of the criteria, workload assignment, procedures, and instruments that are to be used in assessing their work.

2. By May 1 of each year, each faculty member at or above the rank of assistant professor shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the promotion and tenure review schedule, criteria, procedures, requirements, and instruments for the current year. Whenever there is a change in criteria, workload assignment, procedures, or instruments, each faculty member shall be informed by the chairperson in writing within four weeks of the change. Each faculty member shall also be provided with any standard review forms upon which the faculty member is expected to submit information regarding professional activities and shall be informed that they may submit as a part of their promotion/tenure packet a written list of three to five potential reviewers with a brief rationale for each nominee.

3. The performance of each tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty member shall be reviewed annually by their chairperson/head.

4. As long as it is submitted by the deadline established by the faculty and chairperson/head of the unit, each faculty member has the right to submit any material documenting the quality of their performance in scholarship, teaching, and service in the annual review, including for promotion determination.

5. The annual review forms, recommendations, associated narratives, and all other materials used in or resulting from the annual reviews of the faculty member shall be maintained as long as the faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years thereafter. These materials shall be made available to the faculty member upon their request.

6. In the spring semester, the chair/head shall begin, with input from the Unit Personnel Committee, consideration of whom among faculty at assistant professor or higher to nominate for promotion that year. No later than May 1, the chair/head shall inform in writing each faculty member who is being considered for promotion that they are being considered. No later than May 5, any faculty member (whether so informed or not) may request in writing to the chairperson to be nominated for promotion that year; such request shall be honored by the chairperson/head.

*Any tenured UA faculty member holding the rank of Professor may nominate himself or herself for promotion to University or Distinguished Professor. Alternatively, any tenured or tenure-track member of the faculty or the department chair or head of the unit may nominate a tenured Professor for promotion to University or Distinguished Professor. A letter of nomination must set forth the achievements of distinction that warrant the promotion and must be submitted to the nominee's department head/chairperson

7. The chairperson/head shall ask each individual to be nominated for promotion to submit material which they believe will facilitate consideration of their competence and performance. Since this recommendation includes material back to the time of initial appointment or last promotion, the candidate should consider these items and begin accumulation of appropriate material at that time.

8. The candidate and the chairperson/head should take the necessary steps to ensure that the file of supporting material is as complete as possible to facilitate a thorough and fair evaluation. The completed file of materials must be uploaded to the designated site no later than 5:00 p.m. on or before

August 10. No new material shall be included in the files for promotion and/or tenure after August 10, except as described in item IV.B.9.

9. The candidate shall be allowed to add a maximum of three written statements to correct errors of fact or to update the packet concerning a final decision on a proposal, article or book submission, or similar significant scholarly work, so long as the item was included in the initial file. Such additions shall only be made up to a maximum of five business days after the candidate receives: (a) all redacted letters from outside reviewers; (b) the recommendation letters from both the Unit Personnel Committee and the Unit head/chair; and (c) the recommendation letters from both the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee and the College/School Dean. Except for these three specific instances (at a, b, and c) candidate-initiated statements shall not be included with one's packet once the deadline for initial submission has passed.

10. Each candidate's packet should include the following materials along with all documentation relative to satisfaction of the unit criteria:

a. A description of responsibilities with breakdown of teaching, scholarship, and service assignments each semester since the initial appointment or the last promotion, whichever is pertinent.

b. A statement of department criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

c. Any employment correspondence between the faculty member and their supervisor that clearly indicates job responsibilities. This includes the annual faculty workload assignments.

d. Copies of all annual review forms, recommendations, and associated narratives since the initial appointment or the last promotion.

e. When a candidate's appointment requires teaching, a summary of student quantitative evaluations of teaching and other evidence of teaching effectiveness. The student evaluations should be based on responses using the instruments and procedures selected by the candidate's unit. The summary should cover all classes taught by the candidate since the initial appointment or the last promotion, whichever is pertinent. Candidates shall include at least one item of additional evidence of teaching effectiveness from students, faculty peers, or self as described in III.F.1.(a, b or c).

f. External Review Letters. The purpose of impartial outside reviews is to provide an independent, unbiased evaluation of the impact of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service attainment in the discipline or achievement in professional performance. External evaluators may be

asked to focus on the impact of scholarship, professional performance, teaching, or service depending upon the nature of the appointment and criteria for promotion within the unit.

- i. A minimum of three letters from impartial outside reviewers at peer or aspirant institutions will be included. External reviewers should possess credentials that will demonstrate their expertise in evaluating the impact of the candidate's work within the context of the discipline or profession. Impartial outside reviewers are those who lack a familial relationship with the candidate, who lack a former student/teacher relationship with the candidate, who have not collaborated on grants or publications, and who lack any apparent or actual conflict of interest. The candidate shall not solicit or contact potential or actual external reviewers.
- ii. In cases where it is impossible to secure qualified reviewers who have not collaborated with the candidate on grants or publications, as specified in the preceding paragraph, the department head/chair may write a letter to the College/School dean explaining the situation and asking that an exception be made. The dean, after consulting with the College/School Promotion and Tenure Committee, shall decide whether or not to grant the exception. A copy of the dean's letter (whether positive or negative) shall be included in the external review section of the candidate's packet.
- iii. To assist in maintaining reviewer confidentiality, the candidate and the department Personnel Committee will each identify four (4) or five (5) appropriate reviewers. (The department Personnel Committee may, at their discretion, seek suggestions from the department chair/head about potential reviewers.) The candidate will be shown the complete list of potential reviewers and can strike any 2 reviewers within 5 business days of seeing the list. The departmental Personnel Committee will select a minimum of 3 reviewers from the combined accepted lists, including at least one reviewer from the candidate's list and at least one from the Personnel Committee list. The candidate will not be told of the final composition of the list of reviewers. The Unit Head/Chair/Dean is responsible for contacting the final list of reviewers.
- iv. Each college shall determine the relevant dimensions to be addressed by external reviewers for promotion to each rank and shall create a list of the materials that will be sent to external reviewers for their review of each dimension (e.g., tenure checklist, some number of publications, student course evaluations, etc.). The candidate's annual review documents as submitted by the unit head are part of the candidate's private personnel file and may not be among the materials sent to external reviewers.

- v. Each college shall create a template letter to be used to solicit external reviewers. The template may be modified as needed based on the nature of appointment and rank of the candidate. Although minor style changes are acceptable the confidentiality statement must be kept as written. External reviewers should be reminded to address all the dimensions of the review. The text of the letter of solicitation is to be made available to the candidate before it is sent to prospective external reviewers. Letters requesting a review by external constituents shall contain the following confidentiality statement:

“The University of Arkansas makes every effort to maintain the anonymity of external reviewers. Under University policy, candidates for promotion and/or tenure will consider a list of potential reviewers from which final reviewers are selected (but remain unknown to the candidate). Additionally, candidates for tenure and/or promotion may read the external letters of review, but identifying information, such as the letterhead and signature, will be redacted. In the event a candidate requests a copy of an external review letter under the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act, s/he would be entitled to receive a copy of the unredacted recommendation as a part of their personnel file.”

A template of a letter to be used to solicit external reviewers is provided in Appendix B of this document. It may be modified to suit the needs of the particular unit.

- vi. All external reviewer letters received must be included in the packet along with a short vita or bio for each from the external reviewers indicating areas of expertise, scholarly achievements and stature in the discipline. The reviews should be based on the evaluator's knowledge of the complete record of the candidate, including a description of responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service assigned during the time period being evaluated. Candidates have the right to review the comments/written narratives of the external reviewers' letters. However, the reviewers' identifying information (letterhead, signature, etc.) will be redacted to provide the reviewer some confidentiality.
- g. The candidate's file of supporting material, written evaluations from outside reviewers, and any other relevant material shall be evaluated by the Unit Personnel Committee. After both meeting and voting independently of the department chair/head, the Unit Personnel Committee shall make its recommendation, including rationale and recorded vote, in writing and forward it to the chairperson and the Unit Tenured Faculty (for tenured and tenure-track faculty) or the Unit Promoted Faculty (for non-tenure-track faculty). The Unit Personnel

Committee shall send a copy of its recommendation and statement of rationale to the candidate.

11. Each academic unit and the library will establish a single, elected Unit Personnel Committee for the purpose of evaluating and voting on all promotion and tenure (as appropriate) cases originating in the Unit. This Unit Personnel Committee shall consider both tenure-track and non-tenure-track candidates.

a. When electing members of the Unit Personnel Committee, fulltime Unit faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor are eligible to vote, with three exceptions: (1) departments heads or chairs (unless specifically allowed by the college/school policy document), (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination, and (3) visiting faculty members. If appropriate to the size of the department and consistent with detailed consideration of matters by the committee, a unit may, through its approved policies and procedures, designate that its Unit Personnel Committee shall include all eligible tenured and non-tenure track faculty.

b. Fulltime unit faculty members at or above the rank of associate professor are eligible to serve on the Unit Personnel Committee, with three exceptions: (1) department heads or chairs, (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination, and (3) visiting faculty members.

c. The Unit Personnel Committee must have at least one non-tenure-track member, if the unit has at least two non-tenure-track faculty eligible to serve. Non-tenure-track Unit Personnel Committee members shall not vote on the awarding of tenure or on the promotion of tenure-track candidates.

d. Members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall not vote on any candidate for a rank higher than the committee member's rank, except that tenured and tenure-track professors shall be allowed to vote on candidates for University Professor and Distinguished Professor.

e. The Unit Personnel Committee considering any candidate for promotion and/or tenure must consist of not less than three eligible and voting members. In any case where a minimum of three Unit Personnel Committee members are not both eligible and intending to vote on any candidate, the Unit Personnel Committee chair, the Unit chair/head, and the Dean of the College/School shall, working together and with input from the candidate, select and secure one or more eligible members from within the unit. If a minimum of three eligible and intending to vote cannot be found from within the unit personnel committee and within the faculty of the unit one or more

eligible members may be selected and secured from related disciplines outside of the Unit to serve on the committee for that candidate. The number of outside committee members appointed to the Unit Personnel Committee shall not exceed the number required to ensure three eligible and voting members for all candidates.

f. Each member of a Unit, College, or University Personnel or Promotion and Tenure Committee is expected to carefully consider and render either a positive or a negative vote on each candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure, subject to restrictions specified in this section. Committee members have a responsibility to vote. All voting shall occur by secret ballot.

g. When voting as a member of any Personnel or Promotion and Tenure Committee (at the Unit, College, or University level) or Unit Tenured Faculty Committee or Unit Promoted Faculty Committee, a member may cast one of two legitimate votes: Yes (affirmative) or No (negative). When any committee member (at the Unit, College, or University level) believes they have a conflict of interest with regard to any candidate, the committee member shall state that such a conflict exists and shall recuse from all discussion and voting on that candidate. The recusing committee member shall be absent from the meeting during discussion and voting on that candidate. The committee member is not obligated to state the nature of the conflict of interest. When counting and recording committee votes, any recusing member shall be considered as absent for that vote, reducing the total recorded committee vote by the number of recusals.

h. Elected members of the Unit Personnel Committee shall be allowed to discuss and vote on candidates as part of the Unit Tenured Faculty Committee (if qualified to serve) and/or Unit Promoted Faculty Committee (if qualified to serve).

i. A member of the College or School Promotion and Tenure Committee shall not vote on any candidate from their unit during the College or School Committee meeting. However, members shall be allowed to participate in all discussions concerning candidates from their unit during the College or School Committee meeting.

j. Members of the University Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure may discuss but shall not vote on any candidate on whom they have previously voted during the current promotion and tenure cycle.

k. All committee discussions and votes shall remain confidential. Committee members shall not discuss committee votes or committee deliberations with candidates or other colleagues outside of the meeting. The recommendations and rationale concerning any candidate shall only be

communicated through the appropriate voting form and the committee chair's official letter.

- I. Each College/School or Unit may develop additional, specific policies concerning the Unit Personnel Committee so long as these policies do not conflict with this policy.
12. The candidate's file of supporting material, written evaluations from outside reviewers, any other relevant material evaluated by the Unit Personnel Committee, and the Unit Personnel Committee's recommendation and recorded vote shall be evaluated by the Unit Tenured Faculty Committee or Unit Promoted Faculty Committee, as appropriate. After both meeting and voting independently of the chairperson, the appropriate Faculty Committee shall make its recommendation and numerically recorded vote in writing and forward it to the chairperson. Members of the appropriate Faculty Committee shall not vote on any candidate for promotion to a rank higher than the faculty member's rank, except that tenured or tenure-track professors shall be allowed to vote on candidates for University Professor and Distinguished Professor. In any case where a minimum of three of the unit's tenured faculty members are not both eligible and intending to vote on any candidate, the Unit Personnel Committee chair, the Unit chair/head, and the Dean of the College/School shall, working together and with input from the candidate, select and secure one or more eligible members from related disciplines outside of the Unit to serve to evaluate the candidate. The number of outside members shall not exceed the number required to ensure three eligible and voting members for all candidates. A copy of the tenured faculty's recommendation and numerically recorded vote must be sent to the candidate.
13. The candidate's file of supporting material, outside reviews, the written recommendation of the Unit Personnel Committee, the recommendation of Unit Tenured Faculty Committee or Unit Promoted Faculty Committee, and any other relevant material shall be evaluated by the chair/head in deciding whether to make a positive or negative recommendation. The chair/head shall inform the faculty member in writing of their recommendation and the rationale for the recommendation.
14. Prior to the time the chair/head forwards the nomination to the dean, the faculty member may withdraw from further consideration. Such withdrawal shall be in writing to the chairperson.
15. Each nomination shall be forwarded to the dean in writing by a date to be established by the college or school between October 22 and November 20 and shall be accompanied by the chair's/head's recommendation and the candidate's file of supporting material, including all materials provided to the chair/head by the faculty member. Any recommendation shall also be accompanied by a written statement of the chair's/head's rationale for the

recommendation as well as the Unit Personnel Committee's written recommendation, vote, and rationale and the Faculty Committee's recommendation and recorded vote.

16. Each college or school shall provide for a formal review of all nominations for promotion by a review committee elected by the faculty of the respective college or school. *(See I.B.6 and 8 for details of college level review committees)* The College/School review committee shall have at least one non-tenure-track member, provided the college/school has at least two non-tenure-track faculty eligible to serve. The non-tenure-track member will fully participate in the review and voting for promotion cases involving non-tenure-track candidates. The non-tenure-track member may participate in discussions involving tenured/tenure-track candidates for promotion but will not vote in such cases. Upon receiving each nomination, the dean shall provide the *appropriate* review committee with all materials submitted by the chair/head together with any other materials submitted by the candidate. The department/unit chair/head and Unit Personnel Committee should be informed of any additional material submitted by the candidate. After both meeting and voting independently of the dean, the review committee shall make its recommendation and recorded vote in writing and forward it to the dean of the college or school along with a written statement of the review committee's rationale for its recommendation. The review committee shall send a copy of its recommendation and statement of rationale to the candidate.
17. If the candidate does not agree with the review committee, they may provide the dean with a written response and may also request a hearing with the dean. Prior to forwarding any recommendation and rationale or materials to the Provost, the dean shall report their decision and statement of rationale to the candidate and the candidate's chair/head.
18. Prior to the time the dean forwards the nomination to the Provost, the faculty member may withdraw from further consideration. Such withdrawal shall be in writing to the dean.
19. Each nomination shall be forwarded to the Provost in writing by December 10 and shall be accompanied by the candidate's file of supporting material, recommendations of the candidate's chairperson/head, the candidate's Unit Personnel Committee, then Unit Tenured Faculty Committee or Unit Promoted Faculty Committee, the college or school review committee, and the dean. The dean's recommendation shall also be accompanied by a written statement of their rationale for the recommendation.
20. The Provost shall evaluate the submitted materials and shall communicate their recommendations in writing by January 28 to the candidate, to the Chancellor, to the candidate's dean and to the candidate's chair/head. Concurrent with each positive recommendation, the Provost shall also forward the candidate's

file of supporting material, recommendations of the candidate's Unit Personnel Committee, the tenured faculty of the unit, the candidate's chair/head, the college or school review committee, and the dean (including a copy of the dean's written statement of rationale concerning the recommendation) to the Chancellor. If the Provost makes a negative recommendation, they shall provide the candidate with notice of the negative recommendation by January 28 accompanied by a written statement of the rationale for such recommendation.

21. Upon being notified of a negative recommendation by the Provost, the candidate may request a review by the Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (hereinafter referred to as the APT Committee). The request shall be in writing and submitted to the Provost by February 14. If the candidate requests review by the APT Committee, the Provost shall submit to the committee all recommendations and materials used at every stage of the matter. The complete file of materials shall be submitted to the chair of the APT Committee by February 16. The APT Committee will have access to the files of all candidates for the current year within the candidate's college. The candidate should include documentation in the appeal file of any deviation from the procedures of this section that is considered by the candidate to have damaged their application. The APT Committee shall provide the Chancellor with a written rationale of its recommendation. The Committee shall also provide copies of the statement of recommendation and rationale to the candidate and to the Provost and the candidate's dean and chairperson/head by March 5.
22. The final recommendations of the Chancellor shall be communicated in writing to the Provost and to the candidate, the chair of the APT Committee, the candidate's dean, and the candidate's Unit chair/head. In addition, the final recommendations for all candidates shall be communicated in writing to the chair of the APT Committee. If the final recommendation of the Chancellor is negative (contrary to a positive recommendation by the APT Committee), the Chancellor shall provide the candidate and the Chair of the APT Committee with a written statement of the rationale for such recommendation.
23. The final recommendations of the Chancellor and of the APT Committee shall be made to the President and the Board of Trustees in time for the Board's consideration of the promotion for the next academic year. If the candidate receives a negative recommendation from the Chancellor, the candidate shall have five (5) business days to furnish a concise statement responding to the Chancellor's recommendation, which the Chancellor will forward to the President for consideration, with copies to the Provost, APT Committee, and Dean.

V. Tenure

The faculty and chairperson of each unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for the granting of tenure. These criteria and procedures must be approved by the dean, the Provost, the Chancellor and the President. The criteria and procedures adopted by the faculty and chairperson/head shall be consistent with Board policies and the following criteria and procedures.

A. Criteria for Awarding Tenure

The University seeks to develop and sustain nationally and internationally prominent programs in teaching and scholarship. A faculty dedicated to high standards is essential to this effort. The University's standards for tenure reflect these high expectations.

Ordinarily, attainment of tenure requires outstanding performance in research and teaching or professional performance in the case of faculty with non-teaching titles; merely good or satisfactory performance is not considered sufficient for a favorable tenure decision. Attainment of tenure requires outstanding performance in both scholarship and teaching, and acceptable performance in service, as well as a clear indication that such a performance level will be maintained over a career as a faculty member at the University. Otherwise, although the emphasis on accomplishment and potential contribution may differ, the criteria for the granting of tenure include the criteria for promotion contained in Section IV.A of this document.

B. Procedures for Awarding Tenure

The procedures for the granting of tenure are the same as the procedures for promotion contained in Section IV.B of this document provided that the final recommendation of the Chancellor and the Tenure Committee shall be made solely to the President.

C. Procedures for Suspending Probationary Period

The probationary period may not extend beyond seven years, except as specifically provided herein, or as otherwise required by law. An initial appointment of one-half year (academic or fiscal) or less will not be included in the probationary period. If more than one-half of any year is spent in approved leave of absence without pay status, that year shall not apply toward the probationary period.

During the first six years of the probationary period, a tenure-track faculty member may request, for reasons set forth below, that the probationary

period be suspended by one (1) year. The reasons for such a request will generally be the same as required under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as amended, and are as follows: (a) the birth of a child to the faculty member or spouse and the child's care during the first year; (b) the adoption of a child by the faculty member or placement in the faculty member's home of a foster child within the first year of placement; (c) the care of the faculty member's spouse, child, or parent with a serious health condition; (d) the serious health condition of the faculty member that makes the faculty member unable to perform the functions of their job; (e) a qualifying exigency arising from the military deployment of an employee's spouse, child, or parent to a foreign country; (f) to care for a covered service member with a serious injury or illness if the employee is the spouse, child, parent, or next of kin of the service member.

On the rare occasion that an additional one-year extension is requested, such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. However, the faculty member will receive any leave to which they are entitled under the FMLA.

A request to suspend the probationary period for these reasons must be made at the time of the qualifying event and shall first be directed in writing to the department chair/head for approval and must also be approved by the dean (or approved through other established administrative channels), the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President, under such procedures as the President shall approve. These procedures may include, but shall not be limited to, the manner in which the faculty member's duties and salary, if any, are determined during such year, the information which is required to substantiate a request and the extent to which a faculty member's performance during such year may be considered in awarding tenure. A faculty member who has been notified that they will not be reappointed may not subsequently request to suspend the probationary period under this policy.

If the faculty member would prefer not to disclose the pertinent information to the chair/head, the faculty member may submit their written request and documentation directly to the Director of Human Resources. The Director will, within five (5) business days, make an assessment of whether the request falls under FMLA guidelines and communicate this assessment directly to the chair/head.

The period of any suspension of a faculty member's probationary period shall be the academic year (in the case of nine-month appointees) or the fiscal year (in the case of twelve-month appointees).

All requests for suspension of the probationary period shall (1) specify which of the six grounds for a suspension under Board Policy 405.1 is

relevant to this request, (2) explain the circumstances, and (3) supply such medical or other documentation as might reasonably be required. To the extent necessary to properly evaluate the request, the chair/head may ask the faculty member for clarification or supplemental documentation. As quickly as possible after the request is presented, the chair/head and the faculty member shall discuss the request and implementation of the requisite leave period, if applicable.

The chair/head shall consider the request and submit their recommendation to the dean. The dean shall consider the request and submit their recommendation to the Provost as soon as possible but in no event later than two business weeks from the date of the faculty member's presenting their request to the chair/head.

The Provost shall consider the request and notify the faculty member of their recommendation as soon as possible but in no event later than two business weeks from the date of their receipt of the request. If the recommendation is to be negative, the faculty member may appeal to the Tenure Committee. The recommendation of the Provost and the Tenure Committee shall be submitted by the Provost to the Chancellor within one business week of the receipt of the recommendation of the Tenure Committee.

The Chancellor shall consider the request and submit their recommendation to the President as soon as possible but in no event later than two business weeks from the date of their receipt of the request.

As each administrator makes their recommendation, they shall notify the faculty member of the recommendation.

In connection with any faculty member whose probationary period has been suspended, each person involved in making a recommendation or decision regarding promotion or tenure of the faculty member shall use their discretion as to whether to consider the faculty member's performance during the year of suspension and, if so, how much weight to give to such performance. If there is an approved tenure extension which is granted prior to the 3rd year review, the 3rd year review is also delayed by one year. If the extension is after the 3rd year review, only the tenure and promotion decision is delayed.

No person involved in the promotion and tenure process shall consider the fact of a faculty member's having sought or obtained a suspension of the probationary period under this policy in decisions concerning promotion or tenure of the faculty member.

If the tenure clock suspension request is granted, an appropriate indication shall be placed in the applicant's promotion file. All documentation regarding the rationale for the request shall be kept confidential and maintained in a file separate from the faculty member's official institutional personnel file. This confidential file may be accessed by and a copy must be released to the applicant upon request.

As part of the approval of a request to suspend the probationary period, the faculty member will be notified of (and acknowledge) the specific period of service which will not be counted towards tenure and of the adjusted timing of the faculty member's probationary period (including the mandatory tenure review). Any extension of the probationary period is subject to all other applicable policies.

Any faculty member whose request does not receive a favorable recommendation by the chancellor may submit within ten business days additional reasons or information to support a request for reconsideration by the chancellor. After considering such material, the chancellor shall promptly make a final recommendation to the president.

D. Mandatory Sixth Year Review - Terminal Appointment

An individual in a tenure-track position who was not awarded tenure within any of the first six academic year or fiscal year appointments must be evaluated for tenure as set forth in Section IV.A. Board Policy 405.1 during the sixth appointment. If they are not approved for tenure, the seventh appointment shall be a terminal appointment and the individual may not be reconsidered for tenure during the seventh appointment. Additionally, no individual shall be considered for tenure and/or promotion during a terminal appointment.

VI. Dismissal of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

This section applies to all tenure-track or tenured faculty members and is intended to implement Board of Trustees Policy 405.1.IV.C.

A. Preliminary Proceedings

1. Except in circumstances where there are personal safety concerns and consistent with applicable law, when a chair/head or dean has reason to consider a decision to dismiss a faculty member prior to the expiration of an appointment, the chair/head or dean shall first discuss the matter with the faculty member privately. After the discussion, if the decision of the chair/head or dean is to recommend dismissal, they shall prepare a statement of the

grounds constituting the cause for dismissal and forward it through the Provost to the Chancellor, with a copy to the faculty member. If there are personal safety concerns, the private meeting can be bypassed and the chair/head or dean can proceed with providing the statement of grounds for dismissal through the Provost to the Chancellor, with a copy to the faculty member. If the Chancellor, after considering the recommendation of the chair/head or dean, decides that a proceeding should be undertaken, action shall be commenced according to the procedures which follow.

2. If requested by either party, or if directed by the Chancellor, prior to further steps in the process, the parties shall engage in informal discussions to determine whether an acceptable resolution of the matter is possible. Such discussions may include assistance of one or more faculty selected for this purpose.

B. Hearing Procedures

1. The formal proceedings shall be initiated by a communication addressed to the individual by the Chancellor informing the faculty member of the dismissal and the grounds for it, and that, if they so request, a hearing to recommend whether their employment by the University shall be terminated on the grounds stated, will be conducted at a specified time and place by the University APT Committee on. Sufficient time shall be allowed to permit the individual to prepare a defense. The individual shall be informed in detail, or by reference to published regulations, of the procedural rights to which they are entitled, including the right to advice of counsel.
2. The individual shall indicate whether they desire a hearing. If the individual desires a hearing, they shall, within 14 days of the mailing of the Chancellor's letter, file with the Chancellor an answer to the statement of grounds for the proposed dismissal.
3. If the individual does not request a hearing, no further action shall be taken by the APT Committee, and the termination shall proceed. Further, at the request of the individual the proceedings provided for herein may be terminated at any time after the request for a hearing on written notice to the Chancellor of the employee's acquiescence in the dismissal. Similarly, the administration may drop dismissal proceedings at any stage.

C. Suspension Pending Dismissal Proceedings

Suspension of the individual from normal duties or reassignment to other duties during the proceedings will occur only if circumstances exist which threaten harm or substantial disruption to the individual, to others, or to the

University. Such determination shall be made by the Chancellor, in consultation with the President. Such suspension shall be with pay. This provision does not preclude disciplinary suspension without pay.

D. Hearing Committee

The APT Committee shall serve as the hearing committee for dismissal cases. If a member of the APT Committee is from the same department as the faculty member requesting the hearing, that member shall not serve on the hearing committee for that case. Upon receipt from the Chancellor of a copy of the statement of grounds for dismissal, accompanied by the individual's answer thereto, the chair of the hearing committee shall conduct hearings and recommend a course of action as described below.

E. Committee Proceedings

1. The committee shall proceed by considering, before the time of the hearing, the statement of grounds for dismissal already formulated and the individual's written response.
2. In addition to the members of the committee and its representative, only the person requesting the hearing and their representative, the Chancellor or their designee, and a representative, and witnesses called by the committee are permitted to attend the hearing.
3. Charges contained in the initially formulated statement of grounds for dismissal may be supplemented at the hearing by evidence of new events occurring after the initial communication to the individual which constitute new or additional cause for dismissal. If such supplementary grounds are adduced, the committee shall provide the individual with sufficient time to prepare their defense.
4. The Chancellor of the campus shall have the option to attend or not to attend the hearing, and they may select a designee to assist in developing and presenting the case. The Chancellor or designee may be assisted by the representative in developing and presenting the case and in other matters related to the hearing.
5. The committee shall determine the order of proof and shall supervise the questioning of witnesses. The committee may decline to accept unnecessarily duplicative material or unduly lengthy or repetitive testimony.
6. The individual shall have the aid of the committee when needed in securing the attendance of witnesses. The individual or their representative and the Chancellor (or designee) or their representative

shall have the right within reasonable limits to question all witnesses who testify orally.

7. The committee will use its best efforts to provide an opportunity for those involved to confront all witnesses, but where this cannot be achieved despite the efforts of the hearing committee, the identity of such non-appearing witnesses, and any written evidence they may have furnished, shall be disclosed to all interested parties during the hearing.
8. Subject to these safeguards, written statements may, when necessary, be taken outside the hearing and reported to it. All of the evidence shall be duly recorded. These are not legal proceedings and formal rules of court procedure or evidence do not apply, but the committee shall exercise reasonable efforts to protect the rights of the parties in the receipt of evidence. For purposes of illustration, the proceedings shall be recorded digitally rather than via court reporter, and witnesses will not be sworn or subpoenaed. The ultimate objective of the hearing is consideration of the matter in a fair and efficient manner.

F. Consideration by Hearing Committee

The committee shall formulate its recommendation in private, on the basis of the hearing. Before doing so, it shall give opportunity to the individual and the Chancellor or their designated representative to make oral statements before it. If written arguments are desired, the committee may request them. The committee shall make its recommendation promptly, including explicit findings with respect to each of the grounds for removal presented.

The Chancellor and the individual shall be notified of the recommendation in writing and a copy of the record of the hearing shall be available to both parties. A copy of the record of the hearing and the recommendations of the hearing committee shall be furnished to the President of the University for their decision. The decision of the President shall be transmitted to the Chancellor and to the individual involved.

G. Consideration by Board of Trustees

If the decision of the President is appealed to the Board of Trustees, or if the Board of Trustees chooses to review the case, the President shall transmit to the Board of Trustees the full report of the hearing committee, stating its recommendation and their own decision. The review shall be based on the record of the previous hearing, accompanied by opportunity for argument, oral or written or both, by the principals at the hearing or by their representatives. The decision of the Board of Trustees on review shall

be final. It shall be communicated to the President and through him or her to the person involved.

If the decision of the Board is that the faculty member is to be terminated, and the termination is based on unsatisfactory performance, the termination becomes effective at the conclusion of the twelve-month period from the date of the initial notice of termination. If that period has elapsed, or if the termination is based on other grounds of cause, the termination becomes effectively immediately following the Board's decision.

VII. Dismissal of Multi-Year Appointed Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

This section applies to non-tenure-track faculty members who are on merit-based, multi-year term appointments, and is intended to complement Board of Trustees Policy 405.4.2.C. Those non-tenure-track faculty members not on a merit-based, multi-year term appointment are governed by Board Policy 405.4.2.D.

A. Initial Proceedings and Determination.

1. Except in circumstances where there are personal safety concerns and consistent with applicable law, when a chair/head or dean has reason to consider a decision to dismiss a non-tenure track faculty member for cause (including, but not limited to, based on unsatisfactory performance) prior to the expiration of a merit-based, multi-year term appointment, the chair/head or dean shall first discuss the matter with the faculty member privately. After the discussion, if the decision of the chair/head or dean is to recommend dismissal, they shall prepare a statement of the grounds constituting the cause for dismissal and forward it to the Provost, with a copy to the faculty member. If there are personal safety concerns, the private meeting can be bypassed and the chair/head or dean can proceed with providing the statement of grounds for dismissal to the Provost, with a copy to the faculty member.
2. If the Provost, after considering the recommendation of the chair/head or dean, decides that the faculty member should be terminated, the Provost will notify the faculty member of the termination in writing, with a copy to the chair/head and dean. The Provost's communication shall specify the grounds for the termination, which may be a concurrence in the grounds specified by the chair/head or dean. The termination shall be effective immediately.

B. Appeals.

1. The faculty member may, within five working days of dismissal, appeal the dismissal directly to the Chancellor, or request a review of

the matter by the APT Committee. The faculty member's appeal shall be submitted in the form of a letter describing the grounds for the appeal. The Office of the Provost shall forward the letter, and shall furnish the recommendation of the chair/head or dean and any additional records that the Provost determines are directly relevant to the appeal. The Provost may include a written response to the appeal, provided a copy of the response is furnished to the faculty member.

2. If the appeal is to the APT Committee, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall appoint two non-tenure track faculty who have served at least five years with the University and who are in a different college or school than the faculty member to participate in consideration of the appeal. Within ten working days, the Committee shall furnish a written recommendation to the Chancellor on the merits of the dismissal.
3. After considering the recommendation of the APT Committee, if applicable, the Chancellor shall make a final decision on the dismissal. The Chancellor's decision shall be issued to the faculty member, with copies to the Provost, the chair/head and the dean, within ten working days, or as soon as possible thereafter. The Chancellor's decision shall be final.

VIII. *Annual Evaluation Procedures: Non-Classified Staff

A. Annual Review

The performance of non-classified staff shall be reviewed on an annual basis by the appropriate supervisor and/or administrator. Subject to all other University policies, the annual review shall provide a basis for assessment pertaining to successive appointments, merit pay increases, work assignments, and termination. The period covered by the review is the calendar year – January 1 through December 31. Administrative staff should have explicit annual workload assignments with formal updates as necessary.

B. Criteria and Procedures for Annual Review

The criteria by which individuals shall be reviewed are in the area of performance and are reflected in the College's Non-Classified Staff Evaluation Form. Each staff member will present to his or her supervisor by January 15 a written summary of general duties, a narrative self-evaluation of performance during the year being reviewed (including specific

accomplishments, areas for improvement, and any job-related course work completed),

The supervisor will complete the evaluation form and discuss the evaluation with the employee. The employee may add comments if desired after the evaluation. The completed evaluation should be signed by both employee and supervisor, and then submitted to the appropriate unit head (if different from the supervisor) for review and signature.

C. Termination of Employment

Termination of employment of non-classified staff is governed by Board of Trustees Policy 405.4 and by the University of Arkansas Staff Handbook.*

IX. *Review of College Personnel Document

The Personnel Document, including the faculty personnel policies and criteria and standards for annual review of faculty performance, promotion and tenure, shall be reviewed at least every three years by the Honors and Awards Committee and the Dean. The purposes of such periodic reviews are to ensure that the provisions of the document are consistent with the College of Engineering's mission and University of Arkansas policies and procedures. All amendments to this document shall be submitted to the faculty for approval and in turn approved by the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President.*

*Appendix A: Third Year Review Process

The review shall be conducted during the second semester of the third year of tenure track appointments. The date shown below is the latest time for each step to be completed:

- 1/31 Faculty member submits his/her dossier to the Department Head who reviews it for completeness and consistency with the Faculty Review Checklist found in 1405.10. The dossier shall be consistent in content and format with that for tenure and shall include (1) all previous annual evaluations; (2) a personal statement that discusses teaching, research, and service accomplishments; and (3) a personal development plan for the next three years. External letters of evaluation are not required.
- 2/15 The Department Head submits the dossier to the Chair of the Department's Personnel Committee.
- 2/28 The Departmental Personnel Committee submits to the Department Head a written report evaluating the faculty member's overall progress toward tenure, specifically commenting on the past performance record of teaching, intellectual contributions, and service. An evaluation of the faculty member's personal development plan for the next three years must be included along with a statement indicating whether the cumulative record and the faculty member's plans reflect the potential to meet or exceed the criteria for tenure. Due to the developmental aspect of this review, both areas of excellence and areas needing improvement are to be identified within the written report, along with suggested plans of action to address the areas needing improvement. The report should also discuss how the faculty member's contributions advance the department's strategic plan.
- 3/15 The Department Head prepares a report concurring with or dissenting from the Department Personnel Committee review report and the basis for the recommendations. The Department Head meets with the faculty member and provides him or her with a copy of both reports and discusses both reports with the faculty member. The faculty member may forward to the Department Head a written response to the reports within five days of meeting with the Department Head.
- 3/31 The Department Head submits the faculty member's dossier, the Departmental Personnel Committee and Department Head reports, and the faculty member's response, if applicable, to the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee.

- 4/10 The College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee prepares a report concurring with or dissenting from the departmental reports and submits a copy of all reports to the Dean, including the faculty member's response to the departmental reports, if applicable. This report should include recommendations and suggestions on strategies that the candidate should consider to strengthen his/her future contributions and record of achievements.
- 4/20 The Dean prepares a statement to be given to the faculty member that reflects the feedback from the process, noting areas of excellence, identifying performance areas needing improvement, and communicating the final outcome of the review. If the third year review results in a **recommendation of** non-reappointment, the Dean shall notify the faculty member in accordance with the provisions of Board Policy 405.1.

The written feedback by the Department Promotion/Tenure Review Committee, the Department Head, the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean, and the faculty member's response, if any, shall become a part of the faculty member's personnel record.*

*Appendix B: Sample Requests for External Review Letters

1. Tenure-Tenure-Track

Dear Dr. XXXXXXX:

Dr. XXXXXX is being considered for (tenure and) promotion to the rank of XXXXXXXXXXXX in the Department of XXXXXXXXXXXX at the University of Arkansas. As part of our review process, we are seeking reviewers with expertise in the candidate's field to provide an objective and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's work. I respectfully ask for your assistance in providing an assessment of Dr. XXXXXX's professional accomplishments.

Your frank appraisal of Dr. XXXXXX's work and (they or their) potential for future contributions to the profession would be most valuable. Of particular value would be your appraisal of Dr. XXXXXX's teaching, research, and service accomplishments, including such areas as the quality of publications and presentations; contributions, reputation, or standing in the profession and discipline; and potential for further growth. In addition, we ask that you indicate how this candidate would compare with others in their field of specialization at the same stage of professional development. Included for your review are the candidate's vita, college and department promotion and tenure criteria, and all documents required as part of the University of Arkansas Promotion and Tenure Faculty Review Checklist with the exception of personnel documents.

The University of Arkansas makes every effort to maintain the anonymity of external reviewers. Under University policy, candidates for promotion and/or tenure may view a list of potential reviewers from which final reviewers are selected (but remain unknown to the candidate). Additionally, candidates for tenure and/or promotion may read the external letters of review, but identifying information, such as the letterhead and signature, are redacted. In the event a candidate requests a copy of an external review letter under the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act, (they or their) would be entitled to receive a copy of the un-redacted recommendation as a part of their personnel file.

As a final part of this request, I ask that you please include a one-page vita along with your evaluation. Please mail your evaluation to me, or email a scanned image of your completed letter. I would welcome your review by September 15, XXXXX. Please contact me at XXX-XXX-XXXX or by e-mail at XXXXX@uark.edu if you will be unable to participate in this review or meet this deadline.

Your evaluation will help a great deal in this very important decision for both Dr. XXXXXX and the University of Arkansas. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at XXX-XXX-XXXX or by e-mail at XXXXX@uark.edu. Thank you for your consideration and assistance in this important matter. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely, *

2. Non-tenure Track

Dear Dr. XXXX:

Dr. XXXXX is being considered for promotion to the rank of XXXXXX Teaching Professor in the Department of XXXXX XXXXX at the University of Arkansas. As part of our review process, we are seeking reviewers with expertise in the candidate's field to provide an objective and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's work. I respectfully ask for your assistance in providing an assessment of Dr. XXXXX's professional accomplishments.

Your frank appraisal of Dr. XXXXX's work and (they or their) potential for future contributions to the profession would be most valuable. Specifically, we are seeking your assessment as to whether Dr. XXXXX has: demonstrated excellence and creativity in teaching and service, contributed to the scholarship of teaching and learning or to (they or their) technical discipline, developed effective teaching methods and materials, implemented new courses or components of courses and labs, maintained and/or enhanced professional knowledge in areas important to the curriculum, and has effectively mentored students. If you are knowledgeable and able to do so, we would appreciate your comments regarding any recognition Dr. XXXXX may have received, including prizes, grants, honors and awards. We would appreciate your comments, if any, on the candidate's ability to serve as a responsible advisor and role model for students and mentees.

Included for your review are the candidate's vita, college and department promotion and tenure criteria, and all documents required as part of the University of Arkansas Promotion and Tenure Faculty Review Checklist with this/ the exception of personnel documents.

The University of Arkansas makes every effort to maintain the anonymity of external reviewers. Under University policy, candidates for promotion and/or tenure may view a list of potential reviewers from which final reviewers are selected (but remain unknown to the candidate). Additionally, candidates for tenure and/or promotion may read the external letters of review, but identifying information, such as the letterhead and signature, are redacted. In the event a candidate requests a copy of an external review letter under the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act, they would be entitled to receive a copy of the unredacted recommendation as a part of they/their personnel file.

As final part of this request, I ask that you please enclose a one-page vita along with your evaluation. Please mail your evaluation to me, or email a scanned image of your completed letter. I would welcome your review by September 15, XXXX. Please contact me at XXX-XXX-XXXX or by e-mail at XXXXX@uark.edu if you will be unable to participate in this review or meet this deadline.

Your evaluation will help a great deal in this very important decision for both Dr. XXXXX and the University of Arkansas. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at XXX-XXX-XXXX or by e-mail at XXXXX@uark.edu. Thank you for your consideration and assistance in this important matter. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,