

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA



The College of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape Architecture
Advancing Sustainable Design and Planning for Arid Regions

FACULTY, STAFF, *and* STUDENT

HANDBOOK

of the

***COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE, PLANNING
AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE***

The University of Arizona

Adopted January 25, 2011

With accepted revisions

8.19.11

1.9.12

1.26.12

3.22.13

FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENT HANDBOOK

*The College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture
The University of Arizona*

Adopted January 25, 2011

Introduction

This manual sets forth formal policies and procedures that guide the administration, faculty, and staff in the operations of the College. All policies and procedures are in accordance with University policies and procedures as contained in the University of Arizona Handbook for Appointed Personnel and the Classified Staff Human Resources Policy Manual. Policies and procedures particular to the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture are developed, approved, and maintained by the Dean in consultation with the school directors, College Faculty Advisory Council, College Staff Advisory Council, College Faculty Status Committee, the College Senator, and the General Faculty.

Please note that excerpts taken from the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, Classified Staff Human Resources Policy Manual, and other publications are highlighted in *grey italic font*.

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
SECTION I: COLLEGE CONSTITUTION	5
<i>Preamble</i>	5
Article I: Members of the General Faculty	5
Article II: Responsibilities of the General Faculty	6
Article III: Officers of the General Faculty	6
Article IV: College Standing Committees	7
Section 1. College Standing Committees	7
a. Constitution and Bylaws Committee	
b. College Faculty Status Committee	
c. College Curriculum Committee	
Article V: Parliamentary Authority	8
Article VI: Amendments and Ratification of Constitution and Bylaws	8

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
SECTION II: COLLEGE BYLAWS	9
Bylaw 1: Organization and Structure of the College	9
Bylaw 2: Meetings	10
Bylaw 3: College Committees	10
Section 1. Composition	
Section 2. College Standing Committees	
Section 3. College Administrative Advisory Committees	
Section 4. College Ad Hoc Committees	
Bylaw 4: Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Tenure-Eligible Faculty	13
SECTION III: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	17
I. Policies and Procedures for Faculty	17
A. Academic Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty	17
1. Faculty Titles and Definitions	17
2. Successive Renewal, Nonrenewal, and/or Promotion of Nontenure Eligible Faculty	18
3. Successive Renewal, Nonrenewal, and/or Promotion of Tenure-Eligible and Tenured Faculty	20
4. Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Criteria	25
5. Annual Performance Reviews of Faculty	30
6. Sabbatical Leave	38
7. Salary Adjustments	39
8. Maternity/Paternity Leave	40
II. Policies and Procedures for Appointed Personnel and Classified Staff	41
A. Performance Appraisal Review	41

<u>Table of Contents</u>		<u>Page</u>
	A. Salary Adjustments	41
	B. Maternity/Paternity Leave	42
III.	Policies and Procedures for Students	43
	A. Student Academic Appeals	43

APPENDICES

Appendix I	Annual CAPLA Faculty Distribution of Effort Assignment Form	46
Appendix II	Scholarship of Engagement	51
Appendix III	Scholarship Assessed	52
Appendix IV	Annual Performance Appraisal of Appointed Personnel Form – Administrative	
Appendix V	Annual Performance Appraisal of Appointed Personnel Form - Professional	
Appendix VI	College Organizational Chart	

SECTION I

COLLEGE CONSTITUTION

The College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture

Adopted January 25, 2011

Preamble

This Constitution sets forth the basic organization and processes through and by which the General Faculty of the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture shall function, within the scope of its authority and responsibility, under the University constitution, state law, and the policies and regulations of the Arizona Board of Regents authorized by that law.

The College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture is a community of faculty, administrators, students, classified staff, and appointed personnel whose collective contributions are critical to its overall success. Every member of the community has a voice and that voice should be respected, heard, and acknowledged.

Shared governance acknowledges that the responsibility for final decisions within the college rests with the Dean and the Dean's designees, pursuant to the shared governance policy of the University. Nevertheless, the General Faculty of the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture has fundamental responsibilities in the areas of academic personnel policy; instruction and curriculum policy; and research policy in accordance with University policy and Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements.

The College also acknowledges the University's statement on academic freedom. *Academic Freedom is one of the primary ideals upon which the University of Arizona was founded and continues to be a core value. The major premise of academic freedom is that open inquiry and expression by faculty and students is essential to the University's mission. See The University of Arizona statement on academic freedom (Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, 2009).*

ARTICLE I: Members of the General Faculty of the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture *(Article II. Constitution of the General Faculty, University of Arizona)*

Section 1. For purposes of college government, the General Faculty is composed of:

- a. Faculty members who hold half-time or more tenured or tenure-eligible appointments,*
- b. Academic professionals who hold half-time or more continuing or continuing-eligible appointments,*
- c. Lecturers (including Senior and Principal Lecturers) holding half-time or more multi-year appointments,*

d. *Clinical professors, research professors and professors of practice holding half-time or more multi-year appointments, and*

e. *Such persons in categories (a), (b), (c) and (d) who hold Emeritus status.*

Section 2. *No candidate for a degree at the University of Arizona shall be a member of the General Faculty.*

Section 3. *This membership provision shall become effective upon approval by the President.*

Section 4. *Members of the General Faculty (except for emeritus faculty) are eligible to vote in matters of faculty governance and to hold offices and serve on committees established in accordance with this Constitution.*

ARTICLE II: Responsibilities of the General Faculty

The General Faculty [of the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture] has fundamental responsibilities in the areas of academic personnel policy; instruction and curriculum policy; research policy; student affairs policy; ethics and commitment; advice on budget and University support; and acts on such other matters affecting the welfare of the College as are brought for consideration in accordance with University policy and Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements as may be entered into from time to time.

The General Faculty shall exercise its authority through its elected officers [Chair and Vice Chair] as well as through the college representatives in the Faculty Senate, although the General Faculty shall retain appellate power over all official actions of the Faculty Senate as provided in Article VII, Section 1. (Article I, Constitution of the General Faculty, University of Arizona).

Per Article VIII of the Constitution of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona, the general charge of each College is entrusted to its College Faculty, subject to the Board of Regents and the authority vested by the Board in the President of the University. Voting rights in College matters shall be accorded to General Faculty members as defined in Article II. Bylaws for each College should be established in accordance with the current Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements and adopted by the appropriate College Faculty and made available to each member. A copy must be filed with the Office of the Provost and in the Faculty Center. Nothing in this Constitution and Bylaws is intended to imply assumption of authority not vested in the General Faculty by state law or Board of Regents policy.

ARTICLE III: Officers of the General Faculty

Section 1. *The officers of the General Faculty shall consist of the Chair and Vice Chair. The General Faculty shall elect all officers by the process prescribed in the College Bylaws in even-numbered years for a term of two years beginning June 1, and shall be eligible for re-election.*

Section 2. *Roles.*

- a. Chair of the Faculty. Shall serve as the chief executive officer of the General Faculty and the chief representative of the faculty before public and University bodies including the University administration, alumni, Arizona Board of Regents, and Arizona Legislature. Shall conduct elections for each of the Standing Committees (except the College Faculty Status Committee and Constitution and Bylaws Committee).
- b. Vice Chair of the Faculty. Shall preside over General Faculty meetings and perform any other duties as delegated by the Chair,

Section 3. Resignation, absence, or incapacity of faculty officers.

- a. Duties of the Chair of the Faculty shall be exercised by the Vice Chair of the Faculty, or in the absence of both, by the Secretary of the Faculty. The Vice Chair shall become the Chair if the remaining term of the Chair is six months or less. If the remaining term exceeds six months, a special election conducted by the Secretary shall be held to fill the remaining term of the Chair.
- b. In the event of the resignation or permanent absence or incapacity of the Vice Chair or Secretary, the Chair shall appoint, subject to approval of the General Faculty at a regularly scheduled meeting, a replacement for the unexpired term of the Vice Chair or Secretary.

ARTICLE IV: College Standing Committees

Section 1. The Standing Committees of the College shall include: 1) College Constitution and Bylaws Committee, 2) Committee on Elections, 3) College Faculty Status Committee, and 4) College Curriculum Committee. Standing committees may be changed only by amending this Article.

1. College Constitution and Bylaws Committee. Shall be responsible for proposing changes to the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty necessitated by revisions to applicable law or policy and for proposing changes recommended by the General Faculty or its committees. The amendment process is specified in Article VI of the Constitution.
2. College Faculty Status Committee. Shall advise the Dean and school directors in all promotion and tenure considerations.
3. College Curriculum Committee. Shall review and recommend to the school directors and/or the Dean actions concerning existing and future curricula as proposed by school curriculum committees. With intent to maximize coordination and cooperation among the academic units of the college, the committee shall report on inconsistencies, unnecessary duplication, and course obsolescence.

ARTICLE V: Parliamentary Authority

In all matters not provided for in the Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona, the rules contained in the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall govern.

ARTICLE VI: Amendments to and Ratification of the Constitution and Bylaws

- Section 1. Amendments to the College Constitution and Bylaws may be proposed by the college Dean, Committee on the Constitution and Bylaws, Chair of the General Faculty, or by way of a petition to the Chair of the Faculty signed by fifteen percent (15%) of eligible faculty. The proposed amendment will be vetted by the Committee on the College Constitution and Bylaws and the Dean to ensure conformance with the University Constitution and Bylaws, Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual, the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, and the Classified Staff Human Resources Policy Manual.
- Section 2. In the case of proposed amendments to either the Constitution and/or the Bylaws, the Chair of the Faculty shall distribute such proposals to all members of the General Faculty and shall convene a special meeting of the General Faculty to consider proposed amendments in a timeframe that is not less than ten (10) working business days after distribution. After this review period, the proposed amendment(s) shall then be submitted to a ballot of the General Faculty. Balloting may be in person, via campus mail, or electronic ballot.
- Section 3. Two-thirds of the eligible votes is necessary for adoption of an amendment to the Constitution. A simple majority of the eligible votes is necessary for adoption of an amendment to the Bylaws. Immediately upon adoption, the amendments shall be transmitted to the Dean.

SECTION II

COLLEGE BYLAWS

The College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture

Adopted January 25, 2011

Bylaw 1: Organization and Administration of the College

- Section 1. The College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture is composed of three administrative units:
- A. The School of Architecture
 - B. The School of Landscape Architecture and Planning
 - C. The Drachman Institute
- Section 2. The organizational structure of the college may change over time in consultation with the General Faculty. Changes in the organization of the college become operative when approved by the Dean and Provost, the President of the University of Arizona, and the Arizona Board of Regents.
- Section 3. Each unit of the college may develop its own Bylaws in accordance with provisions of this document, the University Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual, and other such rules and regulations as may be set forth by the General Faculty, the Dean, University administrative or legislative bodies, Arizona Board of Regents, or other authorized sources.
- Section 4. The college shall be administered by a Dean who serves at the pleasure of the President of the University of Arizona and in accordance with the document entitled, University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.
- A. The Dean is appointed by the President upon recommendation of the search committee, and ratification of the Arizona Board of Regents.
 - B. The Dean shall be evaluated by the faculty every five years as provided by the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.
- Section 5. The Dean shall appoint, in consultation with the faculty, Associate and Assistant Deans as is necessary for the effective conduct of college affairs. Their appointments shall be in accordance with the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.
- a. Reappointment on a continuing basis is at the discretion of the Dean.
 - b. There shall be an annual performance evaluation of the Associate and Assistant Deans. This evaluation is initiated by the Dean.
- Section 6. Each school shall be administered by a director. The director should preside over and give leadership to the faculty as a unit, acting in concert for the welfare of the faculty members, the students, the unit, the college, and the University.
- a. Directors are appointed by the Dean in consultation with the faculty, staff, and search

- committee. Reappointment is at the discretion of the Dean.
- b. There shall be an annual performance evaluation of the directors. This evaluation is initiated by the Dean.
 - c. The director shall be evaluated by the faculty every five years as provided by the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.

Bylaw 2: **Meetings**

- Section 1. Meetings of the General Faculty shall be held at least once each year on the call of the Chair.
- Section 2. Special meetings, limited to the purpose(s) stated in the call, shall be held as deemed necessary on the call of the Chair of the College Faculty, the Dean, faculty senators representing the College, or written petitions of fifteen percent (15%) of the members of the General Faculty. Such petitions, presented to the Chair of the College Faculty, shall state the purpose(s) of the intended meeting.
- Section 3. Fifty-one percent (51%) or greater of the General Faculty shall constitute a quorum.
- Section 4. Methods of voting may include *viva voce* (by the voice), show of hands, rising, roll call, general consent, and by mail ballot (written or digital).

Bylaw 3: **College Committees**

Committee work in the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture shall be assigned to one of three types of committees: 1) Standing Committees, 2) Administrative Advisory Committees, and 3) Ad Hoc Committees. Each of these committees is identified in subsequent sections of the policy manual. Committee chairs for all college committees shall maintain a record of committee meetings. Each chair shall be responsible for submitting a committee report to the Chair of the General Faculty by May 1st of each year.

- Section 1. The purpose and responsibilities of each of the Standing Committees is specified in the College Constitution.
- A. Composition. With the exception of the College Faculty Status Committee, each standing committee shall be comprised of two representatives each from Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Planning.
 - B. Terms. Membership shall be staggered terms of three years.
 - C. Elections. The Chair of the General Faculty shall call upon the faculty for nominations for the College Curriculum Committee and a vote of the General Faculty shall elect the committee. The Dean shall appoint members of the College Faculty Status Committee and Constitution and Bylaws Committee.
 - D. Committee Chairs. Each committee (except the Constitution and Bylaws Committee) shall elect its chair from those of its members who have served at least one year on the committee. If no member has served at least one year, the Dean will appoint a chair.

- E. Meetings. Standing committee meetings (except the College Faculty Status Committee, Dean's Faculty Advisory Council, and Dean's Staff Advisory Council) shall be called by the chair of the committee as the business of the committee requires.

Section 2. The College Standing Committees shall include:

A. Constitution and Bylaws Committee

1. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee will conduct a review and update of the Constitution and Bylaws each academic year, propose amendments as needed, and conduct the voting process for ratification in accordance with the College Constitution, Article VI: Amendments and Ratification.
2. The Committee will be composed of: 1) two representatives from Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Planning appointed by the Dean, and 2) the Dean's appointed representative who shall chair the committee and be responsible for drafting amendments.

B. College Faculty Status Committee

1. The committee shall carefully and systematically review, in accordance with school, College, and University-level criteria, all pertinent materials provided by school directors, and shall ensure that high standards of accomplishment and professional performance across the college units are maintained.
2. Eligibility. The College Faculty Status Committee shall be tenured faculty. To qualify for membership, faculty members must not be currently engaged in a Faculty Development Plan or a Performance Improvement Plan as defined in UHAP. In P&T cases where the candidate is seeking promotion to tenured associate professor, members of the Faculty Status Committee must be at the rank of associate professor with tenure or higher. In cases where the candidate is seeking promotion to full professor, only full professors with tenure may serve. No member of the College Faculty Status Committee shall also be a member of the University Standing Advisory Committee on Continuing Status. The associate dean and school directors are ineligible to serve on this Committee.
3. Selection and Committee Composition. The membership of each elected school faculty status committee shall constitute a pool of College Faculty Status Committee-eligible faculty. In cases of faculty joint appointments, the member shall vote and serve based on the academic unit that holds the majority of his/her appointment.

The Dean shall name committee members from Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Planning in compliance with each school's bylaws. Committee composition will be adjusted according to the candidate's academic discipline with the greatest representation coming from the candidate's discipline. In the event that the academic discipline does not have a sufficient number of qualified members, the Dean shall appoint candidates from disciplines outside the college. The Dean shall attempt to achieve a set of diverse

perspectives when composing the committee. The chair of the Committee shall be elected by its members and shall serve for one calendar year.

4. Confidentiality of Peer Review Process. *Deliberations, evaluations, and recommendations of peer review committees are confidential, as are any evaluations or recommendations received by them. However, a summary of the results of any peer evaluation shall be communicated to the individual evaluated upon request when the results of the performance evaluations are reviewed with the individual by his or her administrative head (UHAP 3.09).*

C. College Curriculum Committee

1. Composition. The Committee shall be comprised of two faculty members from the School of Architecture and two members from the School of Landscape Architecture and Planning. The Dean will determine the outcome of a tie vote.
2. Elections. Members shall be elected by their respective schools.

Section 3. The College Administrative Advisory Committees shall include:

A. Dean's Faculty Advisory Council

1. Composition. Shall be comprised of the following school representatives.

	<u>Architecture</u>	<u>Landscape Architecture & Planning</u>
Full Professor	1	1
Assistant/Associate Professor	2	2
Lecturer/Adjunct	1	1

2. Selection. Members are appointed by the Dean from a pool of nominees generated by a call to the general faculty.
3. Meetings. The council will meet at least once per semester or more often as called by the Dean.

C. Dean's Staff Advisory Council

1. Composition. The Dean's Staff Advisory Council shall be comprised of the following representatives: One from the School of Architecture, one from the School of Landscape Architecture and Planning, one from the Drachman Institute, and two from the Dean's Office.
2. Selection. Members are appointed by the Dean from a pool of nominees generated by a call to all staff.
3. Meetings. The council will meet at least once per semester or more often as deemed necessary by the Dean.

Section 4. The College Ad Hoc Committees are concerned with issues of particular or special interest. The types and number of ad hoc committees will change over time and be responsive to the challenges and opportunities faced by the college and its faculty. The Chair of the College Assembly and/or the Dean shall have the authority to establish an ad hoc committee and to appoint members.

Bylaw 4: Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Tenure-Eligible Faculty

1. Promotion and Tenure Criteria

a. University Criteria

Promotion and tenure require excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence in teaching, research and service. Within these general guidelines, promotion and tenure criteria are to be developed by the faculty members and department head in each department and approved by and filed with the dean and Provost. Members of standing committees at all levels are expected to familiarize themselves with all promotion and tenure criteria applicable to the individual candidates they are to consider. Promotion and tenure criteria shall be reviewed by each department annually, and current copies shall be maintained in the offices of the department head, college dean, Provost and the Faculty Center.

Department heads and departmental standing advisory committees should meet with tenure-eligible faculty members at least once a year to review promotion and tenure criteria and to answer questions. Tenure-eligible faculty members are expected to familiarize themselves with the promotion and tenure criteria applicable to their departments. Tenure-eligible faculty members experiencing or anticipating difficulties in meeting departmental tenure criteria should discuss the matter with their department head and departmental standing advisory committee at the earliest date possible (UHAP 3.11.02).

b. College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture

Overall Performance, rather than time in rank, is will be the primary determinant criterion for all promotion decisions. For a candidate to be promoted, and/or granted tenure, or given continuing status in the college, he/she must demonstrate a record of external peer-recognized, significant work in the three primary areas of endeavor (Teaching and Advising; Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Work; and Service/ Community Outreach) at a regional context, with a national trajectory, for associate professors; at a national or international context for full professors.

Faculty are expected to contribute to the strategic direction of the unit and college as articulated by the Dean and/or school director as well as serve as active members of an interdisciplinary community of scholars through participation and facilitation of free discussion, voluntary service, and constructive collaborations. Faculty are encouraged to attract funding for activities via sponsored projects and/or gifts and these shall be accepted in consideration for Promotion and Tenure when appropriate.

Beyond the quality of work produced, faculty members will be expected to conduct their work in a manner that demonstrates collegiality, i.e., positive attitude, respect for others, and effective leadership as well as support for the leadership of others, balancing the good of the whole with self-interest, and active consensus building.

i. Teaching and Advising

CAPLA is a professional college with the mission of educating the next generation of design and planning professionals. As such, high achievement in teaching and advising of students is a primary expectation of faculty and one of the most significant considerations for promotion and tenure. Faculty are expected to demonstrate a consistent record of effective classroom teaching as well as leadership in the development of innovative teaching methods, courses, and/or programs. As a member of the college's community of teachers, faculty are expected to contribute to the development of the overall curricula, co-curricular, and extra-curricular dimensions of the school.

Faculty are expected to advise and engage students in professional scholarship. Toward this end, faculty shall engage in assigned mentoring of students in theses, research reports, independent studies, capstone projects, and studios.

A faculty member must present evidence of student and peer validation of his/her teaching and advising efforts through a teaching portfolio.

ii. Research/Scholarship/Creative Work

Faculty are expected to contribute to the advancement of the body of knowledge and/or creative expression in the disciplines and/or professions represented within the college. Candidates must demonstrate that such work has been validated by peers recognized at the regional/national level in the case of promotion to associate professor and national/international level for promotion to professor.

Evidence of research/scholarly activity could include publications in established refereed journals and/or books, refereed conference abstracts and proceedings, and via citations to their work in refereed publications, proposals, course materials, and presentations. Creative work should receive external peer validation through such venues as juried and invited exhibits, winning design awards and/or competitions, built works deemed as particularly innovative, transformational, or ground breaking by respected planning or design experts, critics or other serious journalists via articles in refereed journals, professional magazines, national newspapers, internet or television media, etc.

While continuing activity in the development of knowledge is expected, the quality rather than the quantity of research, scholarship, or creative work is deemed most important.

The Various Forms of Scholarship. The College acknowledges and embraces, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, by Ernest Boyer and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the five, "separate but overlapping functions of scholarship," that constitute the primary work of the professoriate: discovery, integration of knowledge, application, engagement, and teaching:

Discovery. Purely investigative search of new information. At the core of scholarship, it is "what contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university" and Boyer considers investigation and research "at the very heart of academic life" (17; 18).

Integration. When scholars put isolated facts into perspective, "making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way" -- work that "seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research" (18-9). Closely related to discovery, integration draws connections and examines contexts often in an interdisciplinary, comprehensive, and interpretive way.

Application. Most practical in that it seeks out ways in which knowledge can solve problems and serve both the community and the campus. As opposed to merely "citizenship," Boyer argues that "to be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity" (22). He importantly notes that knowledge is not necessarily first "discovered" and then later "applied" -- "new intellectual understandings," Boyer writes, "can arise out of the very act of application...theory and practice vitally interact and one renews the other" (23).

Teaching. Recognizes the work that goes into mastery of knowledge as well as the presentation of information so that others might understand it. "Teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well" -- and by interacting with students, professors themselves are pushed in creative new directions (24).

Engagement. Community-engaged scholarship can apply to teaching (e.g., service-learning), research (e.g., community-based participatory research), community-responsive practice, and service (e.g., community service, outreach, advocacy). Should be evaluated based on a full range of process, product, and outcome measures accomplished through practice-based research, practice-based teaching, and practice-based service (see Appendix II for further description). When engaged in the scholarship of engagement via service-learning, a faculty member is required to clearly distinguish his/her scholarly contributions from the coursework products completed by students enrolled in a course.

*Scholarship Assessed. The following six standards are intended to apply to the assessment of all scholarship. and are posed by the authors of *Scholarship Assessed* (Glassick, C. E., M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.*) in order to clarify the standards themselves: 1) Clear Goals, 2) Adequate Preparation, 3) Appropriate Methods, 4) Significant Results, 5) Effective Presentation, and 6) Reflective Critique (see Appendix III for further description).*

iii. Service/Community Outreach

CAPLA's mission includes the advancement of the college, university, community, and profession through service and outreach. As such, each faculty member is expected to contribute significantly through leadership, professional skills, and experience to the appropriate school, college, university, professional, local, state, national, or international community. Faculty are expected to not only serve on committees, task forces, etc., but to assume leadership roles appropriate to faculty rank in important efforts as part of their service on such bodies.

In all categories of service, a faculty member is expected to show evidence of:

- Description of nature of the activity;
- Specific individual role, level of participation, and specific contribution;
- Process and products; and
- Outcomes/significance/impact of the activity.

When engaged in service/community outreach via service-learning, a faculty member is required to clearly distinguish his/her service contributions from the coursework products completed by students enrolled in the course.

iv. Expectation by Rank for Promotion and Promotion with Tenure

To Associate Professor. Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires the fulfillment of criteria for Assistant Professor and indicates that the candidate has a demonstrated record of high achievement in teaching and advising; external peer reviewed research, scholarship, and/or creative work at the regional and national levels; and service within the school, college, or university. The college encourages and promotes outreach as an additional qualification for associate professor via teaching, research, and service. For promotion with tenure, the candidate must demonstrate the capacity for continued excellence and further growth.

To Professor. Appointment or promotion to Professor requires the fulfillment of criteria for Associate Professor and indicates that the candidate is a distinguished and valued teacher and advisor; has an established national/international reputation as a researcher, scholar, and/or creative practitioner in his or her field; is expected to provide significant leadership and service within the college and university; and engage at a leadership level in outreach at the state, regional, national, and international level. Written validation and recognition by national/international experts outside the University shall weigh heavily in the evaluation of stature.

SECTION III

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture

Adopted January 25, 2011

I. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY

A. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE OF FACULTY

1. **Faculty Titles and Definitions.** The College is comprised of the following faculty titles with corresponding qualifications:

- a. **Nontenure-Eligible Faculty.** The following nontenured, nontenure-eligible appointments are recognized in the College (in compliance with UHAP 3.13.01 Rev. 2/2011):

- i. Adjunct Lecturer. Qualifications include appropriate professional or relevant degree; appropriate experience, teaching and service.
- ii. Lecturer. Qualifications include a proven record as an Adjunct Lecturer during which Lecturer abilities were in evidence, plus leadership in service, curricular development or studio coordination, investment in the cultural life of the School, demonstrated and widely recognized collegiality.
- iii. Senior Lecturer. Qualifications include a proven record as Lecturer during which Senior Lecturer abilities were in evidence, plus initiative in improving the pedagogy, culture, and collegiality of the School.

- b. **Tenure-Eligible Faculty**

- i. Assistant Professor

Qualifications. Appointment or promotion to tenure-eligible assistant professor will be recommended largely on evidence of promise, adequate training, depth of knowledge in a particular specialty, and capacity to undertake high quality teaching, research, or service. Assistant professors shall have the terminal degree or equivalent professional experience. *The rank of assistant professor is not a tenurable rank (UHAP 3.12.04).*

ii. Associate Professor

Qualifications. Associate professors with tenure shall have achieved excellence as a teacher and made substantial contributions to the discipline as a teacher and scholar, the latter being evidenced by significant external peer validated design accomplishments, research, and/or academic publication, or activities on the regional level with demonstrated capacity for a national level of recognition. Associate professors shall have made significant contributions to the discipline, profession, university, and community through service and/or outreach activities.

iii. Professor

Qualifications. *There is no rank above that of professor with tenure in the academic community; promotion to this rank must be made with greatest care and consideration. The rank is not a designation of long service, but is recognition of superior achievement with every expectation of continuing contributions to the University (UHAP 3.11.01, 3.12.04, 3.12.06, and 3.12.07).* The faculty member shall have established a reputation of excellence as a teacher or a national or international scholar, planner, or designer, and show promise of continuing productivity and service.

2. Successive Renewal, Nonrenewal and Promotion of Nontenure-Eligible Faculty Members

- a. **Decisions on Renewals.** *Decisions not to renew a nontenure-eligible faculty member shall be made by the school director. The decision may be appealed by filing a written request with the dean or Provost, as appropriate, within 15 days of receiving the decision. The subsequent decision by the dean or Provost shall be final in all cases and not subject to further administrative review (UHAP 3.13.06).*
- b. **Notification of Nonrenewal.** *In the case of nonrenewal of a nontenure-eligible faculty member, notice must be given to the faculty member at least 90 days prior to his or her renewal date (UHAP 3.13.07).*
- c. **Resignations.** *Faculty members who intend to resign at the expiration of their appointments shall notify the department head in writing of their intention as early as possible (UHAP 3.14).*
- d. **Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Adjunct or Visiting Lecturer.**
(in compliance with UHAP 3.13.01 Rev. 2/2011):
 - i. **Adjunct Lecturer.**
term: 1-2 semesters, full- or part-time service, with reappointment possible contingent on satisfactory performance and availability of funds.
process and review: Director reviews for appointment/re-appointment.

i. **Lecturer.**

term: 1-3 years, rolling reappointment, full- or part-time service, with reappointment possible contingent on satisfactory performance and availability of funds.

process and review: Director reviews and recommends to the Dean. The Dean shall approve or deny appointment/reappointment (with Provost's approval when necessary).

ii. **Senior Lecturer.**

term: 1-3 years, rolling reappointment, full- or part-time service, with reappointment possible contingent on satisfactory performance and availability of funds.

process: Nomination - candidate shall be nominated by the school Director.

submittal: Candidate is responsible for the preparation and submittal of a digital dossier, to include contents required by the respective school's Annual Performance Review covering at least the most recent five years.

review: Based on examination of the candidate's dossier, the FSC and Director shall separately and autonomously review and recommend to the Dean either for or against appointment to Senior Lecturer. Based on the director's and FSC's recommendation, the Dean shall approve or deny the appointment/reappointment (with Provost's approval when necessary).

d. **Professor in Practice**

Definition. A Professor in Practice is a special designation for a person who has distinguished himself/herself as a professional with a specific expertise in the disciplines represented in the college. The assistant professor, associate professor, or professor in practice will be expected to work in the service of the interests of their school, college, and the University of Arizona in all of their professional travels. The position of Professor in Practice is nontenure-eligible.

i. Term and Review. *Professor in Practice is appointed for a maximum of three years. A review for appointment renewal may be considered at the conclusion of the initial appointment period. This appointment may be renewed for an additional two terms subject to satisfactory annual performance evaluations. Review procedures for professor in practice faculty will parallel those set out for academic appointments. Decisions not to renew a nontenure-eligible faculty shall be made by the [school director]. The decision may be appealed by filing a written appeal with the Dean within 15 days of receiving the decision. The subsequent decision by the dean shall be final in all cases and not subject to further administrative review.*

ii. Promotion. Promotions within the ranks of nontenured professor in practice will be rare. Guidelines for appointment and, in rare situations, promotion to each faculty rank are:

- To Assistant Professor in Practice. The rank of assistant professor in practice will be recommended largely on evidence of promise, adequate training, depth of

knowledge in a particular specialty, and the capacity to advance the profession in the future.

- To Associate Professor in Practice. The rank of associate professor in practice will be recommended largely on evidence of an established and productive professional career in addition to the qualifications required of a nontenure-eligible assistant professor in practice. Such a person should contribute to the school/department program in a significant fashion.
- To Professor in Practice. Promotion to Professor in Practice is possible after a minimum of three years of service in rank and shall be based on the following criteria:

Teaching: Proven effectiveness as a teacher in and out of the classroom as evidenced by peer and student evaluation; invitations to deliver short courses, seminars, or lectures to external audiences; or special honors or recognition for teaching excellence or innovation.

Expertise: Advancement as a practitioner, as evidenced by national or international recognition, for significant projects in the area of expertise. Such an individual must have achieved national or international recognition in the profession and should bring distinction to the school program.

3. **Successive Renewal, Nonrenewal, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Eligible and Tenured Faculty Members**

- a. **Mandatory Review.** *A faculty member/academic professional cannot waive the right to tenure or renewal review. There must be a review, even in the absence of a Promotion and Tenure packet, unless the faculty member/academic professional submits a letter of resignation in which he/she (a) waives his/her right to a review and (b) resigns as of the end of what would be the terminal year.*
- b. **Limitation of Tenure-Eligible Service.** *A tenure-eligible appointment is for one year and, except for leave of absence without pay or parental delay, shall not be renewed as a tenure-eligible appointment more than six successive times, i.e., for a maximum of seven (or eight, in the case of a parental delay) academic or fiscal years of service, regardless of faculty rank or ranks held during the years of tenure-eligible service (UHAP 3.12.01).*

Parental Delay of Tenure Clock. *While holding a tenure-eligible appointment at the University, an individual may request a one-year “parental delay” of the tenure clock such that the third-year and tenure-status reviews will take place one year later than would have occurred without such a delay. Such a delay or connected set of delays will be granted up to twice during the individual’s tenure-eligible appointment period, if the appointee becomes a parent by the birth or adoption of a child while holding such a tenure-eligible appointment, and if certain eligibility requirements are met, as described in the paragraph which follows. An individual granted a parental delay shall not be subject to additional scholarship or service requirements, above and beyond those normally required, in order to qualify for retention or tenure. If both spouses hold tenure-eligible appointments at the University, and are otherwise eligible, then both shall be granted a parental delay upon request.*

Eligibility requirements for receiving a parental delay include providing a written notice to the department head as early as possible and in no case later than one year subsequent to the date of birth or adoption of the new child. In order to be eligible for a delay of the third-year or tenure-status review, the birth or adoption date must have occurred no later than the summer (or semester) immediately prior to the semester in which the scheduled department-level review is to take place. The request for a delay of a given review must be submitted prior to departmental consideration of the candidate under review. The request for a delay of a given review must be submitted prior to departmental consideration of the candidate under review. The request for parental delay must be approved by the appropriate department head or director, dean, and the Provost.

- c. **Computation of Time/Previous Service.** *Persons having previous faculty service at another educational institution as a tenure-eligible assistant or associate professor may count no more than two years of such service when being considered for tenure at the University. Under special circumstances, prior tenure-eligible faculty service may be discounted. The amount of prior service to be counted shall be determined in writing and must be approved by the Provost at the time of appointment (UHAP 3.06).*

Statements of time periods in UHAP 3.10, 3.11, and 3.12 in all cases include sabbatical leaves but do not include leaves of absence without pay or parental delay unless specifically provided otherwise by the Provost.

- d. **Change in Appointment and Rehires.** *Tenure-eligible faculty members may apply and be considered for other available appointed positions in the University during their first five years of tenure-eligible service at the University. Thereafter, they shall not be considered for a change to a different faculty appointment, either tenure-eligible or nontenure-eligible, except to that of nontenure-eligible lecturer in the same discipline. An individual is allowed, during the sixth year, prior to denial of tenure, to switch to an academic professional position if hired on the basis of a competitive search.*

Individuals who were denied tenure or whose appointment was not renewed for other than reorganization or budgetary reasons shall not be considered for other available appointed positions at the University except as a result of an appeal to the President.

Individuals whose faculty service was terminated for cause shall not be considered for employment in any position at the University (UHAP 3.12.09).

- e. **Levels of Review** *Decisions regarding renewal, promotion and tenure of tenure-eligible faculty members and promotion of tenured faculty members shall involve the following levels of review (UHAP 3.12.07) :*

- i. [School Director]
- ii. [College Faculty Status Committee]
- iii. Dean of College
- iv. University Standing Committee on Faculty Status
- v. Provost

- f. **Confidentiality of Peer Review Process.** *Deliberations, evaluations, and recommendations of peer review committees are confidential, as are any evaluations or recommendations received by them. However, a summary of the results of any peer evaluations shall be communicated to the*

individual evaluated upon request when the results of the performance evaluations are reviewed with the individual by his or her administrative head (UHAP 3.09).

- g. Notice of Recommendation.** *At the time a recommendation regarding renewal, nonrenewal, promotion or tenure is transmitted by the department head or dean to the next administrative level, the faculty member involved should be advised in writing of the nature of the recommendation. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reason for the recommendation (UHAP 3.15).*

Before the end of the sixth year in rank, assistant professors shall be informed in writing by the department head and dean that they are being recommended for: (a) promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure; or (b) appointment as assistant professor for a seventh and terminal year.

- h. Reasons for Nonrenewal or Denial of Promotion and Tenure.** *A nontenured faculty member whose appointment is not renewed or who is denied promotion or tenure is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for that action. However, the denial of promotion or tenure or the refusal to renew need not be construed as due to failure or poor performance on the candidate's part. Considerations such as the need for a different area of specialization or for new emphases; the lack of a continuing position; the need to shift a position or resources to another department or unit; or the opportunity for a more vigorous program in teaching, research, or service may dictate that the individual not be renewed or granted tenure (UHAP 3.16).*

- i. Resignations.** *Faculty members who intend to resign at the expiration of their appointments shall notify the department head in writing of their intention as early as possible (UHAP 3.14).*

- j. Dismissal or Suspension.** *Dismissal or suspension shall not occur until the faculty member has been given an opportunity for any applicable hearing as prescribed in ABOR-PM 6-201. Dismissal refers to termination for just cause of (1) a tenured faculty member, or (2) a tenure-eligible or nontenure-eligible member prior to the expiration of an appointment. The dismissal of tenured faculty members shall be governed by the provisions of ABOR-PM 6-201(J)(I) and ABOR-PM 6-201(L)(3). The dismissal of nontenured faculty members shall be governed by the provisions of ABOR-PM 6-201(J)(2) and ABOR-PM (L)(3) (UHAP 3.17).*

k. Tenure-Eligible Faculty

i. Assistant Professor

Term and Review. *An initial appointment as an assistant professor is for a period of one academic year. The appointment may be renewed at that rank no more than six times, i.e., no faculty member may hold the title of assistant professor for more than seven academic years. The rank of assistant professor is not tenurable. Assistant professors without prior service are permitted six years to tenure unless the Provost approves of a shorter period and the candidate agrees in writing at the time of appointment.*

Before the end of the sixth year in rank, assistant professors shall be informed in writing by the department head and dean that they are being recommended for: (a) promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure; or (b) appointment as assistant professor for a seventh and terminal year. (Section 3.15) A faculty member/academic professional cannot waive the right to tenure or renewal review. There must be a review, even in the absence of a Promotion and Tenure

packet, unless the faculty member/academic professional submits a letter of resignation in which he/she (a) waives his/her right to a review, and (b) resigns as of the end of what would be the terminal year.

An assistant professor may be recommended for promotion, for nonrenewal, or for other change in status at any time though the sixth year of tenure-eligible service. Exceptions to the time-table for tenure and retention review are described in UHAP 3.06.

Third-Year Review. Before the end of the third year in rank, assistant professors shall be informed in writing by their department head that they are being recommended for: (a) reappointment for a fourth, fifth, and sixth year as assistant professor (this does not necessarily preclude consideration for promotion effective the sixth year, nor does it preclude possible no retention at the end of the sixth year); (b) promotion for the fourth year; or (c) nonrenewal at the expiration of the fourth year of service in rank. During a third-year review, departments may seek additional assessments from outside the department and the University regarding a candidate's professional accomplishments, stature as viewed by peers, and scholarly potential.

Reappointments in rank at the end of three years may be made without college or university review, but assistant professors must be formally evaluated at this stage by the department head and college standing committee on faculty status. This evaluation shall be expressed in writing, identifying any problem areas which may preclude the granting of tenure, and given to the nontenure faculty member. Decisions not to reappoint, however, must follow from the full review process (UHAP 3.12.07). The college may require college review of all retention cases.

Six-Year Review. Before the end of the sixth year in rank, assistant professors shall be informed in writing by the department head and dean that they are being recommended for: (a) promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure; or (b) appointment as assistant professor for a seventh and terminal year. A faculty member/academic professional cannot waive the right to tenure or renewal review. There must be a review, even in the absence of a Promotion and Tenure packet, unless the faculty member/academic professional submits a letter of resignation in which he/she (a) waives his/her right to a review, and (b) resigns as of the end of what would be the terminal year.

ii. Associate Professor

Qualifications. Associate professors with tenure shall have achieved excellence as a teacher and made substantial contributions to the discipline as a teacher and scholar, the latter being evidenced by significant external peer validated design accomplishments, research, and/or academic publication, or activities on the regional level with demonstrated capacity for a national level of recognition. Associate professors shall have made significant contributions to the discipline, profession, university, and community through service and/or outreach activities.

Term and Review:

- **No prior service.** An individual whose initial appointment at the University is tenure-eligible at the rank of associate professor but who has not served at another educational institution in the rank of assistant or associate professor, shall be governed by the same time schedule for notification of renewal, nonrenewal, and promotion and tenure decisions as for assistant

professors. A decision on tenure or nonrenewal in faculty rank must be made before the end of the sixth year in rank. Exceptions to this policy are described in UHAP 3.06. Promotion is not required as a condition of continued employment.

- Prior Service. An individual who has had prior service at another educational institution, which is to be counted under UHAP 3.06, at the rank of assistant or associate professor and whose initial appointment at the University is tenure-eligible at the rank of associate professor may be recommended for promotion, tenure, or nonrenewal at any time during the second through fourth year of service at the University. Before the end of the fourth year of appointment in the rank of associate professor at the University, the faculty member shall be informed in writing by the department head that he or she is being recommended for: (a) tenure effective the fifth year; or (b) appointment as an associate professor for a fifth and terminal year. Although a decision on tenure or nonrenewal in faculty rank must be made no later than the fourth year, promotion is not required as a condition of continued employment.

Promotion to Professor. An associate professor with tenure may be recommended for promotion to the rank of professor at any time. If not recommended earlier, before the end of the fifth year of service in the rank of associate professor at the University, the faculty member shall be notified by the department head in writing that he or she has the right to be reviewed during the sixth year for promotion and recommended for: (a) promotion to the rank of professor effective the seventh year, or (b) reappointment as an associate professor for the seventh and subsequent years. A review will be conducted unless the faculty member declines in writing. If promotion to the rank of professor is not recommended or granted, the department head shall ask that the departmental standing committee on faculty status to review the case for promotion at six-year intervals unless the candidate requests a review prior thereto or writes to again decline a review.

iii. **Professor** (UHAP 3.11.01, 3.12.04, 3.12.06, 3.12.07)

Qualifications. The individual will have satisfied the Promotion and Tenure criteria as specified in the Bylaws.

Terms and Review:

- Appointment with Tenure. Professors with tenure are required to undergo annual performance reviews and post-tenure reviews.
- Appointment on Tenure-Track. An individual whose initial appointment at the University is tenure-eligible at the rank of professor may be recommended for tenure or for nonrenewal at any time during the first through third year of service in this rank. Normally, such a person will not be granted tenure effective the first year, but may be granted tenure effective the second year. If tenure is not granted effective the first, second, or third year, the faculty member shall be informed in writing before the end of the third year that he or she is being recommended for: (a) tenure effective the fourth year; (b) an appointment as a professor without tenure for a fourth and terminal year; or, (c) in the case only of individuals who are 60 years of age or more at the time of review and who agree to this third option, appointment renewable on a year-to-year basis by mutual agreement with total service in

rank not to exceed seven years. Cases under the third option shall also be referred to the standing advisory committees on promotion and tenure following the procedures described in UHAP 3.11.011, UHAP 3.12.04, and UHAP 3.12.07. Exceptions to the time table for tenure and retention review are described in UHAP 3.06.

4. **Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Criteria**

The College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture considers the decision to grant tenure as the single most important personnel decision to be made by the University. The granting of tenure and promotion occurs simultaneously with few exceptions. Procedures for tenure decision will parallel those defined for promotion contained within college and school policy and are supplemental to University regulations. However, tenure and promotion acknowledge two different areas of performance and qualifications. Promotion in faculty rank acknowledges past accomplishments commensurate with established expectations. A candidate will be granted tenure on the basis of both excellent performance and the promise of continued excellence.

a. **Candidate Eligibility.**

- i. **Mandatory Review.** *A faculty member/academic professional cannot waive the right of tenure or renewal review. There must be a review, even in the absence of a Promotion and Tenure packet, unless the faculty member/academic professional submits a letter of resignation. A letter may be submitted in which he/she (a) waives the right to review and (b) resigns as of the end of what would be the terminal year (UHAP 3.12.05).*
- ii. **Six-Year Probationary Period.** *A decision on tenure or nonrenewal in faculty rank must be made before the end of the sixth year in rank. Exceptions to this policy are described in UHAP 3.06. Promotion is not required as a condition of continued employment. Exceptions to the time table for tenure and retention review are described in UHAP 3.06.*
- iii. **Withdrawal of Candidacy.** *Consistent with University policy, probationary faculty members who have applied for promotion and who are not in their final probationary year, may, by written notification, withdraw the request for promotion if they desire, up until their promotion/tenure materials go forward to the College Faculty Status Committee. The same rules apply for tenured faculty being considered only for promotion.*
- iv. **Early Review for Promotion and Tenure.** *Tenure-eligible faculty or continuing-eligible professionals may be considered for early review for tenure/continuing status under extraordinary circumstances. An assistant professor may apply for promotion before the final probationary year if the faculty member believes that the established criteria for the full probationary period have been met before the end of the period. An assistant professor whose intent is to remain at the University must apply for promotion during the sixth year of service as an assistant professor at the University.*

If the outcome of this early review is a recommendation to deny tenure or continuing status, the faculty member or professional will not receive a terminal-year appointment and may reapply, without prejudice, for tenure or continuing status during the mandatory review year (usually sixth year) of tenure-eligible or continuing-eligible service.

b. **Scope**

- i. In the case of untenured professors seeking both tenure and promotion to professor at the same time, votes on recommendations of the College Faculty Status Committee shall be separated, i.e., promotion to associate or full professor is considered after and separate from the vote for tenure.
- ii. Annual performance reviews shall be taken into account as part of the promotion and tenure process, but such evaluations are not determinative on promotion and tenure issues. Acceptable ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure. Progress towards promotion and tenure requires scholarly accomplishment over a period of years in the broader range of faculty responsibilities, and includes evaluation by external referees, which is not a part of the annual review process.

c. Roles and Responsibilities

i. Candidate

- The candidate must take primary responsibility for understanding and meeting stated expectations for Promotion and Tenure.
- Candidate will identify potential external reviewers
- The candidate is responsible for the preparation and submittal of his/her own candidate submission, to include: 1) condensed submission for external reviewers, and 2) full submission for internal reviewers. The full candidate's submission should be 8 ½" x 11" and follow the format guidelines found on the University web site (<http://w3.arizona.edu/~vprovacf/p&t>).

ii. School Director

- **Advising.** The school director will advise the candidate on his/her progress toward tenure and promotion throughout the probationary period and on the preparation of the proper submission format. [School directors] *and departmental standing advisory committees should meet with tenure-eligible faculty members at least once a year to review promotion and tenure criteria and to answer questions (UHAP 3.11.02).*
- **Soliciting External Review Letters.** The school director shall identify a pool of external reviewers and solicit external review letters.
- **Routing Candidate Submission.** The school director is responsible for routing the candidate submittal through the entire process.
- **Evaluation and Recommendation to Dean.** Upon receipt of the candidate's submission, the school director will conduct a thorough review, write his or her own independent evaluation and recommendation, and send it and appropriate supporting materials to the dean within the specified deadline. The supporting materials will be forwarded in accordance with standing University policy.

- Notification of Candidate. *The [school director] and dean are required to advise candidates in writing of their recommendations regarding renewal, non-renewal, promotion, or tenure at the time the recommendations are forwarded to the administrative level. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation (UHAP 3.15).*
- The school director will send any additional materials that may later be requested by higher levels in reviewing the candidate's files. However, any such materials must be shown to the candidate and the College Faculty Status Committee, all of whom must be given an opportunity to review and respond.

iii. College Faculty Status Committee

- Evaluation and Recommendation to Dean. Upon receipt and thorough review of the candidate's submission, the College Faculty Status Committee will prepare and submit its own independent evaluation and recommendation to the dean within the specified deadline. The written recommendation should address the requirements of the University as well as the school and college promotion and tenure guidelines. All candidate materials are to be returned to the school director within a timely fashion.
- Chair of the Committee. The Chair shall convene all meetings, draft the committee's letter of evaluation and recommendation, conduct any voting by the committee, direct any questions regarding the candidate's materials to the school director, and submit all written documents produced by the committee to the school director.
- Voting. Voting on candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be done by secret and anonymous ballot. All members must sign the report unless a minority report is to be submitted by a member(s) of the committee. In the case of a minority report, all committee members must sign either the majority or minority report.
- Confidentiality of Peer Review Process. *Deliberations, evaluations, and recommendations of peer review committees are confidential, as are any evaluations or recommendations received by them. However, a summary of the results of any peer evaluation shall be communicated to the individual evaluated upon request when the results of the performance evaluations are reviewed with the individual by his or her administrative head (UHAP 3.09).*

iv. External Reviewers

The function of outside evaluators is to provide independent assessments of the candidate's work and professional standing. For this reason, neither the candidate nor anyone else should influence, or attempt to influence the assessments provided by outside evaluators. The candidate may submit names of possible evaluators to the school director; however, no more than half of the total evaluators may be from the candidate's list.

If the candidate has engaged in extensive collaboration, and the ability of the candidate to make independent contributions may be difficult to ascertain, it may be helpful to request letters

from one or more of his/her collaborators describing the extent and nature of the candidate's contribution to the collaborations.

A sample letter to outside evaluators is included in Appendix D. Deviate from the wording of the sample letter only with the permission of your dean. The content of all questions included in the sample letter must be included in your letter unless you have permission from the Provost's Office to eliminate a question. (Faculty Affairs, Dossier Section VII: Letters from Outside Evaluators).

No application for promotion and/or tenure may be forwarded to the college or University committees with less than five external letters of review.

v. Dean of the College

- Appointment of the College Faculty Status Committee. The Dean shall name committee members from the elected pool of eligible faculty. Committee composition will be adjusted according to the candidate's academic unit with the greatest representation coming from the candidate's unit. In the event that the academic unit does not have a sufficient number of qualified members, the Dean shall appoint candidates from units outside the college. The Dean shall attempt to achieve a set of diverse perspectives when composing the committee. The chair of the committee shall be elected by its members and shall serve for one calendar year.
- Evaluation and Recommendation to Provost. Upon receipt of the evaluation and recommendations of the school director and the College Faculty Status Committee, the dean will write his or her own evaluation and recommendation and send it and appropriate supporting materials to the Provost of the University.
- Notification of Candidate. [School directors] *and the dean are required to advise candidates in writing of their recommendations regarding renewal, non-renewal, promotion, or tenure at the time the recommendations are forwarded to the administrative level. The faculty member is not entitled to a statement of the reasons for the recommendation (UHAP 3.15).*

d. Promotion and Tenure Review Schedule Template

The following schedule is a template for candidates eligible for promotion and/or tenure. Actual dates may vary due to calendar.

Spring

- i. Candidate prepares condensed submission for external review.
- ii. Candidate and school director each provide list of five external reviewers.

May 10

- i. Candidate submits condensed submission to school director.
- ii. School director finalizes list of external referees.

June 1

School director sends letter of request and condensed candidate submission to external reviewers with a deadline of the last week of September.

August 20

Candidate submits full submission to school director.

September 20

External review letters are due to school director.

September 20-October 1

- i. School director finalizes external letters and full candidate submission and submits to Chair of the College Faculty Status Committee.
- ii. School director notifies candidate of his/her recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure.

October 1-November 1

- i. College Faculty Status Committee reviews full candidate submittal and external review letters and prepares evaluation and recommendation.
- ii. School director reviews full candidate submittal and external letters and prepares letter of evaluation and recommendation.

December 1

- i. Chair of the College Faculty Status Committee submits committee letter of evaluation and recommendation to the dean.
- ii. School director submits: 1) candidate submission, 2) school director letter of evaluation and recommendation, 3) College Faculty Status Committee letter of evaluation and recommendation, and 4) external letters of review to the dean.

December 1-January 5

- i. Dean reviews candidate submission and all letters of evaluation and recommendation and submits dean's letter of evaluation and recommendation to the Provost.

- ii. Dean and school director notifies the candidate of his/her recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure.

January 5—20

School director finalizes candidate's full submission complete with all letters of evaluation and recommendation.

January - Date determined by the Provost

School director submits full candidate submission and all letters of evaluation and recommendation to Provost's office for review by University Standing Committee on Faculty Status and the Provost.

e. Post-Tenure Review for Tenured Faculty. Post-tenure review is tied closely to the Annual Performance Review process and evaluation criteria of the school (UHAP 3.10.04).

- ii. *Satisfactory Annual Performance Review.* For tenured faculty, the outcomes of the annual performance review are determined by post-tenure review policy. If overall performance is satisfactory or better, faculty remain in the regular annual performance review process and may be eligible for rewards and/or merit increases available to faculty for that review period.
- iii. *Unsatisfactory Annual Performance Review.* If the performance of a tenured faculty member is found to be unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be required to enter either a faculty development plan or a performance improvement plan, depending on the extent of the deficiency. Details of both plans are described in UHAP.

The faculty development and performance improvement plans are developed collaboratively by the faculty member, peers, and administrators of the unit. The plans will state goals with monitoring and benchmarks.

Failure to meet plan objectives will mean:

- *An automatic overall unsatisfactory rating (requiring entrance into a performance improvement plan) in the case of a failed faculty development plan; or*
- *Consideration for termination of service in the case of a failed performance improvement plan*

Appeals. Appeals of performance ratings and performance improvement plans are available through processes as outlined in UHAP 3.10.06.

5. Annual Performance Reviews of Faculty (UHAP 3.10.01)

- a. Purpose.** Faculty members of The University of Arizona are evaluated with respect to all personnel matters on the basis of excellence in performance. The annual performance review is intended to support faculty members in achieving excellence in the performance of their duties and responsibilities. Annual performance reviews are intended:

- i. *To involve faculty members in the design and evaluation of objectives and goals of their academic programs and in the identification of the performance expectations central to their own personal and professional growth;*
- ii. *To assess actual performance and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and professional service through the use of peer review;*
- iii. *To promote the effectiveness of faculty members through an articulation of the types of contributions they might make that enhance the University;*
- iv. *To provide a written record of faculty performance to support personnel decisions;*
- v. *To recognize and maximize the special talents, capabilities, and achievements of faculty members;*
- vi. *To correct unsatisfactory ratings in one or more areas of responsibility through specific improvement plans designed to correct the deficiencies in a timely manner; and*
- vii. *For tenured faculty members, to fulfill the ABOR-PM 6-201(H), Post-tenure Review.*

b. Levels of Review

The annual assessment of performance shall include an evaluation by both the School Advisory Committee on Faculty Status and the school director. The evaluation of individual faculty performance shall be based on written criteria and shall address, at a minimum, a discussion of the faculty member's: (1) past and present performance; (2) professional progress; and (3) future expectations, based upon a written agreement between the faculty member and the unit head that fits within unit and campus mission and guidelines (UHAP 3.10.02).

c. Criteria

Written evaluation criteria shall be developed by faculty of the unit, together with the unit head, to express the performance expectations for faculty members. The stated expectations will differentiate between satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance and must be in accordance with the mission and goals of the department, college or division, within the norms of the discipline, and must be approved by the college dean and the Provost.

Criteria for annual performance must consider teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly growth, creative activity, service and outreach. Evaluation criteria may provide for recognition of long-term faculty activities and outcomes. Concentration of effort in one of the three major areas of faculty responsibilities (teaching, research, and service) during a particular year is permissible, and may even be encouraged. Guidelines and evaluation procedures within departments shall be flexible enough to meet the particular objectives of the department without undermining the uniformity of the whole system. When teaching effectiveness is evaluated, a systematic assessment of both student and peer opinion shall constitute one component of the evaluation.

Annual performance reviews shall be taken into account as part of the promotion and tenure process, but such evaluations are not determinative on promotion and tenure issues. Satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure. Progress towards promotion and tenure requires scholarly accomplishment over a period of years in the broader range of faculty responsibilities, and includes evaluation by external referees, which is not a part of the annual review process (UHAP 3.10.02/3.10.04).

d. Scope of Review

Each annual performance review shall include the past three-to-five calendar years of the individual faculty member's performance, with substantial emphasis on the most recent year for evaluation of teaching. The review time-period shall be determined by the unit. The review should evaluate the faculty member's performance in his or her unit consistent with that unit's responsibilities. Every annual review of teaching will consist of peer and student input, including student evaluations of faculty classroom performance in all classes, and other expressions of teaching performance.

Dual Appointments. *When an individual holds a dual appointment involving administrative assignments in addition to assignments as a faculty member, the performance evaluation shall address contributions under both assignments (UHAP 5.08.01).*

e. Annual Distribution of Effort Assignment (DOE)

The purpose of the Faculty Distribution of Effort Assignment (DOE) is the facilitation of faculty development, employment of faculty talent toward the achievement of college and university goals, and establishment of accountability for university resources. In addition to a formal assignment, all CAPLA faculty are required to participate fully in the intellectual life of the college, including such extracurricular activities as lectures, exhibits, celebrations, and commencement.

The Faculty DOE specifies the nature of activity and workload distribution of individual faculty members in CAPLA. The DOE is intended to match faculty strengths and productivity with school and college needs and goals, and thus is established each academic year. The DOE serves as both a faculty development as well as a performance evaluation tool. Accordingly, performance outcomes associated with the priorities and goals contained within the DOE will be measured and assessed by the school director and dean as part of individual faculty annual performance evaluation. The DOE process and forms are intended to bring uniformity to the faculty assignment and evaluation process across the various college programs. As such, it replaces current school-specific forms and procedures.

DOE Process. The DOE Assignment is developed initially by the individual faculty member and approved by the school director in consultation with the dean by July 1st of each year. Within each area of effort, faculty are required to establish more specific goals to guide performance. The DOE assignment should be directly reflected in faculty performance priorities, and, as such, a faculty member's time, effort, and productivity should be distributed accordingly. Faculty are required to submit a signed DOE form to the school director each year.

f. Faculty Annual Report. As part of the annual performance evaluation process conducted in the spring semester, faculty are required to complete a self-evaluation report that responds to the goals established in the Distribution of Effort Assignment (DOE).

g. Review Procedure. *The following procedures shall be employed in the annual performance review of faculty members (UHAP 3.10.03):*

- i. The first step is information-gathering, including an opportunity for the faculty member to provide information to the school director and the School Advisory Committee on Faculty Status.*

In the area of teaching, student evaluation of faculty classroom performance in all classes is required.

- ii. *Peer evaluation, through procedures and criteria determined by the faculty and head, is required. The information gathered in the first step, and any other materials which may be deemed relevant, are utilized in the peer review. Results of the peer evaluation are transmitted directly to the immediate administrative head in accordance with Section 3.09.*
 - iii. *The school director, working with the School Faculty Status Committee, evaluates the faculty member on the basis of information provided by the faculty member, peer evaluators, students, and such other information as is available. The unit head provides the faculty member with a preliminary written evaluation no later than April 15th.*
 - iv. *The school director and faculty member meet no later than May 15th to discuss the head's written evaluation, and to agree upon goals, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review.*
 - v. *The faculty member provides comments as desired, signs the document, and returns it to the school director within 15 days of the meeting described in item 4 above.*
- h. Frequency of Reviews.** *Each faculty member's performance shall be evaluated in writing on a scheduled basis at least once every 12 months. Reviews are initiated in January and written evaluations must be completed by May 1st. Reviews, based upon calendar years, cover the previous three years of work.*

Each faculty member's performance shall be evaluated in writing on a scheduled basis at least once every 12 months. Each annual review shall include the past three to five calendar years of the individual faculty member's performance, with substantial emphasis on the current year for evaluation of teaching. The review time period shall be determined by the unit. The unit head's written evaluation shall be shared with the faculty member involved no later than April 15. The faculty member may add written comments to the evaluation before signing it. The signed evaluation shall become a part of the faculty member's departmental records (UHAP 3.10.05).

i. Calendar

Deadline January 31

Faculty member submits Annual Performance Review to school director.

School director distributes Annual Performance Review to School Faculty Status Committee.

Deadline March 1

School Faculty Status Committee submits written evaluation to school director.

Deadline April 15

Preliminary written evaluations completed by school director and shared with the faculty member.

Deadline May 1

Faculty member may request summary of the results of the evaluation conducted by the School Faculty Advisory Committee (UHAP 3.09).

Deadline May 15

- i. *The [school director] finalizes written evaluation and the [Distribution of Effort Assignment] for the next annual review (UHAP 3.10.05).*
- ii. *The faculty member may provide comments as part of the official record.*
- iii. *Faculty written annual performance review and [Distribution of Effort Assignment] becomes part of a faculty member's official file.*

j. Rating Scale

The following five-level annual review rating scale shall be used for the annual performance review. The rating scale is adapted from the Faculty Senate-approved plan for merit-based compensation, and facilitates institutional comparisons. It may be used in determining merit-based salary increases when such funds are available.

- i. *Truly Exceptional*
- ii. *Exceeds Expectations*
- iii. *Meets Expectations*
- iv. *Needs Improvement*
- v. *Unsatisfactory*

k. Outcomes of Annual Performance Review (UHAP 3.10.04)

All faculty members who are found to be performing overall at satisfactory levels in the annual performance review will be eligible for salary increases and other rewards which may exist or be established at the unit, college, or university levels.

Tenured faculty members found to be performing at unsatisfactory levels in any area of responsibility are required to enter one of two processes, depending upon the extent of the deficiency. A tenured faculty member who is evaluated overall as satisfactory, but with a deficiency in any single area of performance, for example, teaching, will enter into a Faculty Development Plan at the unit level. Tenured faculty members with overall unsatisfactory performance will enter directly into the Performance Improvement Plan process.

- i. *Overall Satisfactory with a Deficiency in Teaching, Research, or Service*
- ii. *Unsatisfactory in Teaching, Research, or Service*

The Faculty Development Plan: For tenured faculty, the Faculty Development Plan addresses a single area of deficiency before it becomes sufficiently serious to impair the faculty member's overall performance.

- *Corrective action can involve a plan to improve the deficiency and/or to redirect the faculty member's work responsibilities to areas of particular strengths.*
- *The plan, developed at the unit level in collaboration with the faculty member, may have a maximum of one year duration and should include appropriate interim monitoring and feedback.*
- *Improvement to a satisfactory level in the deficiency area within one year will make the faculty member eligible for any rewards that become available during that year.*
- *If the head and the peer committee determine that satisfactory improvement in the deficient area has not occurred in one year within the terms of the plan, an overall unsatisfactory rating will be assigned and the Performance Improvement Plan process described below, which addresses cases of overall unsatisfactory ratings, will apply.*
- *The faculty member may appeal the finding that there has been unsatisfactory improvement in the Faculty Development Plan at the next highest administrative level.*

iii. Overall Unsatisfactory

- *The Enhanced Review: For tenured faculty, when the annual performance review identifies cases of overall unsatisfactory performance of stated expectations, an enhanced review of the faculty member's performance will occur unless the faculty member chooses to proceed directly with a Performance Improvement Plan.*

The faculty member may opt to have an enhanced review by:

- *A committee of the school appointed jointly by the [Director] and by the chair of the School Advisory Committee on Faculty Status;*
- *By the [College Faculty Status Committee]; or*
- *By an elected peer committee at the university level.*

If deemed necessary by either the faculty member or the peer committee, evaluations from external reviewers expert in the faculty member's discipline will be sought and taken into consideration as part of the enhanced review. Expenses for such external review shall be borne by the University.

The enhanced review is to take no longer than 100 days from the date of communication to the faculty member of the results of the annual performance review. The enhanced review may find that the faculty member's performance meets stated expectations and is satisfactory, or that it fails to meet stated expectations, precisely how it fails, and that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory. For a decision to be reached that performance is unsatisfactory, the burden of proof is on the institution to show that such a finding is warranted.

Should the overall unsatisfactory finding be upheld by the enhanced review, a Performance Improvement Plan must be developed and approved by the dean within 45 days following the decision.

- *The Performance Improvement Plan: When the annual review of a tenured faculty member results in an overall unsatisfactory performance rating upheld in the enhanced review process, or if a tenured faculty member fails to achieve a satisfactory outcome in a Faculty Development Plan, a Performance Improvement Plan will be developed. The objective of the plan will be to enable the faculty member to resume his or her place as a fully contributing member of the faculty. The faculty member must take responsibility for helping to develop and for following the Performance Improvement Plan.*

Within 45 days of the rating or outcome, the Performance Improvement Plan will be developed by the faculty member, the unit head, and the unit peer committee with approval of the dean.

The Performance Improvement Plan shall be implemented no later than the semester following the overall unsatisfactory evaluation.

The plan must state reasonable expectations and may involve an altered mix of job responsibilities.

The university will make reasonable efforts to provide appropriate resources to facilitate the plan's implementation and success.

Depending upon facts and circumstances, the improvement plan might include the following:

- *A description of specific deficiencies.*
- *A list of reasonable outcomes needed to correct deficiencies.*
- *The process to be followed to achieve outcomes.*
- *The timeline for accomplishing the process, including annual or more frequent benchmarks.*
- *The criteria to be used in evaluating progress in the plan.*
- *The resources needed to facilitate the plan.*

The faculty member's performance within the context of the improvement plan must be evaluated as early as possible and no later than one year after the plan is put into effect. This special evaluation will be carried out by the unit head and the elected peer review committee in place at the time of the evaluation and approved by the dean.

The improvement plan will stay in effect until performance returns to a satisfactory level according to stated expectations. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the Provost. In no case shall an improvement plan take more than three years to lead to satisfactory performance.

Failure to demonstrate adequate progress relative to the benchmarks and performance goals of the Performance Improvement Plan shall lead to a recommendation for dismissal, according to ABOR-PM 6-201(J). Such action may occur in cases where one of the following circumstances exists:

- *The faculty member is unwilling to enter into a Performance Improvement Plan following an unsatisfactory judgment and the conclusion of any appeals provided for in UHAP 3.10.06.*

- *The faculty member fails to make progress considered acceptable within the evaluation periods under the implementation of the Performance Improvement Plan.*
- *The faculty member fails to achieve a satisfactory performance according to stated expectations within the duration of the Performance Improvement Plan.*

l. Appeals (UHAP 3.10.06)

i. *Appeals of Overall Satisfactory Ratings.* *Faculty members who disagree with their evaluations may request that they be reviewed at the next administrative level, which ordinarily will be that of the dean of the appropriate college. Such requests for review must be made in writing to the administrative head of the next level within 30 days of receipt of the written evaluation and must state:*

- *The points of disagreement;*
- *Specific findings to be reviewed;*
- *Facts in support of the request; and*
- *Corrective action sought.*

The administrator conducting the review shall consider the facts in support of the request and develop any additional facts deemed necessary. The review shall be completed in writing within 30 days of receipt of the request, with copies provided to the faculty member and the unit or other administrative head involved in the initial evaluation.

ii. *Appeals of Overall Unsatisfactory Ratings.* *For nontenured faculty, appeals of overall unsatisfactory ratings will follow the procedure outlined in 3.10.06(A). For tenured faculty, appeals of overall unsatisfactory ratings will follow the procedure outlined in 3.10.04(B).*

iii. *Appeal of Performance Improvement Plan.* *If no agreement on the terms of the Performance Improvement Plan occurs, the faculty member has a maximum of 15 days to request the peer committee at the next higher administrative level to make a determination on the improvement plan, with approval of the dean. The committee has 45 days to render its determination as to an appropriate improvement plan.*

m. Dean's Level Audit (UHAP 3.10.01)

In order to audit the annual performance review process, the dean and an elected faculty committee convened by the dean shall review a sufficient number of tenured cases each year to ensure that over a maximum of five years, every tenured file is reviewed. This Dean's Level Audit will determine the adequacy, fairness, and integrity of the process. If deemed appropriate as a result of the audit, the dean may refer files back to the unit peer committee.

The Provost will provide an annual summary to ABOR of the review process outcomes and the Dean's Level Audit outcomes. The number of satisfactory (or better) and unsatisfactory ratings of the annual review, by unit, shall be reported by the Provost to the Faculty Senate each year. Results of the Dean's Level Audit are due in the Office of the Provost by October 1st.

6. Sabbatical Leave (UHAP 8.03.02)

After each six years of full-time service by a faculty member with the rank of assistant professor or higher and with tenure or continuing status, and on recommendation of the President, the Board of Regents may grant sabbatical leave when the interests of the University and the enhancement of its faculty strength will be served. In view of the many benefits to the University that a program of well-conceived sabbatical leaves provides, such leaves should be fostered and encouraged at all levels in the University.

The sabbatical leave shall be either for one or two semesters, or for six or twelve months for a faculty member on a fiscal year contract basis. If the sabbatical leave is for two semesters or one fiscal year, the amount of the compensation will be three-fifths of the recipient's salary; if the sabbatical leave is for one semester, or six months, it will be full pay for that period.

a. Approval Procedure:

- i. *Appointed personnel on an academic year appointment may apply for a sabbatical leave of either one or two semesters. Appointed personnel on a fiscal-year appointment may request leave of either 6 or 12 months. If the leave is for two semesters or one fiscal year, the University will pay compensation at three-fifths of the recipient's normal salary. If the leave is for one semester or six months, the University will pay the full salary. Fiscal year employees with teaching assignments who take a leave of six months must arrange to be present during one of the two regular semesters.*
- ii. *The University prizes an inclusive view of scholarship with the recognition that knowledge is acquired and advanced through research, synthesis, practice, and teaching. Given this philosophy, sabbatical leaves are to be granted to further any of the following objectives: research and publication, teaching improvement (including the creation of teaching materials such as new textbooks, software, multimedia materials, or casebooks), intensive public service clearly related to the applicant's expertise, and integration and interpretation of existing knowledge into larger interdisciplinary frameworks.*
- iii. *The [school director] receives faculty requests for sabbatical leave. The [director] must review and recommend action on the request. A recommendation of approval by the [director] must also be accompanied by certification that the leave will not adversely affect the ongoing teaching, research, and service functions of the school.*
- iv. *When a sabbatical leave proposal satisfies these and other conditions stated in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, the request and recommendation of the [school director] shall be assigned to the School Faculty Status Committee and to the [College Faculty Status Committee] for review, and, finally, to the dean for approval.*
- v. *The [College Faculty Status Committee] shall judge sabbatical leave proposals on criteria established by the school, consistent with University Policy.*
- vi. *The dean shall make the final decision on approval or disapproval of a sabbatical request and inform the Provost of his or her decision.*

b. Requirements

- i. Upon completion of the sabbatical leave, no later than the end of the second semester following a sabbatical leave, the faculty member shall submit a written report outlining the accomplishments and products produced as a result of the sabbatical leave to the [school director] and the dean.
- ii. Sabbatical leave is granted only on condition that the employee subsequently returns to the University for a period of further service equal to the length of the leave. If an employee does not return, the case will be reviewed by the Provost. The employee may be required to refund all compensation received from the University during the sabbatical.
- iii. Following a sabbatical leave, six years of further service are required before an employee becomes eligible for another such leave. Leaves of absence without pay totaling no more than one year may be counted toward a sabbatical leave.

7. Salary Adjustments

- a. Types of Adjustments (Legislated and/or ABOR Approved):
 - i. General Adjustments are normally applied to all eligible employees, and may be a flat dollar amount or a percentage of the Institutional Base Salary.
 - ii. Merit Adjustments recognize employees who have consistently performed their duties and responsibilities at a meritorious level.
 - iii. Market Adjustments are granted to employees based on the responsible administrator's evaluation of an individual's salary relative to external salary market conditions and retention risk.
 - iv. Equity Adjustments are granted to individuals based on an evaluation of job responsibilities and rate-of-pay in comparison to other similarly situated jobs within the organization.
 - v. Annual Performance Based Component Pay (APBC) See APPENDIX III for APBC Policy
- b. Performance. Employee compensation shall be based upon performance as recognized within the work unit. An individual whose performance is less than "satisfactory" is ineligible for a salary increase unless otherwise mandated by legislation.
- c. Merit/Market/Equity/APBC Plan and Approvals:
 - i. Deans will develop the process by which allocations are made to their units. They must also provide:
 - Direction for development of unit adjustment plans, including guidance on the definition of 'meritorious' when applicable; and
 - A unit adjustment plan/report to the Provost which includes how shared governance was incorporated in the unit planning.

- ii. *Schools will develop salary adjustment plans with appropriate shared governance involvement. The plans will:*
 - *Include the criteria used for the distribution of the proposed adjustments; and*
 - *Be submitted and approved by the dean before adjustments are made.*
- iii. *In concurrence with dean, [school directors] will determine individual salary adjustments based on the approved plans.*
- iv. *The merit increase process may be appealed, though the amount may not, in accordance with applicable University Policy (Classified Staff Human Resources Policy #308 Merit Increases, and UHAP.10.06/ 5.07 Compensation).*

8. **Maternity/Paternity Leave, Family and Medical Leave**

The University of Arizona adopted a Family and Medical Leave Policy in response to the federal Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. This policy entitles employees up to 12 weeks of job-protected leave in a 12-month period for the following reasons:

- a. *Birth of the employee's child and the care of the newborn child;*
- b. *Placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care;*
- c. *Care for the employee's spouse, child, or parent who has a serious health condition; and*
- d. *A serious health condition that causes the employee to be unable to perform his/her job. While serious health conditions may include illnesses or injuries that cause extended hospitalization, pregnancy, prenatal care, and periodic absences, they may also include any absences related to chronic conditions.*
- e. *Family and Medical Leave does not have to be used in a consecutive block of time. An employee is entitled to intermittent (periodic) or reduced hours (partial days/weeks) if such leave is prescribed by a health-care provider.*
- f. *Eligibility for Family and Medical Leave is limited to employees who have worked for the University of Arizona for at least 12 months and 1250 hours. Under no conditions is an employee entitled to more than 12 weeks of family and medical leave during a 12-month period.*

II. **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTED PERSONNEL AND CLASSIFIED STAFF**

A. **PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REVIEW**

- 1. **Classified Staff** (ABOR Policy # 501.0)

Regular Classified Staff employees shall have their job performance appraised annually, in writing, by their immediate supervisor. Employees on their initial probation period shall have their job performance appraised, verbally or in writing, at mid-probation and at end of probation.

The College shall utilize the modified Factors and Standards Format for annual evaluations of Classified Staff (see Appendix II).

2. **Appointed Personnel**

Year-to-year appointed personnel shall mean employees who hold 51 percent or more FTE appointments under ABOR's Conditions of Professional Service or Conditions of Administrative Service, and are not represented in the Faculty Senate. They are employed in research, teaching, or administrative programs, but hold neither tenure nor continuing status, nor are they tenure-eligible or continuing status-eligible.

The College shall utilize the modified Factors and Standards Format for annual evaluations of Appointed Personnel (see Appendix III). Faculty with appointed personnel status shall annually develop a set of goals jointly with their supervisor. Likewise, each staff member will be evaluated in accordance with these goals by his or her supervisor. Following each annual review, a new set of goals will be established jointly.

- a. Administrative. *The primary criteria by which directors are evaluated for annual performance considerations are their internal administrative accomplishments and their effectiveness in fulfilling the college and University's mission. Research, teaching, and service (i.e., service that does not include duties assigned to them by reason of their responsibilities) are considered in the evaluation of directors in the sense that demonstrated leadership capabilities in these areas are useful in establishing examples for the faculty to follow. The dean shall annually review the performance of each director utilizing the modified Factors and Standards Format for annual evaluations of Appointed Personnel-Administrative (see Appendix IV). [School directors] will be evaluated in keeping with UHAP 5.08 Annual Performance Review of Administrative Personnel.*
- b. Professional. *The College shall utilize the modified Factors and Standards Format for annual evaluations of Appointed Personnel –Professional (see Appendix V).*

B. SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

1. **Types of Adjustments** *(Legislated and/or ABOR Approved):*

- a. General Adjustments *are normally applied to all eligible employees, and may be a flat dollar amount or a percentage of the Institutional Base Salary.*
- b. Merit Adjustments *recognize employees who have consistently performed their duties and responsibilities at a meritorious level.*

- c. *Market Adjustments* are granted to employees based on the responsible administrator's evaluation of an individual's salary relative to external salary market conditions and retention risk.
 - d. *Equity Adjustments* are granted to individuals based on an evaluation of job responsibilities and rate of pay in comparison to other similarly situated jobs within the organization.
2. **Performance.** *Employee compensation shall be based upon performance as recognized within the work unit. An individual whose performance is less than "satisfactory" is ineligible for a salary increase unless otherwise mandated by legislation.*
3. **Merit/Market/Equity Plans and Approvals:**
- a. *Deans will develop the process by which allocations are made to their units. They must also provide:*
 - i. *Direction for development of unit adjustment plans, including guidance on the definition of 'meritorious' when applicable, and*
 - ii. *A unit adjustment plan/report to the Provost which includes how shared governance was incorporated in the unit planning.*
 - b. *Schools will develop salary adjustment plans with appropriate shared governance involvement. The plans will:*
 - i. *Include the criteria used for the distribution of the proposed adjustments, and*
 - ii. *Be submitted and approved by the Dean before adjustments are made.*
 - c. *In concurrence with Deans, [School Directors] will determine individual salary adjustments based on the approved plans.*
 - d. *The merit increase process may be appealed, though the amount may not, in accordance with applicable University Policy (Classified Staff Human Resources Policy #308 Merit Increases, and University Handbook for Appointed Personnel 5.07 Compensation).*

C. MATERNITY/PATERNITY LEAVE, FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE

The University of Arizona adopted a Family and Medical Leave Policy in response to the federal Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. This policy entitles employees up to 12 weeks of job-protected leave in a 12-month period for the following reasons:

- a. *Birth of the employee's child and the care of the newborn child;*
- b. *Placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care;*
- c. *Care for the employee's spouse, child, or parent who has a serious health condition; and*

- d. *A serious health condition that causes the employee to be unable to perform his/her job. While serious health conditions may include illnesses or injuries that cause extended hospitalization, pregnancy, prenatal care, and periodic absences, they may also include any absences related to chronic conditions.*

Family and Medical Leave do not have to be used in a consecutive block of time. An employee is entitled to intermittent (periodic) or reduced hours (partial days/weeks) if such leave is prescribed by a health-care provider.

Eligibility for Family and Medical Leave is limited to employees who have worked for the University of Arizona for at least 12 months and 1250 hours. Under no condition is an employee entitled to more than 12 weeks of family and medical leave during a 12-month period.

III. POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTS

1. STUDENT ACADEMIC APPEALS

Grade Appeal

A student may appeal a grade by using the following procedures, which have been condensed from the University catalog (<http://catalog.arizona.edu/2001-02/policies/gradappeal.htm>).

All timelines refer to the first regular semester after the semester or summer term in which the grade was awarded. Grade appeals are not processed during the summer sessions unless the Dean determines a case warrants immediate review.

- Step 1:** *Within the first five weeks of the semester, the student should discuss the concerns with the course instructor, stating the reasons for questioning the grade. If the instructor is a teaching assistant/associate and this interview does not resolve the difficulty, the student shall discuss the problem with the person in charge of the course.*
- Step 2:** *Within the first five weeks of the semester, the student shall go to the Office of the Dean to obtain any requisite forms and to review directions. The student must attest in writing that s/he has informed the instructor s/he intends to file a grade appeal.*
- Step 3:** *Within the first five weeks of the semester, the student shall carefully formulate an appeal in writing, and submit it to the instructor with a copy to the [school director].*
- Step 4:** *Within two weeks from the date of receipt of the student's written statement, the instructor shall respond to the student in writing. The instructor should explain the grading procedures and how the grade in question was determined as well as other issues raised in the student's statement.*
- Step 5:** *If the instructor is not available or does not resolve the matter within the two-week period, the student shall, within one week thereafter, readdress and submit the written appeal to the school director.*

Step 6: *The school director has two weeks to consider the student's written statement, the instructor's written statement, and confer with each. The [school director], who does not have the authority to change the grade, shall inform the instructor and the student in writing of his/her recommendation. If a grade change is recommended, the instructor may refuse to accept the recommendation. The instructor shall notify the school director and the student in writing of his/her decision.*

Step 7: *If the [school director] does not act on or resolve this matter within a two-week period, the student shall, within one week thereafter, readdress and submit the written appeal to the dean.*

Step 8: *The dean shall convene a committee to review the case. The committee consists of five members. Faculty representatives include one from the school of the instructor concerned, and two from closely related schools/departments or colleges. The appropriate student organization of the college shall provide two student representatives. Student representatives shall be full-time, upper-division, undergraduate students for appeals by undergraduate students or full-time, graduate students for appeals by graduate students. All student members must be in good academic standing in that college.*

Within the structure provided by the dean, the committee shall design its own rules of operation and select a chair other than the faculty representative from the department concerned. The student and instructor shall represent themselves. The committee may, or may not:

- a. *Meet separately with the student, the instructor, and the [school director];*
- b. *Request each party to submit a brief written summary statement of the issues; and/or*
- c. *Interview other persons who have relevant information.*

If feasible, the committee should meet with the student and the instructor together in an attempt to resolve the difference. The committee shall consider all aspects of the case before making its recommendation. The committee shall make a written report with recommendations and provide copies to the student, the instructor, the [school director], and the dean.

Step 9: *The dean shall make a final decision after full consideration of the committee's recommendation and within four weeks of receiving the student's appeal. The dean has the authority to change the grade and the registrar shall accept the dean's decision. The [school director], the instructor, and the student shall be notified in writing of the dean's decision.*

Grade Appeal Time Table

<u>Prior to:</u>	<u>Complete steps:</u>	<u>Responsibility of:</u>
Week 5	1, 2, and 3	Student
Week 7	4	Instructor

<i>Week 8</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Student</i>
<i>Week 10</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>Director/Instructor</i>
<i>Week 11</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Student</i>
<i>Week 15</i>	<i>8 and 9</i>	<i>Dean</i>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I:

Annual CAPLA Faculty Distribution of Effort Assignment

Introduction and Purpose:

The purpose of the Faculty Distribution of Effort Assignment (DOE) is the facilitation of faculty development, employment of faculty talent toward the achievement of college and university goals, and establishment of accountability for university resources. In addition to a formal assignment, all CAPLA faculty are required to participate fully in the intellectual life of the college including such extracurricular activities as lectures, exhibits, celebrations, and commencement.

The Faculty DOE specifies the nature of activity and workload distribution of individual faculty members in CAPLA. The DOE is intended to match faculty strengths and productivity with school and college needs and goals, and thus is established each academic year. The DOE serves as a faculty development as well as a performance evaluation tool. Accordingly, performance outcomes associated with the priorities and goals contained within the DOE will be measured and assessed by the school director and dean as part of individual faculty annual performance evaluation. The DOE process and forms are intended to bring uniformity to the faculty assignment and evaluation process across the various college programs. As such, it replaces current school-specific forms and procedures.

Process:

The DOE Assignment is developed initially by the individual faculty member and approved by the school director in consultation with the dean by July 1 of each year. Within each area of effort, faculty are required to establish more specific goals to guide performance. The DOE assignment should be directly reflected in faculty performance priorities and, as such, a faculty member's time, effort, and productivity should be distributed accordingly. As part of the annual performance evaluation process conducted in the spring semester, faculty are required to complete a self evaluation report that responds to each category of the DOE.

Guidelines:

The basis of a faculty member's teaching assignment is based on the number of credits delivered as follows:

3 Credits	20% DOE
6 Credits	40% DOE
9 credits	60% DOE
12 Credits	80% DOE

For example, an 80% teaching assignment is equal to a total of 12 credits delivered per semester in whatever course combination (i.e.: 4-3 credit courses, 2-6 credit courses, etc.) is determined by the school director. Faculty with no formal assignment in research/scholarship/creative works (visiting and lecturers) typically receive an 80% teaching assignment. Tenure-line faculty typically receive a three credit course release to conduct and produce formal external peer validated research/scholarship/creative works. Faculty with more extensive, funded research and outreach activities can be assigned to a reduced teaching and service load, but no faculty will be completely exempted from participation in the teaching and service mission of the College.

While not intended as a limited set of categories, the following examples are offered to illustrate faculty titles possibilities and typical associated DOE assignments:

a.	Visiting Faculty and Lecturers	80% Teaching 15% Service/Outreach 5% Advising
b.	Regular Tenure-Line Faculty	60% Course Teaching 25% Research/Scholarship/Creative Works 10% Service/Outreach 5% Advising
c.	Research Faculty	Minimum 51% research duties Substantial portion of salary funded by external sources Tenure-eligible and nontenure-eligible appointment
d.	Outreach Faculty	Minimum 51% outreach duties Substantial portion of salary funded by external sources Tenure-eligible and nontenure-eligible appointment
e.	Administrative Faculty	Minimum of 51% administrative duties with teaching duties
f.	Special Assignment Faculty	Minimum 51% special duties as temporarily assigned

CAPLA Faculty Distribution of Effort Assignment

ACADEMIC YEAR 20__

SIGNATURES

School Director: _____

Date: _____

Faculty Member: _____

Date: _____

ASSIGNMENT

I. TEACHING _____ **DOE** **%**

Goal 1.

Goal 2.

Goal 3.

Contribution Toward Achievement of College Strategic Plan:

Goal 1 – Goal 7

II. STUDENT ADVISING (Masters Thesis, Capstone) _____ **DOE** **%**

Goal 1.

Goal 2.

Goal 3.

Contribution Toward Achievement of College Strategic Plan:

Goal 1 – Goal 7

III. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS _____ **DOE** **%**

Goal 1.

Goal 2.

Goal 3.

Contribution Toward Achievement of College Strategic Plan:

Goal 1 – Goal 7

IV. SERVICE/OUTREACH DOE %

Goal 1.

Goal 2.

Goal 3.

Contribution Toward Achievement of College Strategic Plan:

Goal 1 – Goal 7

V. ADMINISTRATION DOE %

Goal 1.

Goal 2.

Goal 3.

Contribution Toward Achievement of College Strategic Plan:

Goal 1 – Goal 7

VI. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT DOE %

Goal 1.

Goal 2.

Goal 3.

Contribution Toward Achievement of College Strategic Plan:

Goal 1 – Goal 7

APPENDIX I: Examples of CAPLA Faculty Activities**TEACHING**

- A. Course preparation and delivery
- B. Course management – Maintenance of course records, materials, and websites; participation in studio section coordination and management; research and scholarship related to course material currency and delivery
- C. Course development – New course design; development of teaching techniques and technologies
- D. Advising – Advising of students in and outside of class regarding course assignments and requirements; career advising; student recruitment

STUDENT ADVISING

- A. Committee Chair – Service as chair of a dissertation or master’s thesis committee
- B. Committee Member – Service as a member of a dissertation or master’s thesis committee
- C. Student Recruitment

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS

- A. Publications – Books; journals, invited papers and monographs; professional publications, popular media, research reports
- B. Presentations – Invited presentations; keynote addresses; academic conferences; professional conferences
- C. Exhibits – Juried and invited national and international
- D. Design Competitions – National and international
- E. Patents – Software, products, materials, etc.
- F. Grants and contracts

SERVICE/OUTREACH

- A. University Service – Service on school, college, or university committees or councils; advising of student organizations; faculty mentoring
- B. Professional Service – Service on councils and committees of professional organizations, election to office of professional organizations
- C. Community Service – Leadership of community outreach projects and activities; service on boards and committees of community organizations, appointment or election to public office and/or commissions

ADMINISTRATION

- A. Roles including fiscal and/or personnel oversight including college dean, associate dean, school director, institute director, and associate director.

SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT

- A. Could include any temporary, specific task assignment conducted on behalf of the university, college, school, or institute including administration, research, or outreach.

APPENDIX II: Scholarship of Engagement

*Adapted from: Calleson, et al. "Community-Engaged Scholarship: Is Faculty Work in Communities a True Academic Enterprise? *Academic Medicine*, Vol. 80, No. 4/April 2005.

The scholarship of engagement is a form of reflective scholarly activity that applies to teaching (e.g., service-learning), research (e.g., community-based participatory research), community-responsive practice, and service (e.g., community service, outreach, advocacy). The scholarship of engagement serves to strengthen collaborative ties between academics and practice and enables faculty to apply disciplinary knowledge to practice with communities (39). Engagement scholarship is evaluated based on a full range of process, product, and outcome measures accomplished through practice-based research, practice-based teaching, and practice-based service.

- A. *Process Measures. The processes involved in collaborating with various 'communities' (to include public agencies, professional organizations, clients, institutes, and universities, etc.) is an essential part of the methodology of the scholarship of engagement. The collaborative inquiry and the relationships that form between faculty and communities to examine and address problems should be an essential part of a faculty member's assessment. Process measures should be included with the traditional focus on products or outcomes such as publications in peer reviewed journals, grants obtained as a principal investigator, and/or external recognition such as competitive awards.*
- B. *Product Measures. Faculty committed to the scholarship of engagement need to generate products that balance community priorities and university requirements for knowledge generation, transmission, and application (9). Three primary types of products typically represent engagement scholarship: peer-reviewed publications and presentations, applied products, and dissemination products.*
1. *Peer reviewed books and other publications. The traditionally accepted product is usually an publications in reputable peer-reviewed journals. These articles communicate to others in the field lessons learned and descriptions of innovative programs, and serve as a vehicle for documenting research methods and findings.*
 2. *Applied products. These products allow practice to inform and enrich theory and involve the immediate transfer of knowledge into application. Applied products include innovative programs, policies, and other forms of technical assistance adopted at the community, state, and federal agency levels. These products can be evaluated for evidence of scholarship by the extent to which they require a high level of discipline-related expertise, received rigorous peer review as innovative and contributing to the body of knowledge/field, been implemented or adopted, and had a demonstrated impact on learners, organizational or community capacity, or individuals (18,19).*
 3. *Dissemination products. These products can include peer reviewed agency reports; proceedings and/or presentations at regional, state, and national conferences and forums: officially sanctioned Web sites; and major presentations to community leaders and policy makers at state and national levels (31). These products provide valuable opportunities for reflective critique by peers both in the community and in the academy (8).*
- C. *Demonstrated Impact and Project Outcome Measures. Impact encompasses the outcomes of faculty members' efforts to foster and sustain change in communities and in the academy. Impact occurs through the relationships faculty members develop and sustain with communities (see the preceding process section) and the products (see the preceding products section) that they develop together. Measures of impact in the community can include official changes in policy and/or procedures, changes in community design and planning processes or procedures that result in measurable enhancements to quality of life or economic*

development; *improved community capacity and leadership; and/or increased funding to the community for design, planning, or research projects (21,31).*

APPENDIX III: Scholarship Assessed

The following six standards are intended to apply to the work of all scholars. The following questions are posed by the authors of Scholarship Assessed (Glassick, C. E., M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff. 1997. Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.) in order to clarify the standards themselves:

1. *Clear Goals: Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?*
2. *Adequate Preparation: Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?*
3. *Appropriate Methods: Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the method selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?*
4. *Significant Results: Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequently to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?*
5. *Effective Presentation: Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to pre- sent his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?*
6. *Reflective Critique: Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work? These six standards are intended to apply to the work of all scholars.*

APPENDIX IV: Annual Performance Based Component (APBC) Pay Policy

Annual Performance Based Component (APBC) Pay Policy

1. Purpose

The (College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture) seeks to establish compensation policies and practices that promote and the recruitment and retention of excellent faculty. The purpose of these (policy) is to provide procedures by which (the

College) may grant an additional salary component that is awarded on a one time basis only for the next contract year but does not become part of the faculty member's regular salary. This (policy) does not apply to any other aspect of faculty compensation. This component is intended for faculty who have high annual performance reviews in teaching, research, and/or service.

2. Methodology

- The Dean will determine availability of funds each fiscal year for APBC pay.
- School Directors will nominate to the Dean eligible faculty members or continuing professionals for APBC pay based on stated criteria.
- APBC pay shall be determined annually with the individual faculty member or continuing professional and his/her (School Director as part of the Annual Performance Review and Distribution of Effort process) and shall be approved by the Dean.
- Faculty must receive a notification in writing from the Dean or (School Director) when the APBC pay has been approved.

3. Eligibility

- For purposes of this (policy) "faculty" shall have the meaning as set forth in Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) Policy 6-201, et seq. Eligible faculty members may be tenured, tenure-eligible or nontenure-eligible.
- This (policy) also may be applied to continuing and continuing-eligible professionals, as defined in ABOR Policy 6-301 and Chapter 4 of UHAP.

Only professional personnel who are employed full-time and whose positions are funded by state appropriations or other sources of funds which are recognized by ABOR as the equivalent of state appropriations are eligible to be designated as continuing-eligible or as continuing. Professional personnel who hold part-time appointments or who are designated as year-to-year are not eligible for continuing status. (UHAP, Chapter 4).

- The faculty member (and/or continuing professional) must receive annual performance reviews.
- Receipt of APBC in one year does not disqualify eligibility for APBC pay the following or subsequent years.

4. Criteria for Selection

- Factors that may be considered in determining APBC pay include (but are not limited to) academic performance, quality of work, and productivity in the areas of teaching, research, scholarly activity, and/or service.
 - Consideration will be given for accomplishments in the areas listed above that are truly extraordinary and above and beyond regular duties and responsibilities as specified within the individual Distribution of Effort Agreement.
5. Methodology for calculating APBC Pay
- APBC Pay will be distributed in lump sums as determined by the Dean.
6. Plan for Funding APBC Pay
- APBC pay is dependent on the availability of funds. The level of funding for APBC Pay will be made on a college-wide basis. The Dean will determine the total fund pool available for distribution as well as approve individual pay amounts.
7. Requirements
- The faculty member or continuing professional must receive a notification in writing from the Dean or (School Director) when the APBC pay has been approved. APBC pay must be included and separately identified in the annual Notice of Reappointment.
 - APBC pay may only be awarded on a one time basis for the upcoming contract term, but APBC pay may be awarded in subsequent years using the (College's) criteria and process of evaluation. An award of APBC pay in one year creates no expectation that it will be awarded in future years.
 - Receipt of APBC in one year does not disqualify eligibility for APBC pay the following or subsequent years.
 - Failure to receive APBC pay in subsequent years will not be considered disciplinary action.
 - APBC pay may not be implemented off-cycle, adjusted during the award period or awarded retrospectively.
 - (School) and College APBC pay plans may be more, but not less, restrictive than these Guidelines and must be consistent with the Guidelines.

- This (policy) is subject to all other applicable University and ABOR policies, including Conflict of Interest and policies related to compensation charged to sponsored grants and contracts.
- 8. Timelines and Monitoring
 - Each department and college that intends to implement APBC pay must develop and APBC plan and submit it to the Provost's Office for approval by December 15 prior to the fiscal year of implementation. The Provost's Office will notify colleges/departments, if the plans are approved, by February 1.
 - School Directors nominate eligible faculty/continuing professionals to the Dean for APBC pay by April 15.
 - APBC pay must be determined by May 15th of every year for the following fiscal year. The identification of the source of fund and annual performance review must be sent to the Dean along with the request. (The request must be submitted by the annual rollover worksheet deadlines.)
 - Monitoring responsibilities of APBC pay will rest with the Dean. Grievances concerning APBC pay may be filed with the Dean. The Dean's decision on APBC grievances is final and not subject to further grievance or review.