NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS)

1. NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY CONDITIONS OF FACULTY SERVICE

Arizona Board of Regents Policy 6-201 constitutes the conditions of employment as a faculty member. The complete ABOR Policy Manual is available at the Cline Library, the Deans' offices, the Faculty Senate Office and the Office of the Provost. The ABOR Policy Manual may also be obtained on-line at the following address: http://www.azregents.edu/.

ABOR policies may be referred to herein. ABOR Policy 6-201 provides for local university implementation and definition of conditions of faculty service. Northern Arizona University's local conditions are set forth below in this document separate from the ABOR policy. If a provision of the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service is in conflict with ABOR policy, the ABOR policy shall govern.

1.1 Definitions

The following definitions shall apply as the words or phrases are used in the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service.

Academic Criteria – The guidelines developed at the academic unit and college level to describe the performance expectations for retention, promotion, tenure, and annual review. These criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and the Provost.

Academic unit - The term *academic unit* may be used to identify to any degree-granting department, school, or college

Administrator - The term *administrator* refers to someone who either has a notice of appointment issued under the ABOR Conditions of Administrative Service, or a faculty contract with administrative duties.

Annual Review Committee (ARC) – This committee conducts annual reviews at the unit level. See Appendix B for additional information including committee alternatives for ARC.

Chair- The administrator immediately responsible for management of the academic department, division, unit, or other entity. Typically, this is the faculty member in charge of an academic department of the University. In some units, this role may be assumed by the Director, Executive Director, or Dean.

College - The use of the word *college* in this document shall include a freestanding *college*.

Day – This means calendar day, except that where the last day of any specific time period falls on a Saturday, a Sunday, or a university-recognized holiday. In these cases the time period shall run until 5:00 pm of the next day, or close of business as specified by university policy of the next day which is not a Saturday, a Sunday or a university-recognized holiday.

Dean - The use of the word *Dean* in this document shall include any person who is designated as the head of a college.

Faculty Status Committee (FSC) - This committee of faculty performs a department level review and evaluation. See Appendix B for additional information.

Full-time Faculty – Faculty employed in a 50% or greater capacity for an academic or fiscal year period.

Part-time Faculty - Individuals whose appointment is 49% or less Full-Time Employed (FTE) and who are not eligible for university benefits.

President – The President of Northern Arizona University or the President's designated representative.

Promotion and Tenure Committee - A committee from the faculty in the school or college which reviews and makes recommendations regarding promotion, tenure, and Regents' awards. See Appendix B for additional information.

Provost – The chief academic officer responsible for academic affairs within the university; the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

School - The use of the word *school* in this document refers to an academic unit within a college.

Statement of Expectations –The description of the annual Workload Assignment based on the academic unit criteria by which the performance of that workload will be evaluated. The Statement of Expectations is the result of a negotiation between the faculty member and the Chair and, when indicated by department policy, the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Temporary Faculty – This term refers to the following two categories: faculty, whether full–time or part-time, who have appointments restricted to one year and faculty who have appointments for less than six months and are not benefit eligible.

Workload Assignment - The allocation of a faculty member's time and effort across categories of responsibility consistent with the mission of the University and the faculty member's academic unit. These categories may include teaching and other student-related responsibilities; scholarship, research, and/or creative activities; service to the University and to the profession; and other activities as appropriate.

1.2 Faculty Classifications

Promotion or Tenure Timeline

Faculty are eligible to apply for promotion or tenure during their 6th year at rank, after five years of service at rank inclusive of prior service credit awarded at the time of hire. The University will consider applications for early promotion or tenure only under rare and unique circumstances. Such rare and exceptional considerations are limited no more than 1 year early; the timelines for each have been established to provide fair and equitable evaluation of a faculty's track record. Any deviation from established 6th year application timeline will only be considered where approved unit level P&T policy explicitly articulates criteria specific to each rank that are scaled to workload assignment and where, prior to the submission of any promotion application, both the Chair/Director and Dean confirm that the faculty member significantly and demonstrably exceeds all criteria in all areas of workload assignment as calibrated to assigned effort, *to a degree that is outstanding in the context of unit or similarly situated college peers.* Any application for promotion or tenure prior to eligibility requirements being met must be identified as "early", include additional documentation from the chair/director and Dean with rationale supporting the deviation from standard timeline, and describe considerations for equity among other similarly situated faculty. The rationale should include but not be limited to demonstrate *substantially* higher than expected performance excellence in all areas of assigned faculty responsibility. This is the case for all position tracks and ranks.

Credit for Prior Service

Credit for prior service, such as at other academic institutions or professional experiences may be awarded in the review of promotion or tenure cases. The years of credit to be credited for such service outside of NAU cannot exceed the number of years served in those external roles. Any such prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring, or in a subsequent formal petition, must be approved by the chair/director, dean and provost by April 15th prior to the application for promotion or tenure and be aligned with the established prior credit policy. This is the case for all position types.

Teaching outside of the academic year (fall and spring) must be evaluated for performance and is counted towards evidence of sustained teaching but will not accelerate the six-year requirement of when a faculty is eligible to apply for promotion.

NAU maintains a list of approved terminal degrees located at the NAU provost office website. This list informs and defines all references about terminal degrees below.

1.2.1 Tenure-Eligible Positions

The tenure-eligible positions include Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Tenure-eligible faculty shall have a maximum probationary period no longer than seven years in full-time service at tenure-eligible rank, except in cases of waiver by the Provost for an individual faculty member.

All tenure-eligible positions require an earned doctorate or approved terminal degree in the appropriate discipline. Any exception to this degree requirement must be recommended by the faculty and Chair of the academic unit and approved by the Dean and Provost. Achievement of a tenured or tenure-eligible faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written academic unit criteria which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation. Units are required to articulate and define the standards listed below for each faculty rank within their approved promotion and tenure documents and criteria. Academic units shall articulate criteria that are proportionate to and aligned with workload assignment during the period of review. Academic unit criteria may exceed, but must not be less than, ABOR standards (6-201 I.) and the NAU standards below.

Responsibilities: Tenured and tenure-track faculty are primarily responsible for teaching courses at all levels, with the expectation of scholarship/creative activity, and providing service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community consistent with unit needs.

Term of Appointment: Tenure-track faculty members are appointed annually where renewal is subject to successful demonstration of expectations in rank and progress towards tenure. Tenured faculty have ongoing appointments that are updated annually.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

The rank of assistant professor is a tenure-eligible position. To hold the rank of assistant professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must:

a. Show promise of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and

b. Show promise of scholarly and creative activity related to the faculty member's discipline; and

c. Show promise of service to the Department/School, College and University community.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The rank of associate professor is a tenure-eligible or tenured position. A faculty member may not be promoted to associate professor unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured associate professor. A faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of associate professor in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor at NAU.

To hold the rank of associate professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

a. A record that demonstrates substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, and other student-related responsibilities; and

b. A record that demonstrates a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline; and

c. A record that demonstrates a pattern of sustained service to the Department/School, College and University as well as professional and external communities. Additionally shows the potential to assume a leadership role within the Department/School, College, and University as one moves toward the rank of professor.

PROFESSOR

A faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the Notice of Appointment indicates it is at the rank of professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research or leadership. A faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of professor in the sixth (6^{th}) year of full-time service at the rank of associate professor at NAU.

To hold the rank of professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

a. A record that demonstrates a sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and

b. A record that demonstrates a sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline. Leadership contributions to the department, college or university may also be considered in combination with scholarly and other creative productivity for promotion to this rank; and

c. A record that demonstrates a mix of sustained service to the Department/School, College and University communities and evidence of leadership within the department college or university.

In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (a) or (b) above as defined by college and academic unit criteria.

1.2.2 Career Track Faculty (also known as Non-Tenure eligible or Non-Tenure Track)

Career track positions include instructor, lecturer, teaching faculty, clinical faculty, professors of practice, research faculty, visiting faculty, part-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and visiting scholars.

Career Track faculty will demonstrate commitment to student success through effective teaching, other student related activities, scholarship/creative activity, service to the Department/School, College and University.

Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written academic unit criteria which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation. Academic units shall articulate criteria that are proportionate to and aligned with workload assignment during the period of review. Units are required to articulate and further define the standards listed below for each faculty rank in their approved promotion and tenure documents and criteria. Academic unit criteria may exceed, but must not be less than, ABOR standards (6-201 I.) and the NAU standards outlined here.

INSTRUCTOR

Instructors are non-tenured, non-tenure-eligible faculty, and non-promotion eligible. This title should be used in one of two ways: (1) for appointments of one to three years; or (2) as a temporary designation for individuals who have been hired into a tenure-track assistant professor position, but who have not yet

completed all requirements for the terminal degree; Upon completion of the dissertation or other final terminal degree requirements, such individuals as defined in case (2) will be ranked as tenure-eligible assistant professors. Units may establish criteria and procedures to move instructors to lecturer ranks after an appropriate period.

Responsibilities: Instructors are primarily responsible for teaching courses at the undergraduate level as well as providing service to the department or school. Instructors are expected to demonstrate a commitment to student success through effective teaching and other student related activities. They shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current appointment period.

Term of Appointment: If an individual was appointed as an instructor into a position initially considered temporary, they may be reappointed according to the unit's policies if the need continues. If the title of instructor was given as in case (2) above, then their rank may be changed during an academic year. Should it change during the fall semester, then that academic year will be considered the first year of their six-year probationary period. Should it change during the spring semester, however, the mandatory probation period will not begin officially until the next fall semester.

Qualifications: For cases (1) and (2) above, an earned masters degree in the appropriate discipline and, where required, certification or licensing in their field of competence.

LECTURER FACULTY

Lecturers are non-tenured, non-tenure-eligible faculty. A faculty member in this category is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer.

Responsibilities: Lecturers are primarily responsible for teaching undergraduate, or graduate, courses, supporting other student related activities, as well as providing service to the department. Potential assignment to scholarship/creative activity is allowed provided department course capacity needs are prioritized

Term of Appointment: Lecturers are appointed for up to three years, following successful demonstration of expectations of rank. These appointments may be renewed.

Qualifications: Lecturer ranks require an earned master's degree in the appropriate discipline and, where required, certification or licensing in their field of competence.

a. *Lecturer:* To be eligible for the rank of lecturer, the faculty member must demonstrate a potential for student success through effectiveness in teaching, advising, and student-related responsibilities or, in the case of a new appointment, show promise of effectiveness if the candidate has no prior teaching experience.

b. *Senior Lecturer:* A faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Senior Lecturer in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of Lecturer at NAU. To be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following:

    1. A record that demonstrates commitment to student success through effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities; and

    2. A record that demonstrates a commitment to service for the Department/School, College and University and professional development related to the teaching role; and

    3. The equivalent of six years of full-time college-level teaching at the rank of Lecturer or equivalent full-time teaching role inclusive of approved prior service credit.,

c. *Principal Lecturer:* A faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Principal Lecturer in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of Senior Lecturer at NAU. Principal Lecturers are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and service. Leadership contributions may also be considered for promotion to this rank. To be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following:

    1. A record that demonstrates a contribution to student success, as evidenced by sustained excellence at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities; and

2. A record that demonstrates a commitment of sustained excellence in service to the Department/School, College and University community, leadership and professional development related to the teaching role; and

3. The equivalent of six years of full-time college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or similar full-time teaching role inclusive of approved prior service credit.

Full-time ongoing faculty in the Lecturer career track classification at any rank who earn an NAU approved terminal degree (see here for list), are eligible for conversion to the Teaching Faculty series of titles. Such conversion requires a formal request from the Chair/Dean to the Office of the Provost and, if approved, would become effective as part of the next notice of appointment (*no earlier than July 1 each year*) following the conferral and official posting of the approved terminal degree. The process for conversion is administered by the office of the provost. Transition to the teaching faculty title series will be "lateral" to rank and include transfer of time in rank for purposes of promotion eligibility. Approved transitions to the teaching faculty series of titles will require modified SoE's and job responsibilities to align with expectations of teaching professors and that support progression to promotion criteria within the new classification series.

TEACHING FACULTY

Teaching faculty members are Career Track Faculty (defined above in 1.2.2). A teaching faculty member is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor. Faculty in the teaching professor series of titles (all ranks) hold approved terminal degrees in their discipline.

Responsibilities: Teaching faculty members are primarily responsible for teaching undergraduate or graduate courses. Potential assignment to scholarship/creative activity is allowed provided department course capacity needs are prioritized.

Term of Appointment: Teaching faculty members are appointed for up to three years, following successful demonstration of expectations of rank. These appointments may be renewed.

Qualifications: Teaching faculty are faculty members who have earned an approved terminal degree (see here for NAU approved list) in the field in which they teach.

a. *Assistant Teaching Professor*: To be eligible for the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor, the faculty member must have at least the following:

    1. An earned and approved terminal degree in the appropriate discipline and, where appropriate, certification or licensing in their field of competence; and

    2. A record that demonstrates a contribution to student success through effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsibilities or the promise of such effectiveness if the candidate has no prior teaching experience.

b. *Associate Teaching Professor*: A faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Associate Teaching Professor in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor. To be eligible for the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, the faculty member must have at least all of the following:

    1. An earned and approved terminal degree in the appropriate discipline and, where appropriate, certification or licensing in their field of competence; and

    2. A record that demonstrates substantial effectiveness at the Assistant Teaching Professor rank and responsibilities, including a commitment to student success through effective teaching and other student related activities; and

    3. A record that demonstrates sustained service to the Department/School, College and University community, the potential to assume a leadership role and, where appropriate service to the profession as one moves toward the rank of Teaching Professor; and

4. The equivalent of six years of full-time college-level teaching at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor or similar full-time teaching role inclusive of approved prior service credit.

c. *Teaching Professor*: A faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Teaching Professor in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor at NAU. Teaching professor faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching, and service. Leadership contributions may also be considered for promotion to this rank. To be eligible for the rank of Teaching Professor the faculty member must have at least all of the following:

1. An earned and approved terminal degree in the appropriate discipline and, where appropriate, certification or licensing in their field of competence; and
2. A record that demonstrates sustained excellence at the Associate Teaching Professor rank and responsibilities, including a commitment to student success through effective teaching and other student related activities; and
3. A record that demonstrates sustained service and leadership for the Department/School, College and University community and, where appropriate, service to the profession; and
4. The equivalent of six years of full-time college-level teaching at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or similar full-time teaching role inclusive of approved prior service credit.

CLINICAL FACULTY

Clinical faculty members are Career Track Faculty (defined above in 1.2.2). A clinical faculty member is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, or Clinical Professor.

Responsibilities: Clinical faculty members are primarily responsible for teaching and managing students in the clinical, internship, or practical components of their degree programs. Potential assignment to scholarship/creative activity is allowed provided department course capacity needs are prioritized.

Term of Appointment: Clinical faculty members are appointed for up to three years, following successful demonstration of expectations of rank. These appointments may be renewed.

Qualifications: Clinical ranks require an earned master's degree in the appropriate discipline and a license or certification relevant to the assigned disciplinary area. Additionally, clinical faculty are faculty members who have established themselves by professional experience and expertise over a sustained period of time to be qualified to teach or manage practicum, internship, or practice components of degree programs.

a. *Assistant Clinical Professor:* To be eligible for the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. An earned Master's degree in the appropriate discipline and certification or licensing in their field of competence.
2. A record that demonstrates clinical competence in the relevant discipline, a commitment to student success through clinical teaching and other student-related responsibilities.

b. *Associate Clinical Professor*: A faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Associate Clinical Professor in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor at NAU. To be eligible for the rank of Associate Clinical Professor, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. An earned Master's degree in the appropriate discipline and certification or licensing in their field of competence where appropriate.
2. A record that demonstrates clinical competence in the relevant discipline and a pattern of substantial commitment to student success through effective clinical teaching and other student-related responsibilities at the Assistant Clinical Professor rank; and

3. A record that demonstrates a service to the Department/School, College and University community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the unit as one moves toward the rank of Clinical Professor; and

4. The equivalent of six years of full-time college-level teaching at the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor or similar full-time clinical teaching role inclusive of approved prior service credit.,

d. *Clinical Professor:* A faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Clinical Professor in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor at NAU. Clinical Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching, clinical practice and service. Leadership contributions may also be considered for promotion to this rank. To be eligible for the rank of Clinical Professor, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. An earned Master's degree in the appropriate discipline and certification or licensing in their field of competence where appropriate.

2. A record that demonstrates clinical competence in the relevant discipline and a pattern of substantial commitment to student success through effective clinical teaching and other student-related responsibilities at the Associate Clinical Professor rank; and

3. A record that demonstrates a sustained service to the Department/School, College and University community, and a leadership role within the department, college or university; and the profession.

4. The equivalent of six years of full-time college-level teaching at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor or similar full-time clinical teaching role inclusive of approved prior service credit.

PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

Professors of practice are Career Track Faculty (defined above in 1.2.2). A Professor of Practice is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, or Professor of Practice.

Responsibilities: Professors of practice are primarily responsible for teaching courses, including seminars and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students, and for modeling the intersection of theory and practice in the relevant field. Potential assignment to scholarship/creative activity is allowed provided department course capacity needs are prioritized.

Term of Appointment: Professors of Practice faculty members are appointed for up to three years, following successful demonstration of expectations of rank. These appointments may be renewed.

Qualifications: Professors of practice are faculty members who have established themselves by expertise, achievements, and reputation over a sustained period of time to be distinguished professionals in an area of practice or discipline but who may not have the terminal degree in the discipline.

a. *Assistant Professor of Practice:* To be eligible for the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. A record of commitment to student success through effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsibilities or show promise of such effectiveness if the candidate has no prior teaching experience.

b. *Associate Professor of Practice*: A faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Associate Professor of Practice in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice at NAU. To be eligible for the rank of Associate Professor of Practice, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. A record of commitment to student success through substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching and other student related responsibilities; and

2. A record of service to the Department/School, College and University community and, where required, professional development within the area of practice or related to the teaching role.; and

5. The equivalent of six years of full-time college-level teaching at the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice or similar full-time teaching role inclusive of approved prior service credit.,

c. *Professor of Practice:* A faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Professor of Practice in the sixth year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor of Practice at NAU Professors of Practice are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching, practice, and service. Leadership contributions may also be considered for promotion to this rank. To be eligible for the rank of Professor of Practice, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. A record of commitment to student success through sustained excellence at the Associate Professor of practice rank in teaching and other student- related responsibilities; and

2. A record of sustained excellence in service to the Department/School, College and University community and, where required, professional development within the area of practice or related to the teaching role, and leadership to include professional development within the area of practice and related to the teaching role.

6. The equivalent of six years of full-time college-level teaching at the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice or similar full-time teaching role inclusive of approved prior service credit.

RESEARCH FACULTY

Research faculty are Career Track Faculty (defined above in 1.2.2). A research faculty member is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, or Research Professor.

Responsibilities: Research faculty members are primarily responsible for engaging in, being responsible for, or overseeing a significant area of research or scholarship. Research faculty may serve as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the university. They are funded through external resources secured through the efforts of the appointee or in collaboration with others. Self-funded faculty appointed in the research track may be eligible for a salary reserve benefit intended to serve as a bridge should there be a gap in external funding supporting the position. This benefit is described and governed by the NAU Policy on Research Centers, Public Service Centers, and Institutes. Assignment of teaching or service may be negotiated between the faculty member and the unit.

Term of Appointment: Research faculty members are appointed for one year, following successful demonstration of expectations of rank and availability of funding. These appointments may be renewed.

Qualifications: Research faculty are faculty members who have established themselves by expertise, achievements, and reputation to be distinguished scholars and researchers. Research faculty appointments require an earned doctorate degree in the appropriate discipline.

a. *Assistant Research Professor:* To be eligible for the rank of assistant research professor, the faculty member must show promise of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.

b. *Associate Research Professor:* A faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Associate Research Professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Research Professor at NAU. To be eligible for the rank of associate research professor, the faculty member must supply evidence of a record that shows a sustained pattern of substantial scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.

c. *Research Professor:* A faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Research Professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Research Professor at NAU. To be eligible for the rank of research professor, the faculty member must supply evidence of national or international recognition in their field and a sustained pattern of outstanding scholarly activity or

other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline, as well as evidence of leadership within the individual's scholarly and/or creative activity.

VISITING FACULTY

Visiting faculty are non-tenured, non tenure-eligible. They are temporary appointees. A visiting faculty member is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor. This academic rank or track (clinical, practice or teaching) should be that which best aligns with unit expectations and qualifications.

Responsibilities: Responsibilities of visiting faculty will vary depending on the rank and the needs of the unit.

Period of Appointment: Visiting faculty are appointed for one year or less. They are temporary faculty and shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current appointment period. If hired through a competitive search process, visiting faculty may be transitioned to ongoing faculty status (without the visiting qualifier) at the same rank and track if such a position becomes needed and funding is available. Time spent in a full-time visiting role is eligible for prior service credit consideration.

Qualifications: Persons considered for visiting faculty ranks shall hold qualifications for those ranks and track as specified by the academic unit.

PART-TIME FACULTY

Responsibilities: Part-time faculty are responsible for teaching undergraduate, graduate, or clinical courses. Part-time faculty are expected to demonstrate commitment to student success through effective teaching.

Term of Appointment: Part-time faculty are hired on a course-by-course basis as determined by the academic unit and in accordance with applicable NAU hiring policies. They shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current assignment.

Qualifications: Part-time faculty shall hold qualifications as specified by the academic unit.

ADJUNCT FACULTY

Adjunct faculty is an affiliate faculty status. They are individuals who are academically qualified or qualified through relevant non-academic experience to render valuable service to the university. The adjunct faculty status is a non-compensated position.

Applications and nominations for adjunct faculty are reviewed by the faculty of the department or academic unit and recommended for appointment by the Chair or Director to the Dean who finalizes the recommendation with HR and ITS.

Since the adjunct appointment is a non-compensated position, an adjunct faculty member must be appointed to another appropriate rank of contract employment to receive compensation.

VISITING SCHOLAR

Visiting scholars are non-compensated faculty members from another institution who spend a limited period at NAU for purposes of collaboration or research. The request for such an appointment is reviewed by the faculty of the department or academic unit and recommended by the Chair or Director to the Dean who recommends to the Provost. Since the visiting scholar appointment is a non-compensated position, a visiting scholar faculty member must be appointed to another appropriate rank of contract employment to receive compensation.

1.3 Appointment

In addition to the ABOR policy set forth above, NAU shall comply with the following policies and procedures in making an appointment of a faculty member at NAU.

1.3.1 Appointment Policies

1. NAU is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. All appointments shall be made consistent with all policies of the Arizona Board of Regents and Northern Arizona University.

2. Initial appointments of faculty shall be made on the basis of high-quality professional experience and educational background and the specific needs of NAU. Job-related factors take precedence in the selection process.

3. Initial appointments of faculty shall be made in accordance with the procedures set forth in 1.3.2 below and in ABOR policy 6-201D as set forth in the ABOR policy manual.

4. Renewal appointments of faculty shall be made in accordance with the procedures set forth in this document (section 1.4, *Faculty Evaluation*) and using the written *Notice of Appointment* referred to in 5 below.

5. Appointment of a faculty member at NAU (whether initial or renewal) shall be made using a written "Notice of Appointment," which shall include at least the following:

    a. A statement which reads: “This Notice of Appointment constitutes the employment contract of the faculty member named herein when accepted in writing by the faculty member;”
    b. The name of the faculty member;
    c. The beginning date of employment;
    d. The type of faculty appointment (e.g. associate professor);
    e. A statement defining the status of the appointment as full-time or less than full-time with *tenure*, *tenure eligible*, or *non-tenure eligible*. Non-tenure eligible (Carer Track) appointments shall also state: "time served under this appointment does not accrue time toward sabbatical or tenure.” Non-tenure eligible (Career Track) appointments may be eligible for provost approved re-assigned time for professional development based on provost office policy and procedures."
    f. In the case of a tenure-eligible appointment, the Notice of Appointment will include a notification of any credit in years for prior professional activity toward tenure. These negotiated terms will not preclude the right of a faculty member to request a delay in tenure review, which shall be subject to approval by the President.
    g. The salary to be paid will be included. Where appropriate for non-tenure eligible faculty, the Notice of Appointment will state that the appointment is dependent for continuation upon funding and that the appointment may be terminated prior to the end of the designated contract period if funding is no longer available.
    h. The Notice of Appointment will also include a statement that employment is subject to ABOR Conditions of Faculty Service and Northern Arizona University Conditions of Faculty Service. Any other rules or policies including conditions of faculty service are found in the *Faculty Handbook* which is available at http://nau.edu/provost/. In addition, other policies that apply to different areas of service may be applicable. It is the individual’s responsibility to acquire additional materials of reference.
    i. In addition to the Notice of Appointment, a statement of general responsibilities for the faculty member at the time of initial appointment is required. This statement will be modified in consultation with the faculty member within six weeks after commencement of the appointment period and will then constitute

the first annual Statement of Expectations.

1.3.2 Appointment Procedures -- Initial Appointment

1. Screening Committee

   The academic unit shall establish a screening committee in accordance with the following rules and procedures:
   a. The faculty of the academic unit shall elect from among themselves at least 50% of the committee's membership.
   b. The academic unit head (Dean or designee) and/or department Chair or Director shall appoint the remaining members of the committee with particular attention paid to providing representation that includes ethnic and gender diversity. This requirement may mean that the Chair must go outside the department for committee members to ensure the inclusion of underrepresented groups.
   c. If the faculty, the Chair or Director, and the Dean concur, the entire faculty of the academic unit may serve as the screening committee. Gender and minority representation referred to in (b) above is still required.
   d. If the position to be filled will likely serve two or more departments or colleges, representatives from each academic unit involved shall serve on the committee.
   e. The committee Chair will be appointed by the department Chair and/or academic unit head in consultation with the screening committee.

2. NAU Faculty Recruiting and Hiring Procedure
   Hiring guidelines are outlined in Appendix C. The procedure offers a step-by-step description of the elements and forms required for the hiring of faculty. The required forms and documentation for recruiting and hiring are provided in the procedure. For all benefit-eligible positions, it is the responsibility of the academic unit head (Dean, Chair or Director) to consult with the screening committee Chair, and prepare materials for the hiring procedure.

The hiring procedure will be reviewed annually in consultation with faculty and is available in the offices of Deans, Chairs, Directors, Human Resources and Affirmative Action and online at https://in.nau.edu/eao/Faculty-Search-Guide/.

3. Policy for Part-time, Non-tenure-eligible Positions
   Faculty and administrators from each academic unit shall in accordance with the hiring procedure, establish in writing and publish their own set of policies and procedures for hiring part-time, non-tenure-eligible faculty. The policies and procedures will provide the opportunity for faculty participation in the hiring process and must be reviewed and approved by the Provost.

1.4 Faculty Evaluation

1.4.1 Scope of Evaluation

The Arizona Board of Regents recognizes the need for a faculty performance evaluation system that identifies, assesses, and enhances performance. It is essential that the evaluation process incorporate guidelines relevant to the achievement of the academic goals and objectives of teaching, advising, mentoring, research/scholarship/creative activity, and professional service while recognizing the unique nature and diversity of the units. To this end, it is necessary that guidelines be established and evaluations conducted in a manner that is flexible enough to serve the particular mission, objectives, and needs of the respective units.

Faculty performance evaluations will take several forms. For tenured faculty these include annual review and promotion review. For tenure eligible faculty these include annual review, probationary (retention) review, promotion review, and tenure review. For non-tenure eligible faculty these can include annual review, reappointment review, and promotion review.

Faculty with full-time administrative responsibilities, such as Deans or those with full-time special assignments, will be evaluated according to criteria established by the Provost or President as appropriate. Faculty on administrative assignments, such as Chairs, will be evaluated according to the allocation of effort. Thus, their evaluations will be conducted by both peers and their supervisors. Supervisor ratings shall incorporate input from peers.

Part-time faculty will be evaluated according to the procedures established within the departments.

1.4.2 Review and Evaluation Criteria

Academic units will establish criteria for evaluation and measures of quality and will make these criteria available to the faculty member. These criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and the Provost before implementation.

Typically, academic units will have different criteria and levels of performance expected for annual performance evaluations (e.g., unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, highly meritorious) than for retention, tenure, and promotion. Annual evaluations do not cumulate into tenure and/or promotion decisions. For probationary (tenure eligible) faculty, the annual evaluation should not be confused with the probationary (retention) review. While these may occur simultaneously and be based upon overlapping material, the probationary (retention) review incorporates the unit's estimate of the faculty member's future promise and contributions to the unit and the discipline based on the performance and accomplishments to date. Annual performance evaluations are retrospective of a single year, and summative in nature. Tenure and promotion reviews incorporate an evaluation of the quality of contributions of the faculty member to date and promise of continued excellence.

1.4.3 Calendar for Performance Evaluation Procedures

Periods for review and evaluation shall be in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar,* which shall be prepared annually by the Provost and furnished through the Deans to all academic units conducting evaluations. Published dates for review of tenured, tenure eligible, and non-tenure eligible faculty will be set by the administration by the first day of the fall semester. This calendar will specify the due dates for faculty submission, committee consideration and recommendations, administrators' consideration and recommendations, and actions by the Provost and President. The *Personnel Action Calendar* can be accessed at http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure/ .

For the purposes of Probationary Review, "first" and "second" year for tenure eligible faculty shall be determined by years of service at NAU regardless of years of prior service agreed to

at the time of hire.

1.4.4 Personnel Involved with Faculty Evaluation

Depending on the type of review, the personnel involved with faculty evaluation may include

1. The faculty member;
2. Chair;
3. Committees (Annual Review Committee, Faculty Status Committee, Promotion and Tenure Committee);
4. Dean;
5. Provost;
6. President.

1.4.5 Materials Required for Review and Evaluation

1.4.5.1 Statement of Expectations

Normally, all tenured, tenure eligible, and non-tenure eligible faculty, whether full or part-time appointees, must have a Statement of Expectations that will be used as the basis for performance evaluations. Exceptions to this policy include part-time faculty.

a. Creating a Statement of Expectations:

A Statement of Expectations should be constructed so as to utilize the education, skills and talents of the faculty member as they relate to the missions and needs of the department, academic unit, school, college and/or the university. The performance of the faculty member will be measured within the context of his/her Statement of Expectations.

By April 1 of each year, all those holding faculty appointments at Northern Arizona University will have a Statement of Expectations covering the next academic contract (usually the academic year). The Statement of Expectations is the result of negotiation between the faculty member and the Chair and when indicated by department policy, the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee. Consultation with the Dean may be required to reach final agreement. The Statement of Expectations will be individualized for each faculty member. It will encompass the faculty member's anticipated activities for the time period under university contract indicating the percentage of effort devoted to the activities. It will include or otherwise refer to formal, written criteria determined by the academic unit that will be the basis for the evaluation of faculty performance in that unit, both annually and for retention, promotion, or tenure, as appropriate. The Statement of Expectations for those faculty who have administrative responsibilities (such as Chairs, program coordinators, etc.) will enumerate these responsibilities, indicate the percentage of effort devoted to them, and establish the criteria for evaluation of their administrative performance.

Each Statement of Expectations is to be signed by or approved electronically by the faculty member, the Chair (or Dean in non-departmentalized colleges), and the Chair of the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee (if these committees are brought into the negotiation in accordance with department policy) and a copy forwarded to the Dean. These signatures indicate common understanding and agreement to the expectations for the forthcoming contractual period. If the Statement of Expectations is not signed by the faculty member (and relevant committee Chair as appropriate) by the end of the academic year, indicating acceptance of the terms of employment for the coming contractual period, the Statement is still considered operative and will be the basis upon which the faculty member is evaluated during the annual review process.

b. Revising the Statement of Expectations

If, during the period covered by the Statement of Expectations, there are significant changes in the faculty member's responsibilities or the faculty member has experienced significant changes in individual circumstances, then the Statement of Expectations may be revised through a negotiation process involving the faculty member, the relevant administrator(s), and/or the Faculty Status Committee or the Promotion and Tenure Committee (in accordance with department policy).

The revised Statement of Expectations must show the signatures or electronic approval of all relevant parties to be considered the statement of record against which performance is evaluated unless the revised Statement of Expectations has become operative without the signature(s) as provided in paragraph "a" above.

c. Tenure Eligible and Tenured Faculty

Unless otherwise specified, the Statement of Expectations for tenure eligible and tenured faculty will set forth the workload assignment (including professional development), indicating percentage of effort that is anticipated in each of the following areas for the contract period:

1. Student-related responsibilities (to include at least teaching, advising, mentoring, and student supervision);
2. Scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; and
3. Service to the profession, the University (including administration/ college/school/department/area) and to the community (local, state, national, and international) as it relates to the mission and guidelines of the University and the profession.

d. Faculty Members Not Eligible for Tenure

A Statement of Expectations for faculty who are not eligible for tenure will be developed to reflect the specific responsibilities for which those faculty have been employed.

Part-time and temporary faculty will normally have duties enumerated at the time of hire.

e. Faculty Members Serving More than One Discipline or Academic Unit

Statements of Expectations for faculty members who serve more than one discipline or academic unit should clearly specify the allocation of each faculty member's efforts that will be assigned to each of the academic units served. The Statement of Expectations specifies how the allocations will be reflected in the evaluation process in each of the evaluation areas listed in (c) above.

f. Workload Assignment

Individual departments or Academic Units will develop unit policies for determining workloads. These policies must be approved by the Dean and Provost. Individual faculty workload assignments are negotiated on an annual basis and described in the Statement of Expectations. Unit level workload policies shall conform to University level guidelines.

Workload Assignments are negotiated on an annual basis and described in the Statement of Expectations.

1.4.5.2 Professional Review File

Typically, there are three types of files related to personnel: the Professional Review File (PRF) which is used in the faculty evaluation processes, the Personnel File which contains the standard hiring and reappointment forms, and Supervisory Files which are used by administrators to hold notes and materials that are informal in nature and not included in the PRF. Only the PRF and any letters of reference for which the faculty member has waived access shall be considered in the evaluation processes.

The Chair has the responsibility to maintain Professional Review Files including electronic versions for all faculty members within the academic unit regardless of the nature of their appointments. Only the faculty member whose records are involved, appropriate administrators and staff, and evaluation committee members shall have access to the Professional Review File (in paper or electronic form) unless release to others is required as a matter of law or to represent the interests of the University, such as in an Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance procedure. The file shall include at least the following:

a. All Statements of Expectations and any subsequent amendments to these documents;
b. Each Annual Faculty Performance Report filed by the faculty member. The faculty member will retain all supporting material, documents, productions and/or creations evidencing activity and/or recognition in the areas referred to in the Statement of Expectations. These materials must be available for review upon request by any evaluating committee/administrator;
c. Results of formal student, peer, and administrator evaluations, including recommendations and/or decisions relating to the faculty member resulting from such evaluations;
d. All letters, documents or communications written by faculty, students, committees, and/or administrators that will be considered in the evaluation process by a Faculty Status Committee or other applicable committee. A copy of any such material shall be given to the faculty member at the time it is placed in the file;
e. Application materials for promotion and/or tenure, including vitae. The faculty member will retain all supporting material, documents, productions and/or creations evidencing activity and/or recognition in the areas referred to in the Statement of Expectations. These materials must be available for review upon request by any evaluating committee/administrator;
f. Material relevant to the evaluation or review of a faculty member, by a Faculty Status or other applicable committee, including materials relating to leaves of absences and sabbaticals (for tenured faculty) or Professional Project/Development reassigned time (for Career Track Faculty);
g. Any other relevant materials the faculty member may wish to include in the file, such as letters of support or reference, records of outside funding, evidence of awards and professional recognition, and responses to any other material in the file.

Any materials, such as letters of reference, that are received into the file with an understanding that access has been waived shall remain confidential and in a separate file, not available for review by the faculty member. In addition, any materials required by law to be maintained as confidential shall remain confidential and separate from the Professional Review File.

No material other than the items listed in subsections a-g above shall be placed in the faculty member's Professional Review File and nothing shall be placed in the PRF without the knowledge of the faculty member. The faculty member shall be provided with a copy of any material placed in the file by someone other than the faculty member. Materials received with an understanding of confidentiality agreed to by the faculty member remain in a separate file not available for review or challenge by that faculty member. A faculty member shall have the right to challenge, in writing, the accuracy of material included by others in the Professional Review File. Such a challenge or objection shall be addressed in writing to the

Chair. If the faculty member wishes to Appeal the response of the Chair, he or she may do so in writing to the Dean if it was a Chair's response or to the Provost if the response was from the Dean. The Dean or Provost will provide the faculty member with a written response within ten (10) days.

By mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Chair, material previously placed in the Professional Review file may be removed and placed in the supervisor's file.

1.4.5.3 Annual Faculty Performance Report

Each faculty member shall file an Annual Faculty Performance Report with the immediate unit administrator on the appropriate working day as determined by the *Personnel Action Calendar*. The report shall specifically address the areas referred to in the Statement of Expectations and the workload assignment described therein for the evaluation period. A current curriculum vitae of the faculty member shall be attached to the report or made available through electronic means. The report shall contain reference to materials submitted as described in a-d below.

a. For the evaluation of teaching and student-related responsibilities, the faculty member will supply materials to document performance. Such materials may include a teaching portfolio consisting of syllabi, reading lists, handouts, samples of examinations and student papers; advising logs; colleagues' peer-observation reports; reports of participation in teaching-improvement workshops; or other materials deemed appropriate by the department/unit. Every annual review will include course evaluations by students and every faculty member is expected to be evaluated on every course, every semester.
b. For the evaluation of scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and professional development, the faculty member will provide evidence appropriate to the discipline and the Statement of Expectations.
c. For the evaluation of service (including a faculty member's administrative service duties), the faculty member will supply a list of his/her service activities (including service to the profession, department/ school/ college/ university, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university) as defined in a faculty member's Statement of Expectations and any other relevant materials selected by consensus within the unit.
d. A faculty member may provide additional materials related to the three areas listed above as part of his/her performance report.

1.4.6 Policies for Faculty Review and Evaluation

Evaluations of faculty members must be based upon the documentation available in the Professional Review File, including material that the faculty member has provided to clarify any documents placed in the Professional Review File. In addition, letters of reference for which the faculty member has waived access shall be considered in the evaluation. Approved academic unit and college/school criteria will provide the basis for the judgment of faculty performance.

1.4.6.1 Tenure Eligible/Tenured Faculty

1.4.6.1.1 Annual Review

All faculty who have less than full-time administrative responsibilities will be evaluated annually by faculty peers and appropriate administrators. The Annual Review shall be conducted during the semester following the year being evaluated. For first-year faculty, the first year's review is primarily intended to determine whether to retain the faculty member as

an employee and will encompass only the first semester; however, merit scores will not be assigned until the second-year review (producing a merit rating for the first full year). The Annual Review shall focus upon: 1) the Statement of Expectations, and (2) the Annual Faculty Performance Report and shall be based on the criteria and standards set forth by the individual units, the University, and ABOR. These unit criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and Provost before implementation and will be made available to the faculty member.

The Annual Faculty Performance Report is due each fall in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure/). The Annual Review will be conducted by the Chair and either an Annual Review Committee or a Faculty Status Committee as determined by the academic unit structure.

The Annual Review shall be based on performance in the three areas specified in the Statement of Expectations (teaching/advising; scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; service). All faculty members are expected to maintain levels of professional activity appropriate to their disciplines to ensure that they will remain current in their disciplines and capable of delivering present and future curricula.

a. Annual Review Procedures

1. The Chair is responsible for providing the faculty member with a list of essential materials to be submitted and dates for the Annual Review.
2. Performance shall be evaluated overall and in the three areas of (1) student-related responsibilities (including teaching, advising, and mentoring), (2) scholarship, research and/or creative activity; and professional development, and (3) service (including service to the department/school/college/university/profession, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university).
3. Every faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the areas specified on a four point scale, with one (1) corresponding to an unsatisfactory rating, two (2) corresponding to a satisfactory rating, three (3) corresponding to a meritorious rating, and four (4) corresponding to a rating of highly meritorious. No faculty member can be rated unsatisfactory overall unless he or she is rated unsatisfactory in one or more areas. Whether a rating of unsatisfactory in one or more areas is a basis for an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory will depend upon the percentage of the faculty member's efforts assigned to those area(s) in the Statement of Expectations and the application of the applicable academic unit criteria to the faculty member's performance.
4. At the request of the President, reviewers may identify "exemplary performers" based on exceptional performance vis-à-vis established criteria.

b. Steps in the Annual Review Process

1. Faculty submit the Annual Faculty Performance Report, curriculum vitae, and any supporting materials to the Chair by the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.
2. The Chair reviews materials for completeness and when determined to be complete, forwards the materials to the appropriate committee (ARC, FSC or P&T).
3. The committee shall review the materials and provide a written recommendation to the Chair and a copy of the recommendation to the faculty member.
4. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the committee, the faculty member shall have the option to:
   a. Submit a written response to the Chair within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation; or,
   b. Make no response.
5. The Chair uses the performance of each faculty member as well as the recommendation of the review committee to complete the Annual Review for each

faculty member. A written copy of this Review shall be provided to the faculty member and the Dean.

6. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Chair's Annual Review, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the next level of administration within seven (7) days of receipt of the evaluation.
7. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the outcome of that appeal, the faculty member may submit an appeal to the Provost within seven (7) days of receipt of the outcome. The decision of the Provost is final.
8. If a tenured faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating in any category for a single year, the faculty development plan is initiated in accordance with section 1.4.7 of this document. See section 1.4.7 for full description of the post tenure review process.

c. Merit Policy

The basis for merit raises, including those for first year faculty, shall be the Annual Review. The Dean will provide to the Provost the ratings of all faculty members.

The Provost shall approve the plan for distribution of merit raises with input from the Faculty Senate. Should merit funding not be available annually, evaluation for the subsequent merit increase will be based on the three immediately preceding years, or on the period since the previous merit distributions, whichever is shorter.

If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the merit decision of the Dean, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the Provost. The Provost will review the appeal and supporting documentation. The decision of the Provost is final.

1.4.6.1.2 Probationary (Retention) Review for Tenure Eligible Faculty

A faculty member whose appointment is tenure eligible shall have no legal right of continued employment or expectation of retention beyond the current contract period. Retention will be based on the review and evaluation procedure described below and on the approved ABOR, NAU, and unit/college criteria. In addition, retention shall consider the needs of the university/college/school/department. For the purposes of Probationary Review, "first" and "second" year for tenure eligible faculty shall be determined by years of service at NAU regardless of years of prior service agreed to at the time of hire.

Retention Review Procedure:

Tenure eligible faculty members will be reviewed for retention every year. The purpose of the retention review is to assess the faculty member's progress toward earning tenure and the University's need for the role and functions served by that individual. The review considers the faculty member's Annual Performance Reports and evaluation outcomes for the year(s) served as well as all other materials from the Professional Review File. The criteria of ABOR and the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service as well as approved unit/college criteria will be used in the evaluation of faculty for retention.

The procedure for review and evaluation shall be as follows:

a. A review and evaluation of the faculty member shall take place in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure/). Each of the following committees and administrators will be involved in the review process.

    1. Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC) (in non-departmentalized colleges this is the college or school Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T);
    2. Chair (no review at this level in non-departmentalized colleges);
    3. Dean of the college;
    4. Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President;
    5. President.

b. At each review level, the Professional Review File shall be evaluated in accordance with approved criteria. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall make written recommendations to the next level, providing a copy of such recommendations to the faculty member. Upon receipt of each recommendation made, the faculty member shall have the following options:

    1. Within twelve (12) days of receipt of the written recommendation, submit to the next level of review a written response within the faculty evaluation system. The final written response shall become a part of the Professional Review File to be reviewed by subsequent reviewing levels.
    2. Make no response.

c. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall assess the process followed to date to ensure that it is in accordance with these Conditions of Faculty Service. Upon finding, in the opinion of the reviewing committee/administrator, that the procedure has been followed satisfactorily, the committee/administrator may then proceed with the review and evaluation. If at any level a reviewing committee/administrator believes that appropriate procedure has not been followed, the committee or administrator shall return materials to the previous reviewing level with written instructions for a re-review.

d. For each tenure eligible faculty member, at each level of review the recommending committee/administrator must make available to the next level all materials in the faculty member's Professional Review File. Because a file may contain a large volume of material, the recommending committee/administrator may forward a subset of materials to the next level. This subset must be approved by the faculty member. The remaining contents of the file are available upon request. At a minimum, the faculty member's current curriculum vita, all Annual Faculty Performance Reports**,** and all annual faculty evaluation results shall be forwarded, as well as any materials the faculty member designates.

e. Each level of review shall specifically state either "Recommended for Retention" or "Not Recommended for Retention."

    "Recommended for Retention" does not imply total satisfaction with progress towards requirements for tenure or with meeting all expectations of the faculty member. If there are suggestions for improvement in areas subject to evaluation, the suggestions must accompany the decision for retention and should be addressed in subsequent Statements of Expectations.

    "Not Recommended for Retention" need not be construed as due to failure or poor performance by the faculty member, but may be based on other considerations as set forth in ABOR Policy 6-201-I.4b.

f. The decision of the President shall be final as to retention or non-retention. A tenure eligible faculty member who receives an adverse decision from the President is entitled upon request to a written summary of the reasons for the final decision.

g. A tenure eligible faculty member has no expectation of continued employment and shall not be entitled to a hearing following or prior to a decision of non-retention except as provided for in ABOR Policy 6-201M.1, except in cases involving alleged discriminatory or unconstitutional action, or violations of due process or academic freedom.

h. First year tenure eligible faculty members shall be notified of non-retention by March 1 of the first academic-year of service. Second year tenure eligible faculty members will be notified of non-retention no later than December 15 of the second academic-year of service. Third through fifth year tenure eligible faculty who will not be retained or who withdraw from the tenure process will be offered a terminal contract for the following academic year.

1.4.6.1.3 Promotion Review

Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written ABOR and NAU criteria, and college/academic unit criteria which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation. Academic units shall articulate criteria that are proportionate to and aligned with workload assignment during the period of review. Academic unit criteria may exceed ABOR (6-201 I.) and NAU standards.

In making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered. Units may establish additional standards and criteria for work productivity that must occur after coming to NAU. Such additional criteria shall be articulated in unit level guidelines and communicated to faculty.

Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Promotion

The procedure for review and evaluation of faculty for promotion shall be:

a. During the fall semester, in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure/), applications for promotion must be filed in the office of the Chair;

b. A review and evaluation of the faculty member shall take place by each of the following committees/administrators;
    1. Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC) (in non-departmentalized colleges this is the college Promotion and Tenure Committee);
    2. Chair (no review at this level in non-departmentalized colleges);
    3. Promotion and Tenure Review Committee;
    4. Dean of the college;
    5. Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President;
    6. President.

    A faculty member being considered for promotion who at such time is acting in an administrative capacity shall not participate as an administrator in his or her review process. The level of review at which the administrator would normally be involved shall be eliminated for review of this administrator for promotion.

c. At each review level, the Professional Review File shall be evaluated in accordance with approved criteria. In addition, the materials such as letters of recommendation received to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access shall be made available. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall make written recommendations to the next level, providing a copy of such recommendations to the faculty member. Upon receipt of each recommendation made, the faculty member shall have the following options:

    1. Within twelve (12) days of receipt of the written recommendation, submit to the next level of review a written response within the faculty evaluation system. The final written response shall become a part of the Professional Review File to be reviewed by subsequent reviewing levels..
    2. Withdraw his/her name from consideration for promotion.
    3. Make no response.

d. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall assess the process followed to date to ensure that it is in accordance with these Conditions of Faculty Service. Upon finding, in the opinion of the reviewing committee/administrator, that the procedure has been followed satisfactorily, the committee/administrator may then proceed with the review and evaluation. If at any level a reviewing committee/administrator believes that

appropriate procedure has not been followed, the committee or administrator shall return materials to the previous reviewing level with written instructions for a re-review.

e. For each faculty member, at each level of review the recommending committee/administrator must make available to the next level all materials in the faculty member's Professional Review File as well as the confidential file containing letters of recommendation to which the faculty member has waived access. Because a Professional Review File may contain a large volume of material, the recommending committee/ administrator may forward a subset of materials to the next level. This subset must be approved by the faculty member. The remaining contents of the file are available upon request. At a minimum, the faculty member's current curriculum vitae, all Annual Faculty Performance Reports**,** and all annual faculty evaluation results shall be forwarded, as well as any materials the faculty member designates.

f. The recommendation made at each level of review shall specifically state either "Recommended for Promotion" or "Not Recommended for Promotion."

g. A faculty member who receives an adverse decision from the President is entitled, upon request, to a written summary of the reasons for the final decision.

h. A faculty member must await the President's decision before initiating a formal appeal of a promotion decision. Within fourteen (14) days of receipt by the faculty member of the President's decision, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the President stating specific reasons for the Appeal and providing any supplemental material relevant to the Appeal.

Upon receipt of the faculty member's written appeal, the President shall follow these guidelines:

1. Review all materials submitted for the initial decision and materials submitted with the appeal;
2. Meet with the faculty member upon request to clarify all reasons for the appeal.
3. Issue a final decision

Note: If the appeals process fails to reverse the decision against promotion, the faculty member has no further recourse, except as provided for in ABOR Policy 6-201.M.1, that is, except in cases involving alleged discriminatory or unconstitutional action, or violations of due process or academic freedom.

1.4.6.1.4 Tenure Review

To be eligible for tenure the faculty member must meet the criteria for associate professor and, in addition, must show promise of continued productivity in all areas. The potential for long-term productivity of the faculty member to the university must be considered in making the tenure decision. Tenure is typically offered only to those faculty serving full-time in a tenure eligible position.

Normally, tenure applications and decisions are made in the sixth year of full-time service at NAU including approved prior service credit. The maximum probationary time permitted in a tenure eligible appointment shall be no longer than six (6) years in full-time service as a tenure eligible faculty member. A faculty member may withdraw his/her application at any time prior to a response from the President. A faculty member may only be reviewed for tenure once at the Presidential level. Unless otherwise negotiated, when a faculty member's initial appointment is for the spring semester, the faculty member's probationary period will commence with the following fall semester.

Upon request, the President has the discretion to extend this probationary period for the faculty member for good cause following review and recommendation by the appropriate academic administrators. The President's decision shall be final. Good cause might include

serious illness, disability, exceptional family care responsibilities, and less than full-time service when the cause is shown to interfere with a faculty member's efforts to perform duties necessary to meet the criteria for tenure. Any extension of the probationary period shall be confirmed in writing and placed in the Professional Review File of the faculty member.

If a faculty member takes a leave of absence during the probationary period, the Provost and the faculty member must reach agreement prior to the time of leave as to the effect of such leave on the probationary period. A leave of absence will in some cases justify an extension of the probationary period if approved in writing by the Provost prior to the start of the leave.

Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Tenure
The procedure for review and evaluation of faculty for tenure shall be the same as the policy set forth above in Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Promotion (1.4.6.1c). A faculty member may only be reviewed for tenure once at the Presidential level. If tenure is awarded, it begins with the Notice of Appointment for the next period of employment. If tenure is not awarded, the faculty member is entitled to a final year of employment and the next Notice of Appointment will reflect that it is the faculty member's final year of employment at NAU, unless the faculty member is in the first or second year at NAU. In that case, the year of review is the final year. The faculty member shall be entitled upon request to a statement of reason in writing for the denial of tenure (ABOR Policy 6- 201.I.1.)

Note: A faculty member can request to be removed from a tenure eligible to a non-tenure eligible appointment status. This request will be evaluated according to procedures established by the academic unit and approved by the Provost. If such an agreement occurs, the faculty member forfeits all time toward tenure.

1.4.6.2 Non-tenure Eligible Faculty

1.4.6.2.1 Annual Review

All full-time faculty who have less than full-time administrative responsibilities will be evaluated annually by faculty peers and appropriate administrators. The Annual Review shall be conducted during the semester following the year being evaluated. For first-year faculty the first review is primarily intended to determine whether to retain the faculty member as an employee and will encompass only the first semester; however, merit scores will not be assigned until the second-year review (producing a merit rating for the first full year). The Annual Review shall focus upon: (1) the Statement of Expectations, and (2) the Annual Faculty Performance Report and shall be based on the criteria and standards set forth by the individual units, the University, and ABOR for non-tenure eligible faculty. These unit criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and Provost before implementation and will be made available to the faculty member.

The Annual Faculty Performance Report is due each fall in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure/). The Annual Review will be conducted by the Chair and either an Annual Review Committee or a Faculty Status Committee as determined by the academic unit structure.

The overall evaluation shall be based on performance in the areas specified in the Statement of Expectations as measured against the approved unit criteria.

Annual Review Procedures

a. The Chair is responsible for providing the faculty member with a list of essential materials to be submitted and dates for the Annual Review.
b. Performance shall be evaluated overall and in the areas of designated responsibility. These areas would include one or more of the following (including professional development): (1) student-related responsibilities (including teaching, advising, and mentoring), (2) scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and (3) service (including

service to the profession, department/school/college/university and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university).

c. Every faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the areas specified on a four point scale, with one (1) corresponding to an unsatisfactory rating, two (2) corresponding to a satisfactory rating, three (3) corresponding to a meritorious rating, and four (4) corresponding to a rating of highly meritorious. No faculty member can be rated unsatisfactory overall unless he or she is rated unsatisfactory in one or more areas. Whether a rating of unsatisfactory in one or more areas is a basis for an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory will depend upon the percentage of the faculty member's efforts assigned to those area(s) in the Statement of Expectations and the application of the applicable academic unit criteria to the faculty member's performance.

Steps in the Annual Review Process

a. Faculty submit the Annual Faculty Performance Report, curriculum vita, and any supporting materials to the Chair by the date specified in the *Personnel Action Calendar.*
b. The Chair reviews materials for completeness and when determined to be complete, forwards the materials to the appropriate committee (ARC, FSC or P&T.)
c. The committee shall review the materials and provide a written recommendation to the Chair and a copy of the recommendation to the faculty member.
d. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the committee, the faculty member shall have the option to:
    1. Submit a written response to the Chair within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation; or,
    2. Make no response.
e. The Chair uses the performance of each faculty member to complete the Annual Review for each faculty member. A written copy of this review shall be provided to the faculty member and the Dean.
f. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Chair's review, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the next level of administration within seven (7) days of receipt of the evaluation.
g. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the outcome of that appeal, the faculty member may submit an appeal to the Provost within seven (7) days of receipt of the outcome. The decision of the Provost is final.

Merit Policy

The basis for merit raises, including those for first year faculty, shall be the Annual Review. The Dean will provide to the Provost a list of faculty members who are to receive merit raises.

The Provost shall approve the plan for distribution of merit raises with input from the Faculty Senate. Should merit funding not be available annually, evaluation for the subsequent merit increase will be based on the three immediately preceding years, or on the period since the previous merit distributions, whichever is shorter.

If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the merit decision of the Dean, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the Provost. The Provost will review the appeal and supporting documentation. The decision of the Provost is final.

1.4.6.2.2 Renewal Review for Non-tenure Eligible Faculty

A faculty member whose appointment is non-tenure eligible shall have no legal right of continued employment or expectation of renewal in that appointment beyond the current contract period. Renewal of appointment will be based on the review and evaluation process described below in consideration of approved ABOR, NAU, and unit/college criteria for non-tenure eligible faculty. In addition, renewals shall consider the needs of the university/college/school/ department and funding availability.

Renewal of Appointment Procedure

Non-tenure eligible faculty members will be reviewed for eligibility for renewal every year unless they have multiple-year appointments. In that case, the renewal review will occur in the final year of the appointment. The purpose of the renewal of appointment review is to assess the faculty member's potential for reappointment in light of the university's needs, availability of funding, performance, and functions served by that individual. The review considers the faculty member's Annual Performance Reports and evaluation outcomes for the year(s) served as well as all other materials from the Professional Review File.

The procedure for review and evaluation of non-tenure eligible faculty shall be as follows:

a. A review and evaluation of the faculty member shall take place in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure/). Each of the following committees and administrators will be involved in the review process.
    1. Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC) (in non-departmentalized colleges this is the college Promotion and Tenure Committee);
    2. Chair (no review at this level in non-departmentalized colleges);
    3. Dean of the college;
    4. Provost.
b. At each review level, the Professional Review File shall be evaluated in accordance with approved criteria for non-tenure eligible faculty. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall make written recommendations to the next level, providing a copy of such recommendations to the faculty member. Upon receipt of each recommendation made, the faculty member shall have the following options:
    1. Within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation, submit to the next level of review a written intent to respond, copied to the recommending committee/person. The final written response shall be completed within twelve (12) days of receipt of the initial written recommendation, and shall become a part of the Professional Review File to be reviewed by subsequent reviewing levels.
    2. Withdraw his/her name from consideration for renewal, which shall constitute a resignation effective the end of the current academic year.
    3. Make no response.
c. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall assess the process followed to date to ensure that it is in accordance with these Conditions of Faculty Service. Upon finding, in the opinion of the reviewing committee/administrator, that the procedure has been followed satisfactorily, the committee/administrator may then proceed with the review and evaluation. If at any level a reviewing committee/administrator believes that appropriate procedure has not been followed, the committee or administrator shall return materials to the previous reviewing level with written instructions for a re-review.
d. For each non-tenure eligible faculty member, at each level of review the recommending committee/administrator must make available to the next level all materials in the faculty member's Professional Review File. Because a file may contain a large volume of material, the recommending committee/administrator may forward a subset of materials to the next level. This subset must be approved by the faculty member. The remaining contents of the file are available upon request. At a minimum, the faculty member's current curriculum vitae, all Annual Faculty Performance Reports**,** and all annual faculty evaluation results shall be forwarded, as well as any materials the faculty member designates.
e. Each level of review shall specifically state either "Recommended as eligible for Renewal" or "Not Recommended as eligible for Renewal.". "Recommended as eligible for Renewal" does not imply total satisfaction with all expectations of the faculty member. If there are suggestions for improvement in areas subject to evaluation, the suggestions must accompany the decision for reappointment and should be addressed in subsequent Statements of Expectations.

"Not Recommended as eligible for Renewal" need not be construed as due to failure or poor performance by the faculty member, but may be based on other considerations such as changing program needs or lack of funding.

f. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the outcome of the renewal review, the faculty member may submit an appeal to the Provost within seven (7) days of receipt of the outcome.
g. The decision of the Provost shall be final as to renewal of appointment or non-renewal of appointment.

1.4.6.2.3 Promotion Review

Advancement in non-tenure eligible faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written ABOR, NAU and academic unit criteria for the appropriate faculty classification. These criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and Provost before implementation. In making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered. Academic units shall articulate criteria that are proportionate to and aligned with workload assignment during the period of review.

Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Promotion

The procedure for review and evaluation of non-tenure eligible faculty for promotion shall be:

a. During the fall semester (in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar)*, applications for promotion must be filed in the office of the Chair.
b. A review and evaluation of the faculty member shall take place by each of the following committees/administrators.

    1. Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC) (in non-departmentalized colleges this may be the college Promotion and Tenure Committee);
    2. Chair (no review at this level in non-departmentalized colleges);
    3. College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee;
    4. Dean of the college;
    5. Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President;
    6. President.

c. At each review level, the Professional Review File shall be evaluated in accordance with approved ABOR, NAU, and unit criteria for the appropriate non-tenure eligible classification. In addition, any material such as letters of recommendation to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access shall be made available. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall make written recommendations to the next level, providing a copy of such recommendations to the faculty member. Upon receipt of each recommendation made, the faculty member shall have the following options:

    1. Within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation, submit to the next level of review a written intent to respond, copied to the recommending committee/person. The final written response shall be completed within twelve (12) days of receipt of the initial written recommendation, and shall become a part of the Professional Review File to be reviewed by subsequent reviewing levels.
    2. Withdraw his/her name from consideration for promotion.
    3. Make no response.

d. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall assess the process followed to date to ensure that it is in accordance with these Conditions of Faculty Service. Upon finding, in the opinion of the reviewing committee/administrator, that the procedure has been followed satisfactorily, the committee/administrator may then proceed with the

review and evaluation. If at any level a reviewing committee/administrator believes that appropriate procedure has not been followed, the committee/administrator shall return materials to the previous reviewing level with written instructions for a re-review.

e. For each faculty member, at each level of review the recommending committee/administrator must make available to the next level all materials in the faculty member's Professional Review File, as well as the confidential file containing letters of recommendation to which the faculty member has waived access. Because a Professional Review File may contain a large volume of material, the recommending committee/ administrator may forward a subset of materials to the next level. This subset must be approved by the faculty member. The remaining contents of the file are available upon request. At a minimum, the faculty member's current curriculum vitae, all annual faculty performance reports**,** and all annual faculty evaluation results shall be forwarded, as well as any materials the faculty member designates.

f. The recommendation made at each level of review shall specifically state either "Recommended for Promotion" or "Not Recommended for Promotion."

g. Appeal Process: A faculty member must await the President's decision before initiating a formal appeal of a promotion decision. Within fourteen (14) days of receipt by the faculty member of the President's decision, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the President stating specific reasons for the appeal and providing any supplemental material relevant to the appeal.

   Upon receipt of the faculty member's written appeal, the President shall follow these guidelines:

   1. Review all materials submitted for the initial decision and materials submitted with the appeal;
   2. Meet with the faculty member upon request to clarify all reasons for the appeal.
   3. Issue a final decision

   Note: If the appeals process fails to reverse the decision against promotion, the faculty member has no further recourse, except as provided for in ABOR Policy 6-201.M.1, that is, except in cases involving alleged discriminatory or unconstitutional action, or violations of due process or academic freedom.

1.4.7 Post-Tenure Review Process

The goals and principles of the Post-Tenure Review Process, as implemented in 1997 by the Arizona Board of Regents, are established at Northern Arizona University to ensure sustained high quality faculty performance, especially in the areas of teaching and other student-related responsibilities, and specifically as faculty move well beyond the point of receiving a tenured appointment. The post-tenure review process emphasizes opportunities for continued faculty development and provides additional accountability to the university community, to the public, and to the Board.

The post-tenure review process is linked to the annual performance review process (see 1.4.6.1.1 above). According to ABOR policies 6-201 and 6-211, an annual performance evaluation of an individual must be conducted by his/her peers, and by the Chair. The Dean must also review this evaluation. Specific criteria and standards for performance are to be developed in each unit**,** and must be approved by the Dean and the Provost before implementation. These standards and criteria must be consistent with the mission of that unit, as well as the mission of the University. These standards and criteria are then used by the Annual Review Committee or the Faculty Status Committee to evaluate the performance of every faculty member in the unit in relation to his/her Statement of Expectations.

If an individual who has already achieved tenure at any rank (assistant, associate, or professor) is judged to be performing at less than a satisfactory level as defined below under 1.4.7.1, then a faculty improvement process is developed as under 1.4.7.2 to assist that individual.

1.4.7.1 Relation of Annual Review Process to Post-Tenure Review Process

a. "Post-tenure review" refers to the full process of reviewing tenured faculty, including the annual review and any development plans that may result from that review.
b. The purpose of annual performance evaluations is to provide systematic assessments of faculty accomplishments and to encourage outstanding performance through a system of rewards that are based on the evaluation. At a minimum, the evaluation should determine whether faculty are performing their duties at a satisfactory level, while ideally at the same time identifying a profile of accomplishments that are well above average, and setting the standard for others to emulate. Finally, those who are not performing at a satisfactory level must be identified. Thus, a faculty member may be rated at one of the following four levels: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, or highly meritorious.
c. If a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory performance rating overall, or in a single evaluation category (teaching/advising, research/scholarship/creative activity, or service) for a single year, then the Annual Reviews and supporting documentation for the past thirty-six (36) months will be examined carefully by the department chair.
d. The rating of unsatisfactory means that there is demonstrated substantial failure to perform properly-assigned duties as set forth in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations. The burden of proof for an unsatisfactory rating rests with the evaluating committee and/or administrators, who must agree upon and provide the faculty member with a written statement specifying the basis upon which this rating was determined, and the nature of the remedial action being recommended.
e. Northern Arizona University recognizes that extenuating circumstances (illness, accident, personal tragedy, etc.) may affect one's performance in such a way that leads to an unsatisfactory evaluation outcome. However, within the spirit of the principle governing this process, it is up to the academic unit peer faculty and administrators (Chair and Dean) to work with the individual to determine an appropriate course of action to address the concern over the individual's performance. If an unsatisfactory rating in an individual area is due to extenuating circumstances which have passed or been overcome, then remedial action may not be necessary.
f. As a result of an annual performance evaluation, if a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation and the faculty member chooses not to contest the evaluation, or if the unsatisfactory evaluation is upheld through the administrative review process, the following actions apply:

    1. The first rating of unsatisfactory in any single area must be addressed by the Chair. Depending on the specifics and sources of the problem the Chair may work with the faculty member on an individual basis to isolate the sources of difficulty and to develop a plan to ameliorate them; or, if the Chair deems it necessary or the faculty member requests it, create a formal Faculty Development Plan described in section 1.4.7.2.1, *Faculty Development Plan*.

    2. A faculty member must enter a unit level Performance Improvement Plan as described in section 1.4.7.2.2 *Performance Improvement Plan* whenever:

        a. The faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation for overall performance that is not due to extenuating circumstances that have already been overcome,
        b. The faculty member receives two unsatisfactory evaluations in the same or different areas of assigned responsibility within a thirty-six (36) month review period and is not participating in a Faculty Development Plan, or
        c. The faculty member does not complete a Faculty Development Plan successfully.

1.4.7.2 Faculty Improvement Process

This section describes the Faculty Development Plan and the Performance Improvement Plan for improving upon unsatisfactory evaluations:

1.4.7.2.1 Faculty Development Plan

The purpose of the Faculty Development Plan is to identify strategies and resources to assist the faculty member in achieving a performance level of satisfactory or higher. The plan will set forth specific benchmarks to be achieved by the faculty member during the plan period, which is normally twelve (12) months.

a. Initiating the Faculty Development Plan:

1. The Faculty Development Plan is to be initiated within twenty-one (21) days from final notification of the unsatisfactory rating following the outcome of any challenges to the rating.
2. The faculty member and the Chair will create a Faculty Development Plan through a consultative process involving the faculty member, the Chair and the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee as determined by the academic unit structure. If the faculty member and the Chair cannot reach agreement then the faculty member may choose to challenge the proposed plan to the next administrative level, up to the level of Provost. The decision of the Provost is final.
3. The Faculty Development Plan becomes a part of the Statement of Expectations for the faculty member.
4. Under no circumstances will the development and implementation of a plan occur later than the semester following the unsatisfactory evaluation.

b. Strategies and Resources for Faculty Development Plans:
Appropriate strategies and resources for Faculty Development Plans may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Reassigning the faculty member's allocation of effort (e.g., changing teaching assignments and/or schedules in ways that will enhance the faculty member's performance), as set forth in the annual Statement of Expectations, in ways that will best utilize the faculty member's education and talents as well as maximize the faculty member's contributions to the university.

2. Providing the faculty member with support for faculty development to improve performance in the area of difficulty.

3. Enabling the faculty member to obtain reasonable assistance in dealing with barriers that may be interfering with effective performance.

c. Successful Faculty Development Plans
Upon completion of the Faculty Development Plan, if the faculty member's performance is satisfactory in all areas, the faculty member returns to the regular performance evaluation process.

d. Unsuccessful Faculty Development Plans
1. If a faculty member participating in a Faculty Development Plan fails to achieve a level of performance that is satisfactory or higher within a 12-month period, the faculty member must enter a Performance Improvement Plan as set forth in ABOR, *Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process*, Item 5 (Appendix D, COFS).
2. The faculty member's performance while in the Faculty Development Plan must be found unsatisfactory by both the Administrator and the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee, and any challenges to the

evaluation must have been exhausted before the faculty member is required to enter into a Performance Improvement Plan.

1.4.7.2.2 Performance Improvement Plan

The purpose of the Performance Improvement Plan is to provide a final opportunity for the faculty member to achieve a level of performance that is satisfactory or higher. The plan will set forth specific benchmarks to be accomplished by the faculty member. As provided in Item 2 of the *Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process (Appendix D)*, developed by the Arizona Faculties Council in 1996-97, the Performance Improvement Plan is required if a faculty member is evaluated as overall unsatisfactory, or receives two unsatisfactory ratings within a thirty-six (36) month period in the same or different evaluation area(s) during an Annual Performance Evaluation and is not participating in a Faculty Development Plan, or if a faculty member fails to achieve a level of performance of satisfactory or higher under a faculty development plan within a twelve (12) month period. If a faculty member chooses not to enter into a Performance Improvement Plan, the appropriate administrator may begin the process for dismissal for just cause.

The following sections define the process for establishing the Performance Improvement Plan.

1. Creating a Performance Improvement Mentoring Committee
   When a Performance Improvement Plan is required, a Performance Improvement Mentoring Committee consisting of at least two tenured faculty members will be established. One of the two tenured faculty members will be selected by the faculty member and the other(s) will be selected by the Dean in consultation with the Chair. The Performance Improvement Mentoring Committee will be charged with advising the faculty member on strategies and progress related to successful completion of the Performance Improvement Plan. The committee may also be consulted in the creation of the Plan.

2. Creating the Performance Improvement Plan
   The Performance Improvement Plan, which will become part of the faculty member's Statement of Expectations, will be created as follows:

   a. The Performance Improvement Plan is to be initiated within twenty-one (21) days from final notification of the unsatisfactory rating following the outcome of any challenges to the rating.

   b. The faculty member will create a Performance Improvement Plan through a consultative process involving the faculty member, the Chair, and the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee as determined by the academic unit structure. If the faculty member and the Chair cannot reach agreement, then the faculty member may choose to challenge the proposed plan to the next administrative level, up to the level of Provost. The decision of the Provost is final.

   c. Under no circumstances will the development and implementation of a plan occur later than the semester following the unsatisfactory evaluation.

3. Strategies and Resources for Performance Improvement Plan
   Appropriate strategies and resources for the Performance Improvement Plan may include, but are not limited to the following:
   a. Reassigning the faculty member's allocation of effort (e.g., changing teaching assignments and/or schedules in ways that will enhance the faculty member's performance), as set forth in the annual Statement of Expectations, in ways that will best utilize the faculty member's education and talents as well as maximize the faculty member's contributions to the university.

b. Providing the faculty member with support for faculty development to improve performance in the area(s) of difficulty.

c. Enabling the faculty member to obtain reasonable assistance in dealing with barriers that may be interfering with effective performance.

4. Mentoring the Completion of the Performance Improvement Plan

Once a Performance Improvement Plan has been created, progress against established benchmarks for the plan will be monitored by the Performance Improvement Mentoring Committee. At the completion of each benchmark, progress is reported to the Chair. A faculty member participating in a Performance Improvement Plan may request a review of his/her updated Professional Review File by the Faculty Status Committee (Promotion and Tenure Committee in non-departmentalized units) at any time to determine if the faculty member has reached a level of performance better than unsatisfactory. At any time that a faculty member participating in a Performance Improvement Plan achieves a level of performance better than unsatisfactory, he/she will return to the regular Annual Review process.

5. Time Frame for Completion of the Performance Improvement Plan

Deficiencies generally will be addressed through a one-year Performance Improvement Plan. In rare circumstances, where the deficiency cannot be fully remedied in one year, the duration of the plan may be extended upon the recommendation of the unit Director or the Dean, with approval by the Provost.

6. Unsuccessful Performance Improvement Plan

At the end of the Performance Improvement Plan period, the Faculty Status Committee (Promotion and Tenure Committee for non-departmentalized units) will evaluate the faculty member's progress and level of performance against the plan. If the faculty member has not achieved a level of performance better than unsatisfactory, the committee will recommend dismissal in accordance with the procedures set forth below in section 1.5, ABOR 6-201, and the *Common Elements of Post Tenure Review Process* (Appendix D).

If dismissal is recommended, the faculty member will continue to retain the rights to use the appeal process set forth in Appendix A of the Conditions of Faculty Service.

1.4.7.3 Accountability Mechanisms

The following information will be collected regularly and presented to the Arizona Board of Regents upon request to document implementation of the post-tenure review process.

a. Tenure Audit
The tenure audit will include a count of the outcomes of annual reviews for tenured faculty, and the number of individuals entering into a post-tenure process. Status of individuals already engaged in a faculty improvement process will also be reported.

b. Dean's Level Audit Report
In addition to the Dean's normal participation in the annual review process each year, the Dean creates a committee consisting of the Dean and two tenured faculty within the college to conduct a yearly review of the performance ratings of 20% of the college's tenured faculty. Over a five year period, all files of tenured faculty within the college should have been reviewed.

The purpose of the audit is to determine the adequacy and fairness of the processes for faculty review within the units, and if appropriate, to refer the files back to the unit for discussion and resolution. Feedback is to be provided to the appropriate Chair and peer review committees regarding the outcome of the process evaluation.

c. Academic Program Review
Program reviews will occur every five (5) to seven (7) years, and will be conducted by the Chair, Dean and a panel of qualified members, which shall include external experts. The program review will include evidence about faculty contributions to the unit and University missions.

1.5 Suspension and Dismissal

Faculty members may not be dismissed or suspended without pay except for just cause. See definitions of these terms in Appendix A.2 of NAU COFS. Recommendations for dismissal or suspension without pay shall be made in accordance with the following procedure. This procedure does not apply to non-renewal of a non-tenured faculty member's contract, with notice as provided for in the ABOR Policy 6-201.J:2(b).

1.5.1 Procedure for Suspension and Dismissal

1. Whenever the Chair determines that dismissal or suspension without pay of a faculty member is to be considered, a written recommendation must be submitted to the department Faculty Status Committee (FSC) or the Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T) as appropriate to academic unit structure before further steps are taken. A copy of the recommendation will be given to the faculty member. This recommendation must detail the reasons the proposed action is being considered. Upon receipt of the recommendation, the faculty member will be allowed seven (7) days to submit a response and any relevant materials on his/her behalf, which will become a part of the official record of the case. Within fourteen (14) days of receipt of the Chair's recommendation and the faculty member's response, the FSC or P&T is to review the matter promptly and make a written recommendation, detailing the reasons, to the department Chair.

2. After considering the recommendation of the FSC or P&T and consulting with the faculty member, the Chair shall submit to the Dean his/her final written report and recommendation as well as the committee's written recommendation, if either the Chair or the FSC/P&T is recommending dismissal or suspension without pay. If the Chair and the committee disagree, the committee will be given an opportunity to respond within seven (7) days to the Chair's report and recommendation. This response will be forwarded to the Dean and become a part of the official record of the case. Within seven (7) days, the faculty member will be allowed to submit additional materials on his/her own behalf, which will also become part of the official record forwarded to the Dean. For non-departmentalized units, these materials will be forwarded to the Provost and the process will proceed directly to step 4.

3. After receiving the above materials, the Dean shall make a recommendation in writing to the Provost within fourteen (14) days after receiving all of the materials indicated above. The Dean will provide the Provost with all the previously forwarded materials and will ensure that all reports and recommendations are provided to the faculty member.

4. The Provost will consider all the materials submitted to him/her. The Provost shall make a report and recommendation to the President within fourteen (14) days after receipt of the materials from the Dean. The faculty member involved will be given a copy of this report and recommendation by certified mail.

5. If the Provost's recommendation to the President is for dismissal or suspension without pay, the faculty member may Appeal the recommendation to the President. The Appeal must be submitted in writing to the President within ten (10) days of receipt of the Provost's report and recommendation.

6. Consistent with ABOR policy 6-201.J.and L.3.a, the President shall refer such an Appeal to a Conciliation Committee of the Faculty Grievance Committee within ten (10) days of receiving the Appeal.

7. The Conciliation Committee shall attempt to arrive at a mutually agreed upon solution within no more than thirty (30) days of receipt of the Appeal.

8. If conciliation fails or after thirty (30) days following the date on which the Appeal was referred to the Conciliation Committee and the Committee determines that there is no prospect for successful conciliation, then the President shall provide the faculty member with a written notice of dismissal or suspension.

9. The faculty member may Appeal the notice by providing the President and the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee with a written detailed statement of the faculty member's position within ten (10) days after receipt of the notice of dismissal or suspension. If an Appeal of the President's decision is filed, the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee shall establish a date for a hearing. (See ABOR 6-201.L.4, and COFS Appendix A). Failure to provide the written statement within the ten (10) day period shall immediately terminate the procedure.

1.6 Honored Faculty Appointments

1.6.1 Nomination and Selection for Appointment as a Regents' Professor

The designation of Regents' Professor is an honored position, reserved for faculty members of exceptional academic ability who have achieved national and/or international distinction.

The President shall take an active role in examining the progress being made in the representation of women and minorities and ensuring that all the values to which the University is committed are being reflected in these awards.

The procedure for nomination and selection of faculty for appointment as Regents' Professor shall include the following considerations:

1. Eligibility:
    a. Tenured faculty who hold the title of professor or equivalent;
    b. Outside individuals who will be granted tenure upon appointment, or;
    c. Individuals of equivalent rank from another institution in a specified academic unit, school, or college at the time of appointment.

2. Criteria:

    a. The candidate must be recognized nationally and/or internationally as a distinguished scholar whose work is of superior quality according to standards set by leading scholars in the field.
    b. The candidate must be a successful teacher of exceptional ability. The candidate's ability and desire to teach, stimulate, inspire, and communicate effectively with students should not be limited to an individual's particular discipline.
    c. The candidate must have interests and accomplishments that extend beyond a particular scientific, scholarly, or creative specialty and also will demonstrate a willingness to serve beyond the home academic unit.
    d. Typically, the candidate will have served at the full professor level for at least five years.

3. Nomination and Selection Process

    The nomination and selection process is outlined below. A complete explanation of the steps may be obtained from the Office of the Provost http://nau.edu/provost/ .

    a. The President issues a university-wide call for nominations. Deadline for nominations and all subsequent steps in the process are included in the *Personnel Action Calendar*.
    b. Nominations may be made by any tenured or tenure eligible NAU faculty member, but self-nominations are not accepted. Procedures for the nomination process may be obtained from the Office of the Provost.
    c. A Regents' Professor Nomination Committee is appointed by the President. The committee will be comprised of seven (7) members, representing a diversity of disciplines. At least two (2) of the members will be Regents' Professors. Committee membership will be drawn from faculty members recommended from the colleges. Colleges may nominate up to two (2) faculty of outstanding accomplishment who are professors or Regents' Professors for committee membership.
    d. Nominations for Regents' Professor are submitted to the Provost who forwards them to the Nomination Committee for review.
    e. The Nomination Committee selects semi-finalists for portfolio development.

f. Nominees and nominators are notified of the status of each nomination by the Nomination Committee. If a nominee is selected as a semi-finalist and agrees to continue in the process, the Nomination Committee members work with the nominator to identify and collect additional materials and reference contacts. The nominee must agree in writing to waive the right to access letters of reference.
g. The Nomination Committee and nominators collect names for letters of reference including students, and internal and external colleagues. The burden is on the nominator and nominee to identify a sufficiently high level, diverse pool of references to build a case for designation as Regents' Professor.
h. Letters of reference are solicited only by the Chair of the Nomination Committee. These letters of reference, both internal and external, shall remain confidential.
i. Committee and nominators collect supporting documentation for the nomination, including evidence of teaching effectiveness (teaching reviews, products, and innovations), products of scholarship and/or creative activity and other materials as appropriate to the case. The nominator submits materials to Provost's Office.
j. Nomination files are reviewed simultaneously and independently by the following:

    1. Faculty Status Committee (for departmentalized colleges)
    2. Chair or Academic Unit Director
    3. Promotion and Tenure Committee
    4. Dean

k. Letters of review and recommendation are sent by each of the reviewers to the Provost and the Chair of the Nomination Committee.
l. The Nomination Committee conducts a review of files, including all previous recommendations, and makes a recommendation to the Provost.
m. The Provost reviews the files, including all previous recommendations, and makes a recommendation to the President.
n. The President conducts a review and determines whether to recommend an appointment as Regents' Professor.
o. The Arizona Board of Regents determines whether to approve the appointment as Regents' professor.

4. Terms of Appointment

The President, subject to approval by the Arizona Board of Regents, shall make the appointment of a Regents' Professor. Appointment involves service as advisor to the President and Provost, as well as availability for activities throughout the university system. Regents' Professors receive a salary increment to their base salary, subject to approval by the Arizona Board of Regents, and a special allocation of funds for research and scholarship activities, subject to availability as determined by the University President. In recognition of the special significance of the title and the rigor of the selection process, the maximum number of Regents' Professors at any one time shall not exceed three (3) percent of the number of full time tenured and tenure eligible faculty members at the University.

1.6.2 Evaluation for Appointment to Emeritus Status

1. Emeritus status may be awarded to faculty upon retirement, consistent with the following policies:

    a. The faculty member must have served as a faculty member at NAU for at least ten (10) years;
    b. If emeritus status is conferred**,** it shall be at the last academic rank of the faculty

member, (e.g. associate professor emeritus, professor emeritus).

2. Recommendations for awarding emeritus status can be initiated in writing by the Chair, the Dean, the Academic Unit Director, or the Provost. Such requests shall be forwarded through the appropriate administrative channels. The President makes the decision to award emeritus status, which includes the following privileges for the faculty member:

    a. A formal letter of appointment issued by the President's office entitling the faculty member to the following privileges:

        1. Authorization to purchase a faculty campus parking permit;
        2. Library and bookstore privileges accorded to faculty members at NAU.

    b. Consideration for space in which to work and carry on writing and research, including the following:

        1. Office space;
        2. Laboratory privileges;
        3. Computer usage;
        4. Space in the library providing some security of writings and projects; and/or
        5. Assistance in applying for research grants.

    c. Invitation to take part in ceremonies and academic processions.

1.7 Faculty Benefits

1.7.1 Sabbatical Leave

To be considered for sabbatical leave, an eligible faculty member may submit a sabbatical application no earlier than the sixth (6th) year of full-time service to Northern Arizona University. Any prior service credit awarded at the time of hire for promotion or tenure does not apply to sabbatical eligibility. For some faculty, this timeline may allow sabbatical applications to occur concurrently with a tenure application. In such cases, any decision related to sabbatical is dependent on an approved tenure review and the sabbatical leave must occur after tenure is awarded. For sabbatical leave eligibility, time on an unpaid leave of absence may or may not be counted as provided in COFS 1.7.5 below

Sabbatical leave will be for research and other creative endeavors, or professional development. Sabbatical leave is not to be used for efforts that are primarily commercial.

The sabbatical leave shall be either for one or two semesters or, for a faculty member on a fiscal year contract basis for six or twelve months. 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.

Faculty on sabbatical leave may supplement their compensation through fellowships, scholarships, employment, or grants-in-aid to cover expenses such as travel, secretarial assistance, tuition, research, and publication.

A person on sabbatical leave may not receive supplemental pay from Northern Arizona University for teaching or administrative responsibilities during the period of leave.

The procedures for review and evaluation of faculty for sabbatical leave are as follows:

1. By April 1 in the academic year preceding the application, a pre-application request for sabbatical leave must be provided by the faculty member to the Chair of the department or their current supervisor if serving in a full-time administrative appointment. The preapplication should be reviewed from the administrative perspective to confirm sufficient resources exist to maintain the department (or area) program during the faculty member's leave. Preapplications determined to not be feasible should not result in a subsequent full-application.

2. During the fall semester in the year preceding the proposed sabbatical, and in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar*, the faculty member must file a formal application for sabbatical leave. The components of the application must include:

    a. pre-application request
    b. faculty review routing form
    c. detailed plan, goals, and timetable
    d. current curriculum vitae
    e. list of courses taught for the last two years
    f. documentation of advance arrangements
    g. copy of report from last sabbatical

More detailed instructions can be found at the Office of the Provost or at http://nau.edu/Provost/Sabbatical-Information/.

3. A review and evaluation of the sabbatical application shall take place by each of the following committees and administrators.

a. Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC) (in non-departmentalized colleges this is the college Promotion and Tenure Committee);
b. Chair (no review at this level in non-departmentalized colleges);
c. Dean of the college;
d. Provost

4. At each level of review, the applicant's proposal must be reviewed and evaluated as to whether it has merit according to one or more of the following criteria:

    a. Enhancing the teaching or scholarly work of the academic unit;
    b. Enhancing the applicant's effectiveness as a faculty member;
    c. Adding to the reputation of the institution;
    d. Contributing to knowledge in the subject field;
    e. Providing outstanding public or professional service at a local or national level.

5. At each level, a positive recommendation that the sabbatical leave be granted may be forwarded if the following conditions are met;

    a. The proposal is judged as having merit;
    b. There is a high probability that the faculty member will carry out the proposal; and
    c. Re-affirmation from the original pre-application review that sufficient resources exist to maintain the department (or area) program during the faculty member's leave. Documentation of coverage is required from the Chair or Dean.
    d. The Provost will make the final decision on sabbatical leave.

6. Upon receiving an adverse decision, if the faculty member believes this policy was not followed, the decision can be appealed using the Grievance procedure described in Appendix A

7. If a faculty member finds it necessary to revise the time frame, goals, or activities of the original sabbatical proposal, this revision must be submitted to the Chair in a timely manner. Normally, this would be March 1 of the year in which the application is approved. Such revisions are not automatically granted but are considered in light of Academic Unit and college needs. The Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean who makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost provides the final decision.

8. Once the sabbatical leave is approved, the Statement of Expectations developed for the semester or year of leave must incorporate the sabbatical plan.

9. Any expected compensation in addition to the University salary must be fully explained in the sabbatical application and approved before the leave is granted. Should opportunities for supplemental compensation develop after the sabbatical leave has begun or after the application has been submitted and approved, such opportunities must be submitted to the Chair for review and approval, and copied to the Dean and the Provost at the earliest opportunity.

10. A faculty member granted a sabbatical leave is required to return to the University as a faculty member for one year following the leave. Failure to return may result in a requirement that the faculty member refund to the University the amount of pay received during the sabbatical leave.

11. During the semester following completion of the sabbatical leave, the faculty member must do the following:

    a. File a written report (using the template from the Provost's office and

documenting that the purposes of the sabbatical leave were met) with the Provost, with copies to the Chair and Dean; and

b. Present a seminar or lecture on the results of the leave. The intent is to contribute knowledge to the NAU community by sharing the results of the sabbatical in an appropriate public forum available to that community.

12. A faculty member shall not be eligible for another sabbatical leave until he/she has served an additional six (6) years of continuous full-time service.

13. Consideration of any sabbatical leave after the first or any subsequent leaves shall take into account whether expectations were met and whether provisions defined in step 11 above were fulfilled.

1.7.2 Faculty Compensation

Faculty compensation is addressed in ABOR Policy 6-201 F. In addition, ABOR Policy 6-201 D.9 provides for a right to a review of a salary adjustment. A faculty member may request such a review by submitting a written request to the Chair for departmental units and Dean/Director for non-departmental units.

1.7.3 Supplemental University Employment

Faculty may be approved to accept additional university responsibilities from time to time provided such supplemental employment does not interfere with contractual responsibilities. The limit of supplemental work is set at or equivalent to a maximum of one 3 or 4 credit course 'extra' per term (fall, winter, spring, summer).

1.7.4 Employment, Services, or Consulting Outside the University ("Outside Employment")

NOTE: Outside Employment must not be incompatible with other University responsibilities. All faculty and staff must take the NAU CERT: Conduct, Ethics, Reporting, and Transparency course http://nau.edu/Comptroller/Conflict-of-Interest/ and complete the annual requirement. Employee updates to the e-CERT (disclosure) are required within 15 days of when circumstances change. Newly hired employees must also complete within 30 days of hire.

Outside employment, services, or consulting may not in any way interfere with or be incompatible with the University duties of the faculty member. ABOR 6-705 and other NAU policies referring to Conflict of Interest or Commitment may apply to all periods of time during the calendar year inclusive of holidays, summer and winter breaks. Exceptions may be approved during these times through the process described below. The evaluation and review of conflict of interest situations will include consideration of the entire calendar year, while conflict of commitment review is limited to the period of the employment contract. The criteria for determining whether outside employment interferes with regular duties and other assigned responsibilities include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Outside employment must not cause absence from regularly scheduled classes or interfere with timely completion of other university responsibilities. Outside

Employment may not result in scheduling a person's teaching of classes in a manner that is not in the best interest of the academic unit as determined by the Chair and the Dean of the college.

2. Outside Employment must not cause absence from the campus during the initial or final periods of the contract when meetings, attendance at commencement exercises, or other professional participation is expected.

Outside Employment must not involve a time commitment that detracts from preparation for teaching and/or other University-related responsibilities.

Outside Employment must not be incompatible with other University responsibilities.

NOTE: The following process has been replaced by the CERT course http://nau.edu/Comptroller/Conflict-of-Interest/ . Prior to accepting or engaging in Outside Employment, a faculty member must obtain written authorization beginning with the Chair and proceeding through the Dean and the Provost. The form for Notification of Employment, Services, or Consulting outside the University is available at http://nau.edu/Comptroller/Conflict-of-Interest/. An annual report of such activities must be provided to the Chair of the academic unit at the end of each academic year.

Faculty proposing to engage in Outside Employment must avoid conflict of interest as defined by the Conflict of Interest Laws of the State of Arizona (see NAU Purchasing Policy and Procedure #102 and AZ Revised Statutes, section 38-501 et. Seq.) No university facilities, resources including personnel, or equipment may be used for such employment.

1.7.5 Faculty Leave of Absence without Pay

The President or Provost of the university may grant a leave of absence without pay to members of the faculty upon written recommendation from the Chair/Dean, and the Provost. Requests for leaves of absence without pay, other than those of an emergency nature, should be made at least four months prior to the start of the proposed leave.

A leave of absence without pay may assure the faculty member that following termination of the leave period, the faculty member may return to the university upon the terms stated in the approval granted by the President for the leave of absence. Additionally, the faculty member may be assured that the rate of pay upon return will not be less than the academic year salary immediately prior to the leave of absence. If the position involves an administrative and a teaching, research, or other assignment, it is understood that only a teaching assignment may be assured upon return, unless the administrative, research, or other assignment is clearly set forth, approved, and authorized in advance of the leave period.

To permit academic planning for the following year, a faculty member on academic or fiscal-year leave of absence without pay shall notify, in writing, the Chair/Dean, by March 1, if the faculty member plans (or does not plan) to return, unless the faculty member and the Chair/Dean agree to a later notification date. Failure to notify the Chair/Dean by March 1 (or another date mutually agreed upon) may be deemed a resignation and forfeiture of any right to appointment or renewal.

The leave of absence may be extended with approval of the President of the university if it has no adverse effects upon academic programming. Normally, periods of leave will be for a semester or academic year for faculty employed on an academic year basis. For faculty on a fiscal year basis, the leave will normally be for the first or second six months of a fiscal year

(providing no conflict occurs with a teaching or other assignment) or a fiscal year (July 1 - June 30). Fiscal year faculty do not accrue vacation time while on leaves of absence.

The period of one year or less granted as a leave of absence without pay may be counted towards years of full-time service for promotion, tenure, and sabbatical when the leave is in the best interest of the faculty member and the University as determined by the President. Whether the period of leave is or is not to be credited as years of service for promotion, tenure, and sabbatical eligibility will be so stated in the authorization that grants the leave. Faculty granted a leave of absence without pay for one year or less will be eligible for cost of living and market salary adjustments should they be awarded during the period of the leave. Eligibility for merit increases for the period of leave must be specified at the time of leave approval.

Faculty members taking leave of absence without pay must make arrangements regarding group insurance and other benefits of normal employment at the University that may be affected while the faculty member is no longer on payroll. Faculty are advised to contact the Human Resources Office for details.

1.7.6 Faculty Input into Conditions of Faculty Service Procedures

These NAU Conditions of Faculty Service shall be reviewed annually by a standing committee of the Faculty Senate at NAU and by the Office of the Provost. Any modification to these conditions shall require the approval of the Faculty Senate, Provost, and President.

A. FACULTY RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

A.1 Introduction to Dispute Resolution Procedures

Northern Arizona University recognizes the importance of resolving work-related disputes through processes that are fair, equitable, efficient, and thoughtful. The recommended starting point for resolving a dispute is through discussion with the Chair and, if appropriate, with the Dean or Associate Dean, as delegated. Additionally, confidential, informal, impartial and independent assistance is available with informal dispute resolution is available for any faculty member through the Office of the University Ombuds. Engagement with and assistant from the Ombuds Office are distinct and separate from formal dispute resolution procedures.

Should informal resolution processes not resolve the dispute, or should the faculty member not choose to use this route, faculty may seek review as described below. The use of informal resolution processes does not extend the deadlines for filing.

a. If a faculty member is recommended by the Provost to the President for suspension without pay or for dismissal, the faculty member may APPEAL the Provost's recommendation by submitting written notice of appeal to the President no later than ten (10) days following the date on which the recommendation is received. See A.3.5.1 for a full description of the process.

b. A faculty member who receives an adverse decision from the President concerning their promotion, tenure, non-renewal, or release from employment and believes that the adverse decision was a discriminatory action or was based on unconstitutional grounds (including violations of due process or academic freedom), may file a written COMPLAINT. This complaint must be filed with the Office of the President within ten (10) days of the faculty member's receipt of the notice of the final adverse decision. See A.3.5.2 for a full description of the process.

c. Faculty who allege a violation of these Conditions of Faculty Service or any other policies of the Board or the University relating to faculty members may initiate a GRIEVANCE by filing a written statement that describes the specific action(s) being challenged and citing any Board or University policy that has been violated and the requested relief. This statement is filed with the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee within forty five (45) days of the occurrence of the incident giving rise to the Grievance. See A.3.5.3 for a full description of the process.

d. All Appeals, Complaints, or Grievances involving allegations of prohibited harassment, discrimination and /or violations(s) of the Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy must be reported to the Equity and Access Office by the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) upon receipt of the filing.

A faculty member has the discretion whether or not to file an Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance when that faculty member has a work-related dispute. Failure to 1) file an Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance within the time periods specified in these dispute resolution procedures, and 2) pursue the dispute resolution process through completion to a final decision from the University will be considered to be a failure to exhaust administrative and contractual remedies. Such failure may preclude a faculty member from having his or her Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance reviewed outside the University.

Faculty alleging sexual or other prohibited harassment may file with the Office for the Resolution of Sexual Misconduct (ORSM) by following procedures developed by that office, or may pursue a Grievance under the procedure outlined in A.3.5.3, but not both.

In addition, claims of alleged retaliation based upon whistle blowing are governed by a separate University policy, and ABOR policy 6-914. Such allegations shall be heard and decided under that policy. Refer to Appendix F for additional information related to the whistle-blower policy.

All individuals with faculty status (as defined in the *Conditions of Faculty Service*), irrespective of their administrative duties or assignments at the time of the action or inaction giving rise to the dispute, may use these dispute resolution procedures.

A.2 Definitions

Academic Freedom - finds its origins at least in part in the United States Constitution. As such, its role as a right held by members of the faculty has developed through decisions of our court system. It is a right held not only by members of the faculty, but in somewhat different fashion, by students and by the University itself. Academic freedom thrives not only on the independent and uninhibited exchange of ideas among teachers and students, but also, and somewhat inconsistently, on autonomous decision-making by the University itself. Discretion to determine, on academic grounds, who may teach, is one of the essential freedoms of a University. Academic freedom is not a doctrine to insulate a member of the faculty from evaluation by the institution that employs that person.

Though the University has not adopted the definition of academic freedom issued by the American Association of University Professors in 1940, its discussion there can help to guide thinking in the context of the handling of grievances where academic freedom is invoked by a member of the faculty. In America, it is understood that academic freedom is more than a right, in that it also establishes a corresponding responsibility on the part of the faculty member. Academic freedom is understood at Northern Arizona University to be subject at all times to the faculty member's duty to fulfill all assigned responsibilities, as described in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations and policies of the Arizona Board of Regents and the University. Consistent with the AAUP's statement:

- Faculty members are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties, but research for pecuniary return must be done in accordance with the applicable policies.
- Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching matter which has no relation to their subject.
- Faculty members are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate they are not speaking for the institution.
- For the AAUP Policy Statements on Academic Freedom, see http://www.aaup.org.

Advisor - means a non-attorney who accompanies a Claimant to a Grievance Hearing at his or her request, and who may consult with, advise, and speak on behalf of the Claimant during the Hearing proceedings.

Appeal - means a written, signed statement filed with the University President following a recommendation or notice of dismissal or suspension without pay **(see also Grievance).**

Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) - at Northern Arizona is the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC).

Chair – shall mean the person immediately responsible for management of the academic department, division, unit, or other entity; typically this is the faculty member in charge of an academic department of the University. In some units, the title may be Director or Executive Director. In non-departmentalized colleges, this role may be assumed by the Dean.

Claimant - means the faculty member submitting a written Appeal, Complaint, or grievance.

Complaint – means a written, signed allegation that an adverse decision concerning promotion, tenure, non-renewal, or release from employment was a discriminatory action, or was based on unconstitutional grounds including violations of due process or academic freedom (**see also Grievance**).

Conciliation - means a process by which individuals involved in an Appeal attempt to reconcile their differences with the facilitation of a Conciliation Committee in order to develop a mutually agreeable outcome for the Appeal.

Conciliation Committee - means one or more members of the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) who work with a Claimant and Respondent in an attempt to arrive at a mutually agreed upon solution (ABOR 6-201 L. 3.a)

Counsel - means an attorney licensed to practice law in the state of Arizona.

Day – means calendar day except that where the last day of any specific time period falls on a Saturday, a Sunday or a University-recognized holiday, then the time period shall run until 5:00 pm of the next day which is not a Saturday, a Sunday or a University-recognized holiday.

Discrimination - means disparate treatment on the basis of gender; race; color; religion; national origin; age; qualified handicap status; sexual orientation; veteran status; and/or any other discrimination prohibited by state or federal law (see also Safe Working and Learning Environment Policy).

Dismissal - means termination for just cause (defined below) of a faculty member prior to the expiration of an appointment. Dismissal of a faculty member shall only be for just cause. Dismissal does not include non-retention of a tenure-eligible faculty member or non- renewal of a non tenure-eligible faculty member.

Dispute - means an unresolved disagreement among two or more parties regarding an application or interpretation of an ABOR or University policy and/or a work place conflict. A dispute may take the form of an Appeal, a Complaint, or a Grievance.

Faculty – for the purposes of grievance, faculty includes academic professionals.

Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) - is a committee comprised of fifteen faculty members, elected from the general faculty membership and trained in the process and procedures for addressing Appeals, Complaints, and Grievances (see A.3.4.1, Members).

Grievance – is a written, signed statement that is filed by a faculty member with the Faculty Grievance Committee alleging that there has been unfair treatment, an incorrect interpretation, or incorrect, arbitrary, or discriminatory application of ABOR or University policy,

regulation, or procedure which, as applied to the faculty member, violates his/her terms and conditions of employment and for which there is no other resolution process. A Grievance statement shall describe the specific action(s) being challenged, citing any Board or University policy that has allegedly been violated, and shall specify the requested relief.

Informal Dispute Resolution – is a process of communication between and among affected

parties to a dispute in an effort to seek mutual agreement and to resolve the problem to the satisfaction of all parties without resorting to lengthy formal hearings.

Just Cause- for dismissal or suspension (ABOR 6-201 J.1.b) shall include, but not be limited to, demonstrated incompetence or dishonesty in professional activities related to teaching, research, publication, other creative endeavors, or service to the University community; unsatisfactory performance over a specified period of time and a failure to improve that performance to a satisfactory level after being provided a reasonable opportunity to do so by the University, as demonstrated through the Board-approved post-tenure review process; substantial neglect of or refusal to carry out properly assigned duties; personal conduct that substantially impairs the individual's fulfillment of properly assigned duties and responsibilities; moral turpitude; misrepresentation in securing an appointment, promotion, or tenure at the University; or proven violation of Board or University rules and regulations (including the code of conduct, the e-mail use policy, or any other disciplinary rules), depending upon the gravity of the offense, its repetition, or its negative consequences upon others.

Respondent(s) - is the person or persons responsible for allegedly taking the action that brought about the Appeal, Complaint or Grievance.

Sexual harassment - is unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when: (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, education, or participation in a Board or University activity; (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions or academic decisions affecting such individual; (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work, education, or participation in Board or University activities or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment (ABOR 6-707). For more information concerning prohibited behaviors, please refer to the *Safe Working and Learning Environment Policy (SWALE)* at https://in.nau.edu/eao/Faculty-Search-Guide/ .

Suspension - means removal from duty without pay.

A.3 Resolution Processes and Procedures

A.3.1 Informal Dispute Resolution

Individuals are encouraged to resolve informally a problem or conflict. However, the use of informal resolution processes does not extend the deadline for filing an Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance.

There are two options for informal dispute resolution: discussion with administrators in the chain of command and consultation with a member of the University Ombuds Program.

a. Chain of Command

When discussion with one or more administrators within the chain of command is used to resolve the dispute, the resolution of the dispute may be based on any terms that are mutually acceptable to the faculty member, the Respondent, and the highest ranked administrator involved in resolution discussions. That administrator is responsible for ensuring that the resolution is acceptable to the University. Faculty are encouraged to start informal resolution with the most immediate supervisor in the chain of command.

b. University Ombuds Program
The University provides the services of the Ombuds Program to assist faculty who seek informal resolution of work-related issues, concerns, or conflicts. . The office operates outside of and independent from the formal dispute resolution procedures of the University. An Ombuds offers individual consultation to (a) help provide perspective,

explore options, and empower faculty to develop strategies for addressing work-related issues, (b) help faculty understand University policies and procedures, and (c) direct faculty to available campus resources. An individual may choose to discuss an issue with an Ombuds with full assurance of confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.

Ombuds uphold the International Ombuds Association's Standards of Practice and Code of Ethics. An Ombuds may provide informal, confidential, impartial, and independent assistance before faculty enter formal processes and procedures..

c. Effect of Informal Resolution
Utilization of informal negotiation shall not preclude the opportunity for an individual to pursue an Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance through formal channels. An Appeal to a recommendation of dismissal or suspension without pay must be filed within ten (10) days of receipt of the recommendation. A Complaint of discriminatory action or violation of constitutional rights in an adverse personnel decision on promotion, tenure, non- renewal, or release from employment must be filed within ten (10) days of receipt of the adverse decision. A Grievance about a violation of conditions of faculty service or any other policies of the Board or the University relating to faculty members must be filed within forty-five (45) days of the incident giving rise to the grievance.

A.3.2 Formal Dispute Resolution

Faculty members may use an informal resolution process first, or not at all, before using formal dispute resolution. However, if formal dispute resolution has been chosen, the parties may resort to an informal resolution at any time during the formal process.

The existence of formal dispute resolution processes in no way diminishes the responsibility of faculty and administrators to exercise sound judgment in the fulfillment of their duties and responsibilities. The following considerations apply to formal dispute resolution:

a. The Board of Regents, University President, administrators and the faculty of NAU recognize the importance of having dispute resolution procedures, using them appropriately, and cooperating with them fully.

b. Dispute resolution procedures for faculty shall be separate from the dispute resolution procedures for students (including teaching and other assistants who do not hold faculty rank) and for other categories of University employees.

c. The integrity of the dispute resolution process is dependent on a timely resolution of all disputes.

d. All parties involved in a dispute procedure have the right to expect fair and equitable treatment. Fairness includes the right to have the dispute heard by an impartial faculty panel, the right to demand that evidence be provided to support charges, and the right to provide a rebuttal to charges.

e. An annual report for all disputes in which a formal resolution process has been used shall be provided to the University President by the Faculty Senate President by October 1 for the preceding academic year. The report will include the number and type of Grievances filed; the number of Grievances resolved and a description of those resolutions, including those that were dismissed; the number of Grievances pending; and the number of Grievances referred by the FGC elsewhere within the University (such as to Affirmative Action).

f. Disputes involving faculty members who teach at a location not on the main NAU campus shall be handled by the same procedures described herein.

g. Persons who change from faculty status to another employment category at NAU are

entitled to file as a faculty member if the incident giving rise to the dispute occurred while in faculty status.

h. Retaliation against the Claimant, witnesses, or other parties to the procedure is not allowed and may result in disciplinary action being initiated against those who retaliate.

i. These dispute resolution policies and procedures, as well as any changes or amendments, shall be approved by the NAU Faculty Senate and the President.

A.3.3 Faculty Grievance Committee Jurisdiction

The following are the types of disputes that may be heard by the Faculty Grievance Committee:

a. A faculty member has submitted an Appeal to a notice of dismissal or suspension without pay.

b. A faculty member has received an adverse decision concerning his/her promotion, tenure, non-renewal, or release from employment and has filed a Complaint alleging:

1. discrimination on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, national origin, age, disability status, sexual orientation, veteran status, and/or any other discrimination prohibited by state or federal law, or
2. a violation of the faculty member's academic freedom or due process or other unconstitutional grounds.

c. A faculty member alleges a violation of the Conditions of Faculty Service or any other rules of the Board or University relating to faculty members ("Grievance" per ABOR 6-201 N) including allegations of sexual or other prohibited harassment.

d. Grievances involving violations of the Safe Working and Learning Environment Policy, including allegations of prohibited harassment or discrimination may be addressed by either the Office for the Resolution of Sexual Misconduct (ORSM) or heard by the FGC, but not both.

The FGC does not have jurisdiction over:

a. Issues related to workload assignments. These issues will be dealt with by the Faculty Status Committee (FSC) within each college/school. Each college/school will establish procedures to deal with faculty concerns over workload assignments.

b. Issues related to annual performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations. These issues are also to be dealt with by procedures established within each college/school. After having exhausted all appeals at the college/school level, a faculty member may appeal performance evaluation or merit pay decisions to the Office of the Provost. The decision of the Provost is final.

c. Issues related to substantive academic judgment and decisions, including those pertaining to sabbatical, non-renewal, promotion, and tenure. However, Grievances concerning violations of prescribed University, college/consortium, and /or departmental unit policies or procedures are heard by the FGC (see also ABOR 6-201-N).

A.3.4 Structure of Faculty Grievance Committee

The Conditions of Faculty Service adopted by the Arizona Board of Regents require that the University faculty select members to serve on the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT). At Northern Arizona University the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) serves as the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

A.3.4.1 Faculty Grievance Committee Members

The FGC will consist of fifteen (15) members elected from the general faculty membership. The members of the FGC shall be elected from the faculty as described in the Faculty Senate By-Laws, and shall serve a term of three (3) years. The terms of members shall be staggered so that the terms of no more than five (5) members will expire each year. Members may be re-elected for a second term.

A.3.4.2 Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee

The Chair of the FGC shall be appointed from among the members of the FGC by the President of the Faculty Senate with the advice and consent of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Chair of the FGC may be any tenured faculty member at NAU, and does not need to be a current member of the Senate. The FGC Chair may appoint member(s) of the FGC to determine whether a dispute filed with the FGC is properly before the FGC and /or whether a Hearing Committee should be appointed.

A.3.4.3 Faculty Grievance Hearing Committee Chair

The Chair of the FGC is responsible for constituting from among the faculty elected to the FGC a Hearing Committee of three to five (3-5) individuals to review an Appeal, Complaint, or grievance. The Chair of the FGC will also appoint one of the members of the Hearing Committee as Hearing Committee Chair.

It is the duty of the Chair of the FGC to ensure that all Appeals, Complaints, and grievances are heard in an efficient, effective manner with adherence to due process and in compliance with this procedure and the applicable policies of the Arizona Board of Regents and the University. This means that while the Chair of the FGC may delegate his/her authority to organize the Hearing Committee, she/he cannot delegate the responsibility to ensure that the activities of the Hearing Committee are carried out in a timely, effective, and appropriate manner.

A.3.5 Formal Dispute Resolution Processes

A.3.5.1 Formal Appeal Steps

1. Filing an **Appeal** (ABOR 6-201 L): Suspension without Pay or Dismissal

   If suspension without pay or dismissal for just cause has been recommended by the Provost to the President and the faculty member has elected to file a formal Appeal, the faculty member must provide a written detailed statement of his/her position to the University President no later than ten (10) days following the date on which the recommendation is received. Failure to provide the written statements within the ten-day (10) period shall immediately terminate the procedure.

2. Conciliation or Mediation (for an Appeal)

   a. If the deadline is met, the University President shall refer such Appeal to a Conciliation Committee of the FGC within ten (10) days of receiving the notice.
   b. If conciliation fails or after thirty (30) days following the date on which the Appeal was referred to the Conciliation Committee and the Committee determines that there is no prospect for successful conciliation, then the President shall provide the faculty member with a written notice of dismissal or suspension. The President's written notice of dismissal or suspension shall:

      1. Refer to the particular statutes, rules or policies, if any, involved.
      2. Contain a statement of the reasons for the recommendation in sufficient detail to enable the faculty member to prepare a defense.

c. As an alternative to meeting with the Conciliation Committee, a faculty member may agree to participate in a mediation process to be established by the University. In the case of mediation, the same deadlines for referral and termination of the procedure shall pertain as in the case of conciliation.

3. Preparing for Hearing (for an Appeal)

a. The faculty member may appeal a notice of dismissal or suspension without pay from the University President by providing the University President and the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee with a written detailed statement of the faculty member's position within ten (10) days after receipt of the notice of dismissal or suspension. Failure to provide the written statement within the ten day period shall immediately terminate the procedure.

b. The faculty member shall further provide a copy of the notice of dismissal or suspension and the statement of position to the Chair of the FGC. The Chair shall then fix a time for hearing, which shall begin not less than thirty (30), nor more than forty-five (45) days, after receipt by FGC of the notice of dismissal or suspension and the written statement of position from the faculty member. The Chair shall serve upon the parties a written notice of hearing at least twenty (20) days prior to the hearing. The Chair may shorten or extend these time periods for good cause shown or upon consent of the parties but the notice of hearing shall not be shorter than twenty (20) days without the consent of the parties.

The notice of hearing shall include:

1. A statement of time, place and nature of the hearing, and notice of the right to a closed hearing upon request of any party to the Appeal.
2. The names of the panel members.
3. A statement that the hearing is held in accordance with ABOR Policy 6-201L (Conditions of Faculty Service, Hearing Procedures for Faculty).

4. A copy of the notice of dismissal or suspension attached and incorporated by reference.

c. At least ten (10) days before the hearing date each party shall provide to the hearing committee and the other party or parties a written list of the names and addresses of each witness the party intends to use at the hearing. No witnesses shall be used at the hearing other than those listed except for good cause shown or upon written agreement of the parties.

4. Conducting the Hearing (for an Appeal)

a. Failure of either party to appear at the scheduled hearing shall be treated as follows: In the case of the faculty member, failure to appear shall waive the faculty member's right to appeal the decision. In the case of the University representative, failure to appear shall be treated as resolution of the Appeal in favor of the Claimant. Failure of either party to appear may be excused for good cause by the committee, in which case, the hearing may be rescheduled.

b. The record of the hearing shall include, but it is not necessarily limited to the following:

1. All documents filed by the parties and all notices, orders, or other documents issued by or submitted to the Faculty Grievance Committee in connection with the proceeding.
2. Testimony received and considered.
3. Record of objections and offers of proof and rulings thereon, which may be contained in the transcript.

4. Findings.
5. The written recommendation reflecting the decision of the hearing committee.

c. Each party to the hearing shall be afforded an opportunity to respond and present evidence and argument on all issues involved. Each party shall have the right:

1. At the party's own election and cost, to be represented by counsel or accompanied by an advisor, which advisor may consult with and advise the party, and may speak on behalf of the party; and
2. To present witnesses and submit evidence, including documentary evidence; and
3. To question adverse witnesses and object to the submission of evidence.

d. The following shall be observed with respect to the hearing:

1. The hearing, but not the deliberations of the committee, shall be recorded by a court reporter at the University's expense, and shall be transcribed upon the request of any party at that party's own cost.
2. The hearing may be conducted in an informal, collegial manner and without adherence to the rules of evidence required in judicial proceedings. The FGC shall exclude irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence.
3. The Chair of the hearing committee shall have the authority to issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and for the production of books, records, documents and other evidence, and shall have the power to administer oaths. The subpoena shall be in writing and shall be served upon the witness in person. Members of the University community are required to cooperate during the appeal process and to comply with subpoenas issued pursuant to this procedure unless compliance would result in unavoidable personal hardship or participation beyond the terms of the contract.
4. On application by a party, the Chair of the hearing committee, at his or her discretion, may permit a deposition to be taken, in the manner and upon the terms designated by the Chair, of a witness who cannot be subpoenaed or is unable to attend the hearing. Prehearing depositions and subpoenas for the production of documents may be ordered by the Chair, provided that the party seeking such discovery demonstrates that the party has reasonable need of the deposition testimony or the materials being sought and no other reasonable means of discovery are available.
5. The Chair shall preside over and conduct the hearing and shall rule upon all matters of procedure including the admission of evidence. The Chair shall also exercise control over the hearing to avoid needless consumption of time and to prevent the harassment or intimidation of witnesses.
6. The FGC has the right to speak to the parties and witnesses during the hearing, including the right to question and to receive responses from the parties and witnesses directly.
7. Official notice of certain facts may be taken.
8. At the conclusion of the submission of all evidence, the hearing committee shall permit each party or counsel to make an oral or written summation.

9. The University bears the burden of proving the existence of just cause by a preponderance of the evidence.
10. A committee legal advisor, selected by FGC from a list of qualified attorneys provided by the University, shall sit in attendance at the hearing and may be asked to comment on questions of procedure and admissibility of evidence and shall otherwise assist in the conduct of the hearing, but shall not vote. A person shall not serve as both a committee legal advisor and as an advisor or legal counsel in the proceedings for either of the parties. The legal advisor for the committee will be compensated by the University.

e. The recommendation of the hearing committee shall be in writing; shall include findings of fact based exclusively on the evidence; and shall be presented to the University President within thirty (30) days following the conclusion of the hearing except, upon good cause, the President may extend the recommendation date by an additional thirty (30) days.

5. Outcome of the Hearing (of an Appeal)

Upon receipt and review of the hearing committee recommendation, the University President shall approve, disapprove, or modify the committee recommendation or remand one or more issues for further consideration by the committee. The President shall issue a decision in writing, no later than forty-five (45) days following receipt of the committee recommendation and record. The President shall not be bound by the recommendations of the committee. Copies of the President's decision and the Hearing Committee's recommendation shall be mailed to the parties, and the Chair of FGC. The President's decision shall include a statement that an appeal to the Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. §12-901 et. seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date when a copy of the decision sought to be reviewed is served upon the party affected.

6. Reconsideration of President's Decision (of an Appeal)

a. The faculty member may request reconsideration of the President's decision by filing a written request setting forth a ground for reconsideration with specificity within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the decision. If no request for reconsideration is made, the President's decision is effective at the expiration of the period in which to request reconsideration. Grounds for reconsideration are:

1. Irregularities in the proceedings, including but not limited to any abuse of discretion or misconduct by the committee which has deprived the employee of a fair and impartial process;
2. Accident or surprise that could not have been prevented by ordinary prudence;
3. Newly discovered material evidence, which could not have been available for the presentation;
4. Excessive or insufficient result;
5. The decision is not justified by the evidence, is contrary to law, or is arbitrary and capricious.

b. If the faculty member requests reconsideration, the President shall issue a decision on reconsideration within twenty (20) days of receiving a request for reconsideration.

c. The President's decision on reconsideration shall include a statement that

1. This is the final decision of the University, and
2. That an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative

Review Act, A.R.S. §12-901, et. seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date on which the decision on reconsideration is served on the party affected.

7. Failure to Complete the Review Process

   Failure to complete the above review procedures shall constitute a failure to exhaust administrative and contractual remedies.

A.3.5.2 Formal Complaint Steps

1. Filing a **Complaint** (ABOR 6-201 M): Discrimination or Unconstitutional Grounds

   a. A faculty member who receives an adverse decision from the University President concerning his/her promotion, tenure, non-renewal, or release from employment may file a written Complaint alleging that the adverse decision was a discriminatory action or was based on unconstitutional grounds (including violations of due process or academic freedom). This Complaint must be filed with the office of the University President within ten (10) days of the faculty member's receipt of notice of the final adverse decision.

   b. "Receipt of notice" means delivery of written notice of the final adverse decision to the faculty member's last known address by certified mail, return receipt requested. If undeliverable, the written notice is deemed to have been received by the faculty member if properly sent to the faculty member's last known address.

2. Preparing for a Hearing (of a Complaint):

   a. The faculty member shall have the right to a hearing before the Faculty Grievance Committee.

   b. The written Complaint shall be transmitted to the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee within seven (7) days after receipt by the office of the University President. The hearing shall occur no earlier than thirty days (30) nor later than forty-five days (45) after the filing of the Complaint, except that with consent of both the University and the complaining party, or upon majority vote of the hearing committee, the hearing may be advanced or delayed.

3. Conducting the Hearing (of a Complaint):

   The burden of proving discriminatory action or unconstitutional grounds shall be on the faculty member. The hearing procedures shall provide for the following:

   a. The right to an impartial hearing committee of not fewer than three committee members; and

   b. A closed hearing upon request of any party to the Complaint; and

   c. The right of each party to obtain access to all relevant, non-privileged documents relating to the allegations which are subject to the other party's control and which do not violate the privacy rights of non-parties; all disagreements relating to the disclosure of documents shall be decided by the Chair of the hearing committee; and

   d. The authority of the Chair to administer oaths and to issue subpoenas for the

attendance of witnesses and for the production of books, records, documents and other evidence. The subpoena shall be in writing and shall be served upon the witness in person. Members of the University community are required to comply with subpoenas issued pursuant to this procedure unless compliance would result in unavoidable personal hardship or participation beyond the terms of the contract; and

e. The right of the University and the faculty member to present witnesses and evidence and to question witnesses; and

f. At the party's own election and cost, the right of each party to be represented by counsel or accompanied by an advisor, which advisor may consult with and advise the party, and may speak on behalf of the party; and

g. The hearing shall be recorded by a court reporter at the University's expense. A transcript may be obtained by any party at that party's own cost; and

h. Written findings of fact; and

i. The right of the University, faculty member and committee members to a copy of the written recommendation of the committee; and

4. Outcome of the Hearing (of a Complaint):

a. The recommendation of the committee shall be transmitted to the University President within thirty (30) days following the conclusion of the hearing except, upon good cause, the President may extend the recommendation date by an additional thirty (30) days. No later than forty-five (45) days following receipt of the committee recommendation the President shall render a final determination in writing as to whether the challenged decision shall be affirmed or modified. A copy of the determination shall be mailed to the parties and the committee members. The date of the mailing shall be the effective date of the decision.

b. The President's decision shall include a statement that an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. §12-901, et seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date when a copy of the decision sought to be reviewed is served upon the party affected.

c. The faculty member may request reconsideration of the President's decision by filing a written request setting forth a ground for reconsideration with specificity within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the decision. If no request for reconsideration is made, the President's decision is effective on the fifteenth (15^{th}) day after the date of the decision at the expiration of the period in which to request reconsideration. The grounds for reconsideration are:

1. Irregularities in the proceedings, including but not limited to any abuse of discretion or misconduct by the committee which has deprived the employee of a fair and impartial process;
2. Accident or surprise that could not have been prevented by ordinary prudence;
3. Newly discovered material evidence, which could not have been available for the presentation;
4. Excessive or insufficient results;
5. The decision is not justified by the evidence, is contrary to law, or is arbitrary and capricious.

d. If the faculty member requests reconsideration, the President shall issue a

decision on reconsideration within twenty (20) days of receiving a request for reconsideration.

e. The President's decision on reconsideration shall include a statement that 1) this is the final decision of the University and 2) that an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. §12-901, et. seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date on which a copy of the decision on reconsideration is served upon the party affected.

5. Failure to Complete the Review Process

Failure to complete the above review procedures shall constitute a failure to exhaust administrative and contractual remedies.

A.3.5.3 Grievance Process

A Grievance may be filed if a faculty member alleges that there has been unfair treatment, an incorrect interpretation, or incorrect, arbitrary, or discriminatory application of ABOR or University policy, regulation, or procedure, which, as applied to the faculty member, violates his/her terms, and conditions of employment and for which there is no other resolution process. A Grievance statement shall describe the specific action(s) being challenged, citing any Board or University policy that has allegedly been violated, and shall specify the requested relief.

Informal resolution of a Grievance may occur at any time throughout the formal Grievance process. Thus, the formal process below may be suspended or ended at any of the stages outlined below.

The following steps outline the process for the formal Grievance:

1. Filing a Grievance

a. Within forty-five (45) days of the occurrence or the discovery of an action forming the basis for a Grievance, the grievant must file a written statement with the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) at the office of the Faculty Senate.

b. Elements to be filed in support of the formal Grievance:

1. Claimant's name, address, phone number and the date on which action is filed
2. Date of action which formed basis for Grievance
3. Department, college, or unit involved
4. Names, addresses and phone numbers of parties involved who may be Respondent
5. Statement and documentation of the Grievance and position taken on the issues. The statement should describe the specific action(s) being challenged and any Board or University rule that has allegedly been violated.
6. Names of witnesses who may be called to testify on behalf of the Claimant and a brief summary of their anticipated testimony
7. Copies of exhibits intended to be offered as evidence
8. Remedies and relief sought
9. Statement of intention regarding use of legal counsel; and if an attorney will be used, the name of that counsel
10. At the same time, a copy of the request for a hearing and documentation of the alleged Grievance must be provided by the Claimant to each Respondent.

2. Response of the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC)

   The FGC is charged with reviewing allegations and requests for hearings to determine whether the matter is grievable and for hearing all Grievances.

   a. Within five (5) days of the filing of a Grievance, the Chair of FGC shall make a request for input from the Respondent(s). Respondent shall have ten (10) days from the receipt of the request for input to respond and to challenge the grievability of the allegations. The Chair of the FGC, along with members of the FGC who may be consulted, reviews the allegations and any response, and decides whether the complaint is grievable according to the terms of this procedure. If so, the Grievance shall be assigned within twenty-one (21) days of initial filing to a Hearing Committee of FGC.

   b. Once a Hearing Committee is assigned the Grievance, the Chair of the designated Grievance Hearing Committee has three (3) days to send letters to Claimant and Respondent. The letter to the Claimant and Respondent must include all attachments included in the filing of the Grievance to Respondent and the procedures to be followed by all parties. Upon receipt of a letter from the designated Hearing Committee Chair, Respondent have ten (10) days to respond in writing to the allegations, and to identify witnesses they want to testify at the hearing, a brief summary of their anticipated testimony, and exhibits intended to be offered as evidence.

   c. If a specific issue (or issues) that constitute the basis for a hearing has not been clearly established before the hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall establish a clear definition of the issues and seek agreement on these issues by both parties at least five (5) to the hearing itself

3. The Grievance Hearing Process

   a. The hearing shall be closed upon the request of any party to the Grievance.

   b. The hearing shall begin no less than thirty (30) nor no more than forty-five (45) days from the date of the filing of the Grievance.

   c. No later than twenty (20) days prior to the hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall send a letter to the Claimant and Respondent announcing the hearing date. The hearing may be postponed only for good cause, as determined by the Chair of the Grievance Hearing Committee.
   d. It is the responsibility of the Claimant and the Respondent to ensure that their witnesses are available for the hearing.

   e. The hearing will be recorded by a court reporter at the University's expense. Either the Claimant or the Respondent may record the hearing with an electronic recording device at their own expense. However the court reporter's recording will be considered the official recording of the hearing, and any party to the proceedings who wishes transcription of that recording may acquire it at the party's own expense.

   f. Unless compelling reasons are given to the Hearing Committee and other appropriate parties, all parties shall have access to all information that is presented to the hearing body at no expense to them.

   g. The Claimant and the Respondent will have an opportunity to present an opening statement. The opening statement should be brief and explain what the main problem is, what remedy is being sought, and how one intends to prove

his/her case through witness testimony and exhibits.

h. After opening statements are completed, the grievant is allowed to develop his or her case before the Grievance Hearing Committee. Previously identified witnesses may be called and documents offered as exhibits. Exhibits offered by one party are subject to inspection by the other party. The Claimant and Respondent may question each other and witnesses during the hearing, and the Hearing Committee may question either party at any time. Rulings on the admissibility of testimony and exhibits shall be made by the Chair of the Hearing Committee. The rules of evidence observed in judicial proceedings shall not apply to these hearings, although the Chair may exclude privileged, irrelevant, immaterial, unduly repetitious and scandalous evidence.

i. The Chair of the Hearing Committee may call additional witnesses and offer additional exhibits upon request of either party or on the Chair's initiative. The parties to the Grievance must be informed of these witnesses and exhibits at least five (5) working days before the hearing. The Chair of the Hearing Committee may also require the reproduction of books, records, and other evidence, provided each party is notified of this action within ten (10) days before the hearing.

j. At the conclusion of the hearing, each party may present closing statements.

k. The burden of proving facts necessary to support the Grievance will be on the Claimant.

l. A Grievance hearing shall be dismissed if the Claimant, after timely notice of the hearing, does not appear for the hearing and has not obtained postponement from the Chair of the Hearing Committee. If the Respondent, after timely notice of the hearing, fails to appear and does not request postponement from the Chair, the hearing may be held with only the Claimant and his/her witnesses giving testimony.

4. Report and Recommendations

a. Within ten (10) days after completion of the Hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Committee will forward a report of findings and a recommendation(s) to the President and/or the Provost, as appropriate, with a copy to the parties to the Grievance, and a copy to the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee.

b. If it has been determined that there has been a substantial failure to adhere to academic unit procedures, particularly those involving an application (e.g., for tenure and/or promotion, for sabbatical or unpaid leave of absence, for faculty development support, etc.) the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall advise the Provost through a copy of the report to the President, so that the following additional steps can be taken before further action is taken by the President:

1. The application of the Claimant shall be returned to the academic unit with instructions to reconsider the application as soon as possible, and in accordance with the procedures, process, criteria, and standards as applied to all faculty within the unit. The Provost shall consult with the other faculty and/or the Chair of the academic unit to ensure that the reconsideration is executed fully and fairly and that steps are taken to ensure that no substantial failures in the unit's process and procedure occur in the future.
2. If the Provost determines that it is not likely that the Claimant can

receive fair reconsideration from the academic unit, an *ad hoc* procedure will be devised by the Provost to determine if the faculty member has met the criteria and standards of the academic unit for approval of the application. Such a procedure might involve submitting the faculty member's application to a committee composed of members of other academic units from this University, or from another University, or a combination thereof.

3. The Provost will render a decision as promptly as possible and report this to the President.

5. The Final Decision

No later than ten (10) days after receipt of the report and recommendations from the Hearing Committee or the Provost, as applicable, the President shall decide the matter and forward a written statement to the Claimant, the Respondent, and the Chair of the Hearing Committee. If the President cannot issue a decision promptly the President will notify the parties of a delay, reasons for the delay, and the date on which the decision can be expected.

6. Reconsideration of President's Decision

a. The faculty member may request reconsideration of the President's decision by filing a written request setting forth a ground for reconsideration with specificity within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the decision. If no request for reconsideration is made, the President's decision is effective at the expiration of the period in which to request reconsideration. The grounds for reconsideration are:

1. Irregularities in the proceedings, including but not limited to any abuse of discretion or misconduct by the committee which has deprived the employee of a fair and impartial process;
2. Accident or surprise that could not have been prevented by ordinary prudence;
3. Newly discovered material evidence, which could not have been available for the presentation;
4. Excessive or insufficient result;
5. The decision is not justified by the evidence, is contrary to law, or is arbitrary and capricious.

b. If the faculty member requests reconsideration, the President shall issue a decision on reconsideration within twenty (20) days of receiving a request for reconsideration.

c. The President's decision on reconsideration shall include a statement that 1) this is the final decision of the University and 2) that an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. §12-901, et. seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date on which the decision on reconsideration is served on the party affected.

NOTE: Should an Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance be delivered to the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee during holiday breaks or any other day when the University is not in session, that Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance will be held for review until the first day after the end of the break period. The days on break shall not be counted toward the time schedule set forth in this document for the disposition of an Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance. The same break periods as mentioned above shall not be counted in the time allowed for the Claimant to submit his or her Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance, nor will these periods be

counted in the time allowed for response from the Respondent. In addition, these periods will not be counted in rendering the final committee decision according to prescribed time schedule. During the summer months (May 15 to August 15), a hearing may be conducted if all parties to the Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance, and the designated Hearing Committee agree to do so.

B. COMMITTEES (EFFECTIVE 1/1/98)

This appendix contains information on the composition and structure of the following committees:

- Faculty Status Committee (FSC)
- College Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)
- Annual Review Committee (ARC)

B.1 FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE (FSC)

The following paragraphs describe the Faculty Status Committee (FSC). The duties of the Faculty Status Committee are to make recommendations concerning renewal appointments, promotion, tenure, sabbatical leave or Regents Professor awards. In some colleges or school units with small numbers of faculty, there is normally only one committee (FSC) which reviews faculty for various actions described in this section. In other units which are much larger, the faculty may decide to create a separate Promotion and Tenure committee.

B.1.1 Structure of FSC

By the beginning of each Fall semester, every academic unit will establish a Faculty Status Committee (FSC) through their locally approved process. These committees will consist of a minimum of 3 full-time faculty who represent the faculty roles and tracks in the department/unit. Department chairs and deans are not eligible to serve as FSC members. In non-departmentalized colleges or schools, each area (or comparable unit) shall have at least one representative on the FSC, elected according to policies established by the college. The Faculty Status Committee will be responsible for reviewing faculty records and making recommendations with respect to contract renewal, tenure, promotion, sabbatical, Regents' Professor status, and any other status-change matters determined to be appropriate by the academic unit.

B.1.2 Charge of FSC

The department chair will call the first meeting of the FSC at which time the committee will elect its own chair. The elected chair will be responsible for ensuring that subsequent meetings are called and that the committee completes its work by the dates set in the Academic Administrative Calendar.

B.2 College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The following paragraphs describe the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The duties of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are to review and recommend promotion, tenure, sabbatical or Regents Professor awards.

B.2.1 Structure of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee

Each college shall create a College Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, elected or appointed in accordance with college practice. There shall be at least three members on the committee. Membership on the committee is restricted to full-time faculty at second level faculty rank (Associate or Senior) or higher and shall represent the distribution of faculty roles and tracks in the department/unit. Deans and department chairs are ineligible to serve. Members will serve three-year staggered terms so that approximately one-third of the members are elected each year. If a member of the committee is being considered for promotion, he or she must be replaced on the committee for that year. The faculty of the college are to be informed by the dean of the membership of the P&T Committee in writing a soon as is practical after all members have been elected for the current academic year.

1. Departmentalized Colleges
   Each department in the college will elect one member to this committee. In a college with only two departments, the third member shall be elected from the college at large. If the dean of the college determines that there are not sufficient full-time faculty in a department to conduct a realistic election, the dean may request an exemption from the Provost. When replacement is necessary or in the case of resignation from the committee, the vacancy will be filled by election from the affected department (or college if an at-large position) for the remainder of the academic year or the remainder of the elected term, whichever is appropriate.

2. Non-Departmentalized Colleges
   Each area (or comparable unit) into which the college is organized shall have at least one representative on the committee. Colleges may choose to have the election of the professional area representative take place within the professional area or the selection may be at large. If the dean of the college determines that there is not sufficient full-time faculty in some areas to conduct a realistic election, the dean may request an exemption from the Provost. When replacement is necessary or in the case of resignation from the committee, the vacancy will be filled by election for the remainder of the unfilled term.

B.2.2 Charge of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The dean will call the committee together for its initial meeting of the academic year. The committee will elect its own chair who will be responsible for ensuring that meetings are held and the committee completes its work by the dates set in *Personnel Action Calendar.*

B.3 Annual Review Committee (ARC)

The Annual Review Committee will conduct the unit's annual performance evaluation of faculty and make recommendations on matters concerning the annual performance rating of faculty members, merit increases, and other matters pertaining to annual performance evaluation determined to be appropriate by the academic unit. The structure and charge for the committee is outlined below.

B.3.1 Structure of the Annual Review Committee

By the beginning of each fall semester, every academic unit will establish an Annual Review committee (ARC) through their locally approved process.. This committee will consist of a minimum of three full-time faculty members. In non-departmentalized colleges each area (or comparable unit) shall have at least one representative on the ARC, elected according to policies established by the college.

The academic unit will determine the categories of full-time faculty members who are eligible to serve on the ARC. Each academic unit will establish clear written policies governing the composition of its Annual Review Committee. Annual Review Committee membership should be comprised of faculty from all roles and tracks represented in the department/unit. Units may choose to limit the membership of the Annual Review Committee to those who serve on the Faculty Status Committee or they may elect to constitute the unit's ARC by augmenting the FSC with additional faculty members, or they may elect a separate ARC from among the eligible faculty.

B.3.2 Charge to the Annual Review Committee

If the Annual Review Committee is elected from among the full-time faculty in the academic unit, then the department chair or college dean will call the committee together for its initial meeting of the academic year, and the committee will elect its own chair. Otherwise, the chair of the FSC committee from which it was constituted will chair the committee. The chair will be responsible for ensuring that meetings are held and the committee completes its work by the dates set in the *Personnel Action Calendar*.

C. HIRING PROCESS FOR FACULTY AND ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

The recruitment, selection, and hiring of a highly qualified, mission-driven, diverse workforce, heretofore called the "search process," aligns with the current NAU strategic plan. These principles guide and inform hiring process and policy documents produced by the following offices:

NAU Human Resources
NAU Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
NAU Equity and Access Office

The following guiding principles are based on the Mission Driven and Diverse Faculty and Staff Strategic Priority and NAU's commitment to, and recognition that, individuals from all racial, ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, national origins, disabilities, age, veteran status, religious or political beliefs, sexual orientations, gender identities and expression, and lived experiences strengthen our institutional workforce culture that incorporates diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice in the pursuit of excellence and the promotion of student success.

1. **Inclusivity:** We actively foster a climate of universal access and respect for underrepresented perspectives, cultures, and experiences in all stages of the search process.

2. **Shared Responsibility and Accountability:** Through intentional checks and balances everyone involved in the search process holds themselves accountable to their role in the process and to each of the core and guiding principles, including furthering the institution's hiring goals towards becoming a diverse, equitable, inclusive, and just environment. Central offices provide regular oversight on individual and organizational compliance with the search core and guiding principles and search policies and procedures.

3. **Transparency, Consistency, and Timeliness:** Search policies and procedures promote fair, efficient, timely and thorough searches, and are consistent with other related policies, procedures, and legal requirements including, but not limited to, nondiscrimination, and equal opportunity laws and regulations.

4. **Flexibility and Measurability:** Search procedures are regularly reviewed and revised to meet the evolving needs of the NAU community and alignment with the current NAU Strategic plan and to support ongoing improvement.

5. **Integrity:** As individuals and as an organization, we are honest in our communications and actions both internally as well as with current and future applicants.

D. COMMON ELEMENTS OF THE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

ABOR Policy 6-201 H.1 states that the Common Elements were first approved by the Regents in Dec 1996.

Post-tenure review processes include the common elements below.

1. Performance Evaluation

   The review has three components that all faculty will undergo the Annual Review, the Dean's Level Audit, and the Academic Program Review.

   a. Annual Review

      - Normally covers the immediately preceding 36-month prior with substantial emphasis on current year evaluation of teaching.
      - There will be four measurements—teaching, scholarship, service, and overall performance.
      - Conducted by unit head and/or peer committee.
      - Based on written goal-based agreement negotiated by the individual and unit head that fit within unit campus mission and guidelines.
      - Every annual review of teaching will contain and seriously consider student input including evaluation of faculty classroom performance in all classes.
      - Every instance of unsatisfactory evaluation in teaching will be addressed (see outcomes and consequences of performance evaluation.)

   b. Dean's Level Audit

      - Covers a proportion of reviews each year, so that over a maximum of 5 years, every file is reviewed.
      - Panel is convened by the Dean
      - Checks the adequacy of the process and makes appropriate recommendations to unit per committee
      - If appropriate, refers files back to the unite peer committee

   c. Academic Program Review

      - Occurs every 5-7 years.
      - Conducted by Dean and a panel of qualified members, which shall include external experts, community representatives and recent alumni of the program.
      - Where appropriateness of contribution is questioned, the file will be returned to the unit peer committee for intense examination.

2. Outcome of the Annual Review and Consequences of Performance Evaluation

   - Satisfactory performance in all areas of evaluation allows the faculty member to remain in the regular evaluation process with the possibility of merit pay raises.
   - Overall satisfactory with a single area of unsatisfactory leads to a faculty development plan at the unit level.
   - An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas of unsatisfactory or may result from one area of unsatisfactory leads to a faculty development plan at

the unit level.

- An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas of unsatisfactory or may result from one area of unsatisfactory (for example, teaching) depending upon the emphasis assigned to that area in the goal-based agreement and the extent of the deficiency.
- Overall unsatisfactory leads to a Performance Improvement Plan approved at the college level.
- The Chief Academic Officer on each campus shall ensure that every unit develops a clear definition of unsatisfactory performance that is appropriate to the mission of that particular unit and consistent with the mission of the university.

3. Addressing Unsatisfactory Performance

   Faculty members found to be performing at an unsatisfactory level are required to enter one of two processes depending upon the extent of deficiency. Any single area of unsatisfactory performance—for example, teaching—will be addressed in a Faculty Development Plan at the unit level. Faculty members with overall unsatisfactory performance go directly into the Performance Improvement Process.

4. Faculty Development Plan (at unit level)

   - Addressed a single area of deficiency, where the overall performance is satisfactory, before it becomes sufficiently serious to impair the faculty member's overall performance.
   - Maximum of 1 year duration with appropriate interim monitoring and feedback.
   - If satisfactory in all areas at the end of the Faculty Development Plan, the faculty Member returns to the regular performance evaluation process.
   - If plan objectives are not achieved at the end of the year, the faculty member shall receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory and must enter the performance improvement process.

5. Performance Improvement Process

   - Development and implementation of a performance improvement plan shall occur no later than the semester following the overall unsatisfactory evaluation.
   - Performance improvement plan is developed in concert with appropriate administrators and peers.
   - Performance Improvement Plan identifies areas of specific deficiency, and identifies the means by which the faculty member will improve the performance.
   - Teaching and service deficiencies will generally be addressed through a one-year performance improvement plan. In those rare circumstances where the nature of the deficiency cannot be fully remedied in on year, the duration of the plan may go beyond one year. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the Provost.
   - Annual or more frequent benchmarks tied to performance goals must be met.
   - Failure to demonstrate adequate progress relative to these annual or more frequent benchmarks and performance goals shall lead to a recommendation for dismissal.
   - For a research deficiency or for the research component of an overall deficiency, the duration of the plan shall be as brief as is reasonable, but under no circumstances will it be longer than three years. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the Provost.

6. Implementation

   - Each university shall adopt procedures to implement board policy and common elements for the 1997-1998 academic year.
   - Procedures shall be reviewed for consistency by appropriate university and central office staff.

7. Documenting the Impact of Post-Tenure Review

   The goal of post-tenure review is to create an institutional climate that motivates faculty to continuously improve and maintain high levels of performance, and provides a timely mechanism with which to deal with those faculty whose performance continues to flail below institutional expectations. The success of this policy will be evidence by ongoing improvements in faculty performance. To document the way in which the policy is being implemented, a number of reporting mechanisms are proposed:

   The Tenure Audit will contain:

   - The number of faculty who are evaluated as satisfactory or better
   - The number of faculty members who enter Faculty Development Plans, the nature of the deficiencies, and the outcome for those plans
   - The number of faculty members who enter the performance Improvement Process, the nature of the deficiencies, the number of plans of different lengths, and the outcomes for the Process

   The Dean's Level Audit Report:

   - The deans will report annually to the Regents on their audits of the annual review

   The Academic Program Review Report will contain:

   - Summary data on the evidence about the appropriateness of faculty contributions to the unit's and university mission

E. PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC REORGANIZATION

E.1 Reorganization with Anticipated Retrenchment

The procedures outlined in this section are intended to apply to an academic reorganization likely to require or result in retrenchment, with a loss of faculty and/or involuntary reassignment of faculty to other programs.

Declaration of Fiscal Exigency

According to Arizona Board of Regents policies 6-101, 6-301, and 6-1201 employees may be released prior to the end of the appointment period, when deemed necessary due to a financial emergency as declared by the Arizona Board of Regents [ABOR].

As soon as practicable, but no more than 48 hours after the ABOR's declaration of fiscal exigency, the President of the university shall meet with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to discuss the situation and to begin to formulate an institutional response. The Executive Committee may choose to work directly with the President, staff, and student representatives on formulation of a response or may choose to appoint an ad hoc committee for this purpose. Affected faculty should not serve on the committee.

Within the time limit specified by the ABOR or within ninety (90) days, whichever is less, the Executive Committee directly or through its appointed ad hoc committee will present the proposed institutional response (s) to the full Senate and will also hold a minimum of two meetings open to the entire academic community. The Executive Committee will report faculty, staff, and student responses, questions, and proposed alternatives to the President at least one week in advance of the President's deadline for providing an institutional response to the declaration of fiscal exigency.

The institutional response and minutes from the public and committee meetings should be maintained by the university archives, part of the NAU Cline Library.

Severe Loss of Operating Funds of 10 Percent or Greater

A severe loss of operating funds, 10 percent or more, will likely result in the elimination of faculty positions or involuntary reassignments to other programs. As soon as practicable once the problem is identified, but no more than thirty days after the loss of operating funds has been reliably forecast, the President of the university shall meet with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to discuss the situation and to begin to formulate an institutional response. The Executive Committee may choose to work directly with the President, staff, and student representatives on formulation of a response or may choose to appoint an ad hoc committee for this purpose.

Within a time line agreed upon by the Executive Committee and the President, the Executive Committee directly or through its appointed ad hoc committee will present the proposed institutional response(s) to the full Senate and will also hold a minimum of two meetings open to the entire academic community. The Executive Committee will report faculty, staff, and student responses, questions, and proposed alternatives to the President at least one week in advance of the internally-established deadline for providing an institutional response to the loss of operational funding.

The institutional response(s) and minutes from the public and committee meetings should be maintained by the university archives, part of the NAU Cline Library.

E.2 REORGANIZATION WITH NO ANTICIPATED RETRENCHMENT

The procedures outlined in the section are intended to apply to an academic reorganization, which is unlikely to result in a loss of faculty and/or involuntary reassignment of faculty to other programs.

Significant Loss of Operating Funds of 5 to 10 Percent
As soon as practicable, but no more than thirty days after the loss of operating funds has been reliably forecast, the President of the university shall inform the Executive Committee of the particulars of the situation. The President shall also ask the deans of the schools and colleges to formulate plans for dealing with the loss of operating funds while also continuing to advance the university's mission.

The Executive Committee shall assume responsibility for ascertaining that the faculty and academic professional senators in each school or college work closely and constructively with the deans on such plans. The senators will provide copies of the proposed plans to the Executive Committee, which will in turn consult with the full Senate. Proposed changes to the plans and/or alternative plans will be communicated to the appropriate dean(s) by the President no more than thirty days from receipt of the original plan by the Executive Committee.

Voluntary Academic Reorganization
Academic reorganizations--e.g., the consolidation of degree programs, the transfer of a degree program from one department to another, the merger of academic units or the creation of new ones--occur continuously in a university that is intellectually vital and responsive to the needs of students and society. When the proposed reorganization originates with the program faculty and does not entail either loss of faculty positions or involuntary reassignments, the relevant faculty shall first seek the approval of the dean(s) of their school or college. If the dean(s) concurs, the proposal will be submitted to the Provost for budgetary implications and consistency with ABOR policies and to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for review of possible impact on other units or programs. The Provost and the Chair of the Faculty Senate will respond to the proponents of the reorganization within sixty days of receipt of the proposal.

F. FACULTY REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR TENURED AND TENURE ELIGIBLE FACULTY WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS IN TWO COLLEGES (09/09/2009)

The following procedures cover tenured and tenure eligible faculty with joint appointments in units located in different colleges. These procedures are to be used for retention/annual review (1st through 5th year faculty), promotion and tenure/annual review, and post-tenure annual review. The procedures only apply to cases where the joint appointment is a formal appointment and at least 40 percent of the appointment is outside of the home college.

RETENTION/ANNUAL REVIEW: 1ST-5TH YEAR FACULTY

TENURE HOME COLLEGE	NON-TENURE HOME COLLEGE
On the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar, the faculty member submits a copy of the professional review file (PRF) with the supporting materials to the chair/director of the unit. The chair/director makes arrangements to keep the supporting materials in a location where they can be reviewed by review committees and administrators in both colleges.	On the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar, the faculty member submits a copy of the professional review file (PRF), minus the supporting materials, to the chair/director of the unit.
The chair/director instructs the unit's Faculty Status Committee (FSC) and Annual Review Committee (ARC) that their review must recognize the faculty member's time is split between two units. The faculty member's review must be based on the percent allocated to the unit, not 100%.	The chair/director instructs the unit's Faculty Status Committee (FSC) and Annual Review Committee (ARC) that their review must recognize the faculty member's time is split between two units. The faculty member's review must be based on the percent allocated to the unit, not 100%.
The unit's FSC and ARC conduct the retention and annual review and send recommendation letters to the faculty, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of both units.	The unit's FSC and ARC conduct the retention and annual review and send recommendation letters to the faculty, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of both units.
If a faculty member wants to respond to the committee letter(s), a written response is sent to the chairs/directors of both units, with a copy sent to the chair of the unit committee(s), within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.	If a faculty member wants to respond to the committee letter(s), a written response is sent to the chairs/directors of both units, with a copy sent to the chair of the unit committee(s), within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.

The chairs/directors of both units conduct the retention and annual review and take into consideration the written response of the faculty if such a response has been submitted. The chairs/directors write a joint recommendation letter that is sent to the faculty, with copies sent to the deans of the two colleges.
If a faculty member wants to respond to the joint review letter from the two unit chairs/directors, a written response is sent to the deans of both colleges, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of the two units, within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar
The deans conduct their retention review and take into consideration the written response of the faculty if such a response has been submitted. The deans write a joint recommendation letter that is sent to the faculty, with copies sent to the Provost and the two unit chairs/directors.

If a faculty wants to respond to the joint recommendation letter from the deans, a written response is sent to the Provost, with copies sent to the two deans, within the time limit specified in COFS.

PROMOTION and TENURE/ANNUAL REVIEW
and
PROMOTION/ANNUAL REVIEW

TENURE HOME COLLEGE	NON-TENURE HOME COLLEGE
On the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar, the faculty member submits a copy of the professional review file (PRF) with the supporting materials to the chair/director of the unit. The chair/director makes arrangements to keep the supporting materials in a location where they can be reviewed by review committees and administrators in both colleges.	On the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar, the faculty member submits a copy of the professional review file (PRF), minus the supporting materials, to the chair/director of the unit.
The chair/director instructs the unit's Faculty Status Committee (FSC) and Annual Review Committee (ARC) that their review must recognize the faculty member's time is split between two units. The faculty member's review must be based on the percent allocated to the unit, not 100%.	The chair/director instructs the unit's Faculty Status Committee (FSC) and Annual Review Committee (ARC) that their review must recognize the faculty member's time is split between two units. The faculty member's review must be based on the percent allocated to the unit, not 100%.
The unit's FSC and ARC conduct the promotion and/or tenure and annual review and send recommendation letters to the faculty, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of both units.	The unit's FSC and ARC conduct the promotion and/or tenure and annual review and send recommendation letters to the faculty, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of both units.
If a faculty member wants to respond to the committee letter(s), a written response is sent to the chairs/directors of both units, with a copy sent to the chair of the unit committee(s), within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.	If a faculty member wants to respond to the committee letter(s), a written response is sent to the chairs/directors of both units, with a copy sent to the chair of the unit committee(s), within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.

The chairs/directors of both units conduct their promotion and/or tenure and annual review and take into consideration the written response of the faculty if such a response has been submitted. The chairs/directors write a joint recommendation letter that is sent to the faculty, with copies sent to the deans of the two colleges.
If a faculty member wants to respond to the joint recommendation letter from the two unit chairs/directors, a written response is sent to the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee of the tenure home college, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of the two units, within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.
The faculty member's PRF and supporting materials are made available to the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee of the tenure home college. The P&T Review Committee conducts their review and takes into consideration the written response of the faculty if such a response has been submitted. The P&T Review Committee writes a recommendation letter that is sent to the faculty, with copies sent to the deans of the two colleges.

If a faculty member wants to respond to the recommendation letter from the P&T Review Committee, a written response is sent to the deans of the two colleges, with a copy sent to the chair of the P&T Review Committee, within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.
The deans conduct their promotion and/or tenure review and take into consideration the written response of the faculty if such a response has been submitted. The deans write a joint recommendation letter that is sent to the faculty, with copies sent to the Provost and the two unit chairs/directors.
If a faculty wants to respond to the joint recommendation letter from the deans, a written response is sent to the Provost, with copies sent to the two deans, within the time limit specified in CoFS.

POST-TENURE ANNUAL REVIEW

TENURE HOME COLLEGE	**NON-TENURE HOME COLLEGE**
On the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar, the faculty member submits a copy of the Annual Performance Report with the supporting materials to the chair/director of the unit. The chair/director makes arrangements to keep the supporting materials in a location where they can be reviewed by review committees and administrators in both colleges.	On the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar, the faculty member submits a copy of the Annual Performance Report, minus the supporting materials, to the chair/director of the unit.
The chair/director instructs the unit's Faculty Status Committee (FSC)/Annual Review Committee (ARC) that their review must recognize the faculty member's time is split between two units. The faculty member's review must be based on the percent allocated to the unit, not 100%.	The chair/director instructs the unit's Faculty Status Committee (FSC)/Annual Review Committee (ARC) that their review must recognize the faculty member's time is split between two units. The faculty is not evaluated as if 100 percent of their time is in the unit. The faculty member's review must be based on the percent allocated to the unit, not 100%.
The unit's FSC/ARC conducts the annual review and sends recommendation letters to the faculty, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of both units.	The unit's FSC/ARC conducts the annual review and sends recommendation letters to the faculty, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of both units.
If a faculty member wants to respond to the committee letter(s), a written response is sent to the chairs/directors of both units, with a copy sent to the chair of the unit committee(s), within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.	If a faculty member wants to respond to the committee letter(s), a written response is sent to the chairs/directors of both units, with a copy sent to the chair of the unit committee(s), within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.

The chairs/directors of both units conduct the annual review and take into consideration the written response of the faculty if such a response has been submitted. The chairs/directors write a joint letter that is sent to the faculty, with copies sent to the deans of the two colleges.
If a faculty member wants to respond to the joint review letter from the two unit chairs/directors, a written response is sent to the deans of both colleges, with copies sent to the chairs/directors of the two units, within the time limit specified in the Personnel Action Calendar