

**Appeal Summary Form**  
**To the University RPT Standards and Appeals Committee (Policy 6-305)**

Name of Party Bringing Appeal: \_\_\_\_\_  
Addresses: University: \_\_\_\_\_ Home: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone #: University: \_\_\_\_\_ Home: \_\_\_\_\_  
Fax #: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Party's Standing** (check one):

☐ Candidate      ☐ Dept. SAC      ☐ Dept. Faculty Advisory Committee  
☐ Dept. Chair      ☐ College Dean      ☐ Vice President

If a joint appeal is filed, separate Appeal Summary Forms should be completed by each party. However, one party may indicate s/he/they adopt the statements included in the other party's Appeal.

**Summary of Appeal.**

Indicate whether the complaint is **Procedural** or **Substantive** (or both) by checking which of one(s) apply.

Complete summary/summaries that apply:

A. ☐ **Procedural.** Party appealing contends that the procedures followed at any stage of the formal RPT review process were not consistent with university regulations and contained substantial defects so that party was denied basic fairness and due process. Party asserting a procedural violation must prove it by a preponderance of the evidence (more likely than not). **Summarize** these claims here:

1. State what the relevant procedures are and where they are written:

2. State what was done that party believes was inconsistent with these required procedures:

3. Explain why party believes these procedural errors denied the party basic fairness and due process:

B. ☐ **Substantive.** Party appealing contends that the recommendation of the cognizant V.P. is based upon grounds that are arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable or is discriminatory with respect to criteria which are legally impermissible. Party asserting a substantive violation must prove it by clear and convincing evidence (a higher burden than a preponderance of the evidence) as the recommendation of the Provost/VP is presumed to be in the best interests of the University. **Summarize** these here:

1. State which grounds used by the Provost/VP party believes were "arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable" and explain:

2. State whether party believes the Provost's/VP's recommendation was based upon illegal discrimination (e.g. race, sex, age, religion, handicap, sexual orientation), identify the basis of that discrimination, and describe the evidence of discrimination:

C. ☐ **Other Procedures.** Has party complained about any of the above-described problems to another Committee, office or administrator? ☐ Yes      ☐ No. If so, state to whom: