

## **Policies 6-302, 6-303, 6-003 Appendix: Revisions of policies on faculty appointments and related matters**

**Faculty Appointments Policies Proposal-- 2007 (final version, 2007-04-02)**

### **Memorandum**

**To: Senior Vice Presidents David W. Pershing and A. Lorris Betz**

**From: Associate Vice Presidents Susan M. Olson and Richard J. Sperry**

**Date: February 12, 2007**

**THIS DESCRIBES A PROPOSAL FOR REVISING VARIOUS PORTIONS OF UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO MAKING FACULTY APPOINTMENTS.**

#### **I. Background:**

Since June 2005, an ad hoc committee formed at the request of the Academic Senate Executive Committee has been developing this proposal for revising University policies on appointments of faculty and the closely related matter of granting tenure at the time of a faculty appointment.

The project was begun in response to a report made to the Executive Committee by a panel of the Consolidated Hearing Committee. The CHC panel had investigated a complaint about a particular incident in which there were significant misunderstandings between a faculty appointment candidate and the academic department which hired the candidate, and between administrators and the existing faculty of the department. The CHC panel reported to the Executive Committee that the unfortunate misunderstandings in that incident raised broader concerns about a lack of clarity in existing policies and procedures related to faculty appointments. The Executive Committee learned that other problematic incidents had occurred in recent years, raising similar concerns about inadequacy of existing regulations. Most prominently, there were concerns about inadequacy of rules to ensure that administrators consult fully with departmental faculty before committing to the key

terms of a faculty appointment, including the rank and tenure status of the appointment. The Executive Committee charged the ad hoc committee to carefully examine relevant existing policies and procedures, and then to “develop a proposal for revising University regulations so as to provide very clear requirements for the appropriate sequence of events in a hiring process.”

The proposal now being presented fulfills that charge. In addition, in carefully examining existing regulations, the committee identified a number of areas in which existing regulations are inappropriately silent, confusing, contradictory, or more fundamentally incorporate what is simply bad policy. Most of those problems are closely related to the faculty appointments process, and others are more distantly related but appear within the same portions of PPM that will need to be revised for the core of this project, and so included in this proposal are recommendations for resolving that broader set of problems.

Members of the committee were Bob Flores--Chair (Academic Senate President 2005-06, Professor of Law), Susan Olson (Associate V.P. Academic Affairs, Professor of Political Science), Richard Sperry (Assoc. V.P. Health Sciences, Assoc. Dean of Medicine, Professor of Anesthesiology), Joanne Yaffe (Senate Executive Committee Secretary, Assoc. Prof. Social Work), Leslie Francis (Senate Executive Committee, Professor of Law, Professor of Philosophy, Chair of Philosophy), Larry DeVries (Academic Senate President 2004-05, Distinguished Professor of Engineering). Karen Dace (Assoc. V.P. for Diversity, Assoc. Prof. Communication) assisted in limited parts of the project.

## **II. Guiding principles for the proposed revisions:**

- A. Clarity in describing the procedures to be followed, so that all persons involved in making an appointment can with relative ease understand what must be done, by whom, and when. With the degree of clarity achieved if these recommendations are adopted, there will be minimal likelihood of misunderstanding the steps to be taken, and therefore little likelihood of any significant step being overlooked.

- B. Integration of regulations applicable when a particular candidacy involves multiple decisions. For example, when a senior level outside candidate is being considered to receive both an administrative appointment, and a faculty appointment, and being considered for granting of tenure at the time of appointment, there is a need to coordinate three distinct sets of procedures. The proposed revisions would provide a basic level of guidance for such coordinated activities.
  
- C. Comprehensive coverage- so that at least the most important aspects of most appointment proceedings are encompassed in the regulations. In particular, in a few areas the committee found that important, desirable, long-established practices were either entirely unacknowledged in the current regulations, or were mentioned only briefly and sometimes in odd locations. The proposal brings those desirable practices out of the shadows and gives them solid grounding in written regulations.
  
- D. Maintaining an appropriate balance of inclusiveness of various constituencies in decision-making, procedural fairness for all persons involved in appointments proceedings, and administrative ease. It is important on the one hand to ensure that faculty and others in the academic community have ample opportunities to present their views about particular appointments. On the other hand, there are a few situations in which the University is best served by giving administrators flexibility to move expeditiously to complete an appointment. The proposal identifies such situations and provides guidance on how those situations can be managed. In particular, it allows for short term visiting faculty appointments to be made through expedited proceedings, and it allows expedited proceedings for granting of tenure at time of permanent appointment of a senior-level candidate. Also related to the theme of administrative ease, the proposal takes into account the effects of modern technology by recognizing that in some situations voting by committee members can best be managed 'virtually' through electronic mail rather than face-to-face gatherings. However, in each instance in which expediting of procedures is allowed for, the proposal carefully circumscribes such

authorization to ensure against undesirable encroachment on the core principles of inclusion of faculty and others in important decisions.

### III. Highlights of specific changes:

Existing regulations affecting faculty appointments are found in various parts of the Policies and Procedures Manual. The committee identified three distinct major parts of Policies and Procedures Manual that will need to be revised to fully accomplish the mission of clarifying and improving the rules. The three are listed below, with a brief description of the proposed changes affecting each.

#### **Policy and Procedure 6-302** (“Appointments of Faculty”).

Highlights:

- A. New statement of scope, to clarify relationship between this policy for faculty appointments, and other policies for tenure decisions and for administrative appointments, with guidance for cases in which all might be simultaneously applicable, as with a senior-level hire (e.g., an outside hire of a department chair with a faculty appointment and tenure).
- B. Statement of general policy revised to make clear the appointment-related powers of the president, departments, and colleges, with president's ultimate statutory authority in part delegated to departments and colleges through this policy. Includes new footnote describing tailoring of procedures to fit single-department colleges. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section A.1, and -7.](#)
- C. New part to provide basic guidance on appropriate methods of recruiting candidates for appointment, allowing departments great flexibility in selecting recruitment methods, but requiring that recruitment be done in compliance with the University's strong commitment to diversity. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section .A.4.](#)
- D. New requirement that candidates be given “reasonable notice” about the appointments process. This was a core concern driving the revision project-

based on incidents in which candidates reportedly were not being given sufficient information about the process, leading to serious misunderstandings about the status of an appointment. It is drafted in general terms so as to not hamstring administrators, or give rise to lawsuits, as might occur if the policy dictated details of precisely how such notice should be given. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section 1.A.6.](#)

- E. Clarified rule for determining voting membership of departmental faculty appointments advisory committees. Allows for existing auxiliary faculty to be included as members for limited purposes of considering other auxiliary candidacies. Clarifies that the department chair leads meetings of the committee, but that neither the department chair nor any higher administrator who holds a faculty appointment within the department is allowed to vote within the committee. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section B.](#)
- F. New part allowing for 'electronic meetings' of departmental committees under some circumstances, for administrative ease. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section 1.B.](#)
- G. Important change-new rules on use of secret or open ballots for departmental faculty appointments committee voting. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section C.1.](#)
- H. Important change-giving junior faculty a greater role in appointments of senior-level candidates. Sets up a two-step procedure for such senior-level appointments, first having all regular faculty (including those of lower rank than is proposed for the candidate) vote on a threshold question of the general suitability of the candidate, and then having only the senior-level faculty vote on whether a senior-level rank is appropriate for the candidate. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section C.2](#)

- I. Clarified rule that colleges have the option to establish college-level appointments advisory committees. Describes basic parameters for creating such committees. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section D](#)
- J. Clarified rule empowering department chairs to make short-term visiting appointments without formal consultation with the departmental advisory committees when circumstances make such formalities overly burdensome. This eliminates some potentially troublesome vagueness in the existing policy. [Policy and Procedures 6-302, Section G](#).

**Policy and Procedure 6-303** (“Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews”).

Highlights:

- A. Important change-- new part codifying existing practices with expedited procedures for making tenure decisions in cases involving 'hiring with tenure.' The streamlined procedures allow moving quickly to extend an offer of a faculty appointment with tenure to a highly sought-after senior level candidate (while ensuring adequate consultation within department and college, and with UPTAC). Such practices have been widely used, although existing policy only very vaguely referred to the possible use of such expedited procedures, and gave almost no guidance on when they would be applicable or what steps should be followed, and the relevant passages were hidden in obscure parts of PPM. The proposed revision consolidates the relevant contents into one new part, and gives clear guidance on when and how to use the authority for expedited procedures. As compared to ordinary tenure decisions involving 'in-house' candidates, these 'hiring-with-tenure' procedures are greatly streamlined, including eliminating opportunities for time-consuming appeals. [Policy and Procedures 6-303, Section K](#)
- B. Important change to membership of departmental RPT advisory committees. Revised so that for all decisions on tenure (including hiring with tenure and in-house candidates for tenure), and all decisions on formal retention, the voting

membership would consist solely of the tenured faculty, regardless of rank. The existing rules on voting rights of committee members are overly complicated, set poor policy, and likely are so poorly understood that they have not been consistently complied with. They allowed voting on tenure or retention by some persons who are themselves not tenured, and precluded voting by some tenured persons because their rank is lower than the rank of the candidate. This revised simplified policy would affect both the tenure-at-hiring cases which are the main focus of the proposed revisions, and also all other tenure and formal retention decisions. [Policy and Procedures 6-303, Section A.3.a.i](#), & iii. and [Policy and Procedures 6-303, Section K](#).

- C. Important new part, to provide limited guidance on how colleges should structure the membership of college-level RPT advisory committees. The existing rules do presume that college-level committees might exist, but provide no guidance whatsoever on how such committees should be structured. The new part would explicitly require that each college establish a college-level RPT committee, and would set out basic parameters to be considered in structuring such committees. This change would affect the function of college-level committees both for the tenure-at-hiring cases which are the main focus of the proposed revisions, and also all other tenure decisions. [Policy and Procedures 6-303, Section G.1](#)

**Policy and Procedure 6-003** (“Areas of Responsibility of College Councils”).

The main principle for the proposal is to remove from this part of PPM certain language that does not belong here, because it purports to govern procedures for faculty appointments, and those should be controlled solely by the proposed revised contents of [Policy and Procedures 6-302](#). As long as revisions are being considered for [6-003](#), it is appropriate to also propose other improvements which are not directly related to faculty appointments.

Highlights:

- A. Removal of existing language in [6-003, Section 2.B.1](#) purporting to regulate faculty appointments procedures, and instead inserting similar provisions into the newly revised [Policies and Procedures 6-302](#) and [6-303](#), as described above.
- B. Important change-- to clarify the structure of college councils, and clarify who is empowered to choose that structure. Existing policy gave very little guidance. The revised policy would clarify that it is the regular faculty of the college who determine how a council is structured, within parameters requiring that majority power within a council must always be held by regular faculty, and that other persons may be included (including representatives of auxiliary faculty, students, staff). [Policy and Procedures 6-003, Section 2](#) (C).] [Note: By decision of the Senate April 2, the proposed changes to Part C were tabled and referred to an ad hoc committee for further study, with a revised proposal expected to be brought forward again in fall 2007.

#### IV. Further Details-Drafting Notes:

The drafting committee created an extensive set of 'drafting notes' explaining each significant change included in the proposal. A separate document with those notes is available as an appendix to the proposal documents.

---

--end--

Marked up version of changes to Policy 9-5

**Policy 6-302 (Faculty Appts) final version, 2007-04-02.]**

**Policy: 6-302 Rev: 4& 5**

**Date: ~~March 8, 1999~~ & Effective July 1, 2007**



## Faculty Regulations - Section 1

### Subject: Appointments, Retention, Promotion and Tenure

#### Section 1. Appointments of Faculty

Scope: This policy governs all appointments of faculty (regular and auxiliary, of any rank), including annual appointments after retirement.

It is not intended to be the primary regulation for appointment of administrative officers, as such. In instances in which a candidate is being appointed as an administrative officer and contemporaneously being considered for a faculty appointment, reference should be made to both this section governing the faculty appointment process, and to those regulations and statutes applicable to appointments of administrative officers, including [Policy and Procedure 2-005 (authority of President for appointment of administrative officers)]; [Policy and Procedure 6-311 Section 5 (retention and tenure status for faculty serving as administrators)], [State Board of Regents Policy 205 (Regents' power to appoint president)], and [Utah Code - 53B-2-102 & 106 (Regents' power to appoint president, president's power to make all other administrative appointments with approval of Board of Trustees)].

This policy is not intended to regulate the process of granting of tenure. In instances in which a candidate is being considered for granting of tenure contemporaneously with being initially appointed to a faculty position (commonly referred to as hiring with tenure), reference should be made to both this policy governing the faculty appointment process and to those policies applicable to the granting of tenure (primarily [Policy and Procedure 6-303], and also including [Policy and Procedure 6-311.2(B)].)

#### A. General Policies

1. The president of the university, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, shall appoint has final authority to appoint members of the faculty ~~the administrative officers~~ and faculty. [Utah Code Ann. 53B-2-106 (2001); PPM 8-4] ~~53-48-15(1) (1970)~~. The president's authority to initiate the process of

- making such appointments is delegated to the affected departments and colleges as described in this policy, and procedures are established here for presenting the president with recommendations from faculty within those departments and colleges.
2. Criteria for appointment to faculty positions shall be determined by each department's ~~faculties, not~~ faculty appointments advisory committee (as defined here) and shall not be inconsistent with the approved criteria formulated for use in retention, promotion, and tenure reviews. See [Policy and Procedure 6-303.] The criteria may should take into account and accord appropriate weight to the objective of developing a faculty with diverse educational backgrounds, varying intellectual experiences, and broadly ranging academic interests. ~~However, t~~ The fact that an otherwise qualified candidate for appointment received one or more degrees from the University of Utah does not, ~~by itself,~~ disqualify that candidate from appointment to a faculty position. Nor does prior service as an auxiliary faculty member in any way disqualify a candidate for appointment to the regular faculty.
  3. Each ~~regular faculty~~ appointment to any regular faculty position and rank, ~~and/or the granting of tenure,~~ shall be dependent upon the availability of reliable funding as determined by the president.
  4. The chairperson of each department, in consultation with the department's faculty appointments advisory committee may determine the appropriate methods of recruiting candidates to be considered for faculty positions. Recruitment methods shall be consistent with the University's strong commitment to equal opportunity and diversity. Such methods may, and for appointments of regular faculty ordinarily will, include formation of a representative and diverse search committee, including members of the department faculty and when appropriate nonfaculty and representatives from outside the department. Administrative officers charged with overseeing the

- University's commitment to equal opportunity and diversity are available to assist departments in developing appropriate recruitment methods.
5. The principle of consultation with faculty should be observed to the fullest extent possible, consistent with efficient management of appointments. As described in greater detail in the following subsections, recommendations for appointments should be initiated at the departmental level and subsequently submitted to the dean of the college, the faculty appointments advisory committee of the college in certain cases, and the cognizant senior vice president, before presentation to the president.
  6. Candidates for appointment to faculty positions should be given reasonable notice about the University procedures that will be followed for consideration of such appointments, including the roles to be played by advisory committees and administrators.
  7. Whenever it is proposed that a candidate be considered for immediate granting of tenure contemporaneously with an initial appointment to the faculty, there must be compliance with both this policy regarding appointments and all University policies regarding granting of tenure, including [Policy and Procedure 6-303.K].

B. Department faculty appointments advisory committee

1. In each department, there shall be a departmental faculty appointments advisory committee. The committee membership shall include all of the regular faculty, consisting of the professors, associate professors and assistant professors (both tenured and tenure-eligible), except as follows. ~~shall be members of a department appointments advisory committee.~~ The chairperson of the department shall serve as chairperson of the committee but shall not vote on actions of the committee. Deans, and other administrative officials who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity, and who hold regular faculty

appointments within the department, may attend meetings and participate in discussions, but shall not vote on actions of the committee. If approved by a majority of the regular faculty, other interested persons, who may include auxiliary faculty, regular faculty from outside the department, staff, students, and community representatives, may be allowed to participate in discussions with the committee, but shall not vote on actions of the committee.

Current auxiliary faculty (as described in [Policy and Procedure 6-300.4]) may be allowed to serve as voting members of the departmental committee for particular cases involving appointments to auxiliary faculty positions, if (a) the cognizant college council has adopted a policy allowing such participation of auxiliary faculty for departments within the college, and (b) a majority of the regular faculty of the department has approved the inclusion of auxiliary faculty on the committee either by continuing policy or for purposes of a particular appointment decision. Whenever any auxiliary faculty are made members of the committee for purposes of a particular appointment recommendation, the department chairperson shall include a description of such participation in the written report transmitted to the dean of the college provided for in Part D of this policy.

2. Ordinarily, meetings of the committee shall be conducted with members physically present at the meeting site. When the chairperson determines that circumstances make such a meeting impractical for a majority of eligible members, voting may be conducted through telephone, electronic mail, or similar means of communication. Such alternative voting methods should be used only rarely and in exigent circumstances for appointments of regular faculty, but may be used as a matter of course for other appointments. The chairperson of the committee shall provide members with as much notice as is practicable under the circumstances of the intent to conduct voting through such an alternative method.

3. A quorum of the department faculty appointments advisory committee shall consist of two-thirds of the members entitled to vote (as provided for in paragraphs B(1) and C(2) of this policy ~~see paragraph C(2) infra~~), except that any member unable to ~~attend~~ participate in the meeting because of formal leave of absence or ~~physical disability~~ medical condition shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum.
4. Whenever practicable, the ~~department~~ chairperson shall advise each eligible member on leave or otherwise absent and unable to participate in the meeting of the proposed action and shall request his/her written opinion and vote. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed during at the meeting, and their votes will be recorded and counted the same as other votes. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting during at which a vote is taken by the committee. ~~and their written vote shall be recorded separately in the report of the meeting.~~

C. Action by the department faculty appointments advisory committee

1. The department chairperson shall convene and chair the department faculty appointments advisory committee at appropriate times to consider proposed appointments. ~~, including annual appointments after retirement.~~
  - a. All committee deliberations and votes are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law. By majority vote the committee may at any time move to executive session, from which some or all nonvoting participants may be excluded to ensure such confidentiality.
  - b. Committee votes on specific candidates shall presumptively be conducted by secret ballot. However any such vote shall instead be conducted by open ballot if the voting members of the committee, through a secret ballot taken at or before the meeting, unanimously determine that open balloting is appropriate under the circumstances for any particular vote.

- c. In all cases when the committee uses secret ballots, and any individual member's vote is submitted in written form because the individual is an absentee voter, or because voting is conducted through electronic mail or other alternative means (as permitted under part B-(2) of this policy), that member's vote shall be treated as made by secret ballot unless otherwise authorized by the member.
2. After full consideration and discussion, ~~a vote of the committee members holding a rank equal to or higher than that proposed for the candidate for appointment shall be taken on each candidate who is nominated for appointment.~~ the votes of the committee members shall be taken as follows, for each candidate considered: First, all members of the committee shall vote on a recommendation as to the making of the appointment generally, with the appointment to be made carrying at least the lowest rank applicable for the type of position being filled. Second, if it is proposed that the appointment be made at any higher rank, then there shall be a separate vote taken among only those members holding a rank equivalent to or higher than the proposed appointment rank, and they shall vote on a recommendation as to that specified higher rank. For example, with an appointment proposed at the rank of associate professor, the assistant professor members of the committee shall participate with other members in the first vote--producing a recommendation regarding appointment with at least the rank of assistant professor, and then only the associate and full professors shall participate in a second vote on recommending that the appointment carry the higher rank of associate professor.

D. Action by department chairperson

1. Subsequent to receiving the recommendations of the department faculty appointments advisory committee Tthe department chairperson shall prepare a written recommendation on the appointment of each candidate, and if the recommendation of the chairperson differs from the recommendations of the

- committee with regard to the appointment generally or the specific rank of the appointment, the chairperson shall state specifically the reasons for such difference. ~~stating specifically the reasons for a recommendation contrary to the vote of the department appointments advisory committee.~~
2. The department chairperson shall then transmit to the dean of the college a written report of the action of the department faculty appointments advisory committee, including a tabulation of the votes taken, together with his/her the chairperson's recommendations. ~~to the dean of the college.~~
- E. Action by dean and college advisory committee
1. The college council of each college shall adopt a policy determining: a) whether the college will maintain a standing college faculty appointments advisory committee, b) which faculty of the college the committee members shall be drawn from, and c) what role such committee shall have in making recommendations with respect to appointments of regular or other faculty. [See Policy and Procedure 6-003.] If there is no college policy providing for a standing faculty appointments advisory committee applicable to a particular type of appointment, the dean of the college may act without further consultation with faculty of the college, or may ask another appropriate standing college committee or an ad hoc committee to study further any individual proposed appointment. The dean of the college shall consider the recommendations of the department faculty appointments advisory committee, and the department chairperson, and the college committee, if any. ~~may, at his/her discretion, ask an appropriate college committee or an ad hoc committee to study further any individual candidate for appointment.~~
  2. The dean shall then prepare his/her written recommendations, together with reasons therefor, and forward the entire file to the cognizant senior vice president ~~for academic affairs.~~

F. Action by cognizant senior vice president ~~for academic affairs~~, president, and Senate

1. The vice president ~~for academic affairs~~ shall review the previous action on candidates for appointment and may, at his/her ~~the vice president's~~ discretion, require further clarification of individual cases.
2. The vice president ~~for academic affairs~~ shall then forward the entire file with a recommendation, where appropriate, to the president.
3. The president shall then inform the Academic Senate of proposed appointments to the faculty. If a majority of the Senate objects to any proposed appointment, the objection shall be referred to the Executive Committee of the Senate for investigation and review. The Executive Committee shall prepare a report, and shall transmit its report to the president. See [Policy and Procedure 6-001.2].
4. The president shall then submit such candidates as the president shall determine for appointment to the Board of Trustees for approval at its next meeting ~~unless there is objection to any of these recommendations by a majority of the Senate~~ and shall include a copy of the Executive Committee's investigation report in cases of objection by the majority of the Senate.
- ~~5. Objections shall be referred to the Executive Committee of the senate for investigation and review, and the report of the Executive Committee shall be transmitted by the president to the Board of Trustees.~~

G. Provisional appointments of visiting faculty

1. Provisional nontenured appointments of visiting faculty for a duration up to one year ~~may~~ shall be made by the procedures outlined in this policy section, except that for such appointments ~~the recommendations of the department appointments advisory committee and the college advisory committee are not necessary in advance.~~ if the chairperson of the department determines that



circumstances require the use of expedited procedures, then such appointments may be made without advance consultation with either the department faculty appointments advisory committee or college appointments advisory committee. In such cases, members of the department faculty appointments advisory committee shall be notified of the appointment as soon as practicable. The continuation beyond one year of any appointment initially made by such expedited procedures

2. ~~However, these committees shall be notified, and the continuation of such an appointment beyond one year shall not be permitted until the full procedures outlined herein in parts A-F of this policy shall have been carried out. See the definition of visiting faculty given in [Policy and Procedure 6-300.4( D)(5)].~~

#### H. Appointments initiated by dean or president's office

1. The delegation of authority for initiation of appointments to the faculty, referred to in Part A-1, shall not prevent any dean or the cognizant vice president ~~for academic affairs~~ or the president from initiating appointments when, in their judgment, the best interest of the university will be served by doing so.
2. In the event the president, vice president ~~for academic affairs~~, or a dean initiates an appointment, the proposed action shall first be referred to the appropriate department appointments advisory committee and thereafter the procedures described in Parts A-G of this policy, as appropriate, shall be followed. ~~where the procedure described above shall be then followed in considering the proposed appointment, including written reports with stated findings and reasons where feasible and appropriate, submitted through the stated channels to the president.~~

---

Approved: University Academic Senate ~~2/1/99~~ April 2, 2007

Board of Trustees ~~3/8/99~~ \_\_\_\_\_, 2007

To take effect, as revised, July 1, 2007

---

1. This policy has no application to appointments for positions which carry classroom teaching responsibilities but are not faculty positions, including associate instructors, teaching fellows, and similar positions. See [Policy and Procedure 6-309]
2. In cases involving such contemporaneous consideration of a candidate for initial faculty appointment, and administrative appointment, and/or granting of tenure, the responsibilities and procedures described here and in other pertinent regulations must be coordinated appropriately, including as follows.

For appointment of an academic dean, department chairperson, vice president, or other administrative officer who is also to be considered for a faculty appointment, the search and the administrative appointment should be conducted in accord with [Policy and Procedure 2-005](search originates with president or cognizant vice president, who shall arrange for faculty input). Once that search has produced one or more candidates for a faculty appointment, consideration of the faculty appointment must proceed as prescribed in this policy, including presentation of the candidate to appropriate representatives of the affected department/college for their recommendations.

In the case of appointment of the president of the University who is also to be considered for a faculty appointment, the search and the administrative appointment should be conducted in accord with procedures of the Board of Regents, and when the search has produced a candidate for faculty appointment, consideration of the faculty appointment must proceed as prescribed in this policy, including presentation of the candidate to appropriate representatives of the affected department/college for their recommendations, and those recommendations must be presented to the cognizant vice president

and interim or acting president, and then to the Board of Trustees for final decision.

3. In instances in which a candidate is being considered for granting of tenure contemporaneously with being initially appointed to a faculty position (i.e., hiring with tenure), whether or not the candidate is also being considered for an administrative appointment, the process of granting of tenure should be conducted in accord with [Policy and Procedure 6-303], and the process of making the faculty appointment must be conducted in accord with this policy. Inasmuch as there are certain differences between the procedures required for each decision, care should be taken to ensure that the procedural requirements for each are satisfied, in addition to ensuring that the appropriate substantive criteria are employed for each decision.

Procedurally, at the departmental level, the department chairperson must serve as chairperson of the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (as provided in this section), yet cannot serve as chairperson of the Tenure Advisory Committee (See [Policy and Procedure 6-303.B(3)(b)]). The makeup of each advisory committee may also differ in certain circumstances (compare this policy to [Policy and Procedure 6-303.B(3)(a)(iii)]). Therefore, the respective chairpersons of each committee should ensure that only eligible voters participate in each decision.

At the college level, for purposes of faculty appointments (with or without contemporaneous granting of tenure), each college has the option of having candidates reviewed by a college-level Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (as provided in this section). For granting of tenure however, review by the college-level Tenure Advisory Committee is mandatory (as provided in [Policy and Procedure 6-303.G(1)(b)]). There should be coordination of these differing college-level proceedings in cases involving contemporaneous candidacy for an initial faculty appointment and granting of tenure (i.e., hiring with tenure).

Subsequent to the college-level review, there are different procedures to be followed for the tenure granting decision (most importantly review by the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, per [Policy and Procedure 6-303.H]), and the faculty appointment decision (described here), for which there is no equivalent of UPTAC).

4. The regulations stated here in [6-302] are stated in terms appropriate for the most widely adopted form of organizational structure, in which a faculty appointment is made in a subdivision known as an “academic department,” which is organized together with related subdivisions in a parent “college.” There are several variations in organizational structure relevant to appointments of faculty, as explained in [Policy and Procedure 2-004.1(Academic Organization)].

These regulations in [6-303] shall be interpreted for appropriate adaptation to accommodate such relevant variations in organizational structure, including the following.

- a. Where necessary, the term “department” shall refer to an academic subdivision within a parent college, which operates as equivalent to a department but is known by another name, including any “free-standing division” or “school.” See [Policy and Procedure 2-004.4].
- b. Where necessary, the term “college” shall refer to an academic organization which operates as equivalent to a college, but is known by another name, including a “school.” See [Policy and Procedure 2-004.1].
- c. For colleges that have no formal internal academic subdivisions (known commonly as 'single-department colleges' or 'nondepartmentalized colleges'), faculty appointments are made to positions in the college. See [Policy and Procedure 2-004.1]. Accordingly, the procedures described here for development of criteria, conducting recruiting, and making appointments shall be modified appropriately, including as follows:

- i. Formulation of criteria for appointments, described here in [6-302.1(A)(2)], shall be conducted within the college.
- ii. The functions described throughout [6-302] as being performed by a department-level faculty appointments advisory committee shall instead be performed by a standing college faculty appointments advisory committee. The description of the membership and leadership of the committee shall be interpreted to include appropriate modifications, including that committee members shall be drawn from the college faculty, the regular faculty of the college shall determine in each instance whether auxiliary faculty shall be members of the committee for purposes of a particular appointment, and the college dean will be the non-voting chair of the committee.
- iii. The functions described throughout [6-303] as being performed by a department chair shall be performed by the college dean, including such activities as determining recruitment methods, arranging for and chairing meetings of the advisory committee, preparing recommendations, and transmitting written reports to the vice president.
- iv. The actions described here in [6-303.E] and elsewhere as being performed by a college dean and college-level advisory committee after recommendations are made at the departmental level shall be inapplicable. Instead, appointments recommendations from a single-department college shall be transmitted directly to the cognizant vice president.