

Grievance hearing should not be elected but 10 names submitted by both – 4 struck by other side
Discrim committee should not be elected but must have member of discrim group on it.

Suggested changes to the Faculty Handbook:

Section III

Section IV

Section V

Document II

Document III

Document X

Document XI

Document XII

Document XV

Document XVI

Document XXI

Document XXIX

Document XXXI

Document XXXV

Document XXXVII

Appendix B

DRAFT

Changes

1. To be added to the faculty handbook, Section III, at the end of the subsection entitled Faculty Salaries:

When the budget allows, faculty members will receive yearly raises. Raises are of four types which are given in the following order.

Market Adjustments

Every year that monies are available, existing faculty salaries will be reviewed by the Human Resources Department and adjusted, if deemed necessary by the President, in consultation with the Provost, so as to be competitive with other universities.

Merit Raises

Every year that monies are available, merit raises will be awarded on the basis of merit evaluations which are to be undertaken on a yearly basis and will include three categories of merit; research and scholarship, teaching and service each receiving a score from 0 to 5, Five (5) being the best. See Section V and Document XXI below.

University Service

From time to time, at the discretion of the Provost and the president of the University, raises will be awarded for exemplary University service.

College Service

From time to time, at the discretion of the deans and with the approval of the Provost and the president, raises will be awarded for exemplary service to one's college.

2. The paragraph, "See Appendix A, Document XII for the latest rules regarding the use of travel funds and the limits permitted for lodging and meals." In section III, under the heading "Travel Allowances" should be replaced with the contents of Document XII. All following documents in appendix A should have their numeral reduced by one.
3. In section III at the end of the first paragraph under the heading "University Budget" the words, "It is at this point that dollar values are attached to merit raise categories." Should be replaced with, "It is at this point that the four categories of faculty raises are calculated."
4. In section IV, under the heading Academic Freedom, the phrase "1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom" which appears in quotes should be replaced with the proper title of the document: "1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure With 1970 Interpretive Comments".
5. The contents of section IV under "Research Policies" should be replaced with the contents of document XXIII which should be deleted. All following documents in appendix A should have their numeral reduced by one.
6. Section V, under the heading "Regular Continuing Faculty", in the subsection "Non-Tenure-Track Appointments" should be modified to reflect recent changes which have resulted in three kinds of instructors.
7. **[Recommended Policy Change by the Provost]** In section V, under the heading "Probationary Period" in the second paragraph, the words "but application for tenure and promotion will not usually be considered simultaneously. An Assistant Professor applying for tenure shall not apply for promotion in the same period, except in the most

unusual cases.” should be replaced with, “Application for tenure and promotion will usually be considered simultaneously.”

8. Section V, “Performance Evaluation and Merit Pay” should be replaced with:

Performance Evaluation and Merit Pay

The University conducts an annual performance evaluation which rates a faculty member's performance. A faculty member's department head or immediate supervisor, sometimes with the assistance of a departmental personnel committee, evaluates that person's performance in the areas of teaching, research and professional activities, and university and community service. The department head's evaluation is ultimately reviewed by the dean of the college and by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, both of whom may adjust the faculty member's overall evaluation relative to other members of the college or the University.

The evaluation instrument used in each college may vary slightly, but the general procedure and aims of the process are similar. The evaluation instrument, which a faculty member completes in January each year, summarizes the person's activities for the preceding calendar year. Faculty members are judged on the basis of their overall merit in all activity areas. At the department level, all faculty are ultimately scored in the three primary workload components; Teaching, research and service, separately. Scores in the three components are then weighted (multiplied) by the percentage of their workload each component comprises (see Appendix A, Document XXI). The rating scale includes scores of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0. The characteristics of faculty performance for each merit score are delineated below:

- 5 = Distinctive/Exemplary Performance. Distinction, requiring extraordinary productivity and performance that is not expected to be replicated on an annual basis.
- 4 = Exceeds expectations. High quality performance/productivity that could be sustained on an annual basis.
- 3 = Meets expectations. Good performance/productivity that could be strengthened and still sustained on an annual basis.
- 2 = Does not meet expectations. Requires improvement in one or more areas.
- 1 = Poor performance. Requires significant improvement in one or more areas.
- 0 = Unacceptable

An aggregate (weighted) rating of 2 or less, twice in any consecutive three-year period indicates continuing serious problems that must be addressed by the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. A faculty member who scores 1 or less, two consecutive years or three times in a five-year period is subject to a formal remediation process, as delineated in *Remediation Procedures for UL Lafayette Personnel with Category 5 Merit Evaluations* (Document XXXV in the *Faculty Handbook*, which should be renamed “*Remediation Procedures for UL Lafayette Personnel with Merit Score 1 or less Merit Evaluations*”).

Following their evaluation and scoring process, individual departments submit their results to the dean of their college, who must review the results and integrate the merit scores of the departments in that college. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs integrates the scores of all University faculty. Ultimately, salary increases awarded by the University are

based on these merit scores and are generally awarded at the beginning of the academic year. However, the dollar amount of the raises cannot be set until the Legislature allocates funds to higher education (usually in the Summer) and the Board of Supervisors approves the University's proposed operating budget (usually in August).

9. ***[Recommended change in policy]*** In section V, under "Non-Reappointment"/"Tenured Academic Appointments"

"Cause for discharge, termination of contract or demotion in rank shall consist of conduct seriously prejudicial to the University such as infractions of law or commonly accepted standards of morality, failure to follow orders, violation of institutional or Board rules and regulations, willful neglect of duty, inefficiency or incompetence."
Should be changed to:

"Cause for discharge, termination of contract or demotion in rank shall consist of conduct seriously prejudicial to the University such as serious infractions of law or extreme violations of morality, failure to follow orders which do not infringe upon academic freedom, violation of institutional or Board rules and regulations, willful neglect of duty, extreme inefficiency or extreme incompetence."

10. ***[Recommended change in policy]*** In section V, under "Other Employment"/"Summer and Intersession Employment at the University" at the end of the first paragraph, the sentence: "Pay for summer and intersession classes is on a per-course basis and is not a percentage of the faculty member's nine-month salary." Should be changed to: "Pay for intersession classes is on a per-course basis and is not a percentage of the faculty member's nine-month salary. Pay for a full time load of summer classes, however, is 3/9 of a faculty member's nine-month salary."

11. ***[Recommended change in policy]*** In section V under "Faculty Responsibilities"/"Service on Committees" the first paragraph

"The President appoints members of standing and special faculty committees. Each spring a list of committees to be staffed for the next academic year is distributed. All faculty members are asked to consider volunteering their services. Faculty members who answer the call are considered for membership on committees they request."

Should be changed to align with AAUP policy documents to:

"With the exception of the University Committees listed in Appendix B, the President appoints members of standing and special faculty committees. Each spring a list of committees to be staffed for the next academic year is distributed. All faculty members are asked to consider volunteering their services. Faculty members who answer the call are considered for membership on committees they request."

And the third paragraph:

"The Faculty Senate has a special interest in some of the University Committees listed in Appendix B and will therefore elect their membership. Annually the Committee on Committees shall prepare a slate of nominees for this purpose and shall submit it to the Senate for approval. The slate for each committee shall contain as many names as there are vacancies on the committee. Following Senate approval, the slate of nominees shall be forwarded to the President for use in appointing members of the committees. For a list of University committees to which the Senate nominates members, please see the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws."

Should be changed to correspond with the AAUP policy documents and current practice to:

“The Faculty Senate has a special interest in some of the University Committees listed in Appendix B and will therefore elect their membership. Annually the Committee on Committees shall prepare a slate of nominees for this purpose and shall submit it to the Senate which will vote on the candidates for each position. The slate for each committee shall contain at least two (2) candidates for each open position on each committee. For a list of University committees to which the Senate elects members, please see the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws.”

[The Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws must also be changed accordingly.]

12. Fix computer denial Document III at the end. (What about moodle or web-aid?)

13. **[Recommended change in policy]** Appendix A Document X in the introduction, the last paragraph:

“The principal vehicle for this faculty involvement is the Program Review Committee, a standing university committee. Membership on the Committee will consist of a tenured representative of each academic college and the library, with members serving a three-year term. Nominations of members for this Committee will be initiated through the Faculty Senate, which will advance at least two nominees for each position. The President and Provost will select the membership from the Faculty Senate list of nominees. The Provost or his/her designee will also serve on the Committee.”

Should be changed to:

“The principal vehicle for this faculty involvement is the Program Review Committee, a standing university committee. Membership on the Committee will consist of a tenured representative of each academic college and the library, with members serving a three-year term. Nominations of members for this Committee will be initiated through the Faculty Senate, which will elect its members. The Provost or his/her designee will also serve on the Committee.”

14. **[Recommended change in policy]** Appendix A Document X under “I Criteria for Academic Program Review and Discontinuance” item “G” “program revenue and cost“ is not appropriate except under a declaration of financial exigency and should be stricken.

15. Appendix A Document XI, under the heading “C. Coverage”, the last sentence, “This policy protects men and women equally from sexual harassment, including same-sex harassment, and protects students from harassment by other students.” Should be changed to, “This policy protects men and women equally from sexual harassment, including same-sex harassment, and protects faculty, students and staff from harassment by faculty, staff or students.”

16. Deletion on web of I in Document XI?

17. Appendix A, Document XII, “UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT LAFAYETTE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY” should be examined and brought into line with the AAUP “Statement on Copyright” adopted June 1999, by someone with more legal training than me.
18. Appendix A, Document XV, under “Definitions”/”Testing Designated Positions”, reference is made to an “Appendix D Presidential Option” which does not appear in the appendices. Such an appendix should be drafted (or found) Keeping in mind that the courts have outlawed suspicionless drug and alcohol testing of university faculty and our policy must follow that precedent.
19. In Appendix A, Document XV, “ADDENDUM TO EMPLOYEE (FACULTY & STAFF) ALCOHOL & DRUG POLICY”/” University of Louisiana at Lafayette Drug Testing Policy Revised May 2010” reference is made to [“http://www.safety.louisiana.edu/Policy/Eighth%20edition/Sec15%20employee%20drug%20testing%20policy%208th%20ed.pdf”](http://www.safety.louisiana.edu/Policy/Eighth%20edition/Sec15%20employee%20drug%20testing%20policy%208th%20ed.pdf) which has suffered link rot. The appropriate link is [“http://www.safety.louisiana.edu/sites/safety/files/EmployeeDrugTestingPolicyJanuary2013_0.pdf”](http://www.safety.louisiana.edu/sites/safety/files/EmployeeDrugTestingPolicyJanuary2013_0.pdf). Other links that appear in the Faculty Handbook may also have suffered link rot and should be verified.
20. Appendix A, Document XVI, under “Travel” the mileage rate of \$.30 is in need of update.
21. Appendix A, Document XVI, under “Registration” reference is made to a “telephone registration system”. Is there such a thing? Don’t we mean ULink?
22. In Appendix A, Document XVI, under **Textbooks**, the language “Texts used in off-campus sections are the same as those used for on-campus sections. If more than one text is used by multi-section on-campus courses, the instructor may choose the one he/she prefers to use after consultation with the academic department head.” should be stricken since the choice of texts is the instructor’s.
23. In Appendix A, Document XVI, under “**Dupre Library**” are these hours correct?
24. **[Recommended change in policy]** All but the last paragraph in Document XXI, the section on “Faculty Workload Tracks” should be replaced with:

Faculty Workload Tracks

The University takes its primary responsibilities to be the advancement of knowledge through research, the extension of knowledge through teaching and service to the University, the college, the department and the community. These are, therefore, the primary components of the workload of all faculty members and the main descriptors of the University’s expectations of faculty.

The minimum weight assigned to each of these primary components will be determined for each faculty member, in consultation with his/her department head and dean and approved by the Provost.

The primary factor determining the minimum weight of each component is the mission of the department and/or college in which they reside. While special circumstances may allow a modification of this general principle in the case of some faculty, faculty work within the context of the goals and purposes of the department and college in which they reside. Thus, faculty who staff departments which offer undergraduate degrees should expect to direct more of their effort to scheduled instruction than those in departments offering graduate degrees. Consequently, a

higher minimum weight will generally be assigned to teaching, for such faculty. Faculty in graduate degree-granting areas will be held to a higher expectation of *visible* research and scholarly productivity. Consequently, a higher minimum weight will generally be assigned to research, for such faculty. It is quite possible that faculty in a department with multiple roles (e.g., teaching a large contingent of undergraduate majors, teaching general education “service” courses, engaging in significant externally-funded research, and/or preparing doctoral candidates) will be assigned different component minimums.

It is important to note that descriptions of workload expectations do not equate to subsequent performance evaluation; performance evaluation is driven by the quality of one’s work, not the fact that it meets the percentage expectations of the workload track to which one is assigned.

Within the constraints of the assigned minimums for each component, the calculation of merit scores will be maximized by a procedure in which the component with the highest merit score receives the highest weight possible so as to insure a more creditable measure of the actual merit of the actual work done by each faculty member, for the university.

25. In document XXI, under the heading, “Workload Forms” the text: “The report will include the faculty member’s assessment of the percent of his/her work effort during the preceding year that was spent in each of the four major categories of faculty activity: teaching, research, service, and administration, if applicable. The work effort earmarked for each type of activity is not dictated explicitly by the faculty member’s workload track; for example, a faculty member may have expended more effort in research and scholarship than the general profile of his/her assigned track might indicate should be expected. Evaluation of a faculty member’s performance is holistic and is not tied inflexibly to the workload track descriptions.” should be deleted.
26. Appendix A Document XXIX, “Smoking Policy” is currently being redrafted by an administrative committee so as to conform to new state law.
27. Appendix A Document XXXI needs major revision
28. Appendix A Document XXXV, “REMEDIATION PROCEDURES FOR UL LAFAYETTE PERSONNEL WITH CATEGORY 5 MERIT EVALUATIONS” should be changed to:

Remediation Procedures for UL Lafayette Personnel with Merit Score 1 or less Merit Evaluations

In compliance with the University of Louisiana System Policy and Procedures mandate that remediation be initiated for any faculty member who receives an “poor performance” (1 or less) evaluation score in two consecutive years or in three years out of five, the University of Louisiana at Lafayette adopted the following policy in February 2004. The policy was formulated and approved by the Faculty Senate and was approved by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the University President.

The UL Lafayette Remediation Process is based on the Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) system currently used at UL Lafayette. The remediation process is based on AAUP guidelines and is separate from the University’s current processes for mediation and faculty grievance. The policy is not retroactive. A copy of this Remediation Process document is included in the *Faculty Handbook*.

The Remediation Process

After the affected party has received official notice of his or her second consecutive (or third in five years) “poor performance” (≤ 1) Annual Performance Evaluation (which usually occurs in August or early September of the following year), the following remediation process is launched.

The affected person has two full evaluation cycles (three calendar years) to improve his or her evaluation status to a 2 or better. A “full evaluation cycle” is the period between the time a faculty member submits his or her APE for the previous calendar year to the evaluating authority (usually department or unit head in January of a particular calendar year) and the time that the faculty member is notified of his or her “official” evaluation score (i.e. the document signed by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean, and Department head or equivalent authority and usually disseminated in August or September of the same calendar year).

It should be noted that the time-line for the process that is described below is rather complex. The reader may wish to consult the sample time-lines at the conclusion of this document.

The remediation process consists of 5 steps.

Step 1:

Within one month of the faculty member receiving official notification of a second consecutive “poor performance” (≤ 1) evaluation (or the third in five years) (usually in August or September of a calendar year) his or her dean or equivalent authority must appoint an ad hoc Remediation Committee (RC), which has the task of compiling a Remediation Plan (RP) in consultation with all parties, if possible. The RC must inform the affected person, in writing, of the stipulations of the RP at least three weeks before the end of the fall semester.

If the affected person persistently objects to the makeup of the committee appointed by the dean or equivalent authority, or with its RP, the Academic VP should then appoint a RC, and, if necessary, formulate and impose an RP (see Step 4 below).

The RC will normally consist of from 3 to 5 tenured faculty members, the majority of whom are from the affected person’s department/unit, but at least one of whom is an outside, but voting, member.

It is not the task of the RC to determine whether or not the “poor performance” evaluations assigned the affected party are justified, nor is the RC free to argue that no remediation is necessary. The RC may only be cited in subsequent actions as having arranged, reviewed, and, finally, ruled on the success of the remediation process. Any determination that remediation has or has not been “successful” must not be construed to imply that the RC endorses the “poor performance” evaluations at any point.

If the affected party is willing to participate in the remediation process, go to Step 2; if not, go to Step 4.

Step 2:

Within one month of its appointment, (usually October) the RC must compose a written RP consisting of specific, explicit statements from the evaluation authorities who assigned the merit evaluation(s) of “poor performance” about the precise actions that the affected person needs to take before the end of the next two full evaluation cycles in order to be considered “remediated.” To enable the RC to perform its duties, the affected person, department head, dean, and/or other evaluating authority shall provide the RC with all of the relevant information it requests, including copies of current and past annual performance evaluations, student evaluations, proof of research, and public service.

The RP document must be clear, precise, and practicable, and it must be understood that there can be no “moving the goal posts” after the RP has been approved by the RC. The RC must ensure that the RP contains only requirements that are considered appropriate according to AAUP guidelines (appended).

Step 3:

Once a RP has been formulated by the RC (but no later than six weeks before the end of the fall semester), each of the concerned parties (affected person, department head, dean, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs) must be supplied with a written copy of the RP by the RC. The affected person then has three working days to comment on the RP to the RC.

Ideally, both the evaluating authority and the affected person should sign the RP document to acknowledge its contents. Signing the RP does NOT necessarily imply that the affected person agrees with his or her evaluations or with the RP. It only acknowledges that he or she fully understands what actions the evaluators require him or her to take to be considered successfully remediated. The RP must clearly state that the affected person has two, full, evaluation cycles to improve his or her status; that is, to get an evaluation of 2 or better.

Step 4:

If the affected party is unwilling to actively participate in the remediation process at this initial stage, the Dean or unit head must inform the Academic VP (and other parties) as soon as possible, but at least five weeks before the end of the fall semester.

After consulting with all parties (but at least three weeks before the end of the fall semester), the Academic VP must then formulate his or her own RP and inform all parties, including the chair of the RC, of its stipulations in writing.

Step 5:

Reviews: Each year, before the affected party’s APE has been forwarded by the department/unit to the next relevant authority (usually a dean, in January or February), the RC will meet and review the affected person’s progress based on the annual performance evaluation that will be forwarded from the department.

The RC reviews the progress of the remediation process three times.

- (1) The first review occurs at the end of the 'interim' year, when, if the affected person has received an APE of 2 or better the process ends. If, however, the affected person receives an APE score of less than 2, in this interim year, the RC does not make a report.
- (2) The second review occurs after the first full evaluation cycle.
- (3) If necessary, the RC conducts an additional review after the second, and final, full evaluation cycle.

In the last two reviews the RC determines whether or not remediation has been accomplished and issues a report. If the affected person has been awarded an evaluation of 2 or better in any of these reviews, remediation is deemed to have been successful and the process ends.

Note, again, that the remediation process concludes if, as the result of any one of the three February reviews, the affected person is awarded APE better than or equal to 2 by the evaluating authority or if the RC deems that the person had met the conditions of the RP, although this does not become official until notification is given in August or September

The RC's report must be affixed to the affected party's APE before it is forwarded from the department to the relevant authority, and copies of the report must be sent to the affected person, relevant dean/unit head, and Academic VP. The RC must explicitly state in its report whether or not the affected person has met the terms of the RP, and, if the conditions of the RP have not been met, the specific deficiencies must be cited in the report.

Step 6:

If, after the final review, the affected party is determined by the RC not to have met the conditions of the RP, the university president may wish to institute the UL Lafayette dismissal for cause procedure against him or her. This may be done without reference to or at any time during the procedures described in the above policy.

Illustrative Narrative Time line for Remediation Process (2005-2008)

For the sake of illustration let's assume that the affected person receives a second (or third in five years) official APE ≤ 1 in August 2005. This reflects his or her APE category for the calendar year (CY) 2004.

We see that in the case of a person who has received two APE ≤ 1 (and who is NOT successful in remediation) the process from official notification of second APE ≤ 1 to termination of the full, official, remediation process extends from **August 2005 until August 2008**.

August 2005: Affected person officially receives notice of second consecutive APE ≤ 1 , or third in five years. The year evaluated in the APE was 2004.

August - Dec. 2005: Remediation Committee appointed by Dean, Remediation Plan formulated by RC and agreed to by faculty member (or imposed upon faculty member).

January 2006: Remediation clock begins ticking: Affected party submits APE for 2005 in January or February 2006. RC reviews the APE in February 2006, before it leaves department. If APE 2005 is better than or equal to 2 then remediation process concludes (at least temporarily). If the APE is a < 2 , no report is made by the RC. The remediation process continues.

Note that the remediation process concludes if, at any one of the three February reviews, the affected person is awarded APE better than or equal to 2, or the RC finds that the RP has been achieved, although this does not become official until notification is given in August or September.

August 2006: (interim year): Official announcement of APE for 2005.

January-February 2007: Affected party submits APE for 2006 in January or February 2007. RC reviews the APE in February 2007, before it leaves department. If APE 2006 is better than or equal to 2 then remediation process concludes (at least temporarily). If APE 2006 < 2 then the RC reviews the work of the faculty member on the RP for the past year, 2006. The RC makes a report that is attached to the APE before the APE is sent forward to the dean and Academic V.P. The RC sends a copy of the report to the faculty member. If the RC decides that the RP has been achieved, the remediation process ends. If the RC decides that the RP has not been achieved, remediation process continues. The faculty member's notification of non-achievement must be specific as to the deficiencies.

August of 2007: Official APE Announcement for January-Dec. 2006. This is the first of two full CYs evaluated while RP is in effect. Has been reviewed by RC in February 2007, before it leaves department. If APE 2006 is better than or equal to 2 then remediation process terminates (at least temporarily). If APE 2006 < 2 then remediation process continues.

February 2008: RC evaluates APE for 2007 in light of RP and reports on review to evaluating authorities. The RC should determine whether or not remediation has been successful, regardless of the APE category designation awarded by the department. The RC's report on remediation should be attached to affected person's APE 007 before it is forwarded to Dean and Academic VP, and also sent to the faculty member. At this point, the RC's work terminates.

August of 2008: Official APE Announcement for January-Dec. 2007, (second full year of RP) if APE 2007 is better than or equal to 2 then remediation process concludes successfully. (But all parties have known this since February 2008). If APE 2007 < 2 , remediation process (as determined by the RC) concludes unsuccessfully. Further action, if any, may be taken by University authorities.

Graphic Time Line

2004-05		2006		2007		2008		2009		
Dec.	Jan.	Aug.	Dec.	Jan.	Aug.	Dec.	Jan.	Aug.	Dec.	Jan.

In Aug. 2005, faculty member gets Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) for 2004. If ≤ 1 , (2nd in 2 yrs. or 3 in 5 yrs.), then Remediation Committee (RC) appointed, consults w/ Dept. Head, Dean and makes plan.

Dec. 2005, RC gives plan to faculty member before semester ends.

In Jan.-Feb. 2006, RC looks at the APE for *interim year*, 2005, but faculty member has not had the plan long enough to count this year, unless it turns out the faculty member got a 2 or better, in which case, RC's work is done. If < 2 , RC continues and faculty member continues working on plan – no report.

RC looks at APE for 2006. If 2 or better, RC's work is done. If still < 2 , remediation work done by the faculty member is reviewed and faculty member continues working on plan. RC makes a report as to whether remediation has been achieved, which is attached to the APE before it is forwarded to Dean and Academic V.P., and also sends report to faculty member. If the RC believes the faculty member has achieved remediation, the remediation process ends. If the RC believes the faculty member has not achieved remediation, the remediation process continues. The faculty member is given specifics as to his/her deficiencies in achieving the RP.

RC looks at APE for 2007. If 2 or better, RC's work is done. If still < 2 , RC makes a report to the President as to whether remediation has been achieved, which is attached to the APE before it is forwarded to the Dean and Academic V.P., and also sends this report to the faculty member. Remediation ends.

The faculty member who makes ≤ 1 on his/her APE (2nd 5 in two years or a 3rd 5 in five years) for the year 2004 has from January 2005 until August of 2008 to remedy the problem.

29. Appendix A, Document XXXVII, under the heading, "VIII. REIMBURSEMENT OF FACULTY RELEASE TIME" the language:

"This faculty workload policy encourages faculty to do research and allows University administration to adjust teaching loads to reflect the research agenda for individual faculty. The policy culminates by placing faculty in four separate Tracks based on different ratios of teaching and research activities. As the Track number increases so does the release time and the intensity and expectation for research.

While the Faculty Workload Policy allows some flexibility in the teaching loads expected in various Tracks, the following is the baseline University-funded release time for a faculty member holding professorial rank in each Track:

- Track 1 – 20% release
- Track 2 – 40% release
- Track 3 – 60% release
- Track 4 – 80% release

Return of Indirect Costs

A faculty member who has been awarded external funding through a grant or contract may be eligible to receive some portion of the indirect cost revenues to reinvest in his/her research efforts. However, the amount of the returned indirect costs is dependent on the faculty member's workload Track. Before any portion of indirect costs can be returned to a faculty member, that faculty member must "purchase" his/her release time from the indirect costs at the following rates:

- Track 1 – 0% of annual salary
- Track 2 – 10% of annual salary
- Track 3 – 20% of annual salary
- Track 4 – 30% of annual salary

As an example, before returning any indirect costs to a Track 2 faculty member earning \$80,000 annually, the University would deduct \$8,000 from the indirect costs of his/her project.

Purchase of Additional Release Time

If a faculty member requests and is approved by the Dean and Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs for faculty release time for a sponsored project that is more than the usual release time for the faculty member's assigned workload Track, then the University must be reimbursed for that additional release time from the indirect cost revenues of that project. For example, a Track 2 faculty member earning \$80,000 annually who wishes to increase his/her research release time to 60% would have 20% of his/her salary (\$16,000) deducted from the indirect costs. This reimbursement must be made before any distribution of these funds to the researcher or other academic units.

In no case would a faculty member be allowed to "buy" 100% release time."

Should be changed to:

"This faculty workload policy encourages faculty to do research and allows University administration to adjust teaching loads to reflect the research agenda for individual faculty. The policy culminates by a calculation of the weights assigned to each of the three primary components of faculty workloads based on different ratios of teaching, research and service

activities. As the Track weight minimum for research increases so does the release time and the intensity and expectation for research.

Return of Indirect Costs

A faculty member who has been awarded external funding through a grant or contract may be eligible to receive some portion of the indirect cost revenues to reinvest in his/her research efforts. However, the amount of the returned indirect costs is dependent on the minimum weight of the faculty member's research component.

Purchase of Additional Release Time

If a faculty member requests and is approved by the Dean and Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs for faculty release time for a sponsored project that is more than the usual release time for the faculty member's assigned research workload weight, then the University must be reimbursed for that additional release time from the indirect cost revenues of that project. This reimbursement must be made before any distribution of these funds to the researcher or other academic units.

In no case would a faculty member be allowed to "buy" 100% release time."

30. Add to Appendix A the AAUP policy document on Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression (speak with Hector)
31. Add to Appendix A the AAUP Policy document On Freedom of Expression and Campus Speech Codes.
32. Appendix B, Communications Committee and new appendix A Document on AAUP student rights.
33. Appendix B, "UNIVERSITY AND SENATE COMMITTEES" under "Senate Committees" committees on the University Budget and a Committee on Under-Represented Groups (Initially composed of the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Under-represented Groups).

DRAFT