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The purpose of this manual is to provide all members of the full-time faculty at Golden Gate University with knowledge of the policies, regulations, practices and expectations that prevail at the university. The various provisions of this manual are subject to revision from time to time by the Trustees, on their own initiative or in response to changes in state and federal legislation. Revisions of this policy manual will involve a process for input via the appropriate faculty governance committee, faculty senate and pertinent administrative staff.[1]

This manual contains selected policies and procedures applicable to faculty but does not address all the policies and procedures to which faculty are subject. In addition to the policies set forth in this manual, all faculty members are subject to all general university policies set forth in the Golden Gate University Employee Handbook and any other applicable policy documents of Golden Gate University. In the event of any conflict between the provisions of this manual with other written university policies, the more specific provisions in this document will prevail.[2]

[1] When required by the standards of the American Bar Association, the approval process of certain policies contained herein shall be delegated to the appropriate faculty governance committee or administrative staff.

[2] For business, tax, accounting, UG and PLUS faculty, these provisions shall apply in full to contracts received after July 1, 2007. For faculty teaching in the School of Law, these provisions shall apply in full to contracts received after October 22, 2007. As to all contracts pre-existing or entered into on or before July 1, 2007, (or October 22, 2007 in the case of law faculty), any such contract will be honored for its stated term, but the provisions of these policies in all other aspects shall apply.
I. GENERAL POLICIES

A. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Philosophy
The purpose of this statement is to promote public and institutional understanding and support of academic freedom at Golden Gate University.

Academic freedom is essential and applies to all forms of scholarship, university service and governance. Academic freedom is based upon the premise that scholars are entitled to freedom from coercion in matters of thought and expression, and upon the belief that the mission of the university can be performed only in an atmosphere free from administrative or political constraints on thought and expression in all forms of scholarship, service and university governance. The protection of academic freedom carries with it a corollary obligation to the university community. All faculty members under any contractual arrangement are covered by these provisions.

Protections
- Faculty members are entitled to freedom in their scholarship and teaching.
- Faculty members are both free and encouraged to participate openly and actively and to express their thoughts orally and in writing on all matters including but not limited to university governance, personnel and academic policies and procedures, professional services and matters of public concern.

Responsibilities
The protection of academic freedom is linked to the equally demanding concept of academic responsibility.

- As scholars, faculty members should encourage student inquiry, learning, development, scholarship, and the expression of beliefs.
- Faculty members should treat students with respect.
- Faculty members should be respectful of their colleagues.
- When speaking or acting as a private person, a faculty member should avoid creating the impression that he/she speaks or acts for the school or university.

B. TENURE

Philosophy
The university recognizes that academic tenure serves several purposes. Through academic tenure, the university seeks to attract, develop and bind to itself worthy faculty members and to recognize outstanding faculty performance and commitment. Academic tenure maximizes the ability of the university to develop within the faculty a sustained and abiding interest in and commitment to Golden Gate University. In addition, academic tenure is a natural extension of the assurance of academic freedom. The university's commitment to academic tenure also enables the university to attract and retain outstanding faculty members. The university recognizes the advantage of having a core of tenured faculty members to fulfill requirements of faculty governance and tenure review.

The university recognizes the fundamentally reciprocal nature of academic tenure. The protection of academic tenure carries with it a corollary obligation to the university community.
**Protections**
The award of academic tenure ensures a faculty member with continuous employment which is irrevocable unless one of the following conditions pertains:

- Dismissal for cause
- Faculty lay-offs

**Responsibilities**
The protection of academic tenure carries with it the following faculty responsibilities:

- To serve as a role model with respect to standards and performance for the greater faculty community at the university.
- To provide leadership to advance the institution or help resolve difficult situations within the university.
- To stand up for academic freedom on behalf of the faculty, thereby acting as a guardian of academic freedom.
- To sustain the level of competence and commitment to the university as required in the post-tenure review.
II. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND ACADEMIC RANK

A. TYPES OF FACULTY

A full-time faculty member is a person who holds a contract letter designating him/her as a full-time faculty member in one of the following categories:

Professor (Assistant, Associate, Full, Emeritus/Emerita)

Those with a terminal degree[3] may be offered a position as either Assistant, Associate or Full Professor after a full search has been completed in compliance with the procedures for selection set forth in this document.

For faculty in the Schools of Business, Tax, Accounting, Undergraduate Programs and the program in Preparation in Language and University Studies (PLUS), in determining rank at initial appointment, faculty members may be granted experience credit for faculty status at Golden Gate University or at a regionally accredited institution of higher learning other than Golden Gate University. For law faculty, experience credit may be granted for faculty status at Golden Gate University or at other ABA accredited law schools. Credit may also be awarded for equivalent experience outside the academic community. Such service must have been either in a similar full-time capacity or in other relevant academic service which the search committee deems acceptable for the provision of credit. Up to one year of credit may, at the discretion of the search committee, be provided for every year in which at least 12 semester units were taught by the faculty member. Years of academic service involving the teaching of fewer than 12 semester units may, at the discretion of the search committee, result in partial year credit.

A faculty member may be appointed or promoted to one of the following categories:[4]

1. Assistant Professor

[3] For law faculty, a terminal degree is a Juris Doctor or equivalent. For business, tax and accounting faculty, a terminal degree is normally the highest degree awarded in the discipline of the faculty member. However, the dean in business, tax accounting and undergraduate programs, after consultation with the pertinent faculty, shall designate each degree to be considered as terminal. Therefore, in some programs (not including the law school), a degree other than the highest degree may be considered as terminal when it is determined by the program to be in the best interests of achieving the mission of the program.

[4] Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor will be considered at the completion of the regularly scheduled performance review if the faculty member applies for promotion and has served the time requirement necessary for promotion. The time requirements must have been met no later than September 1 of the year in which the candidate is to be reviewed for promotion. Candidates who become eligible for promotion between their regularly-scheduled reviews may apply for promotion in the next year's review cycle. This interim review will not change the review cycle for purposes of contract renewal. The availability for an interim review for purposes of consideration of promotion in rank will not apply to candidates who were previously denied promotion in rank or those who were eligible for consideration at their last review but declined to request such consideration.

The consideration as to the appropriateness of promotion will follow the same process as the regular Performance Review. All law faculty members promoted to their current position prior to July 1, 2007 and all other full-time faculty members hired prior to July 1, 1994, are entitled to continue to hold the academic rank they currently have, regardless of whether they would qualify for such rank under these definitions. In addition, those faculty members hired prior to July 1, 1994, who satisfy the experience requirements for promotion, are entitled to apply and be considered for promotion, notwithstanding the fact that they do not hold the terminal degree, although lack of a terminal degree may be a factor in the promotion decision.
In the Schools of Business, Tax, Accounting and in Undergraduate Programs, the initial appointment to full-time faculty status normally is to the rank of Assistant Professor. The academic rank of Assistant Professor is appropriate for those faculty members with zero to 5 years of full-time equivalent experience at the college level. Assistant Professor is the normal initial rank for a law faculty member hired with a non-tenure track appointment.

2. **Associate Professor:**

In the Schools of Business, Tax, Accounting and in Undergraduate Programs, initial appointment to Associate Professor is appropriate for the faculty member with at least 5 years of experience as a full-time faculty member, either at Golden Gate University or another institution of higher education. For law faculty hired on tenure track or on a long-term contract, the initial appointment is normally the rank of Associate Professor.

To be promoted to Associate Professor, a person must have served a minimum of five years with a terminal degree as an Assistant Professor (at GGU or elsewhere), of which three years must be at GGU. Candidates must have consistently attained review ratings of “high merit” as defined in these policies.

3. **Professor:**

For faculty hired into the Schools of Business, Tax, Accounting, and Undergraduate Programs, initial appointment to full professor is appropriate for the faculty member with at least 10 years of experience as a full-time faculty member either at Golden Gate University or another institution of higher education.

For members of the law faculty, initial appointment to full professor is appropriate only for those faculty hired laterally with tenure and can only be offered upon an affirmative vote of both the full faculty and the faculty evaluations committee.

For faculty members in the Schools of Business, Tax, Accounting and Undergraduate Programs, to be promoted to full professor, a person must serve a minimum of five years with a terminal degree as an associate professor (at GGU or elsewhere), of which three years must be at GGU. Candidates must have consistently attained review ratings of “high merit” as defined in these policies.

For law faculty, promotion to full professor status is automatic upon the granting of tenure.

4. **Professor Emeritus/Emerita:**

In order to recognize faculty members who have retired from full-time status after serving the university for many years, the status of Emeritus/Emerita may be conferred. The professor must have retired from the university after a career of exemplary and exceptional service. The professor must be a faculty member in good standing and have served the university for at least ten years of full-time employment or at least fifteen years of active part-time teaching.[6]

5. **Visiting Professor**

[5] Faculty members in the PLUS program may only be appointed as Lecturers.
[6] A professor who does not meet these criteria but who has made exceptional contributions to the University may be recommended for such status by his/her dean. The President shall make the final decision regarding conferral of the status of Emeritus/Emerita after consulting with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, or in the case of a law faculty member, the law dean. Such an award is for quality of service, not just length of service. The award of the status of Emeritus/Emerita is a recognition through title that carries with it inclusion in Golden Gate University’s faculty roster and unlimited use of library facilities.
A person may be offered a position as Visiting Professor (at Assistant, Associate or full Professor rank) by a dean with approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the President (when the position will be in the Law School), without a faculty search being performed, when to do so is determined to be appropriate by the Vice President for Academic Affairs or President. For faculty in the Schools of Business, Accounting, Tax and Undergraduate Programs, a Visiting Professor must have at least a Master's degree (but preferably a higher degree).

The rank of Visiting Professor is generally reserved for those faculty members hired while still retaining faculty status at another educational institution. Such rank may also be appropriate when the faculty member's professional or non-academic experience warrants such a rank.

Most visitors will be awarded the title of “Visiting (Assistant, Associate or full) Professor.” Visiting faculty from other academic institutions may bring in their rank from their home institution. However, visitors may be awarded the title of “Distinguished Visiting Professor” if their previous experience warrants it, in the opinion of the dean. If a visitor does not have a terminal degree, his/her title is that of “Visiting Lecturer.”

Visiting Professors are hired under a one-year term contract, which may be renewed once at the discretion of the Vice President for Academic Affairs or President, upon recommendation of the dean. For Visiting Professors in the School of Law, a contract for a third year may only be offered after a vote of the faculty in support. The dean hires Visiting Professors, but must do so after consultation with the faculty appointments committee in the school of law, or in the other schools, the faculty members in the department or discipline.


For the Schools of Business, Tax, Accounting, and in Undergraduate Programs and PLUS, those with at least a master's degree may be offered a non-tenure track position as lecturer by the dean or director with approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, without a faculty search being performed, when to do so is determined to be appropriate by the dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs.8

Lecturers are hired under a one-year term contract, which may be renewed at the discretion of the dean with approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs when:

- the Vice President for Academic Affairs believes there is a demonstrated need for the position to continue to exist
- the position remains funded, and,
- supervisor reviews reflect demonstrated high or exceptional merit9

B. SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES – Business, Tax, Accounting and

[7] There should be no more than twenty percent of the total number of full time faculty within the Ageno School of Business, Schools of Taxation and Accounting or Undergraduate Programs that fall under the category of Lecturer. This percentage may be exceeded only upon approval of the VPAA.

[8] Should a person previously holding the Golden Gate University title of Senior Adjunct Professor or Distinguished Senior Adjunct Professor become a full-time Lecturer, such person may use the title of Senior Lecturer or Distinguished Lecturer.

[9] Should the first two requirements for renewal be met, the appropriate supervisor(s) of the lecturer shall write a review of the lecturer’s performance under the contract no later than July 1, using the applicable performance guidelines for teaching (appendix 2) and for administrative services (appendix 3). The term supervisor is used to indicate reviews by either the pertinent chair/director and/or dean.
Undergraduate Programs Faculty

All initial full-time faculty appointments other than Visiting Professor and Lecturer are to be made using the following selection process and procedures:

1. **Search Committee Established:**
   The dean forms a selection committee consisting of the following members: no fewer than three full-time faculty members in the school in which the new faculty member will reside (faculty members to be chosen by the dean after consultation with the faculty); department chair if appropriate; if there is no department chair, the dean's designee. The committee shall be chaired by one of the faculty members on the search committee, to be selected by the dean.

2. **Position Announcement:** The search committee writes a position announcement which is posted in accordance with established university policy.

3. **Candidate Screening:** With the advice of the Director of Human Resources, the committee screens all applicants and nominees. The committee determines the experience, credentials and qualities most desired for the position. Candidates to be interviewed are selected.

4. **Candidate Interviews:** The committee interviews selected applicants and determines the finalists. The dean and other administrators also interview each selected applicant. If the committee determines the applicant pool to be inadequate, the committee has the option of reopening the search.

5. **Committee Recommendations:** The committee shall provide to the dean a list of the recommended finalists. The dean shall select from this list the finalists to be invited to provide faculty presentations. If the dean rejects all the committee's recommendations, the committee shall begin a new search.

6. **Finalist Presentations:** Each finalist presents a seminar on a topic chosen by the applicant. The seminar is open to interested members of the academic community. The committee receives feedback from faculty members in attendance at the presentation.

7. **Recommendation of Finalist:** The committee votes on finalists, recommends to the dean one or more of the final applicants, the appropriate academic rank to be awarded and the appropriate amount of experience credit to be awarded. If the dean does not concur, he or she requests recommendations of other finalists. The committee’s recommendations are forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

8. **Final Decision:** The dean must concur on a hiring decision and recommended academic rank. The Vice President for Academic Affairs concurs or differs with the recommendations and forwards the recommendations to the President. The President either concurs with the recommendations or consults with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean and other members of the search committee. The committee may present additional information to the President before the President reaches a final decision. If the recommendation is not accepted, the search committee shall begin the search process again.

9. **Notification:** In consultation with the Director of Human Resources, the Academic Vice President, with a copy to the dean, sends the selected candidate an offer in accordance with decisions reached after completion of the search process. The dean sends letters of non-selection to the unsuccessful candidates and secures the files of the search committee in accordance with university policy.
C. SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES – Law Faculty

All initial tenure-track and non tenure-track full-time faculty appointments other than Visiting Professors are to be made using the following selection process and procedures:

1. Position Authorization: The dean of the School of Law authorizes the position within the budget.

2. Position Announcement: The appointments committee writes a position announcement which is posted in accordance with established university policy.

3. Appointment Solicitation: The appointments committee solicits applications, reviews resumes, and interviews candidates. It then selects candidates to recommend to the faculty which then interviews candidates.

4. Finalist Presentations: Each finalist gives a presentation on a topic chosen by the applicant. The committee receives feedback from faculty members in attendance at the presentation.

5. Recommendation of Finalist: All tenured, tenure track and long-term contract faculty (excluding the dean) will vote on each finalist. The appointments committee coordinates and tabulates the vote and recommends to the dean one or more of the final applicants who received substantial approval of the faculty. The committee will also recommend the appropriate academic rank and the appropriate amount of experience credit to be awarded.

If the dean concurs with the recommendation, the dean forwards such recommendations to the president. The president either concurs with the recommendations or consults with the dean and members of the appointments committee. The committee may present additional information to the president before the president reaches a final decision. If the recommendation is not accepted, the search committee shall begin the search process again. If the dean does not concur with the recommendation of the appointments committee, he or she requests recommendations of other finalists.

6. Notification: In consultation with the director of human resources, the dean, sends the selected candidate an offer in accordance with decisions reached after completion of the search process. The dean sends letters of non-selection to the unsuccessful candidates and secures the files of the search committee in accordance with university policy.
III. FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

A. GENERAL POLICIES

Teaching

All faculty members are expected to handle their teaching assignments with professional skill. Business, accounting, tax, undergraduate programs and PLUS faculty are expected to abide by the university’s published “teaching expectations.”[10]

As stated by the American Bar Association’s Commission on Professionalism, “…the law school experience provides the student’s first exposure to the profession and professors inevitably serve as important role models for students. Therefore, the highest standards of ethics and professionalism should be adhered to within law schools.”[11]

All faculty members should prepare conscientiously for class and employ teaching methods appropriate for the subject matters and objectives of their courses. At a minimum, the faculty member is expected to meet a class punctually and regularly and to assess the quality of the students’ work by appropriate means and must evaluate student performance in accordance with university policies. The faculty member is expected to report instances of academic dishonesty in accordance with university policy.

Scholarly and Creative Activity

Faculty members should seek to contribute to their discipline through research (integrated, applied or discovery) and/or through quality curricular and pedagogical contributions at the university, except for law faculty who shall comply with the scholarship requirements in Section V. In addition, faculty should keep abreast of current developments in their subject area, and participate in pertinent professional or business associations connected to their discipline.

All full-time faculty members in business, accounting, taxation, undergraduate programs and PLUS, as part of their responsibilities, are expected to participate in development activities each academic year. The following development activities may be considered:

- teaching development academy
- faculty retreat
- faculty assembly
- departmental faculty meetings focused on pedagogy
- GGU online pedagogy courses
- outside pedagogical programs
- other development activities the chair, director, or dean believe to be appropriate

Institutional Service and Citizenship

Assistant, Associate, full Professors and Visiting Professors, in the Schools of Business, Tax, Accounting and Undergraduate Programs: Faculty should strive to be good citizens of the university.

[10] See appendix for full text of the university’s “teaching expectations.”
community, serving with civility as active participants on committees or in whatever other capacity they can render the best service in the affairs of the department, school and greater university. Participation in institutional events such as student orientations and graduations is expected. In addition, faculty should serve, when appropriate, as mentors and advisors of students and be available for student discussion through regular office hours and frequent presence on campus.

Although all faculty members have the right as citizens to take positions on public questions, each professor has a duty not to imply that he or she speaks on behalf of the university. Thus, a professor should take steps to assure that any designation of the professor’s institution in connection with the professor’s name is for identification only.

**Additional Responsibilities of Law Faculty**

Members of the bar, including law professors, are encouraged by the profession to engage in public service or pro bono legal activities. This type of activity may include, but is not limited to work in legal aid or public defender offices, assisting public interest organizations and teaching in continuing education programs.

**B. FACULTY WORKLOAD AND ANNUAL REVIEWS**

1. **Workload**

   a. **Assistant, Associate, and full Professors**

   The dean of each school must manage faculty workloads such that the school achieves an overall teaching average of 4 courses (12 units) for law and 5 courses (15 units) for business, tax, accounting, and undergraduate programs. When calculating the teaching average per year, contractual agreements made upon hire to teach fewer courses than the expected average will not be considered.

   The dean, working with the faculty member, will determine the appropriate teaching load for the faculty member for the year, not to be fewer than 3 courses for law faculty, and 4 courses for all other faculty and not to exceed 6 courses for law faculty and 8 courses for all other faculty. Chairing or supervising student dissertation work will not be considered part of the teaching load and will be on a stipend basis only, with approval of the program director and the dean.

   In determining the appropriate teaching load of a full-time faculty member, the dean shall take into consideration the following factors:

   - class size (small or large)
   - number of total units taught
   - new or repeated course
   - nature of the course (research/lecture/clinical/writing)
   - amount of teaching experience
   - administrative/service assignments that either significantly exceed or are below that normally expected of a faculty member
   - research activity that either significantly exceeds or is below that normally expected of a faculty member

   In addition to teaching, a faculty member is expected to engage in a reasonable amount of professional development, scholarly or pedagogical work, student advising and mentoring, and university/school service.
Accordingly, the appropriate workload and the proportions of time allocated to formal classroom teaching, scholarship, and to service will vary according to individual circumstances. The dean, in concert with the faculty member, will identify the general weight for each of these three categories. [12]

The responsibility for the determination of an individual workload rests with the dean of the school, subject to review by the academic administrator to whom the dean reports.

b. **Visiting Professors and Lecturers**

The workload will be determined by the dean or director and specified in the faculty member’s contract

2. **Annual Reviews and Preparation of Annual Faculty Workload**

To assist in continuous development and in preparation for determining the appropriate workload, goals and expectations for the upcoming year, each faculty member shall prepare a brief report using the “Annual Faculty Report Form” giving an account of his/her professional activities during the academic year and a self-assessment of such activities. Each faculty member should provide this self-assessment to the dean no later than four months prior to the end of each academic year. Using this input and the dean’s personal observations, the dean will prepare a written review of each faculty member and establish with the faculty member goals and expectations for the upcoming year as articulated in the Annual Faculty Workload Agreement. A person newly tenured will not be subject to this annual review until the end of his/her second year of tenure but will develop in concert with the dean an Annual Faculty Workload Agreement.

[12] Each course taught will be awarded a percentage of time allocation ranging from 6-12%, to be determined by the dean after consultation with the chair and/or faculty member

[13] This review is intended for faculty development purposes (“developmental annual review”) and is not intended to be used as evidence in the contract renewal process unless the faculty member chooses to include such reviews in his/her portfolio.
IV. CONTRACT TERMS, RENEWAL PROCESS AND CRITERIA – Business, Tax, Accounting and Undergraduate Programs

A. INITIAL CONTRACT

Entering Assistant, Associate and full Professors will be awarded an initial two-year contract, the first year of which is probationary. During the probationary period, a formal written evaluation by the dean is required upon the completion of each teaching term. The written evaluations are to be prepared and presented to the faculty member no later than thirty (30) days following the end of each term. If any review is unsatisfactory, the dean, after consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director of Human Resources, may terminate the employment relationship.[14] If the reviews are positive, the faculty member will serve the second year of the contract term and be considered for a new contract in accordance with the contract renewal policies stated below.

B. CONTRACT RENEWAL

During the final year of any contract, Assistant, Associate, and full Professors will be reviewed and considered for a three-year term contract. The dean is responsible for initiating and overseeing the review process to ensure that the policies and timelines are followed. Such review process and notification to the faculty member of the decision should be completed as early as possible, but in no event later than August 1 of the final year of the current contract.

As a part of this review, each faculty member is responsible for submitting a portfolio to the dean. The portfolio must contain the following:

- A review by the Dean of the faculty member’s service since last portfolio review (“service dean review.”)15
- All “Faculty Workload Agreements” covering the years since the last portfolio review
- All student evaluations since the last review
- Syllabi for all the non-redundant courses taught since the last review, with sample assignments and exams
- Text of any completed research/scholarship
- A self assessment of:
  - teaching performance, considering the student evaluations and what they suggest in terms of teaching strengths and weaknesses
  - other scholarly work
  - service to GGU (department, school, university) and overall quality of university citizenship
- Other information the faculty member believes will be helpful in the review

The dean will review the portfolio and write an evaluation that includes a qualitative and narrative evaluation for each category of work (teaching, scholarship and service) as well as a numerical evaluation based on the standards identified below and giving appropriate weight to each category of work consistent

[14] Termination during the probationary period is final and does not carry with it the right to a terminal year or severance.

[15] The review is not to be confused with the “developmental annual reviews” described earlier in this manual. The “service dean review” is to be prepared by the Dean for purposes of providing the candidate and review committees his/her opinion of the amount and quality of the faculty member’s service during the review period.
with the relative weight of the faculty member’s workload. Such evaluation will result in an overall composite numerical evaluation. In addition, the dean will provide an overall qualitative evaluation classifying performance as either “exceptional merit” “high merit” “some merit” or “low merit.” The dean will share with the faculty member his/her review and provide the faculty member with the opportunity to respond within a reasonable period of time, after which the dean will make a recommendation regarding action (retention, termination, promotion, tenure) to the Faculty Personnel Committee. The dean will forward his/her review and recommendation to the Faculty Personnel Committee. In order to protect the integrity of the portfolio review process, during the entire review process, the faculty member under review should not initiate discussion of his/her application with anyone directly involved with the process of his/her portfolio in order to reduce the possibility of undue pressure.

In addition to, concurrent with and independent of the dean review, a three-person peer review committee will review the faculty portfolio. Such committee will evaluate each category of work (teaching, research and service) and provide an overall numerical and narrative evaluation for each. Such evaluation will result in an overall composite numerical evaluation. The chair of the peer committee will share with the faculty member the committee’s review in the aggregate and provide the faculty member with the opportunity to respond within a reasonable period of time, after which the chair will provide the committee’s evaluation and recommendation to the Faculty Personnel Committee.

The composition of the peer review committee:

- Two members chosen by the dean (preferably within the discipline of the faculty member), one identified as chair
- One member chosen by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, taking into consideration the following expectations:
  - The person should be outside the school or unit of the faculty member to be reviewed
  - The person must not be a member of the Faculty Personnel Committee
  - The person must hold a rank at least as high as the rank to which the faculty member under review has applied

The Faculty Personnel Committee will examine the reviews and shall meet with the faculty member under review to discuss the contents of the portfolio, the dean and peer reviews, and to address any other issue related to the review. After such meeting, the faculty member will have a reasonable period of time to submit to the Faculty Personnel Committee supplemental material prior to final committee deliberation of the faculty member’s file.

Upon considering all input, the Faculty Personnel Committee chair will notify the faculty member and the Vice President for Academic Affairs of its final recommendation and provide to the Vice President

[16] The dean is to prepare his/her review independent of and without reviewing the peer or external reviews.
[17] The Faculty Personnel Committee shall consist only of faculty members holding tenure.
[18] A faculty member may not serve on a review committee if there exists a significant conflict of interest with the faculty member subject to review. All personal and professional conflicts of interest must be revealed to the dean, including personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude highly objective and unbiased review. Spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with the faculty member subject to review are prohibited from participation in the review. Any concern of the faculty member subject to review regarding the appropriateness of the review committee composition should be directed to the dean. If resolution of the concern is not reached to the satisfaction of the faculty member subject to review, the VPAA shall make the final decision after consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee.
for Academic Affairs all materials considered in the review process.19

The Vice President will determine whether a new contract should be awarded after considering the recommendation of the Faculty Personnel Committee as well as documents relevant to the committee’s recommendation.

All decisions applying these procedures shall be based on supporting evidence. If the Vice President for Academic Affairs intends not to follow the recommendation of the Faculty Personnel Committee, he/she will meet with the committee to discuss the matter before making a final decision. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will notify the faculty member under review of his/her decision as well as inform the dean and Faculty Personnel Committee as early as possible but no later than August 1 of the final year of the current contract.

Should the university decide to retain the faculty member, a new three-year term contract will be issued to begin upon conclusion of the current contract. Should the university decide not to issue a new contract, the faculty member will be awarded a one-year non-renewable terminal contract. The faculty member will cease being an employee of the university as of the end of the terminal contract period. This provision applies to all contracts issued after July 1, 2007.

In the event that any of the conditions authorizing faculty lay-offs under this Manual shall apply to any full-time faculty member whose contract has been recommended for renewal, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the dean and President, may determine not to renew such contract in lieu of lay-off, and the faculty member shall have the option at the conclusion of his or her expiring contract term of either a one-year terminal, non-renewable contract or severance pay under the university severance policies effective July 1, 2007.

C. TENURE

In the last year of a three-year contract, an Associate or full Professor holding a terminal degree may apply for tenure if the faculty member completed at least seven years by the first day of the last year of the contract of full-time faculty equivalent service. Unless the faculty member was previously tenured at another institution, in order to apply for tenure, a faculty member must have completed at least four years by the first day of the last year of the contract as a full-time faculty member at Golden Gate University. This provision applies to all faculty hired on or after July 1, 2007. Candidates who become eligible for tenure between their regularly-scheduled reviews may apply for tenure the year in which they become eligible.

Those applying for tenure may withdraw their application at any time prior to final determination by the President. If denied tenure, a faculty member may reapply for tenure in the last year of the new contract.

The review process for consideration to receive tenure is the same as articulated above for renewal of contract decisions with the following adjustments:

- The tenure review process will consider the faculty member’s body of work over the preceding seven years of service. This should include all contract renewal reviews prepared by the dean
and peers while a full time faculty member at Golden Gate University.

• In addition to the internal peer review process, the dean, in consultation with the faculty member, will identify and seek a separate evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching and scholarly work by two external reviewers. The dean should give preference to external reviewers who are tenured at their institution and who hold the same rank as that to which the faculty member being reviewed has applied.

The dean shall provide to each external reviewer a copy of all pertinent portions of the faculty member’s portfolio, a copy of the University Faculty Policy Manual and the appropriate forms on which the evaluator will record his/her evaluations of the faculty member’s teaching and scholarly work.20

The external reviews will be forwarded directly from the external reviewer to the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee.21

• Faculty members applying for tenure must submit a minimum of four copies of their portfolio to their dean – two complete portfolios plus two without the service component which the dean will send to the external reviewers.

• The Vice President for Academic Affairs will submit his/her recommendation, along with that of the Faculty Personnel Committee and the review results of the peer committees, dean, and external reviews to the President. The President, after considering all recommendations, shall make the final decision on the appropriate course of action with regard to the faculty member under review. Should the President determine that the award of tenure is appropriate, the President will consult with the Board before making the final decision.

No person will be granted tenure at the time of hire, nor promised that tenure will be granted at some time in the future, unless the person is approved for tenure by the Faculty Personnel Committee, the dean of the school in which the faculty member is to reside, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President.

D. LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE

A determination by the dean, peer evaluation committee and the Faculty Personnel Committee that a faculty member’s overall level of performance is of high merit is a requisite threshold decision before a recommendation may be made for retention or promotion. A determination by the dean, peer evaluation committee and Faculty Personnel Committee that a faculty member’s level of performance is of exceptional merit is a requisite threshold decision before a recommendation may be made for the granting of tenure. The determination of the necessary level of performance or a recommendation by the dean, peer evaluation committee and Faculty Personnel Committee will not, by itself, require the university to retain or promote a faculty member or confer tenure. It is not intended to create an expectation or right to a multi-year appointment or tenure.

[20] The external evaluator will not be requested to evaluate the faculty member’s service.

[21] External reviewers shall be offered the ability to waive their right to confidentiality, and in such case, the faculty member under review may have access to the reviews submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee by the external reviewers
Performance will be evaluated using the following guidelines[22]:

1-2 low merit
3-5 some merit
6-8 high merit
9-10 exceptional merit

Evaluation of Teaching

In evaluating teaching performance, the reviewer should first consider the level of adherence and commitment to the university’s “teaching expectations.”[23] In addition, the reviewer should consider course content, currency of material presented, clarity and thoroughness of course syllabi, appropriateness of course structure and assignments to meet course objectives, rigor, and activities that promote active learning. Student evaluation results for teaching effectiveness and course structure (both numerical and comments) should be given significant weight in the review except in circumstances where the response rate is too small to be informative. Faculty interest in innovation and exploring ways to improve pedagogy should also be considered. In addition, the faculty member’s self assessment of teaching is an important component of the review.

Evaluation of Scholarship

In evaluating scholarship, the reviewer should consider the both the quantity and quality of the scholarly work produced in relation to the overall workload of the faculty member, commitments made in establishing the annual workloads, and ability to produce scholarly work. Scholarship includes but is not limited to presentations, publications, curricular and course development, faculty development and assessment of programmatic educational effectiveness.

Evaluation of Institutional Service and Citizenship

In evaluating institutional service and citizenship, the reviewer should consider the faculty member’s involvement in institutional activities other than teaching and scholarship such as committee work, departmental leadership, program leadership, student mentoring, participation in student clubs and activities, and involvement in other activities that serve to benefit the university in some way. The level of involvement and commitment should be considered in light of the faculty member’s overall workload. In addition, the faculty member’s effectiveness in the service activities should be considered, to include success in achieving objectives of departmental or program leadership, quality of student mentoring, and quality and effectiveness in committee work.

[22] See appendix for guidelines for each standard
[23] See appendix for full text of university approved “teaching expectations.”
V. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE DECISIONS - Law School Faculty

A. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Tenure-track faculty position(s)

To create a new tenure-track faculty position, the dean of the Law School makes a recommendation to the president who shall make the decision whether to create a new position.

A tenure-track position may be offered at Assistant Professor or Associate Professor rank, depending on the individual's background and experience.

Upon hire, it shall be made clear by the dean in the offer letter whether the faculty position is tenure-track.

- Initial Contract: Tenure-track entering Assistant, Associate and Full Professors will be hired on initial one-year contracts.
- Contract Renewal: During the final year of any contract, the faculty member will be reviewed and considered for a new contract. Any new contract will be for a one-year period until tenure is awarded or the faculty member is not retained.

Non-tenure-track position(s)

To create a new non-tenure track position, the dean of the Law School makes a recommendation to the president who shall make the decision whether to create a new position. A limited number of fixed, short-term appointments may be made for skill-track faculty in each skill-track program so long as the program’s full-time staff is predominantly full-time faculty members under multi-year contracts.

All full-time (non-visitor) skills-track faculty (including academic development, writing and clinical faculty) other than program directors are to be hired by the faculty using the same Appointments Committee competitive process used to hire tenure-track faculty.

- Initial Contract: For both new skills track faculty and skills-track faculty who previously have had visitor appointments, initial appointment contracts will be for two years.
- Contract Renewal: Skills-track faculty will be evaluated for reappointment during the second year of their contracts. If performance meets applicable standards, reappointment will be for three years. Subsequent contracts will be for five years.

During the initial contract or any renewal period, the contract may be terminated for good cause, which for skills-track faculty includes termination or material modification of a skills-track program, or for financial exigencies or cause, pursuant to the terms and procedures set forth in this manual.
Jurisdiction

All recommendations concerning retention, promotion, and tenure for faculty shall be made in the first instance by the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee (sometimes hereinafter the "Committee") shall make its recommendation to the dean of the Law School. The dean of the Law School shall make the final decision for retention and promotion decisions. In the case of a recommendation to award tenure, the dean shall provide his/her recommendation, along with that of the Evaluation Committee, to the president who shall make the final decision, after consultation with the Board of Trustees.

Membership of Evaluation Committee

The Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Law School's faculty. A faculty member who is on an approved leave of absence is calculated in the membership total only when that member is physically in attendance at a meeting. A faculty member on an approved leave of absence who wishes to participate in meetings shall provide the chair with a current address for receipt of notice of meetings. The dean of the Law School shall be an ex-officio member of the Committee without voting rights, except as otherwise provided.

The Evaluation File

The Committee shall initiate an Evaluation File for all faculty members.

The Evaluation File is to be confidential and access shall be limited to the dean of the Law School, members of the appropriate Evaluation Committee, the president and the director of human resources when the president deems access appropriate. However, an individual's Evaluation File shall be open to inspection by the individual during, regular business hours upon 24 hours' notice to the dean of the Law School.

The Evaluation File will contain all relevant information to be used in the retention, promotion and tenure decisions made by the Evaluation Committee. This will include, but not necessarily be limited to, student evaluations; reports of faculty visitations; materials submitted by the faculty member; evidence of university, community and professional service; and scholarly publication. In addition, copies of all official communications between the dean, and/or the Evaluation Committee and the faculty member will be included.

Quorum

A majority of the membership of the Committee shall constitute a quorum of that Committee for all purposes other than a decision pertaining to an individual faculty member. There can be no discussion or vote concerning the retention, promotion or tenure of a particular faculty member unless two-thirds of the membership of the appropriate Committee is present.

Voting Procedures

Each member of the committee has one vote and may not vote by proxy.

All votes pertaining to the promotion, retention or tenure of an individual shall be by secret ballot. Two committee members appointed by the committee chair shall each count the ballots in the presence of
the committee and shall each sign and date the record of the vote which record shall be given to the dean for retention in the particular faculty member's Evaluation File.

**Retention**

The Evaluation Committee shall evaluate all tenure-track faculty members annually. The evaluation committee shall make a recommendation that a tenure-track faculty member shall be retained upon an affirmative vote of a majority of those members of the Evaluation Committee voting yes or no. The committee will make a recommendation to the dean who shall make the final decision. In the event that the dean intends not to follow the committee’s recommendation, the dean will first meet with the evaluation committee before making a final decision.

Although decisions regarding reappointment and promotion shall usually be based on a comprehensive and objective assessment of a faculty member's qualifications and performance, in the event that any of the conditions authorizing faculty lay-offs under this Manual shall apply to any full-time faculty member under consideration for retention, the dean, after consultation with the President, may determine not to renew such contract in lieu of lay-off, and the faculty member shall have the option of either a one-year terminal, non-renewable contract or severance pay under the university severance policies effective July 1, 2007.

**Tenure**

A tenure decision shall be made in the fifth year of full-time teaching under a tenure-track appointment. In the event that tenure is denied, the faculty member will be entitled to remain on the faculty for a final sixth year and will have no further rights of employment.

At the request of the faculty member, the tenure decision will be deferred for one additional year. In such event, the right to an additional year of employment will be deemed waived and, if tenure is denied, the member will not be entitled to remain on the faculty beyond the faculty member's sixth year.

If, during, the five (or, at the option of the faculty member, six) year period, the member is on leave for a total of less than one academic year, such leave will not affect the timing of the tenure decision. If the member is on leave for one academic year or more, the tenure decision will be made at the end of the year in which s/he has completed five years of full-time teaching under a tenure-track appointment. If the faculty member who was on a leave of absence wishes to defer the decision until the sixth year of full-time teaching under a tenure-track appointment, he or she may do so only with the concurrence of a majority of the Committee at a meeting at which at least two-thirds of the Committee members are present. In the event that such a request is made and granted, the right to an additional year of employment will be deemed waived, and, if tenure is denied, the member will not be entitled to remain on the faculty beyond the faculty member's sixth teaching year.

The granting of tenure shall be recommended to the dean upon an affirmative vote of two-thirds of those Committee members voting yes or no, provided, however, that no one shall be recommended for tenure upon an affirmative vote of less than a majority of the members of the Committee including those absent and/or not voting. If two of those voting yes or no is not an even number, then any fraction of one or more shall require an additional yes vote.

In the event the dean agrees with the Committee’s recommendation, the dean shall provide his/her recommendation, along with that of the Evaluation Committee, to the President who shall make the final decision, after consultation with the Board of Trustees.
In the event that the dean or President intends not to follow the recommendations, the dean or President will first meet with the evaluation committee before making a final decision.

**Notification**

**Tenure-Track:** A decision not to retain a tenure-track faculty member shall be made and given to the faculty member in writing by the dean by the following dates:

- Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of full-time teaching under a tenure-track appointment at Golden Gate University, if the appointment expires at the end of that academic year, or, if a one-year appointment terminates during the academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination;

- At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after one or more years of full-time teaching, under a tenure-track appointment at Golden Gate University.

**Non Tenure-Track:** A decision by the dean not to reappoint a long-term contract faculty member shall be made and given to the faculty member in writing by the dean at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment for a faculty member serving under a two, three, or five-year contract.

**B. THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

**Law Faculty Evaluation**

- Unless impractical, all class visits will be made during the 9th and 10th week of a semester.

- During the first year of teaching, a non-visiting faculty member will be visited by two Evaluation Committee members for three hours each, all visits being made during one semester.

- During the second year of teaching, a non-visiting faculty member will be visited by two Evaluation Committee members for three hours each, all visits being made during the first semester of the contract year of the faculty member to be visited.

- During each successive year up to but not including the year in which a faculty member is being considered for tenure or, in the case of long-term contract, renewal, a faculty member will be visited by two Evaluation Committee members for three hours each, one visiting during the first semester, and the other visiting during the second semester.

- During the year in which a faculty member is being considered for tenure, or, in the case of a long-term contract faculty, renewal, a faculty member may be visited by all members of the Evaluation Committee. These visits will be made during the 9th, 10th or 11th week of either semester unless an alternative time is arrived at by mutual agreement between the Committee member and the faculty member being evaluated. No written reports are required to be submitted as a result of these visits; however, they may be submitted at the option of the Committee member. In the case of faculty clinical directors, a Clinical Tenure Subcommittee appointed by the chair of the Evaluation Committee shall visit the classes of the faculty member. In addition, all members of the Evaluation Committee may, but are not required to, visit the classes of the clinical director. Such visits shall be coordinated through the Clinical Tenure Subcommittee. In the case of legal research
and writing directors, a Legal Research and Writing Subcommittee appointed by the chair of the Evaluation Committee shall visit the classes of the faculty member. In addition, all members of the Evaluation Committee may, but are not required to, visit the classes of the legal research and writing director. Such visits shall be coordinated through the Legal Research and Writing Subcommittee. In the case of academic development directors, an Academic Development Subcommittee appointed by the chair of the Evaluation Committee shall visit the classes of the faculty member. In addition, all members of the Evaluation Committee may, but are not required to, visit the classes of the academic development director. Such visits shall be coordinated through the Academic Development Subcommittee.

- Any member of the Committee may make an informal visit to any non-tenured law faculty member's class during the 9th week of either semester or by pre-arrangement at any other time.

- Committee members who make the evaluation visits referred to in b, c, d and e. above are required to submit written reports.

- All reports of visits are to be submitted to the Evaluation Committee no later than one week after the visits have taken place.

- The faculty member being evaluated shall be provided a copy of any report written by any Committee member following a class visit pursuant to these rules. As soon as the person who was visited has received a copy of an evaluator's report, that person and the evaluator are urged to discuss the contents thereof.

- Official visits on behalf of the Committee shall be made by its members; however, if the Committee Chair perceives a need, and in special circumstances, others may also be asked to visit classes for the purpose of evaluating the faculty member. No official Committee visit shall be made by the dean, but the dean may visit any class at any time.

**Student Evaluations**

The student evaluation form used by the Law School must be approved by a majority of the tenured, tenure-track and long-term contract faculty of the Law School. The Law School dean's office distributes, collects and tallies these evaluations.

Student evaluations shall normally take place during the thirteenth week of class in a fifteen-week semester and the twelfth week of class in a fourteen-week semester.

**Librarian Evaluation**

Since the Law Librarian's position is also one which may provide for tenure, both teaching quality to the extent the librarian is required to teach and performance as Law Librarian must be evaluated, with primary attention to the librarian’s performance as a librarian.

- With respect to classes taught by the Law Librarian, the same procedures described above shall pertain.

- The following materials will be solicited and considered in evaluating the performance of the Law Librarian.
ABA evaluations and other accrediting agency evaluations of the library.

The Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee will solicit all members of the faculty for their appraisal of the work of the Law Librarian.

The dean of the Law School will evaluate the performance of the Law Librarian. During the 9th or 10th week of each semester, students will be requested to fill out evaluation forms in the Library as to their view of the functioning of the Library. These forms will be prepared, distributed, collected and tallied by the Law School dean's office. During promotion and tenure-decision years, the Law Librarian will prepare a written self-evaluation consisting of the items listed below.

Under special circumstances, an evaluation may be made by use of one or more outside Law Librarian(s).

Evaluation of Faculty Clinical Directors

The administrative performance of a clinical faculty director shall be evaluated by the Clinical Tenure Subcommittee referred to above.

The dean of the Law School also will evaluate and report to the Evaluations Committee the administrative performance of clinical faculty directors.

Evaluation of Legal Research & Writing Directors

The administrative performance of a legal research & writing director shall be evaluated by the Legal Research & Writing Tenure Subcommittee referred to in above.

The dean of the Law School also will evaluate and report to the Evaluation Committee the administrative performance of legal research & writing directors.

Evaluation of Academic Development Directors

The administrative performance of an academic development director shall be evaluated by the Academic Development Subcommittee referred to above.

The dean of the Law School also will evaluate and report to the Evaluation Committee the administrative performance of academic development directors.

C. THE DECISIONAL PROCESS

1. The primary materials for assessing an individual's teaching abilities are the student evaluations and written reports of classroom visitations made by other faculty members. The student evaluations and copies of the faculty visit reports will be made a permanent part of the individual's Evaluation File.

2. Each faculty member under consideration must prepare a written self-evaluation including evidence of university, community and professional service and scholarly publication(s).

3. A faculty member may, at any time, submit to the Evaluation Committee additional materials.
which he or she believes will be useful to the Committee. Such materials will become a permanent part of that individual's Evaluation File.

4. If an adverse recommendation of the Evaluation Committee appears likely, the faculty member under consideration will be given the opportunity to appear personally before the Committee before a vote is taken.

5. All adverse recommendations by the Evaluation Committee must be accompanied by a written report stating the reasons for the Committee's judgment. This report shall become a permanent part of the individual's Evaluation File.

6. After an adverse vote has been taken, the faculty member may request a reconsideration of the decision. Such reconsideration will be given in the case of a retention decision upon the affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the Committee, or upon the request of the dean, and in the case of a tenure decision, upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the membership, or upon the request of the dean.

7. Time requirements for notices of non-reappointment are satisfied by the first notice of an adverse decision.

8. All rules which require a super-majority require the same super-majority of the membership of the Committee to change such a rule.

9. Disclosure Rules:

   Permissible disclosure
   • Content of any discussion of any matter not bearing on a specific faculty member may be disclosed by any member of the Evaluation Committee. Any member of the Evaluation Committee may disclose the tenor of the general discussion on matters affecting a specific faculty member to the specific faculty member under consideration.

   • At the discretion of the dean or the Chair of the Committee, the President and/or Vice Presidents may be consulted who may consult with the Director of Human Resources, members of the Board of Trustees or legal counsel about any matter under consideration by the Committee before, during, or after deliberations of any kind.

   • In preparation for or response to legal matters at the discretion of the President, any matter under consideration by the Committee before, during, or after deliberations of any kind may be disclosed.

   • Any member of the Evaluation Committee may disclose to any party who is neither a Committee member nor the faculty member being evaluated, (1) his or her individual opinion and votes and/or (2) the tenor of the general discussion on matters affecting a specific faculty member, but only if the Evaluation Committee has received a general waiver from such specific faculty member.

   • No member of the Evaluation Committee shall disclose (1) the position or vote of any other individual member of the Committee or (2) the content of student evaluation forms submitted on faculty members or summaries thereof.

   • Except as otherwise provided, while a specific faculty member is under discussion, a rule of
absolute confidentiality will be observed.

D. J.D. PROGRAM TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

1. Standards for J.D. Program Faculty

Decisions regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure shall be based on a comprehensive and objective assessment of a faculty member's qualifications and performance. The two primary criteria for retention, promotion and tenure are teaching performance and scholarship.

Teaching performance

The standard for tenure is excellence as defined in the appendix. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is potential for excellence at the time the tenure decision is to be made. The determination whether a faculty member has met such standards will be based primarily upon the faculty and student evaluations conducted.

Scholarship

The standard for tenure is publication of a reasonable amount of high quality legal and law-related material, including traditional law review articles, casebooks, treatises, contributions to treatises, and works directed to the needs of the practicing bar. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is a demonstrated potential for compliance with the tenure standard at the time the tenure decision is to be made.

Each Committee member shall make an independent judgment as to the quality of the scholarly material submitted pursuant to subsection (b), below. In addition, all such material shall be sent to at least three impartial outside evaluators. Evaluations which are returned in timely fashion shall be considered by the Committee. The Committee shall make every effort to assure that such evaluators' expertise is consistent with the nature of the material submitted.

- A faculty member being considered for tenure shall submit to the committee such scholarly material as s/he wishes to be part of the evaluation process no later than December 1 of the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made.

- A faculty member being considered for tenure shall choose from among his/her scholarly material a representative body of scholarly pieces (not fewer than two) which s/he wishes to be submitted for outside review. The exact number of scholarly pieces to be submitted for outside review shall be decided by the Committee chair in consultation with the faculty member. Co-authored pieces will not be considered for such outside review, but will be considered by the Committee for internal review. This election shall be made no later than December 1 of the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made.

- The following procedure shall govern the choice of outside evaluators: The candidate may submit names of proposed evaluators. In addition to the names, the candidate should provide a brief description of the qualifications of the proposed evaluator, his/her relationship, if any, with the evaluator and the evaluator's previous involvement, if any, with drafts of the submitted scholarly material. The Committee shall provide the applicant with the names of the outside evaluators chosen by the Committee and shall consider any reasonable objections raised by the candidate to any of the proposed evaluators.
The faculty member’s involvement in the operation of the Law School and/or the university, or lack thereof, shall be considered. Community and public service shall also be considered affirmatively in promotion and tenure decisions. Community and public service includes contributions to community organizations and the organized bar; law-related public service; community outreach; and work related to the improvement of legal institutions and procedures and development of the law.

2. Standards for Faculty Clinical Directors

Decisions regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure shall be based on a comprehensive and objective assessment of a faculty member’s qualifications and performance. The three primary criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure are teaching performance, scholarship, and administrative performance.

Teaching Performance

The standard for tenure is excellence as defined in the appendix in clinical teaching and supervising students in clinical or similar settings. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is potential for exceptional merit at the time the tenure decision is to be made. The determination whether a faculty member has met such standards will be based primarily upon faculty and student evaluations conducted.

Scholarship

The standard for tenure is publication or production of a reasonable amount of high quality legal and law related material. This scholarship requirement may be satisfied not only by traditional forms of scholarship, such as law review articles, casebooks, treatises, contributions to treatises and works directly related to the needs of the practicing bar, but also in other forms that evolve from clinical teaching and representation of clients. These include studies or reports, practice manuals, legislation, pleadings, briefs, memoranda of law, and other documents prepared in the course of representing clients. Scholarship in the latter context is to be evaluated in terms of the ingenuity and quality of the work product. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is a demonstrated potential for compliance with the tenure standard at the time the tenure decision is to be made.

- Each Committee member shall make an independent judgment as to the quality of the scholarly material submitted pursuant to subsection (b), below. In addition, all such material shall be sent to at least three impartial outside evaluators. Evaluations which are returned in timely fashion shall be considered by the Committee. The Committee shall make every effort to assure that such evaluators’ expertise is consistent with the nature of the material submitted.

- A faculty member being considered for tenure shall submit to the committee a representative body of scholarly pieces (not fewer than two) which s/he wishes to be submitted for outside review. The exact number of scholarly pieces to be submitted for outside review shall be decided by the Committee chair in consultation with the faculty member. Co-authored pieces will not be considered for such outside review, but will be considered by the Committee for internal review. This election shall be made no later than December 1 of the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made.

A faculty member being considered for tenure shall choose from among his/her scholarly material those two items which s/he wishes to be submitted for review by outside evaluators. This election shall be made no later than December 1 of the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made.
The following procedure shall govern the choice of outside evaluators: The candidate may submit names of proposed evaluators. In addition to the names, the candidate should provide a brief description of the qualifications of the proposed evaluator, his/her relationship, if any, with the evaluator and the evaluator's previous involvement, if any, with drafts of the submitted scholarly material. The Committee shall provide the applicant with the names of the outside evaluators chosen by the Committee and shall consider any reasonable objections raised by the candidate to any of the proposed evaluators.

**Administrative Performance**

The standard for tenure is the development and maintenance of a high quality clinical program. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is potential for compliance with the tenure standard at the time the tenure decision is to be made. The determination whether a faculty member has met such standards will be carried out pursuant to the provisions below.

**University and Community Service**

The faculty member’s involvement in the operation of the Law School and/or the university, or lack thereof, shall be considered. Community and public service shall also be considered affirmatively in promotion and tenure decisions. Community and public service includes contributions to community organizations and the organized bar; law-related public service; community outreach; and work related to the improvement of legal institutions and procedures and development of the law.

**Rights and Responsibilities**

Faculty members who have been granted tenure under this section shall have the same rights and responsibilities as all faculty granted such status. Faculty members who have been granted tenure based on these standards shall have primary responsibility to teach clinical courses and shall be eligible to teach traditional classroom and seminar classes if, in the judgment of the dean, there is a teaching need in the area and teaching the course will not have an adverse impact upon the clinical program.

**3. Standards for Legal Research & Writing Directors**

A Legal Research and Writing Director is a faculty member who directs and administers one of the Law School’s legal research and writing programs without any direct supervision by another member of the regular faculty, including another legal research & writing director.

Decisions regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure shall be based on a comprehensive and objective assessment of a faculty member’s qualifications and performance. The three primary criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure are teaching performance, scholarship, and administrative performance.

**Teaching Performance**

The standard for tenure is excellence as defined in the appendix in teaching legal research and writing. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is potential for excellence at the time the tenure decision is to be made. The determination whether a faculty member has met such standards will be based primarily upon faculty and student evaluations conducted.

**Scholarship**

1. The standard for tenure is publication of a reasonable amount of high quality legal and law related material. This scholarship requirement may be satisfied not only by traditional forms of
scholarship, such as law review articles, casebooks, treatises, contributions to treatises and works directly related to the needs of the practicing bar, but also in other written works concerning legal research, legal writing, or concerning the teaching of legal research or legal writing. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is a demonstrated potential for compliance with the tenure standard at the time the tenure decision is to be made.

2. Each Committee member shall make an independent judgment as to the quality of the scholarly material submitted pursuant to the provisions below. In addition, all such material shall be sent to at least three impartial outside evaluators. Evaluations which are returned in timely fashion shall be considered by the Committee. The Committee shall make every effort to assure that such evaluators’ expertise is consistent with the nature of the material submitted.

- A faculty member being considered for tenure shall submit to the committee such scholarly material as s/he wishes to be part of the evaluation process no later than December 1 of the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made.

- A faculty member being considered for tenure shall choose from among his/her scholarly material a representative body of scholarly pieces (not fewer than two) which s/he wishes to be submitted for outside review. The exact number of scholarly pieces to be submitted for outside review shall be decided by the Committee chair in consultation with the faculty member. Co-authored pieces will not be considered for such outside review, but will be considered by the Committee for internal review. This election shall be made no later than December 1 of the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made.

- The following procedure shall govern the choice of outside evaluators: The candidate may submit names of proposed evaluators. In addition to the names, the candidate should provide a brief description of the qualifications of the proposed evaluator, his/her relationship, if any, with the evaluator and the evaluator’s previous involvement, if any, with drafts of the submitted scholarly material. The Committee shall provide the applicant with the names of the outside evaluators chosen by the Committee and shall consider any reasonable objections raised by the candidate to any of the proposed evaluators.

**Administrative Performance**

The standard for tenure is the development and maintenance of a high quality legal research and writing program. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is demonstrated potential for compliance with the tenure standard at the time the tenure decision is to be made.

**University and Community Service**

The faculty member’s involvement in the operation of the Law School and/or the university, or lack thereof, shall be considered. Community and public service shall also be considered affirmatively in promotion and tenure decisions. Community and public service includes contributions to community organizations and the organized bar; law-related public service; community outreach; and work related to the improvement of legal institutions and procedures and development of the law.

**Rights and Responsibilities**

Faculty members who have been granted tenure under this section shall have the same rights and responsibilities as all other faculty granted such status. Faculty members who have been granted tenure based on these standards shall have primary responsibility to teach legal writing and research courses and
shall be eligible to teach traditional classroom and seminar classes if, in the judgment of the dean, there is a teaching need in the area and teaching the course will not have an adverse impact upon the legal research and writing program.

4. Standards for Academic Development Directors

Decisions regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure shall be based on a comprehensive and objective assessment of a faculty member’s qualifications and performance. The three primary criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure are teaching performance, scholarship, and administrative performance.

Teaching Performance

The standard for tenure is excellence as defined in the appendix in teaching in the academic development program, including classes (such as Legal Analysis and Legal Methods), workshops, and individual skills sessions with students. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is potential for excellence at the time the tenure decision is to be made. The determination whether a faculty member has met such standards will be based primarily upon faculty and student evaluations conducted.

Scholarship

1. The standard for tenure is publication of a reasonable amount of high quality legal and law related material. This scholarship requirement may be satisfied not only by traditional forms of scholarship, such as law review articles, casebooks, treatises, contributions to treatises and works directly related to the needs of the practicing bar, but also in other written works concerning academic development or the teaching of academic development. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is a demonstrated potential for compliance with the tenure standard at the time the tenure decision is to be made.

2. Each Committee member shall make an independent judgment as to the quality of the scholarly material submitted pursuant to subsection (b), below. In addition, all such material shall be sent to at least three impartial outside evaluators. Evaluations which are returned in timely fashion shall be considered by the Committee. The Committee shall make every effort to assure that such evaluators’ expertise is consistent with the nature of the material submitted.

- A faculty member being considered for tenure shall submit to the committee such scholarly material as s/he wishes to be part of the evaluation process no later than December 1 of the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made.

- A faculty member being considered for tenure shall choose from among his/her scholarly material a representative body of scholarly pieces (not fewer than two) which s/he wishes to be submitted for outside review. The exact number of scholarly pieces to be submitted for outside review shall be decided by the Committee chair in consultation with the faculty member. Co-authored pieces will not be considered for such outside review, but will be considered by the Committee for internal review. This election shall be made no later than December 1 of the academic year in which the tenure decision is to be made.

- The following procedure shall govern the choice of outside evaluators: The candidate may submit names of proposed evaluators. In addition to the names, the candidate should provide a brief description of the qualifications of the proposed evaluator, his/her relationship, if any, with the evaluator and the evaluator's previous involvement, if any, with drafts of the submitted scholarly material. The Committee shall provide the applicant with the names of the outside evaluators
chosen by the Committee and shall consider any reasonable objections raised by the candidate to any of the proposed evaluators.

**Administrative Performance**

The standard for tenure is the development and maintenance of a high quality academic development program. The standard for promotion and retention prior to tenure is demonstrated potential for compliance with the tenure standard at the time the tenure decision is to be made.

**University and Community Service**

The faculty member’s involvement in the operation of the Law School and/or the university, or lack thereof, shall be considered. Community and public service shall also be considered affirmatively in promotion and tenure decisions. Community and public service includes contributions to community organizations and the organized bar; law-related public service; community outreach; and work related to the improvement of legal institutions and procedures and development of the law.

**Rights and Responsibilities**

Faculty members who have been granted tenure under this section shall have the same rights and responsibilities as all other faculty granted such status. Faculty members who have been granted tenure based on these standards shall have primary responsibility to teach academic development and shall be eligible to teach traditional classroom and seminar classes if, in the judgment of the dean, there is a teaching need in the area and teaching the course will not have an adverse impact upon the academic development program.

**Tenure qualification**

Except in special circumstances, tenure shall not be granted to a faculty member who has had less than five (5) years of full-time teaching experience under a tenure-track appointment, at least three years of which shall have been at Golden Gate University. Requests to accelerate tenure consideration on the basis of special circumstances shall be decided on a case by case basis, based on the Committee’s assessment of all relevant circumstances including those advanced by the candidate and including the Committee’s assessment of the candidate’s readiness for a tenure vote. Readiness may include a showing that the candidate’s excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service over a period of fewer than 5 years would make it appropriate to accelerate the tenure vote.

**E. LLM FACULTY**

**General**

All rules pertaining to regular J.D. faculty shall apply also to LLM faculty members hired or appointed primarily to teach in one or more of the Law School's LLM programs (Environmental Law, Intellectual Property Law, International Law, Taxation, and United States Legal Studies) when such status is made clear in the individual faculty member's employment contract.

Decisions regarding retention, promotion and tenure of LLM program faculty shall be based upon the same standards applicable to JD Program faculty, including a comprehensive and objective assessment of the faculty member's teaching performance, scholarship, service to the law school, and, where relevant, administrative performance. The standard for teaching and/or administrative performance is excellence as defined in the appendix. The standard for scholarship is that applicable to J.D. faculty.
F. LONG-TERM CONTRACT FACULTY

STANDARDS

- Retention and promotion of contract faculty shall be based upon a comprehensive and objective assessment of the faculty member's performance as well as the programmatic and economic needs of the Law School.

- The primary criteria for judging performance are teaching quality and administrative performance where relevant. The standard for each is excellence as defined in the appendix. (The standard for the initial three-year contract is potential excellence.) The secondary criterion is contribution to the Law School through participation on committees and similar activities.

- The programmatic needs of the Law School shall be determined separately by the full faculty. Teaching and administrative performance shall be determined by the appropriate program director or, if teaching in a LL.M. program, the LL.M. Program Evaluation Committee.

- The appropriate program director or, if teaching in a LL.M. program, the LL.M. Program Evaluation Committee shall make its recommendation to the dean of the Law School.

THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Faculty Evaluation

Long-term contract faculty serving under either a two or three year contract shall be visited each year by the appropriate program director or, if teaching in a LL.M. program, two members of the LL.M. Program Evaluation Committee. Long-term contract faculty serving under five year contracts shall be visited in the 3rd and 4th years of such contracts by the appropriate program director or, if teaching in a LL.M. program, two members of the LL.M. Program Evaluation Committee members each year.

Evaluation Committee members who make the evaluation visits referred to above shall submit written reports to the Committee.

Voting

All long-term contracts shall be recommended to the dean upon an affirmative vote of the majority of those members of the LL.M. Program Evaluation Committee voting, yes or no. In non-LL.M. programs, all long-term contracts shall be made at the discretion of the program director after receiving approval from the Law School dean.

Notice Requirements

If a long-term contract faculty member wishes to be considered for reappointment, s/he shall inform the dean as early as possible in the last year of the contract term, and in any event, no later than the first day of the preceding spring semester.

A decision by the dean not to reappoint a long-term contract faculty member shall be made and given to the faculty member in writing by the dean at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment for a faculty member serving under a two, three, or five-year contract.
VI. APPEAL PROCESS

If, after the completion of the evaluation process, dismissal for cause or lay-offs, the faculty member believes the procedures required by this Manual were not followed, the faculty member may request examination of the validity of this concern by the Grievance Committee in cases involving faculty in the Schools of Business, Tax, Accounting, Undergraduate Programs and PLUS or equivalent committee in the Law School when involving a law faculty member. There will be no further review of the merits of the case. To appeal on the basis of failure to abide by the required procedures, the following steps will be taken:

Step 1: Grievant

The grievant will provide to the chair of the Committee a written statement outlining the specific procedures alleged to have been violated and how they were allegedly violated.

Step 2: Grievance Committee

The Committee will meet to confirm that the grievance is a charge of procedural violation. If the Committee determines it does not have purview over the grievance according to the policies set forth below, it shall notify the grievant of this decision within 10 working days of receipt of the grievance.

If the Committee determines that the grievance is regarding procedure, it shall request from the Vice President of Academic Affairs (in cases involving business, tax, accounting, undergraduate programs or PLUS faculty) or Law School dean (in cases involving law faculty) all information it considers to be appropriate in making a recommendation on the matter. The Vice President of Academic Affairs or Law School dean shall provide to the Committee such information he/she believes is appropriate within 3 working days of the Committee’s request.

Within 20 working days of receipt of the grievance, the Committee shall make a confidential recommendation regarding resolution of the grievance to the President. The committee shall also provide notification of the recommendation to the grievant. The President shall make the final decision regarding the grievance.
VII. POST-TENURE REVIEW

The purpose of review of tenured faculty members is to assist tenured faculty members in maximizing their potential and enhancing their contributions to their school, the university, the profession and to the community. To that end, every tenured faculty member must be formally reviewed to assess and promote the goals and performance of each faculty member.

In that spirit, tenured faculty members must go through a formal post-tenure review process at least every five years. [24]

In addition, as is the case for all faculty members, tenured faculty shall be evaluated annually by the dean for teaching performance, scholarly activity, and service. If, as a result of this annual review, the dean believes that the faculty member’s performance is not at the level expected of a tenured faculty member, the dean may initiate a full post-tenure review after consultation with the a subcommittee of Evaluation Committee (in the case of law faculty) or the Faculty Personnel Committee (in the case of business, tax, accounting and undergraduate programs faculty), even if it has not been five years since the last post-tenure review. Alternatively, at the discretion of the dean and in consultation with the faculty member, the dean may establish a one-year professional development plan designed to address deficits in performance. If in the dean’s opinion the overall performance of the faculty member remains below that expected of a tenured faculty member, the dean may initiate a full post-tenure review.

The post-tenure review process is as follows: At the end of five years since the last post-tenure review, or at the request of the dean if earlier, the Law School dean (in regard to law faculty) or the Vice President for Academic Affairs (in regard to business, tax, accounting and undergraduate programs faculty) will notify the faculty member subject to review of the impending review as well as the Faculty Personnel Committee or Law School Evaluation Committee. Within a reasonable time frame, the faculty member shall provide the dean and the Evaluation or Faculty Personnel Committee with a narrative regarding performance accompanied by any supporting documentation the faculty member views as appropriate. [25]

The areas for review are performance as a teacher, performance as a scholar, and service to the university and profession (through department, school or university service).

For business, accounting, tax and undergraduate programs faculty, the dean will prepare an evaluation and provide a copy to the faculty member who will have the opportunity to write a written response within a reasonable period of time. The dean will provide his/her final evaluation to the Faculty Personnel Committee.

The subcommittee of the Evaluation Committee or the Faculty Personnel Committee will prepare a draft report, together with any recommendations, and submit it to the faculty member under review. The Committee will subsequently meet the faculty member to discuss the evaluation. [26] Following the meeting, the faculty member will have the opportunity to provide a written response within 10 working

[24] For law faculty, to initiate this new review process, in 2007-2008, the two or more most senior tenured faculty will be reviewed. Each year thereafter, the next two or more senior tenured faculty will be reviewed.

[25] If not provided by the faculty member under review, the reviewer may, at its discretion, request submission of any of the following: reviewee’s current resume, scholarly work, course materials, and information regarding teaching and service to the university/school/students. Such information gathered for review of law faculty shall be maintained in an individual file accessible to the reviewee.

[26] The faculty member under review may request at any time to be heard. The faculty member under review is permitted to have an adviser of his choosing to act as counsel in any of the discussions.
days of the meeting. After considering all relevant material, the Committee will prepare a final report together with recommendations and provide such report and recommendations to the Law School dean (with respect to law faculty) or the Vice President for Academic Affairs and appropriate dean (with respect to business, tax, accounting and undergraduate programs faculty) and the faculty member under review.

Consistent with the spirit of post-tenure review, the process is anticipated in most cases to generate an increased self-understanding of the reviewee’s strengths as well as areas for continued growth and renewed focus. This will most often assist in informing the development of the upcoming Annual Faculty Workload Agreement. In addition, as a result of the review, the dean may consider a range of actions appropriate to address identified areas of weaknesses, including instituting dismissal for cause procedures.

After the completion of the post-tenure review process, if the faculty member under review believes the review procedures required by this Manual were not followed, the faculty member may appeal under the “Appeal Process” in VI above.
VIII. FACULTY LAY-OFFS

Faculty members may be laid-off when the university experiences financial exigency. This applies to tenured and non-tenured faculty members. A financial exigency refers to a current or imminent financial circumstance that threatens the stability of the university or a material operating segment of the university. A financial exigency may exist without all parts of the university being affected. A financial exigency in a segment of the university that may be rectified through faculty and staff lay-offs in that segment may not trigger a faculty lay-off in another segment of the university.

Evidence of financial exigency may include but is not limited to current or anticipated enrollment decline, revenue shortfalls, and ongoing operating budget deficits that threaten the viability of a program, school or university.

In addition, business, tax, accounting, undergraduate programs and PLUS faculty members may be laid-off when the university experiences other serious exigencies. Other serious exigencies include discontinuance of or substantial reduction in a program or department when it is determined by the President that the educational mission or achievement of strategic goals of the university will be enhanced by a discontinuance or reduction. An exigency is characterized by a substantial and chronic problem within a school, department or program, such as a serious and non-cyclical decline in student enrollments that may affect the allocation of faculty positions within that school, department or program.

When the President of the university has a bona fide belief that a financial or other serious exigency exists, he/she shall consult with his/her management team, faculty leadership and appropriate administrators. Following these consultations, if the President concludes that one or more faculty members may need to be laid-off, the President shall inform the Board of Trustees or its Executive Committee and following such consultation, make the final decision as to the most appropriate actions to be taken. Should a faculty member be terminated as a result of financial or other serious exigencies, the faculty member will be given the option of a one-year terminal non-renewable contract to begin at the end of the teaching term in which notice is given, or severance pay under the university severance policies.

When the President concludes that the lay-off of full-time faculty is necessitated by circumstances indicated above, the following rules will be applied in determining which faculty members will be laid-off:

- Full-time non-tenured faculty in the program/department affected will be laid off before full-time tenured faculty in that unit.

- When all other relevant factors are equal, seniority and rank should be a consideration in determining the order of termination. [28]

The President shall make the final decision regarding full-time faculty layoffs after consulting with the pertinent dean(s), the Vice President for Academic Affairs or Law School dean and faculty leadership.

[27] When the financial exigency is in the School of Law, the law faculty shall determine the process and procedures for making a recommendation to the dean and the President regarding the most appropriate action to rectify such financial exigency. The President in making the ultimate decision on the action recommended by the law school shall assure that the action is consistent with the ABA Standards and adequately and appropriately addresses the financial exigency.

[28] The President may adjust these ordering rules after consultation with the Law School dean and faculty to the extent required to assure continued compliance with ABA Standards.
Faculty affected by the decision to lay off faculty members may be considered for reassignment to any other appropriate academic position within the university, considering the qualifications of the faculty member.

Should the faculty position that was eliminated become available within a three year period immediately subsequent to the date of elimination, any laid-off tenured faculty member whose performance prior to lay-off met the standards applicable to tenured faculty shall have first right to such position.
IX. DISMISSAL FOR CAUSE

Adequate Cause

Dismissal for cause is a severance action by which the university terminates the appointment of a faculty member prior to the end of his/her contract period. A faculty member may be dismissed when, in the judgment of the President, the good of the university requires such action. Such action will be taken only after careful review of the facts by the President, who shall make the final decision. The grounds for dismissal for cause shall be failure, refusal, or inability to perform the duties of the position; demonstrable professional incompetence, substantial neglect of duty, conduct that destroys the cooperation required for the proper functioning and operation of a school, insubordination, conviction of a felony or any offense involving moral turpitude upon a plea or verdict of guilty or following a plea of nolo contendere; fraud in securing appointment; failure or refusal to comply with the lawful directives of the university or violation of its regulations, policies or practices including, but not limited to violation of the university's drug and alcohol abuse prevention policy; violation of the university's sexual harassment policies or non-discrimination policies; or conduct damaging to the welfare or reputation of the university.

Dismissal Procedures

If it is determined that the conduct or performance of the faculty member provides adequate cause for dismissal and a cure period would be appropriate, the dean shall discuss the matter with the faculty member in a personal conference and provide a written statement to the faculty member, outlining the deficient nature of the faculty member’s performance or conduct and being clear about the performance or behavioral standards which govern, what steps need to be taken in order for the individual's performance to become satisfactory and in accord with the policies of the university. If the faculty member declines to address the performance or behavioral issues outlined or does not appropriately respond to this informal attempt to correct the cited performance or behavioral problem(s), or, if after providing such notice adequate progress in correcting unsatisfactory performance or conduct does not occur, more formal procedures shall be initiated.

In cases involving violation of the university’s Discrimination and Harassment Policy set forth in the Employee Handbook, the investigation procedures outlined therein shall be followed prior to any preliminary determinations being made concerning adequate cause for termination and prior to the initiation of any formal dismissal procedures. Once the report of the special investigator and the recommendation of the Human Resources Director is received, when appropriate the dismissal procedures set forth here shall be followed in the case of tenured faculty, in lieu of the procedures set forth in Employee Handbook; provided however, the provisions of Employee Handbook’s Discrimination and Harassment Policy shall be followed regarding the confidentiality of the complainant and all university personnel involved in the dismissal proceedings shall only divulge the name of the complainant, the circumstances of the complaint, and the disposition of the matter, to those people who have a legitimate need to know.

A formal dismissal procedure shall be initiated by providing the faculty member with a written statement outlining the deficient and uncorrected nature of the faculty member’s performance or conduct including the performance or behavioral standards which govern the issues which will be the subject of dismissal proceedings.

The faculty member will be given 21 days to provide a written response to the dean. The faculty member must state in the response whether he or she requests a formal hearing. If such a hearing is
requested, the dean shall notify the faculty member of the time and place of the hearing. The position of all parties will be heard by a faculty committee appointed by the Evaluations Committee (with respect to a law faculty member) or the Faculty Senate (with respect to a business, accounting, tax, undergraduate programs or PLUS faculty member) and by the Law School dean (in cases involving law faculty) or the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The faculty member shall have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense and shall have the opportunity to be confronted by adverse witnesses. Both the university and the faculty member may have the assistance of an advisor of their choosing who may act as counsel. The hearing need not be conducted in accordance with strict rules of legal evidence; however, reasonable efforts shall be made to obtain the most complete and reliable evidence available which bears upon the charges. Adjournments may be granted to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made. The faculty member shall be afforded opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary evidence, and the administration of the university shall, insofar as it is possible for it to do so, secure the cooperation of such witnesses and make available necessary documents and other evidence within its control. The faculty member and the administration shall have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Where witnesses cannot or will not appear, but the interests of either party justify the admission of written statements, the witness or source of information shall be disclosed. The burden is on the university to demonstrate that dismissal is an appropriate action. There shall be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the faculty committee shall deliberate and prepare a written recommendation which shall be transmitted to the Law School dean (in cases involving law faculty) or the Vice President for Academic Affairs (in cases involving business, tax, accounting, undergraduate programs and PLUS faculty) and the faculty member. The Law School dean or Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make a final decision, after consulting with the President and then communicate such to the faculty member, his or her dean/director (with respect to business, tax, accounting, undergraduate programs and PLUS faculty) and the faculty committee.

In certain circumstances it may be necessary to place a faculty member on leave without prior warnings or a cure period for serious offenses, such as, but not limited to, theft of university property, the use of illegal drugs on campus, or sexual harassment or any other circumstance for which a notice and cure period is not appropriate. In such a case, the dean of the Law School or the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final decision after careful review of the facts as to the appropriateness of this action and shall begin formal proceedings for dismissal for cause immediately upon placing the faculty member on leave.

A faculty member terminated under this provision shall have the right to appeal such action through the appeal process set forth in Section VI above; provided however, if a termination resulted from violation of the Discrimination and Harassment Policy set forth in the Employee Handbook, a faculty member may appeal such decision in accordance with the procedures outlined therein.

Sanctions Short of Dismissal

Since tenured, as well as non-tenured, faculty members might engage in conduct which, though not warranting dismissal, might be detrimental to the School, the dean (after consulting with the Director of Human Resources and the President (with respect to a law faculty member) or the Vice President for Academic Affairs (with respect to business, tax, accounting, undergraduate programs and PLUS faculty) may invoke disciplinary sanctions against a faculty member guilty of such conduct. Such disciplinary
sanctions shall include, but are not limited to: (a) an oral reprimand; (b) a written reprimand; (c) reduction in salary for a stated period; (d) suspension from service for a stated period; (e) restitution (for example, payment of damages caused to the School); and (f) loss of prospective benefits for a stated period, such as suspension of salary increases or promotion eligibility.

If such sanction is imposed by the dean, the faculty member may appeal to the President provided however, if a sanction resulted from violation of the Discrimination and Harassment Policy set forth in the Employee Handbook, a faculty member may appeal such decision in accordance with the procedures outlined therein. Except for a violation of the Discrimination and Harassment Policy, at the option of the faculty member, for any sanction other than an oral reprimand, the faculty member may request that there be a review of the sanction imposed. Such review will follow the procedures set forth in Section VI above.
X. TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

Annual Contract

The contract for full-time faculty members shall include the following: 1) identification of faculty rank, 2) nature of the contract [tenure, term, etc.], 3) salary and benefits.

Each full-time faculty member will receive his/her contract by the beginning of the contract year. The contract year for faculty in the School of Law shall begin on August 1 and end on July 31. The contract year for faculty outside the School of Law shall begin on September 1 and end on August 31. Full-time faculty contracts will be for a work period of 40 weeks, which can be served consecutively or in a manner that is agreed upon by the dean. Stipends for additional administrative work carry with them an expectation of work beyond 40 weeks, to be agreed upon by the dean.

Leaves of Absence

Unpaid leaves of absence will be allowed on an individual basis at the discretion of the Law School dean (with respect to law faculty) or the Vice President for Academic Affairs (with respect to all other faculty) if, after consulting with the President, it is determined that such leave meets a business interest of the university. For an unpaid leave, a request must be made in writing to the dean of the school in which the faculty member resides. The dean shall then make a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (with respect to business, tax, accounting, undergraduate programs and PLUS faculty) or the President (with respect to law faculty) who shall approve or disapprove the leave. A leave of absence is for a period of up to one year. The President or VPAA may grant an extension of the leave of absence upon recommendation of the dean. If the employee fails to return from the approved leave(s) of absence, the employment relationship ceases to exist. Leaves of absence do not count as service in determining eligibility for promotion or sabbaticals.

Leaves of absence that fall within the protection of state or federal laws governing medical leaves, disability accommodation or other protected employment rights are governed by the provisions of the applicable laws. Such leaves are coordinated through the Office of Human Resources.

Sabbaticals

All full-time Assistant, Associate, or full Professors may apply for a sabbatical every seven years, either for a twenty week term at full pay or a forty week term at half pay. In academic years when the operating budget is out of balance, sabbatical requests may be relegated to a later time. The eligibility order will be adhered to as sabbaticals are again available.

A sabbatical is given for a specific purpose and the application submitted must abide by the procedures detailed in the appendix to this manual. Award of a sabbatical may be granted only upon approval of the dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs (with respect to business, tax, accounting and undergraduate programs faculty) or President (with respect to law faculty), after consultation with the department or discipline faculty and chair (when applicable).

A faculty member on sabbatical remains subject to this manual. The time spent on a sabbatical is part of the faculty member's current contract and is included in meeting, any and all time-in-grade requirements, including but not limited to promotion, eligibility for contract renewal and tenure. Faculty on sabbatical will continue as full-time employees of Golden Gate University and will continue to fully participate in the university's benefit program while on sabbatical leave.
In order to gain the maximum developmental benefits from sabbaticals, faculty members are encouraged to seek 40-week sabbaticals, combined with partial external appointments and funding. A faculty member who is granted a 20-week sabbatical may not receive compensation for services at another institution or organization except with the expressed agreement of the university, via the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (with respect to business, tax, accounting and undergraduate programs faculty) or the President (with respect to law faculty). Recipients may, however, accept scholarships, fellowships and/or grants-in-aid from approved institutions. Faculty on sabbatical may not teach overload classes for Golden Gate University unless they receive, in advance, the permission of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (with respect to business, tax, accounting and undergraduate programs faculty) or the President (with respect to law faculty).

**Stipends**

- **Overload Teaching:** Due to unforeseen circumstances, teaching assignments beyond that initially agreed to for the year may be necessary to meet the university's teaching obligations. A faculty member may teach such “overload” classes only after receiving the permission of the dean/director and in accordance with policies approved by the President.

- **Administrative work:** Stipends for additional administrative work are subject to policies approved by the President.

**Outside Employment**

By accepting a full-time faculty position at GGU, all full-time Assistant, Associate, or full Professors agree that their primary professional responsibility is to the university and that they will devote their time and energy primarily to the performance of their university duties. At the same time, Golden Gate recognizes that participation of faculty members in outside professional activities often serves the university. Professional consulting, leadership in professional societies, and various forms of public service not only promote the professional development of the faculty, but also expose Golden Gate to others. In addition, outside professional activity in some cases is beneficial for maintaining currency and competence in the discipline.

Accordingly, with the dean’s consent, a member of faculty may secure outside employment that is not detrimental to the interests of the university and does not interfere with university responsibilities. Full-time employment elsewhere is not permitted under any circumstances.

**XI. RESEARCH POLICY AND HUMAN SUBJECTS**

Faculty members undertaking research using a survey instrument, or supervising the work of students engaged in research using a survey instrument, shall be careful to protect the rights and welfare of the persons participating in the study. Should faculty members become involved in human subject experimentation, they shall adhere to all applicable governmental regulations.
APPENDIX 1:  GOLDDEN GATE UNIVERSITY BASIC TEACHING EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY IN THE SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS, TAX, ACCOUNTING, UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS AND PLUS [29]

Purpose

These guidelines are intended as an aid to adjunct and full-time faculty at GGU in preparing and teaching their courses. Explicit expectations are important in order to help individual instructors understand the context in which they are adding value to their students. It is our goal that all instructors will run their courses in ways that are consistent with the mission of the university and the overall objectives of the program(s) served by the course. Since one of Golden Gate University’s objectives is to achieve excellence, it is essential that every course contribute to that goal.

The following are expected of every Golden Gate University faculty member, in conventional settings, on CyberCampus, and in mixed-mode:

Faculty Teaching Responsibilities

1. **Above All**: Be current in your field; focus on the students’ learning outcomes and career success; be aware of how your course fits into its program; be prepared for every class meeting.

2. **Course Content**: The course coverage should be consistent with GGU’s mission -- an integration of theory and current real-world practice. The content and textbook should be consistent with the published course description, and with the curriculum guidance document (CG), if one exists. The course should cover the prescribed material in terms of breadth and depth.

3. **Essential Elements of Each Course.** Note that some programs may choose to implement these points in particular courses and not in others.
   - independent research for graduate students and recommended for undergraduates;
   - reading beyond the textbook;
   - international content if relevant to the discipline;
   - ethics if relevant to the discipline;
   - technology if relevant to the discipline;
   - currency of course materials including the textbook.

[29] Approved by Faculty Committee on Academic Standards July 13, 2004
4. **Recommended Elements**: Cases in subjects where relevant and available, especially for graduate courses; and a variety of teaching approaches, avoiding over-reliance on straight lecture.

5. **Syllabus**: The syllabus should serve as a complete definition of what will happen in the course. In addition to the above, a good syllabus will contain the following
   - **Course description** must be included, as given in the GGU catalog.
   - **Course goals** must be consistent with the overall program objectives
   - **Requirements and guidelines**. All requirements should be spelled out explicitly: readings, assignments, participation, attendance, team projects, homework, etc.
   - **Schedule**. Provide specific and unambiguous timing for topics and assignments.
   - **Grading**. Specific and unambiguous specifications for grading (see below)
   - **Guide to resources** in the university available to the students, for writing, math, and research.
   - **Bibliography** of other useful books, articles, and websites should be listed.
   - **Contact and availability information**.
   - **Academic integrity**. Provide GGU policies and your own expectations

6. **Instructor Attendance**: Face-to-face classes should meet for the full scheduled time. Canceling class should be rare. When the instructor absolutely cannot be present, a substitute should be arranged. If the class cannot meet as scheduled, some form of student contact should be arranged to take its place, such as a CyberCampus session. For expectations for instructor presence in Cyber classes, see the separate section on Cyber teaching guidelines.

7. **Grading**: Grading is an essential part of quality in education.
   **Do**:
   - explain the basis for grading;
   - provide feedback on students’ progress early in the term;
   - differentiate in your grading between better and poorer performers;
   - include class participation in the grading;
   - include elements other than exams in the grading if possible;
   - turn in your grades on time.
   **Don’t**:
   - inflate your grades – it erodes the value of the grade and the GGU degree;
   - share one student’s grade with another student.
8. **Participation:** In the GGU model, participation by all students in class discussions is essential. Make that clear to the students and manage the class meetings accordingly. Provide students with explicit guidelines for how to participate. Bear in mind that class participation may be difficult for international students and you may need to make an extra effort to involve them. Note that the PLUS program is a valuable resource available to international students.

9. **Exams:** At least one exam must be administered in every undergraduate course. Exams are encouraged for graduate courses as well. The exam need not be the main element in grading.

10. **Embrace diversity:** A range of cultures, backgrounds, genders, sexual preferences, ages, and experience level is to be expected in the classroom. We should embrace that variety and recognize it in the learning process as we conduct our courses. International students are an important part of the GGU student body. Their needs should be kept in mind along with those of our primary target audience, the U.S.-based working adult.

11. **Rigor:** Instructors are strongly encouraged to uphold high standards for quality of scholarship in their courses. It is expected that each student will do a substantial amount of work outside of class and that their work product will reflect professional standards of the discipline.

12. **Academic integrity.** Make sure your students are aware of what constitutes plagiarism. Students should be expected to cite sources properly and should know that copying work of others in part or in whole will be result in grading penalties and possibly other sanctions. Take appropriate steps to prevent cheating on exams and other course work.

13. **English.** English is the language of instruction at Golden Gate University, and the quality of students’ written and oral work is part of their performance in each course. The quality of written English in assignments should be part of the grading.

---

**Course Content**

1. **The Syllabus is clear, detailed, and specific.**
   
   - Is consistent with the curriculum guidance document provided by the academic department.
   - Lists required texts & software, including title, edition, author, publisher & ISBN. Textbooks must be current editions.
   - Includes instructor bio, education, teaching history & professional experiences.
   - Explains details of course activities, assignments & major projects.
   - Lists all exams, their location (online or supervised), the exam format & the dates the exam can be taken.
   - Provides the same course description that is listed in the current GGU catalog.
• Lists course objectives and learning outcomes that describe what students will know or be able to
do as a result of taking the course. These objectives are linked to the established departmental
program goals.

• Contains complete course schedule identifying weekly topics, activities, assignments & due dates.

• Provides clear instructions on how to begin & proceed through the course.

• Clearly outlines course policies and expectations such as discussion participation, grading,
penalties for late work, plagiarism, etc.

• Contains instructor's name, title, email address, work phone number (or university contact phone
number) & physical or virtual office hours (if appropriate).

• Explains when & how students receive feedback from the instructor.

• Bibliography is provided, and other resources available in the university, such as the electronic
resources of the Library, the Online Writing Lab (OWL), the Math Lab (MOTH), departmental
tutors when available, etc are listed.

• The university’s and the instructor’s expectations for academic integrity must be specified.

2. Course content is divided into well-constructed, manageable learning units (sessions).

• Each session lists objectives that:
  o are stated in observable, measurable, achievable, & student oriented terms.
  o support the course objectives.

• Each session begins with components that orient the student to the session: an overview,
statements connecting new material to previous content, organizational info, etc.

• Each session contains content that is complete, appropriate & supports session objectives.

• Each session provides instructor’s perspective on the material, including real world examples
where appropriate.

• Content delivery methods are engaging, interactive, varied & challenging for students.

• Content provided by the textbook publisher is referred to or incorporated into the course, if
appropriate.

• Session content is appropriately segmented and sequenced.

• Session activities are rich and varied and might include reading, writing, research requirements,
quizzes, case studies, etc and:
require students where applicable to make appropriate & effective use of external resources, including print, library, Web-based, & other electronic resources.

- allow students ample opportunities to practice & apply concepts & skills in realistic & relevant ways.
- support session objectives.

- Each session concludes with components that re-orient students: a summary, integration with course objectives, assessment, etc.

3. **Courses should include several methods of assessing student learning.**

- Assessment methods work best when tied to course assignments.
- Assessments should be appropriate for the specified in the objectives.
- Assessments should measure course or session objectives.

---

**CYBER-COURSES: DEFINING A QUALITY ONLINE BASIC STUDENT EXPERIENCE**

At Golden Gate University, the creation and delivery of successful, student-focused online educational experiences is the result of an ongoing collaboration among the instructor, the academic department, and the CyberCampus design and support team.

Many ingredients are common to a high quality course. Among these are rich, topical content; clear, consistent objectives and appropriate assessment measures; frequent and rich feedback from the instructor; communications that promote high quality student-teacher interaction; and effective course management.

To promote these qualities, and to assist in providing meaningful guidance and support, the university engages in unobtrusive and productive peer and departmental visitations that result in constructive and supportive feedback to instructors.

The following provide further details on the requirements and recommendations that together describe Golden Gate University’s expectations

*Online Courses – Defining a Quality Student Experience*

**Course Management**

1. Instructor notifies students of their grade or standing in the course throughout the semester.
2. Instructor updates course content as necessary to reflect current events in the field.
3. Instructor identifies course and session start/end dates.

4. Instructor posts student test results and provides assignment feedback promptly.

5. Instructor submits reports to GGU on student progress as requested.

---

**Communication and Student Support**

1. Instructor ensures regular and respectful communication with students throughout the semester.
   
   - On the Syllabus, lists average response time for email and phone calls. Instructors respond within a reasonable timeframe and keep students apprised of their schedule and availability. Under no circumstance should students wait more than two working days for a response from their instructor.
   
   - Instructor logs-in at least four times each week and frequently posts engaging, thoughtful, and meaningful dialogue in Discussions, course Announcements, and via email.
   
   - Instructor regularly provides personalized feedback & encouragement to students. It is not expected that an instructor will respond to every student’s posting.
   
   - Instructor makes proactive attempts to create a rich learning community using such strategies as group activities, peer review, encouraging use of chat, assigning study partners, creating “Cyber Lounge” discussion area, posting class contact info, requiring students to post their bios, etc.
   
   - Instructor shows regular presence in the course through discussion postings, emails, announcements, Chat, and other means.
   
   - Options for ongoing student feedback are provided and encouraged.

2. Course includes links to appropriate student life and student support web pages.

3. Instructor notifies students of their “Cyber Expectations and Responsibilities”.

4. Course includes information regarding external resources for student support: Browser Configuration & Technical Requirements, 24/7 Help Desk, Supervised Exams, Bookstore, GGU Library, Online Writing Lab, Math Online Tutor Help, and Basic Course Navigation, etc.
Technical

1. Course material is accurate and up-to-date.
   - Course does not contain any broken links, missing files or missing images.
   - Course content is free of typos.
   - Session start and end dates are correct.
   - Content not yet ready for student view is hidden.

2. Graphics & text layouts are clear and appealing.

3. Download information is provided for required software or plug-ins.

4. GGU Enterprise Technology Services & CyberCampus support the delivery methods used in the course.

---

CYBER – COURSES: A FACULTY GUIDE TO STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES:

In an effort to promote a high-quality student experience, we want to communicate expectations with regard to participating in the Golden Gate University Cyber Campus delivery system. We believe we have operationalized this mode well, and are receiving good feedback about our Cyber Campus classes. For example, US News and World Report just rated Golden Gate University’s Cyber Campus classes as being amongst the best in the nation.

Golden Gate University’s Cyber Campus classes are designed and managed to deliver the learning outcomes of a traditional, face-to-face classroom. Former students report that Cyber classes are often more demanding than classes offered in alternative modes. Research shows that to be a successful online student, one needs to be self-directed and show ability for independent work. Students should be prepared to invest an adequate amount of preparation and participation time to achieve, for themselves and their classmates, the learning objectives of the class. In achieving this, Cyber Classrooms give them great flexibility in scheduling learning activity time.

We have found it valuable to communicate to students the specifics of what is involved in taking a Cyber Campus class. You are encouraged to communicate the following to your students:

---

Time Management

1. Login frequently. Log-in and participate in class activities at least four days every week unless otherwise instructed by the professor.
2. **Make quality postings.** Quality participation involves more than just making an isolated posting; postings should build on previous submissions and expand the depth of the discussion. Your instructor will have additional guidelines.

3. **Read all materials thoroughly.** Students are responsible for reading all content items in the course, since different class assignments and activities are often located in different areas of the class.

4. **Stay current.** Students are expected to keep current with all the readings, assignments, homework, and classroom participation. It is important to note that falling behind in a Cyber Campus class makes it very difficult to catch up.

---

**Communication**

1. **Have reasonable expectations for e-mail responses.** When communicating with professors, anticipate a reply within two business days; hence, when sending an e-mail build in the expected response time. In case of emergency, try to contact the instructor by phone or fax. Follow the instructions that the instructor gives you about appropriate use of e-mail communication for the given class. In general, communication should be via the class discussion area. E-mails should be restricted to issues of a personal nature.

2. **Create high-quality postings.** Thread your postings with the postings of others in the discussion by engaging in the dialogue. Try to ask questions, add clarifications, present comparisons, relate professional practice insights, and show appreciation for your peers’ contributions.

3. **Avoid value judgments.** Value judgments imply a right and wrong, rather than a difference of opinion. They involve making an estimation of the quality and/or goodness of a person, action or event. They retard rather than promote communication.

---

**Etiquette and Protocols**

1. **Be professional when communicating.** Participation in the class should uphold principles of collegiality and professionalism. Issues that arise between the instructor and the student should be kept isolated to the concerned student and instructor. The use of the cyber platform electronic features such as e-mail, discussion groups, chat, and doc sharing for disbursement of inflammatory issues is considered inappropriate behavior. Instructors reserve the right to delete any such postings.

2. **Avoid abusive language.** Abusive use of language and a hostile attitude within classroom interactions is considered unacceptable. Be careful not to be malicious, spiteful or overly confrontational.

---

**Academic Integrity**
1. **Cite sources properly.** Learning how to cite sources properly, giving credit to original author’s works, is an important element in the Golden Gate University teaching/learning environment. Students should be familiar with the guidelines the university provides and try their utmost to avoid the pitfalls of plagiarism. Citing all sources, hard copy, Web-based, and others in proper academic format is expected of every student.
APPENDIX 2.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR BUSINESS, TAX, ACCOUNTING AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS FACULTY

1-2 points: Low Merit
3-5 points: Some Merit
6-8 points: High Merit
9-10 points: Exceptional Merit

Evaluation of Teaching: In evaluating teaching performance, the reviewer should consider course content, currency of material presented, clarity and thoroughness of course syllabi, appropriateness of course structure and assignments to meet course objectives, rigor, and activities that promote active learning.

Student evaluation results for teaching effectiveness and course structure (both numerical and comments) should be given significant weight in the review except in circumstances where the response rate is too small to be informative. Faculty interest in innovation and exploring ways to improve pedagogy should also be considered. In addition, the faculty member’s self assessment of teaching is an important component of the review.

Evaluators should consider the following as guidelines when rating the faculty member’s teaching performance:

1-2 points: “Low Merit”: Very few of the university “teaching expectations” fulfilled. Course content and structure regularly disorganized, with little relevance to course learning outcomes. Most course material not updated, with only minor attention paid to current theories and practice. The syllabus is not well-thought out and ill-prepared. Assignments and activities have slight relevance to course objectives and are only occasionally suitable to course objectives and active learning. Student evaluations suggest little value added.

3-5 points: “Some Merit”: Many of the university “teaching expectations” fulfilled. Content and structure generally organized with fair relevance to learning outcomes. Course materials are adequately updated and generally reflective of current theories and practice. There is satisfactory syllabus preparation. Assignments and activities are pertinent and adequately contribute to students’ learning. Student evaluations suggest some value added.

6-8 points: “High Merit”: Most of the university “teaching expectations” fulfilled. Course content and structure are well-organized and have significant relevance to learning outcomes. Course materials are updated regularly, and reflect current theories and practices. Syllabus is well-written, clear and comprehensive. Assignments and activities are well-designed, with demonstrable links between course objectives and student learning. Student evaluations suggest a good deal of value added.

9-10 points: “Exceptional Merit”: Nearly all of the university “teaching expectations” fulfilled. Course content and structure are exceptionally well-designed with unmistakable relevance to learning outcomes. Course materials and pedagogy are continuously evaluated and updated to
reflect current theories and practices in the discipline or subject being taught, Syllabus is outstanding in clarity and content and provides all pertinent information above and beyond the norm. Every assignment and activity significantly contributes toward students’ learning, comprehension, retention and application of the subject area. Student evaluations suggest significant value added.

**Evaluation of Scholarship:** In evaluating scholarship, the reviewer should consider both the quantity and quality of the scholarly work produced in relation to the overall workload of the faculty member, commitments made in establishing the annual workloads, and ability to produce scholarly work. Scholarship includes, but is not limited to, presentations, publications, curricular and course development, faculty development and assessment of programmatic educational effectiveness.

Evaluators should consider the following as guidelines when rating the faculty member’s scholarship:

**1-2 points:** “Low Merit”: Slight presence of scholarly work, with little or no impact on his/her discipline or the university’s curriculum.

**3-5 points:** “Some Merit”: Adequate demonstration of a pattern of scholarship and/or research, resulting in some impact on his/her discipline or the university’s curriculum. Scholarship is at a lower level in quality and/or quantity than anticipated when establishing the annual workload.

**6-8 points:** “High Merit”: Conduct significant research or scholarly work resulting in a high level of impact on his/her discipline or the university’s curriculum. Scholarship is at the same or higher level in quality and/or quantity than anticipated when establishing the annual workload.

**9-10 points:** “Exceptional Merit”: A demonstrated pattern of major scholarship resulting in an exceptional level of influence on his/her academic discipline or the university’s curriculum. Scholarship is at the same or higher level in quality and/or quantity than anticipated when establishing the annual workload.

**Evaluation of Institutional Service and Citizenship:** In evaluating institutional service and citizenship, the reviewer should consider the faculty member’s involvement in institutional activities other than teaching and scholarship such as committee work, departmental leadership, program leadership, student mentoring, participation in student clubs and activities, and involvement in other activities that serve to benefit the university in some way. The level of involvement and commitment should be considered in light of the faculty member’s overall workload. In addition, the faculty member’s effectiveness in the service activities should be considered, to include success in achieving objectives of departmental or program leadership, quality of student mentoring, and quality and effectiveness in committee work.

Evaluators should consider the following as guidelines when rating the faculty member’s institutional service and citizenship:

**1-2 points – “Low Merit”**: Participates in some departmental, school or institutional activities that are expected of all members of the faculty. There is little or no additional participation in academic or university committees; little or no participation in program leadership, student mentoring or other similar activities. Participation and quality is at a level significantly lower than anticipated when establishing the annual workload.
3-5 points – “Some Merit”: Participates in most departmental, school or institutional activities that are expected of all members of the faculty. There is a small amount of participation in student mentoring and/or student activity. Participation and quality is at a level lower than anticipated when establishing the annual workload.

6-8 points – “High Merit”: Regularly engages in departmental and/or program leadership. Participates positively in several academic and/or university committees. Provides significant mentorship to students, and is involved in student activities. Participation and quality is at the same or higher level than anticipated when establishing the annual workload.

9-10 points – “Exceptional Merit”: Provides exceptional and continuous departmental and/or program leadership. Provides strong and constructive leadership in academic and/or university committees. Provides outstanding and continuous student mentorship, and is recognized as a superior counselor and guide. Participation and quality is at the same or higher level than anticipated when establishing the annual workload.
APPENDIX 3: EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LECTURERS

The reviewer should consider the level of completion of the agreed-upon responsibilities, the quality of the deliverables, and the degree to which the objectives were achieved.

1-2 points: “Low Merit”: Few or no deliverables are presented. Objectives are not met. Lecturer does not hold her/himself accountable for outcomes.

3-5 points: “Some Merit”: Some deliverables or outcomes are successfully completed. A small number of objectives are satisfactorily met. Quality and/or quantity of work are at a lower level than anticipated.

6-8 points: “High Merit”: Most deliverables are successfully presented on time, and most objectives are satisfactorily met. Quality and/or quantity of work meet or exceed acceptable standards.

9-10 points: “Exceptional Merit”: All deliverables are presented on or ahead of deadlines, and all objectives are met or exceeded. Work reflects exceptional quality and the quantity of work exceeds expectations.
APPENDIX 4: TEACHING PERFORMANCE STANDARD - LAW SCHOOL FACULTY

Excellence in teaching comprehends classroom instruction and a broad range of faculty-student relationships, including ready availability of each teacher to students in the faculty member's office, after class, and otherwise as in advising and encouraging co-curricular and extra-curricular student activities. These include the following traits in the teacher: command of the subject matter, familiarity with advances and developments in the area taught, ability to organize materials and present them with force and logic capturing the attention of the students, ability to arouse curiosity on the part of the students toward further and more independent learning, ability to stimulate students in creative work, ability to prepare a sound and effective examination or other analysis of student comprehension and maintenance of a high standard of achievement, of fairness, and sound judgment in grading.
APPENDIX 5.

SABBATICAL PROCEDURE

Full-time faculty with the rank of Assistant, Associate, or full Professor with at least seven years of continuous full-time service following any previously granted sabbatical are eligible to apply.

Application due dates

Applications for sabbaticals must be submitted to the dean of the applicable School, with a copy to the VPAA (with respect to business, tax, accounting and undergraduate programs faculty) by November 1st of the academic year prior to the start of the sabbatical period. For example, applications for sabbaticals during the academic year 2008-2009 must be submitted by November 1, 2007.

Application requirements

To be complete, the application must include the following:

1. Completed Sabbatical Application Form (to be obtained from VPAA or Law School dean)
2. Written description of the sabbatical proposal; and
3. A letter from the dean attesting to:

   a. The relationship of the project to the mission of the School;
   b. Expected project success based upon the performance record of the applicant;
   c. Impact of the sabbatical, if granted, upon the teaching and service work of the applicant's academic unit, including full-time faculty teaching coverage in any region to which the faculty member may be assigned; and,
   d. Approval of the Sabbatical, if granted

Selection criteria

Sabbatical applications will be judged on:

1. the potential for success of the stated project;
2. the academic and/or professional quality of the proposal;
3. the impact of the project on the mission and academic programs of the university;
4. the faculty workload requirements on the applicant's region, school, department and/or program; and,
5. the impact on the candidate’s professional growth and academic achievement.

Application Approval

Award of a sabbatical leave requires all of the following:

1. Approval by the dean of the applicable school, and,
2. Final approval by the VPAA (with respect to business, tax, accounting and undergraduate programs faculty) or President (with respect to Law Faculty).
Awards Announced

Announcement of sabbaticals awarded will take place by notice to the applicant, his or her dean and the office of Human Resources by no later than March 1st following the submission deadline stated above.

Deferred Implementation

In some cases, such as multiple applications from the same school or department or financial exigency, applications may be approved subject to deferred implementation. In academic years when the operating budget is out of balance, sabbatical requests may be relegated to a later time. The eligibility order will be adhered to as sabbaticals are again available.

Denial without Prejudice

Applications are denied without prejudice. Subsequent submissions of the same proposal are allowed.

Grievances

If any faculty member feels that he or she has a grievance regarding any aspect of a Sabbatical, he or she should submit such grievance to the Faculty Grievance committee or equivalent committee in the School of Law.

Reporting

Within three months after the completion of a sabbatical leave, the faculty member is obliged to "produce a research publication or other document that is acceptable" to the dean of the applicable School. Copies of this report are to be delivered to the VPAA or President (with respect to law faculty). Faculty members may be asked to present a brief version of their reports to the Board of Trustee committee on Academic Policy. Faculty members are encouraged to share the results [via written papers, workshops, colloquia, etc.] with their colleagues at the university.