

Academic Faculty Affairs
Charge from Chair of Senate –J. Ouellette
April 2018

Dear Andy,

As you know, both senate and AFAC have received complaints this year with regard to the college handbook lacking any clear criteria for renewal and continuing appointment for academic faculty. Although there are procedures in 220.06 for how faculty should apply and procedures that committees should use during their review, the handbook does not contain a single line that outlines any minimal criteria for renewal or continuing appointment. During a meeting with Provost Prus I asked him about this, and his response was “it is AFAC’s responsibility to write this section”; hence, I’m charging AFAC with establishing some minimal criteria for both renewal and continuing appointment to be included in 220.06 of the college handbook. See the specific list of charges below.

1. Please review section [220.06 College Policies and Procedures of the Academic Faculty for Renewal of Term Appointment, Granting of Continuing Appointment and Promotion](#), and make a recommendation to Faculty Senate for minimal criteria for renewal and continuing appointment.
2. Please clarify the use of the “rank to rank form” in the use of all personnel applications for renewal, continuing appointment, and rank promotion. Is this document required by the College? If yes, please make that clear in the procedures where necessary. If the document is not required, please question whether this document should be available at all on our web pages or required by departments.
3. Please note, our handbook is out of date, using the word “unqualified rank” to refer to tenure-track faculty members. The updated language is “academic rank” (cf. B.O.T policies). I reported this error to HR many months ago. It’s unclear if they have a plan to fix the handbook. During the review, please change this language accordingly.