TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE: FACULTY GOVERNANCE

I. Responsibilities of the Faculty 5
II. University Faculty Assembly 6

SECTION TWO: THE NATURE OF FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND ACADEMIC RANK

I. Faculty Defined 9
II. Faculty Classifications Defined 9
III. Academic Ranks 11
IV. Appointments and Primary Faculty Contracts 14

SECTION THREE: ANNUAL REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

I. Definition of Tenure 17
II. Schedules for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure 17
III. Evaluation Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure 19
IV. Evaluation Procedures 21

SECTION FOUR: TERMINATION AND NON-RENEWAL OF CONTRACTS

I. Initiated by the Faculty Member 31
II. Initiated by the University 31

SECTION FIVE: LEAVE POLICY

I. Academic Leave 37
II. Academic Leave Without Pay 37
III. Sabbatical Leave 35

SECTION SIX: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

I. University Support 37
II. Externally Funded Grants Policies 37
III. Faculty Participation in Extra-University Income Producing Activities 38

SECTION SEVEN: EEO/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION 39

SECTION EIGHT: SUBSTANCE ABUSE 39

SECTION NINE: ACADEMIC FREEDOM

I. Scholarship and Research 40
II. Public Communication 40
III. Teaching 40

SECTION TEN: AMENDMENT PROCEDURES 41

APPENDICES

The process of modification may differ following University procedure as noted at the beginning of an appendix

APPENDIX A
UFA Bylaws (includes UFA Committees descriptions) 42
APPENDIX B
University of New England Institutional Standing Committees
(Administrator appointed) 53
APPENDIX C
Colleges RPT Standards 54
College of Arts and Sciences 54
Westbrook College of Health Professions 65
College of Osteopathic Medicine 80
College of Dental Medicine 91
APPENDIX D
Faculty Grievance Procedures 99

ATTACHMENTS

Management policies to be edited without the need for formal Board of Trustee approval

ATTACHMENT 1, *approved by UFA in consultation with the deans and Provost*
University RPT Checklist (to be included in submitted portfolios) 105

ATTACHMENT 2, *approved by UFA in consultation with the deans and Provost*
University Timeline for Annual Reviews and the RPT Process 107

ATTACHMENT 3, *approved by UFA in consultation with the deans and Provost*
Sabbatical Leave Process 113

ATTACHMENT 4, *approved by UFA in consultation with the VP of Research Office*
Intellectual Property Policy 120

ATTACHMENT 5, *approved by UFA in consultation with the VP of Research Office*
Investigator Significant Financial Interest Disclosure Policy for Sponsored Projects 130

ATTACHMENT 8, *approved by UFA in consultation with the deans and Provost*

Annual Reviewðde y.¿ /dÜôÜ\á? ‘ a’’ëñ öMÏMÅÎ ð •ËíÀ y.¿ / t F’(“’y.¿ Þj-> ‘ t F’(R’y.¿ Í

University of New England
Faculty Handbook

SECTION ONE:

scholarship, and research;

12. selection and appointment of academic and administrative officers;

13. distribution of gifts presented to the University for discretionary allocation in support of research or scholarly work;

14. academic calendar;

15. other matters referred to it by the President, Provost, administrative officers, the student body, or the faculty of a college, school, or department.

C. Faculty Assembly and University Administration General Guidelines

All UFA committees have representation from the Administration in the form of *ex officio* non-voting members.
Inclusion and active participation of representatives from the Administration at UFA meetings and in UFA committees fosters a climate of collegial and cooperative discussions that support the system of shared governance at UNE. This practice allows the Administration to have input as recommendations are deliberated, finalized and voted upon in UFA Committees and on the floor of UFA.
All motions passed by UFA are in the form of recommendations to Administration, which has the authority to support or not support the recommendations.
UFA bears the responsibility and obligation to represent the faculty voice.

D. Disposition of University Faculty Assembly (UFA) Recommendations

As UFA reports to the Provost and the President (Section II, A.) and the Provost or their designee attends UFA meetings, all recommendations (i.e. motions) passed by UFA will be recorded in the UFA minutes and transmitted to the Provost as part of the minutes of each meeting.
It is the responsibility of the Provost and the UFA Chair to communicate recommendations to the Pres

D. Non-tenure Research Track: a faculty member at any rank, as defined in TWO, A, with a terminal degree and career dedicated to research. In addition to the research program, a minimum of 5% effort will be to teaching and/or service, as a contribution to the intellectual ambience of the college and University. Faculty with this appointment may be promoted, through the review protocol in their college, with contributions weighted in accordance to contractual agreement, but do not have, and may not acquire, tenure by virtue initial appointment or reappointment. These faculty will be appointed by the dean of a college, upon recommendation of a department chair/director and respective search committee. They will be provided the time, space, and administrative support to carry out their research objectives, in a way that assures that existing resources for existing faculty positions are not diluted. All new research materials and salary will be funded by extramural agencies, as agreed upon by contractual arrangement with the University.

E. Emeriti:
All nominees must have been a full-time academic or administrative faculty member at UNE for at least ten years, and must have demonstrated a record of excellence in performance of profession duties (appropriate the nominee s job category) including: teaching, other instructional activities, or professional performance. In addition, the nominee must have made a significant contribution while at the university in at least two of the following areas:
   a. Meaningful contributions to the curriculum or program
   b. A record of sustained research/creative activity that has contributed to the profession
   c. Commitment to and participation in shared governance and service to the University
   d. Additional areas of excellence specific to the nominee s job category

Additional relevant definitions include:

A. Regular Full-time: a faculty member, at any rank, employed in a position budgeted as a regular full-time position, whose workload is comprised of teaching, service and in some circumstances, research and scholarship.

B. Regular Half-time: a non-tenure track faculty member, at any rank, employed in a position budgeted as a regular half-time position and entailing half-time teaching and service.

C. Adjunct: a part-time, non-tenure-track faculty member at any rank contracted to teach courses, provide lecture, provide equivalent clinical instruction, or meet additional responsibilities in regards to teaching and/or service and/or scholarship as designated by the applicable academic dean on a semester-by-semester or other occasional basis. Teaching limits will be determined by a collaboration between the Dean and the college s faculty assembly. Utilizing the non-tenure-track designations from Section TWO, the dean of the respective college will assign one of the following ranks: Adjunct Assistant Teaching Professor, Adjunct Associate Teaching Professor, Adjunct Teaching Professor, Adjunct Clinical Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Clinical Professor, Adjunct Associate Clinical Professor, Adjunct Clinical Professor, Adjunct Assistant Research Professor, Adjunct Associate Teaching Professor, Adjunct Research Professor. Adjuncts have no guarantee of continuing appointment or reappointment. It is the responsibility of the Human Resources Office to ensure that this guideline is followed. Adjunct faculty are not eligible for benefits or service in faculty governance.

C.

not eligible for promotion.

D. Research Associate: A faculty member from an external institution who holds a terminal degree and p support for the research mission of the University. Research Associate status may be granted by the dean of t college on recommendation of faculty. Notification of Research Associate status will be given in writing w copies to the Provost and President.

III. Academic Ranks

All new regular full-time faculty members will be on a tenure-track, except those with an appointment to non tenure-teaching track, non-tenure clinical track, or non-tenure research track, those meeting a temporary or unpredictable need, and those exempted in SECTION TWO, I, B. Regular full-time, and regular half-time, non-tenure track faculty (except those characterized in SECTION TWO, I, B) will be eligible for all promotions according to the same schedule as tenure track faculty. Faculty hired at assistant professor or higher rank ordinarily will have a doctorate or other appropriate graduate or professional degree, as defined by the dean. No faculty member will be reduced in rank or have tenure withdrawn as a consequence of periodic changes i handbook. Otherwise, the most recent Board-approved version of this handbook will always be the reference document.

A. Definitions of Rank

1. Tenure Track

   a. Assistant Professor: a faculty member with a doctorate or other appropriate graduate or professional degree appointed without tenure.

   b. Associate Professor: a faculty member with a doctorate or other appropriate graduate or professional degree, whether or not awarded tenure at the time of appointment. First consideration for prom this level ordinarily will occur during the sixth full year of service as assistant professor.

   c. Professor: a tenured faculty member with a doctoral degree or other appropriate graduate or professional degree. First opportunity for promotion to this level ordinarily will be in the sixth fu year in rank as associate professor. The Provost may, upon recommendation of a dean and departmental faculty, award the title of Professor to appropriately outstanding individuals who d possess a doctoral degree.

2. Non-Tenure Teaching Track

   a. Assistant Teaching Professor: a faculty member with an appropriate graduate or professional degree engaged in teaching, service, and in some cases research and scholarship

   b. Associate Teaching Professor: a faculty member with an appropriate graduate or professional degree engaged in teaching, service, and in some cases research and scholarship. First consideration for

IV.

opportunity and affirmative action laws and policies.

3. At the time of initial appointment, faculty will receive a copy of this handbook and will be advised in writing to review all substantive standards and procedu

SECTION THREE:
ANNUAL REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE GUIDELINES

I. Definition of Tenure

Reappointment, promotion, and tenure are not granted automatically for merely satisfactory performance. they are offered to faculty who have demonstrated the potential for long term contributions to the University. particular, granting of tenure is tantamount to a "second hiring" and each candidate must make a compell See RPT Criteria for each college in Appendix C to this handbook.

Tenure at UNE confers the right of continuous employment from the time of its award, without reduction in until retirement. Apart from reasons of financial or curricular exigency, tenured faculty may be dismissed serious neglect of duty, serious misconduct, or disability that prevents them from performing each of the esse functions of their positions, subject to reasonable accommodations.

II. Schedules for Annual Review, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

A. Ordinarily, initial regular full-time or regular half-time faculty appointments are for three full years, except for faculty who have been granted tenure, or those with terminal, visiting, or adjunct appointments. All non-tenure track faculty namely, Assistant Teaching Professors, Assistant Clinical Professors, Assistant Research

Faculty members on the non-tenure track may be required to undergo additional reviews as defined by their college in Appendix C.

D. Every regular untenured faculty member on the tenure track will undergo an intensive review and evaluation by the subcollege RPT committee, chair/director, college RPT committee, college dean, and Provost in the third full

III. Evaluation Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The following are University-wide criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. In addition, each colleg
specified more detailed criteria particular to the disciplines represented in that college. Those college criter

with non-tenure track appointments are expected to maintain currency in their fields. The following exemp
criteria that may be considered as measures of such currency. These (and others like them) may signi
contribution in the realms of teaching, service or research and scholarship. Candidates should document
satisfaction of these criteria to the extent possible.

1. quality of professional service;
2. maintenance of unrestricted state licensure;
3. maintenance of all credentials and privileges associated with clinical practice, as appropriate to pra
responsibilities;
4. satisfactory completion of all continuing education requirements associated with level of practice;
5. progress and success in certification and recertification with professional societies, as appropriate t
discipline and practice responsibilities;
6. honors or recognition by professional organizations.

review, the details of which will be determined by the college but must include: 1) a college RPT committee, 2) chair/director, 3) a college RPT committee, and 4) dean.

2. There is one University-wide timeline for: a) completion of annual reviews of faculty; b) appointment of college and University-level RPT Committees; c) initiation, submission, and completion of RPT portfolios; and d) completion of reviews and submission of recommendations by subcollege RPT committees, chairs/directors, college RPT committees, deans, the University RPT Committee, the Provost, and the President (see Attachment 2).

3. If a faculty member on the college level or the University RPT Committee has served on a level of pri review for a candidate s current portfolio, this faculty member should recuse himself/herself and neither be present nor participate in any way during the further review of that candidate.

4. In such cases in which a candidate for appointment, promotion, or tenure is a department chair or program director, the candidate in consultation with his/her dean and the Provost will identify a surrogate chair/director who will fulfill this level of review for the candidate in order to maintain the 4-level review process. The University RPTC will serve in its usual capacity.

5. Colleges, through appropriate committees, will process any revision of the college and college standards, criteria, and metrics. All such revisions will require approval by the college faculty assemb and dean. Substantive changes in the college s RPT guidelines require review and approval by the Provost

6. At the time of hire the rank, general expectations59Tm 0 g 0 G [(nnu)] TJ 792the college faculty asse

11. External reviews of scholarship will be solicited from the candidate's disciplinary peers at the time of tenure review and also at the time of review for professor. The process for external review of scholarsh must be completed with letters to be inserted by the dean according to the timeline in Attachment 2. College RPT protocols will identify the specific timeline for the scholarship packet to be readied for external review. The candidate faculty member, chair/director, and dean will jointly determine the external reviewers with details determined by the college. The names of the reviewers will be kept confidential.

    At their option, the colleges may choose to solicit external reviews of teaching and/or service as we

    Three external letters of review will be solicited by the chair/director and sent to and received by the d who will have responsibility for inserting those letters into the faculty member's portfolio before it is reviewed at the subcollege level.

B. Structure of RPT Committees

1. A minimum of three members will serve on each subcollege RPT committee; more than three may be appointed as long as the total number of members is an odd number. Departments, programs, and will determine whether only tenured faculty must serve on this committee. The chair/director should not s on the subcollege RPT committee, but may be asked for his/her comments and insight. When a cand for promotion and/or tenure has a joint appointment in more than one college and the effort in the secondary college is 20% or more, representation from the secondary college on the primary college's subcollege RPT committee is appropriate and should be considered if feasible, but the standards, m and criteria used will be those of the primary college.

2. Each college has its own college-level RPT Committee. The college Faculty Assembly will appoint (ordinarily by election) three members and the Dean will appoint two members. If the college Faculty Assembly fails to appoint any or all of its assigned members by May 1, the Dean will appoint enough members to fill all vacant positions on the Committee. College-level policies and procedures will dictate the composition of the college RPT committee; however, the committee should whenever possible be composed of representative faculty members from the classification of the candidates being reviewed (tenure-track, non-tenure track teaching professor, non-tenure clinical professor, non-tenure research professor). If a college has insufficient representative faculty members of the appropriate classification to formulate a college RPTC, the Dean of the college in consultation with other colleges' Deans will request the appointment of faculty from compatible academic programs in other colleges to form the college five-member RPTC, three of whom will be approved by that college's faculty members.

    Appointment terms for members of the college RPT Committees should be staggered.

    For a description of the University RPT Committee, see Appendix A, section F, item 9a.

C. Responsibilities of candidates

1.

G. Procedures of the dean

1. The dean will review the portfolio, informed by the subcollege RPT committee, chair/director, and the college RPT Committee reviews, formulate his/her separate review and recommendation, and enter it into the candidate s portfolio. The dean is responsible for assuring appropriate subsequent action. The following are possible:

   a. Faculty member on the non-tenure track classification standing for third year reappointment review or sixth year reappointment and/or promotion review and subsequent reappointment or promotion reviews at sixth-year intervals (e.g., 12, 18, etc.) including promotion to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor, or Research Professor

      i. If there is positive agreement among the four levels: the majority vote of the subcollege RPT committee, the chair/director s recommendation, the majority vote of the college RPT committee, and the dean s recommendation, the dean will provide notification of this result to the Provost. T portfolio will not be reviewed by the University RPT committee. The dean will notify the candidate of the final outcome according to the timeline in Attachment 2.

      ii. If any of the four college level review outcomes is negative, the University RPT Committee will be instructed by the dean to perform a substantive review of the faculty member with the portfolio

perform a procedural review of the faculty member with the portfolio continuing on to the Provost and President, who will conduct substantive reviews.

ii. If any of the four college level review outcomes is negative, the University RPT Committee will be instructed by the dean to perform a substantive review of the faculty member with the portfolio continuing on to the Provost and President, who will conduct substantive reviews.

H. Procedures of the University RPT Committee

1. The University RPT Committee, once the college level procedures are completed, will be required to conduct no review, a procedural review, or a separate substantive review. A procedural review is a review assurances that appropriate procedures were followed as outlined in this Faculty Handbook. A substantive review requires a comprehensive review of the content of the candidate s portfolio and includes a procedural review.

2. In the document prepared by the University RPT Committee, the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate will be described in the majority recommendation and in a minority opinion, if there is one. It will include notation of the official vote taken by the committee.

a. Faculty member on the non-tenure track classification standing for third year reappointment review or sixth year reappointment and/or promotion review and subsequent reappointment or promotion reviews at sixth-year intervals (e.g., 12, 18, etc.) including promotion to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor, or Research Professor

i. If there is positive agreement among the four levels: the majority vote of the subcollege RPT committee, the chair/director s recommendation, the majority vote of the college RPT committee, and the dean s recommendation, the portfolio will not be reviewed by the University RPT Committee.

ii. If any of the four college level review outcomes is negative, the University RPT Committee will perform a substantive review of the faculty member with the portfolio continuing on to the Provost who will also conduct a substantive review.

b. Faculty

c. Faculty member on the tenure track classification being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor

i. If there is positive agreement among the four levels: the majority vote of the

7. Faculty have the right to appeal the President s recommendation on promotion and/or tenure on grounds of process or procedure or illegal discrimination only. Appeals will be reviewed by an *ad hoc* Appeals Committee, which will forward its recommendation to the UFA Chair, Provost and President. The President, taking into account the Appeals Committee recommendation, will make the final determinatio Note: 1) appeals are not possible before the President has made a recommendation on a faculty member s case, except in the one situation described in item b. below, 2) the Appeals Committee will consider only on whether appropriate process and procedure were followed (see Appendix D), and 3) the President s decision is final.

   a. The *ad hoc* Appeals Committee will be a special committee of the Faculty Affairs Committee of U Priorities for staffing the three-member committee will be 1) Current FAC members with past URP service, 2) current FAC members with current or past College RPTC service (provided they hav already reviewed the case under appeal), 3) recent FAC members (preferably less than 5 years) with past URPTC service, and 4) recent FAC members with current or past College RPTC service (p they have not already reviewed the case under appeal). Members of the committee will be appointed the chair of UFA, with the advice of the chair of UFA FAC. All members of lower level reviews are excluded from the Appeals Committee, and every effort must be made to avoid membership for th college from where the appeal originated.

   b. Faculty appealing a promotion or tenure recommendation will include in the letter of appeal specific references from the *Faculty Handbook* indicating the procedure or process that is in question.

L. Preparation of Information for the RPT Evaluation Process and Timeline

Before evaluating any application for reappointment or tenure, the chair/director, deans, Provost, and the President may consider institutional need as it relates to that case. For example, clear and demonstra changes in curricular needs of an academic unit might make reappointment or the awarding of tenure inadvisable, notwithstanding the academic merits of a candidate's case.

All faculty scheduled for reappointment and tenure reviews will be so informed, in writing, by the dean by March 1 of the academic year preceding their scheduled review. A copy of this notification will be sent to the appropriate academic dean(s) by the supervisor(s). In addition, faculty eligible and wishing to be cons for promotion must notify their supervisor(s) and dean(s) in writing by May 1 of the previous academic year.

The candidate is responsible for final assembly of those materials listed in Attachment 1 that are desig the candidate s responsibility. Candidates will submit materials to the binder no later than September 1 by 5:00 p.m. In compiling the portfolio, the candidate may solicit documentation from the chair/director or (e.g., course evaluations). The dean will add items as specified in Attachment 1. The portfolio will then be made simultaneously available to the subcollege RPT committee, the chair/director, the College RPT committee, the dean, and the University RPT committee to maximize the time that each level views the portfolio. The timeline specifying the

e

Each reviewer should make an independent evaluation of the portfolio, and may begin to do so as soon as the portfolio is available. However, before she/he finalizes the review, any reviews at prior levels must be carefully considered and may be referenced. Reviewers at the subcollege level have the most familiarity with the candidate and her/his specific field of study, and base their reviews on the most detailed subcollege articulation of RPT criteria.

W

SECTION FOUR:
TERMINATION AND NON-RENEWAL OF CONTRACTS

The following applies to the regular full and regular half-time faculty.

I. Initiated by the Faculty Member

A. Termination of Contract

Faculty members are expected to complete the term of their primary faculty contracts and to perform un their contracts until their contract ends by its terms, is terminated by the University or otherwise terminate pursuant to the terms of the primary faculty contract or applicable provisions of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty members understand and agree that the University reserves the right to initiate legal action to recover damages and obtain equitable relief against any faculty member who ceases to perform under their pr faculty contract prior to the expiration of their contract or otherwise terminates their contract prior to its expiration. Faculty members who wish to terminate their employment with the University prior to the expiration of their primary faculty contract may apply to the Provost for an exception based on a demo hardship. If the faculty member asking for hardship consideration is a dean, the case will be evaluated by t Provost in consultation with the President.

B. Non-Renewal of a Contract

A faculty member who wishes not to renew employment with the University at the end of a primary faculty contract may do so by providing written notice to the appropriate chair/director at least three months prio the last day of employment of the academic year specified in the faculty member s most recent primary faculty contract. Faculty members who provide less than three months prior notice may apply to the Provost for an exception to the notice requirement based on a demonstrated hardship. If the faculty member asking for hardship consideration is a dean, the case will be evaluated by the Provost in consultation with the Pr

Faculty members understand and agree that the University reserves the right to initiate legal action to damages and obtain equitable relief against any faculty member who fails to provide the University wit least three months notice and/or fails to obtain a waiver of this sub-section s notification requirement.

II. Initiated by the University

A faculty member s contract may be terminated only for cause or unavailability to fulfill professional responsibilities.

A faculty member s annual primary faculty contract will be renewed within the term of an academic appointment except for the following circumstances:

1. The faculty member is not reappointed following a reappointment review (see SECTION THREE above); or
2. The faculty member s Dean, in consultation with the faculty and with approval of the Provost, determines that the faculty member s probationary primary faculty contract will not be renewed (see SECTION FOUR II, A, 2 below); or
3. In the event of financial exigency, or discontinuance or curtailment of the academic program.

A. Procedure and Timeline for Non-tenured Faculty Members

1. Termination of a Contract
In cases of termination for cause or unavailability to fulfill professional responsibilities, the termination may be immediate and without notice. The faculty member will not be eligible for a terminal primary faculty contract.

2. Non-Renewal of a Contract During the Probationary Period
   a. If the Dean is considering a non-renewal, the Dean will convene a meeting with a panel of faculty (as described below) to collaboratively review the case. The Dean will present the evidence he or she is considering regarding the non-renewal.
   b. The faculty panel will be convened by March 1 and will consist of two members of the relevant College RPT Committee, appointed by the Chair of that committee, and one member of the University Faculty Assembly Faculty Affairs Committee, appointed by the Chair of that committee.
   c. Following the collaborative review by the Dean and faculty panel, the faculty panel and the Dean will each present their respective recommendations to the Provost by March 15. The Provost will then make a final decision regarding the primary faculty contract by March 20.

Timeline for Non-Renewal Procedure During the Probationary Period

Action	Date	Responsibility
Convene faculty panel	March 1	Dean
Faculty panel and Dean present separate recommendations to Provost	March 15	Faculty panel and Dean
Provost Notifies Dean and faculty member of final decision	March 20	Provost
Faculty supervisor and HR develop written statement for faculty permanent file	May 31	Faculty member s supervisor and HR

3. In the case of non-renewal after the probationary period ends, following the academic year of a successful three-year review, a faculty member will be provided with at least one academic year s advance notification.
4. Non-tenure track faculty members may be non-renewed due to elimination or curtailment of a program: i.e., a major, field, disciplinary area (whether broadly defined, such as a department, or narrowly defined, such as a University requirement).
   1) When the Board of Trustees deems it necessary to eliminate or curtail an academic program, the administrative officers will discuss all financial and personnel implications with the appropriate chairs/directors and the faculty.

SECTION FIVE:
LEAVE POLICY

I. Academic Leave

Academic leave may be used when a faculty member must leave campus to pursue academic activities (e.g., to attend a professional meeting or workshop, present a seminar, or conduct research). It is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure that this leave does not interfere with teaching or administrative responsibilities. The faculty member must have approval from her/his chair/director and dean prior to leaves one week or longer.

II. Academic Leave Without Pay

Members of the regular full-time faculty may apply for up to one year of academic leave without pay for purposes such as: acceptance of a fellowship; professional development; work on an advanced degree; acceptance of assignments of limited duration with other institutions of higher learning, governmental agencies, private foundations, or corporations; or to serve as an expert consultant for purposes consistent with the University's mission. Each application should include a detailed statement of the purpose for which the leave is requested. It must be approved by the relevant chair/director and dean, and the Provost. After one month on academic leave without pay, all benefits will cease, excepting that the faculty member may continue health, life insurance, and dental benefits at his/her own expense. Ordinarily, time spent on academic leave without pay will be counted towards eligibility for promotion and tenure (see SECTION THREE, II, G).

III. Sabbatical Leave

A. Purpose

The purpose of sabbatical leave is to provide a mechanism for continuing professional development of faculty in a manner that ultimately will benefit the faculty member, the students, the University, and the academic community at large. A sabbatical may consist of research, academic study, writing that leads to publication, professional development, etc, through which efforts faculty may increase their knowledge and advance their research, stimulate intellectual interests, enhance teaching, or strengthen contacts with the wider world community of scholars, thus enhancing their contribution to the University on their return.

Sabbatical leave is a privilege for a faculty member. It is not to be considered a form of compensation to which a faculty member is automatically entitled. The merits of a case and both curricular and fiscal constraints may be considered by chairs/directors/supervisors (herein referred to as supervisors), academic deans, and the Provost; and, where applicable, by college committees. It is also not intended to be primarily an opportunity for employment at another institution. Sabbatical leave is intended to promote the professional development of all full-time faculty.

B. Eligibility

All regular full-time faculty may submit an application for initial sabbatical leave in or after their 6th year of service, and are eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves following each six full years of service to the University. Eligibility for faculty with Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure timelines outside of the typical 6-year review cycle will be determined on a case-by-case basis by their Deans in consultation with the

SECTION SIX:
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

I University Support

The University, within its resources, will provide release time, facilities, technical assistance, and financial support for the professional development of its faculty. This support is expected to lead to publication or other professional expression of original works.

Budgeted, individual academic units will decide for themselves how funds available for faculty development may be spent. Emphasis will be on helping faculty to avail themselves of learning opportunities (e.g., professional workshops and academic course-work) that support improved execution of one or more contractual responsibilities. However, care will be taken to avoid imposing on the academic unit any financial burden associated with a faculty member s pursuit of advanced degree work (unless such work is necessitated by programmatic changes in the University).

Internal mini-grant research and scholarship awards are available on a competitive basis through the office of the Associate Provost for Research and Scholarship and are open to regular full-time faculty and to any faculty member who is less than full-time but whose contract has stated expectations for research and scholarship, in order to help develop research and scholarship at UNE. The UFA Research and Scholarship Committee, with the assistance of discipline-specific *ad-hoc* reviewers, will review all applications and forward

listed on the VP for Research website.

B. Intellectual Property Policy (See Attachment 4).

C. Investigator Significant Financial Disclosure Policy for Sponsored Projects (See Attachment 5)

D. Policy on Research Misconduct (See Attachment 6)

E. Policy on Distribution of Facilities & Administration Recovery Funds (See Attachment 7)

III. Faculty Participation in Extra-University Income-Producing Activities

Full-time faculty are expected to render full time service to the University of New England. However, it is recognized that certain outside employment may be considered faculty development, benefiting the fa member and enhancing the image of the University of New England in the community and among othe institutions of higher learning. Therefore, when a faculty member lectures or consults, she/he should ma her/his affiliation with the University clear in an effort to call public attention to the University and its programs.

Outside employment such as client/patient care, consulting, or lecturing will not be restricted unless such activity interferes with adequate performance of faculty duties. In those instances where outside emplo activities are appropriate, the time spent should not exceed more than eight hours per week or over the faculty member s contract year. Faculty may retain all remuneration from these non-University-sponsored activities. Faculty should reimburse the University for direct expenses for resources used in the cours outside employment. If outside employment or service interferes with the performance of regular Univer duties, the University of New England has the right to insist on performance improvement and to take disciplinary action as may be necessary.

Overload contracts within the University of New England for teach land for teach land for teach land for0

SECTION NINE:
ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The University is a marketplace of ideas, and it cannot fulfill its purposes of transmitting, evaluating, and exten knowledge if it requires conformity with any orthodoxy of content and method. In the words of the United Stat Supreme Court, "Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die." (AAUP: Policy Documents & Reports). The preservation of academic freedom is one of the priorities of the University and any charge that academic freedom has been abridged should be investigated promptly and thoroughly.

Therefore, the University of New England, inspired by the AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom a Tenure, adheres to the following:

I. Scholarship and Research:

Teachers are entitled to academic freedom in the pursuit and dissemination of scholarship and research, subject to adequate performance of their other academic duties.

II. Public Communication:

Teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When th speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special p in the community imposes obligations. As persons of learning and educational officers, they should strive to be accurate, show respect for the dignity of others, and make every effort to indicate that they are not institutiona spokespersons.

III. Teaching:

Teachers are entitled to academic freedom in the classroom, including freedom regarding teaching methods and grading practices, consistent with the rights and needs of the University s academic programs to make collective curricular decisions and establish common policies and procedures. The following principles should guide academic freedom:

A. Controversy and differing viewpoints are a normal aspect of free academic inquiry and teaching
B. It is appropriate to teach subjects in the context of current events both locally and globally.
C. The faculty member should strive to be accurate, distinguish between fact and opinion, and show respect for the dignity of others.
D. Faculty are responsible for furthering the learning of students. Therefore, faculty should avoid statements and actions that may inhibit studen

SECTION TEN:
AMENDMENT PROCEDURES

Any member of the faculty may propose amendments to this document. Proposed amendments will be written and include a statement of supporting rationale, and be submitted to either the Chair of UFA Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC, which includes the Provost and President or designees) or the Chair of the University Faculty Assembly (UFA) who will then forward the proposed amendment to the FAC. In either case, the FAC will deliberate and send

Assembly to schedule an orientation meeting to determine committee composition and/or to complete elections for unfilled officers seats as necessary.

d. Each year, UFA should organize an orientation meeting for new UFA members

3. Vacancies:

Faculty Assembly members who vacate their positions before their terms expire will notify the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Faculty Assembly. Senators will be replaced according to a process chosen by the Faculty Assembly of the College they represent. Replacement Senators will serve for the remainder of the term of the members they are replacing.

B. M000912 0 612 792 re W* n BT /F1 11.04 Tf 1 0 0 1 91.104 573.82 Tm 0 g 0 G [( )] TJ ET Q q 0.0000091

choose to allow these methods of voting for a given vote.

3. *Ex officio* members will not have voting privileges unless ot40 G 0.0254 Tc[(ss)] TJ ET Q q 0.00000912 0 612 79

3. Terms of Office

   a. Newly elected officers will shadow current officers for the May meeting and officially will assume their positions at the close of the May UFA meeting. The positions of those newly elected officers will end at the close of the May UFA meeting at their term's completion.

   b.

2. Recall Proceedings

   A petition by a committee's chair or three committee members is necessary to initiate recall proceedings against one of it

Prior to the April meeting, the Executive Committee will solicit nominations for any UFA officer openings and m present a slate of nominees to the Faculty Assembly for voting at the April meeting.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

Colleges RPT Standards

Important Note: The process of modifying the Colleges RPT Standards and Subcollege standards will follow the procedures outlined in SECTION THREE, IV, A.5 of the Faculty Handbook.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (CAS) RPT STANDARDS

I. CLASSIFICATIONS AND RANKS

The College of Arts and Sciences has three classifications that are involved in the Review, Promotion and Tenure process:

A. Non-Tenure Teaching classification: Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor
B. Tenure Track classification: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

(May 1st deadline).
At the time of submission, the candidate places the RPT criteria in the RPT portfolio (September 1st deadline).

1. Teaching

To demonstrate excellence in teaching, the candidate must exhibit mastery of content and pedagogy, with a focus on student learning. No one metric can adequately demonstrate teaching excellence, but the sum of materials presented should indicate that the candidate

department/school
Student mentoring in candidate's area of expertise
Use of Learning Management System
Professional development activities and identification of how these activities were implemented into teaching approaches

A. Guidelines for Peer Observations

The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) acknowledges the unique value of peer observation as a way for faculty members to (a) understand, appreciate, and learn from watching and discussing the teaching practices of our colleagues, (b) help each other develop and improve our teaching practices, and (c) provide an invaluable perspective on each other's teaching practices (in contrast to the student course evaluations) that will ensure such critical information is available to be used in annual reviews and RPT portfolios.

i. For assistant professors and assistant teaching professors: Each full-time CAS faculty member's teaching will be observed at least once each academic year in which they are teaching at UNE. Faculty members are encouraged to seek additional opportunities to be observed by peers, beyond the required one per year, to build their teaching portfolio Candidates should consult with their Chair/Academic Director regarding unit level expectations. In the year before their multi-level reviews, faculty members should be observed by peers promoted to at least the associate rank.

   For associate professors and associate teaching professors: The faculty member will work with their academic director/chair to ensure an appropriate number of peer observations are completed prior to promotion to the associate level in alignment with their intention to seek promotion.

   Faculty members will include all peer observation written summaries in their RPT portfolios.

ii. Peer observers should comment on each of four aspects of teaching: *content, pedagogy, assessment,* and *development*. (Section B, below, provides several "possible indicators" of excellence in each of those categories.)

iii. Before the observation, the faculty member will share relevant course-related materials with the peer observer. Before the classroom observation, the following actions should be completed:

teaching that the faculty member being observed wants feedback on).
Any special preparation to be done before the classroom observation (e.g., reading an assignment for that day's class) is determined.
Any relevant materials related to assessment of student learning from the class period being observed are shared (e.g., quiz, test, written assignment)

iv. Each peer observation includes at least one classroom visit. If the course is delivered online, the observer will work with the faculty member to identify the appropriate elements of the course for evaluation.

v. Each peer observation includes a reflection meeting after the classroom observation has occurred. The observer provides feedback, which should normally include recognition of various strengths and possible areas for development or improvement of teaching. This need not be a critique. Areas for development or improvement can be things the faculty member identified as pedagogical goals. The meeting should be a constructive and collaborative conversation about the positive aspects of teaching practices and the possibility of further enhancement of these practices.

vi. Peer observers are required to submit a brief written observation summary of

Pedagogy

Communication

- Clearly communicates course content
- Demonstrates enthusiasm for the content
- Demonstrates effective oral and written communication skills (slides, writing on board, etc.)
- Demonstrates good organizational abilities and planning skills
- States the goal or objective for the class clearly
- Uses a variety of effective pedagogical strategies and practices, as suits the level and nature of the course
- Encourages critical and/or creative thinking and/or making

Class Environment

- Respects students and is approachable
- Structures opportunities for students to engage with course content, develop their own understanding, and apply the concepts covered to other content-world and real experiences
- Models and supports effective communication skills peer to peer and peer to instructor
- Helps students connect learning experiences and facilitates development of self knowledge
- Recognizes student contributions in class
- Encourages students' intellectual curiosity
- Uses inclusive pedagogical strategies to create an equitable learning environment

Assessment

- Articulates measurable learning outcomes
- Uses multiple methods of student evaluation including objective and written assignments as presented in syllabus and assignments descriptors
- Develops learning experiences aligned with stated student learning outcomes
- Differentiates teaching to meet the objectives of successful student learning
- Maintains high expectations of critical thinking and work, in a formative manner during class
- Connects course assessments to program and/or core learning outcomes

Development

- Engages in self-evaluation and self-reflection
- Open and responsive to feedback and open to setting goals based on feedback
- Consistent development and implementation/application of new methodologies
- Participates in professional development around teaching effectiveness and discipline-specific content – workshops, seminars, book studies, conferences, CETL (Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning), etc.

2. Scholarship

Excellence in scholarship requires that a candidate be a productive member of his or her community of scholars and show evidence that demonstrates a promise of continued productivity. In general, CAS accepts the definitions of scholarship as defined by Boyer (1990). Further, the Faculty Handbook states that the criterion for scholarship is "evidence of a creative program of independent inquiry constituting a credible body of work that is peer-reviewed and disseminated" (Section Three, B.A.2). CAS recognizes that modes of disseminating scholarship will vary from discipline to discipline and department/ schools will recognize and define those appropriate modes. Normally, dissemination of research, scholarship, or creative activities, including presentations at meetings, should be distributed across the pre-tenure years rather than coming at a single point in time. Publication need not occur in every pre-tenure year, but should appear with a timeliness that assures a continuity of productivity following tenure. No single set of criteria can capture the spirit of this requirement for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure in all cases, but a holistic review of the body of work presented will indicate whether a candidate has met the expectations.

Dissemination of research, scholarship or creative activities will typically include:

- Peer-reviewed presentation at discipline specific venues such as regional, national or international conferences, exhibits or performances

1

Opinions of external reviewers on scholarly activity

3. Service

Excellence in service requires that a candidate has demonstrated commitment to enriching their program, school, college, university or professional community. This commitment requires participation at meetings of program, school, CASFA, college; use of advising resources; and participation in annual assessment activities at course and/or program levels, as appropriate. Candidates will demonstrate collegiality and, in consultation with their Academic Directors or Department Chairs, seek activities that 1) reflect their interests, skills and rank, 2) broaden in scope over time, and 3) create opportunities for candidates to make meaningful contributions towards improving or maintaining the quality of the institution.

Beyond the required activities, candidates will document excellence in service with reference to the following categories and examples:

Faculty-Oriented Initiatives (e.g., mentoring colleagues, offering or organizing faculty development presentations, providing "technical assistance" and care of instrumentation, serving on search committees)

Student-Oriented initiatives (e.g., registration advising, Faculty Advisor to Student Clubs a organizations)

Professionally-Oriented Activity (e.g., organizing conferences or seminars in a field, reviewing grants and manuscripts)

Faculty governance and other elected positions or working groups (e.g., to standing committees, or ad hoc committees, curriculum working group or task force)

Recruitment/Retention/Alumni work (e.g., Admissions work such as Experience UNE Days and Open Houses, meeting and/or corresponding with prospective students, maintainin connections with alumni)

Community-Oriented Professional Activity (performing educational outreach, such as presentations or volunteer work, as an application of your professional expertise)

Institution-Oriented Activity (e.g., serving as an academic unit leader, including tasks suc such as scheduling courses, budgeting, supervising faculty and professional staff, or de or coordinating academic programs; or, in exceptional circumstances, serving in an interim acting full-time administrative position at the college level)

As this list suggests, the CAS recognizes and values multiple dimensions of service without pri one. It views service to tuggests (y)2.53 Tm 0 ga(png)10(in i1440.hmma1va)4(u03 Tm 0slk 4

Normally, Assistant Teaching Professors will stand for reappointment in the third year of service, promotion to Associate Teaching Professor will be considered following six years of service at the Assistant Teaching Professor level, and promotion to Teaching Professor will be considered after six years of service at the Associate Teaching Professor rank. Associate Teaching Professors may choose to extend the time to promotion to Teaching Professor, although the Faculty Handbook requires a full college review every six years. Faculty members wishing to stand for early promotion are advised to consult with their Academic Director.

Scholarship is not required in the Teaching Track, or considered in performance reviews, unless it is a temporary workload component requested by the faculty member and mutually agreed upon by the faculty member, Academic Director and Dean – see Request for Scholarship Time, below.

Third-Year Review: Candidates standing for reappointment must demonstrate progress toward excellence in teaching and service commensurate with the standards defined above.

Sixth-Year Review: Assistant Teaching Professors applying for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching and service as defined above. Assistant Teaching Professors applying for promotion who have demonstrated excellence in teaching or service but have demonstrated additional progress toward excellence will be considered for reappointment to Assistant Teaching Professor and must submit for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor in no more than three years (Ninth-Year Review, see below).

Assistant Teaching Professors electing to submit for reappointment (but not promotion) who have demonstrated additional progress towards excellence will be reappointed to Assistant Teaching Professor and must submit for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor in no more than three years (Ninth-Year Review, see below).

Ninth-Year Review: (Does not apply to Associate Teaching Professors). Assistant Teaching Professors who elect to submit for promotion in their seventh year and then in their seventh

faculty member according to the process and timeline described below. If the time reallocation is awar
faculty member is required each semester to submit a progress report to the Academic Director and Dean
detailing the amount of time spent on the project, progress toward project goals and update on plan to
completion of project.

3. Scope of the project: Amount of time requested in a given semester (maximum 20% of workload) and number of semesters (maximum of three).

4. Financial support, if applicable: Explanation of internal or external grant funding obtained for the work proposed in #2.

C. Tenure Track: Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies and Procedures

Normally, Assistant Professors will stand for reappointment in the third year of service, promotion to Associate Professor will be considered following six years of service at the Assistant Professor rank, and promotion to Professor will be considered after six years of service at the Associate Professor rank. H Associate Professors may choose to extend the time to promotion to Professor so as to have an early pro strong portfolio. Faculty members wishing to stand for early promotion are advised to consult with thei Academic Director and Dean.

Third-Year Review. Tenure-track candidates standing for reappointment in the third year must show pr toward excellence in teaching, scholarship and service commensurate with the standards defined abov indicate that there is a reasonable assurance that the standards for promotion will be met in the sixth review.

Sixth-Year Review. Assistant Professors standing for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching scholarship, and service as defined above.

Promotion to Professor. Promotion to Professor is granted only to those Associate Professors who hav achieved a stature of leadership among the EIU faculty and in their community of scholars. Promotion will granted only if there is a record of continued excellence as a teacher and evidence of evolution in teac acumen beyond the level required for promotion to Associate Professor. Professors should be considered among the most accomplished teachers in the University and promotion will be granted only to those w have attained that stature. Candidates are expected to demonstrate a continued level of excellence in productivity. Service contributions of the candidate should be more extensive for promotion to Professo for promotion to Associate Professor.

III. COLLEGE SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

A. Composition of the subcollege RPTC

1. The composition of the subcollege RPTC will be determined by the appropriate Academic Director or Department Chair after consultation with the candidate. The subcollege RPTC should be composed of members from the candidate s academic discipline or, when that isn t possible, from the candidate s school or other academic programs that are close, or relevant, to the candidate s work. The subcollege RPTC will have a minimum of three members with the total membership always being an odd number.

WESTBROOK COLLEGE OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

(Revised May 2023)

INTRODUCTION

The Westbrook College of Health Professions (WCHP) has established the following reappointment, promotion, and tenure standards. When a new faculty member is employed, the department chair/program director will give the faculty member the most recent Board of Trustees approved version of the University of New England Faculty Handbook. The chair/director will meet with the new faculty member to discuss these standards and protocols and specifically advise the new faculty member on the explicit criteria for promotion within the department. Expectations in teaching, service, and/or scholarship should be outlined in the Letter of Hire and/or Annual Review documents, which will be used to standardize the review process. Every faculty member will receive a written annual review conducted by the chair/director according to the

and productivity in scholarship consistent with percent effort.

teaching)
Evidence of mentoring or advising on student projects (research, thesis, independent study);
Reference to additional evidence or documentation of relevance to candidate.

2. Service Excellence

Four levels of meaningful service are considered: a) service to department; b) service to college; c) service to university; and d) external service to the candidate s professional and/or scientific society. The college values service to the community. All candidates must demonstrate excellence in service by providing evidence of generosity of time in activities that contribute to the enrichment of the candidate s department, college, university, and/or profession. Service at all four levels is not a requirement for promotion or the awarding of tenure, but rather the candidate should demonstrate a balance of meaningful service activities.

Service is generally not demonstrated by activities in which the candidate is normally

the creation of a body of scholarship in one s discipline that goes beyond that required

- Evidence of maintenance of unrestricted state license;
- Evidence of maintenance of all credentials and privileges associated with clinical practice, as appropriate to practice responsibilities;
- Evidence of satisfactory completion of all continuing education requirements associated with level of practice;
- Evidence of progress and success in certification and recertification with professional societies, as appropriate to discipline and practice responsibilities.

Candidates should document satisfaction of these to the extent possible.

Every regular faculty member on the Non-Tenure Track Clinical Professor Classification will participate in a multi-level review every third year of employment until promotion to the Associate level. Multi-level review will include the sub-college RPT committee, chair/director, college RPT committee, college dean, and if needed, provost. Once promotion to the Associate level has been achieved, this review will occur again whenever a promotion is beingsought.

Non-tenure track faculty members hired at the Associate Professor rank will undergo one multi-level review in their third year of employment and whenever promotion is sought.

2. Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor will be considered after six years of service at the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor. Faculty standing for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching and service as defined in the aforementioned criteria in "Teaching Excellence" and "Service Excellence" sections. Candidates must also demonstrate ongoing and appropriate credentialing as described in the previous "Credentialing" section. The recommendations of the school committee are critical for promotion, and only those candidates who have demonstrated excellence in teaching, significant service, and continued credentialing will be promoted. Candidates should bear in mind that no amount of service can compensate for inadequate teaching.

3. Promotion to Clinical Professor

Promotion to Clinical Professor typically will be considered after six years of service at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor for those faculty who:

- Demonstrate a record of continued excellence in teaching, including evidence of enhancement and evolvement of teaching beyond that required at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor.
- Demonstrate a record of continued excellence in service, including evidence of enhancement and evolvement of service beyond that required at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor.
- Demonstrate continued and proper credentialing.

D. Non-Tenure Research Professor Classification: Reappointment and Promotion Policies and Procedures

Demonstrated excellence in scholarship and teaching and/or service (5%) is required of Associate Research Professor and Research Professor in the Westbrook College of Health Professions. Faculty members wishing to standardize promotion are advised to consult with their chair/director. Exceptions to policy will be stated at time of hire.

Every regular faculty member on the Non-Tenure Track Research Professor Classification will participate in a multi-level review every thi -

Non-tenure-track faculty members hired at the Professor rank will undergo one level review in their third year of employment.

1. Third-Year Review:

   Candidates standing for reappointment in the third year will demonstrate sufficient progress in scholarship and teaching and/or service as defined by the aforementioned criteria in "Scholarship Excellence", "Teaching Excellence" and "Service Excellence" sections. Progress will be indicative of sufficient potential providing reasonable assurance that the standards for promotion will be met at the sixth-year review. The recommendation of the College RPT Committee is critical for passage at third-year review, and only those candidates

consult with their chair/director. Exceptions to policy will be stated at time of hire.

Please note: External reviewers for RPT candidates will be selected using the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook, Section Three, IV, A.11. Tenure track candidates being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion must submit their scholarship materials to the Dean's Office by June 1st in order for the materials to be sent out for external review. These materials, along with a copy of Section II.A.3 of this document, will be sent to the external reviewers no later than June 15th with a deadline given to the external reviewers of August 15th to submit their letter. This letter is inserted into the candidate's portfolio according to the timeline in Section Three, IV, A.11.

1. Third-Year Review:

   Candidates standing for reappointment in the third year will demonstrate sufficient progress in teaching, service, and scholarship as defined by the aforementioned criteria in "Teaching Excellence", "Service Excellence", and "Scholarship Excellence" sections. Progress will be indicative of sufficient potential providing reasonable assurance that the standards for promotion will be met at the six-year review. The recommendation of the College RPT Committee is critical for passage at third-year review, and only those candidates who have demonstrated promise will be allowed to progress towards six-year promotion.

2. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

   Faculty standing for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching, service, and scholarship as defined in the aforementioned criteria in "Teaching Excellence", "Service Excellence", and "Scholarship Excellence" sections. The recommendations of the sub-

college RPT will take place in March. If the college does not have enough qualified faculty to serve on the college RPT committee, then the process described in the UFH Evaluation Procedures applies. The committee chair is elected by a majority of the committee and should have served on the committee in a previous year.

Westbrook College of Health Professions

Annotated RPT Checklist

The following RPT Checklist is an annotated version of the RPT Checklist described in the University Faculty Handbook (Attachment 1). The annotations are intended to help RPT candidates assemble a complete and well-constructed electronic portfolio.

Prior to submission, candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback about their portfolio from a UNE faculty member who has previously been through the RPT process.

_____1) Cover sheet with candidate's name, department, home college, action expected of RPTC, and date

_____2) RPT E-Binder Annotated Table of Contents

Annotations help the reader quickly understand the type of material found in each section of the electronic portfolio

Annotations may not be necessary if the materials in each section of the electronic portfolio are well organized using descriptive folder and filenames that clearly convey their contents.

_____3) Completed RPT Checklist with faculty signature

_____4) Curriculum vitae (CV), and, as applicable, licensure documentation

CV should be constructed so that a reviewer can easily and quickly identify relevant teaching, service, and scholarship accomplishments described elsewhere in the portfolio

Licensure documentation, if applicable, should reflect continuous licensure throughout the period of review

Licensure documentation should include evidence of continuing education, especially if required for licensure

5) Years of service documentation (letter of hire and any subsequent changes to

The candidate's Dean will be responsible to ensure that the written evaluations from at least three external peer reviews are inserted prior to the sub-college RPTC review. These letters will be inserted in a separate tab marked "External Letters of Review" following all sections that the candidate has compiled.

If the candidate has a joint appointment in more than one college and the effort in the secondary college is 20% or more, the Dean from the primary college will request a letter from the Dean of the secondary college and this letter will be inserted by the Dean of the primary college prior to the sub-college RPTC review.

After each level of review (sub-college RPT committee, chair/director, college committee, dean), the written letter of the committee/reviewer will be inserted in the final tab of the portfolio marked "Current RPT Evaluations" for inclusion at the next level/s of review with this checklist being checked off and signed at the appropriate place below.

Written evaluations from each level of the current review inserted at the appropriate stage of review

Sub-college RPTC

Signature date

Chair/Director

Signature date

College RPTC

Signature date

Dean

Signature date

University RPTC

Signature Date

COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE
COLLEGE RPT STANDARDS
University of New England College of Osteopathic Medicine
Approved by COM Faculty Assembly April 11, 2022

Introduction:

This document will set forth the organization of the faculty within the University of New England College of Osteopathic Medicine. It will specifically address the process for the granting of promotion and tenure within the faculty of the College of Osteopathic Medicine (COM). The COM consists of faculty with diverse backgrounds and varied job responsibilities. The purpose of this document is to develop a process which will allow the COM faculty across all disciplines to evaluate their peers in a fair and equitable manner

I.

decisions for reappointment or promotion based on the percent effort as stated in the Personal Responsibility Agreement (PRA).

ii. Non-tenure track research faculty should negotiate effort through the chair/section head and Dean to include any requirements applying to Review and Promotion. In

2. Teaching Products or Exhibits examples:
    a. Examples of self-written learning objectives, teaching, and assessment materials
    b. Evaluations: Student evaluations; Peer evaluations and letters of support
    c. Developed case vignettes
    d. Local awards for teaching or mentoring; honors or recognitions for teaching contributions
    e. Invited presentation in the field of educational expertise
    f. Senior local leadership role in education
    g. Invitations to speak and teach locally about education, including outside the candidate's department
    h. Contributions to local professional educational organizations
    i. Selection for participation in limited enrollment training programs for educators
    j. Leadership role in regional or national courses related to education
    k. Awards for teaching or mentoring from sources other than the candidate's department/institution
    l. Visiting professorships and invitations to speak nationally or internationally on issues related to education
    m. Leadership of national or international courses related to education
    n. Serving as a consultant nationally or internationally on issues related to development of educational programs, methods, policy, or assessment
    o. National and/or international awards related to education and educational scholarship

3. Examples of Teaching Expertise Across Ranks:
    a. Assistant Professor: The Assistant Professor should provide evidence that s/he is performing at a competent level and is working towards excellence in view of future promotions. The assistant professor may be involved in the development and local adoption of educational material in print or other media including items such as syllabi, curricula, web-based training modules or courses, and/or technologies (e.g., simulation); s/he may also include development of educational methods, policy statements, and/or assessment tools.

    b. Associate Professor: The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor should provide evidence of excellence in teaching. They should have strong teaching evaluations from students and faculty, with colleagues who request assistance in peer observations and improving instructional effectiveness. A candidate for promotion to associate professor

whom s/he had a major influence, including feedback from trainees and publications with trainees.

Scholarship

Faculty carry out the mission of the College of Osteopathic Medicine to create new knowledge. In recognition of diverse faculty in the COM, the RPT process must take a broad view of scholarship while still demanding excellence in scholarship. The COM recognizes an expanded view of scholarship originally codified by Boyer in 1997. This includes four types of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and the scholarship of teaching.

Tenure and research track faculty are required to meet these criteria. Clinical and

c. Maintains membership or holds office in local, state, national, regional, international professional organization
d. Serves as board member for health related local, state, regional, or national organization
e. Attends business meeting of national professional organization
f. Attends community meetings of organizations whose purpose is to promote health
g. Attends COM Faculty Assembly and UNE Faculty Assembly meetings
h. Review of grant proposals or books

2. Evidence of Service Might Include:
   a. Descriptions of duties and responsibilities on committees
   b. Letters of appointment to committees
   c. Letters of support from committee chairs
   d. Program and thank you note from a community function where you were leader or speaker
   e. Community, College, or University Presentation/paper on an issue
   f. Testifying (oral or written) regarding a policy change
   g. Organizing a community event
   h. Serving on a community or association Board of Directors (letter, webpage, photo)
   i. Starting a new department (report)
   j. Response to presentation to community organization
   k. Op-Ed piece in community newspaper
   l. Testimony on a specific issue to city council, legislative committee, e.g., health policy change
   m. A creative work illustrating diversity
   n. Honor or recognition for service
   o. Participation and/or Leadership role in community or professional organization

3. Examples of Service across Ranks:
   a. Assistant Professor: The college and the university benefits from the involvement of its junior level faculty member. An assistant professor is normally expected to provide service at the *local level* of the department or college, for example, by serving as a student advisor, as a member of the admissions committee, or as a member of a faculty search committee. Service at the Faculty Assembly or university level is relatively rare for Assistant Professor, but when it occurs, it is most appropriate for the service to be on university committees that do not have intensive and prolonged time demands.

   b. Associate Professor: Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to serve their department, the college and the university, for example, as chairs and directors as well as through membership on standing committees and ad hoc committees. It is also expected that candidates for Associate Professor ranks give time to their profession through service on editorial boards, grant review committees, program and conference program committees. Candidates also serve as elected or appointed officers of professional societies or associations.

   c. Professor: At the level of Professor, the expectations for candidates increase to include all of the categories initiated in the lower ranks of the professorate, including leadership at all levels of service. Service on certain high impact committees requiring senior faculty (e.g.

RPT and Faculty Assembly committees) is expected. In addition, a candidate for Professor level is expected to serve on university-wide committees when appointed or invited. Candidates are expected to offer *frequent* and *broadly distributed* service to multiple constituencies within the academic community.

Clinical Domain

The College of Osteopathic Medicine recognizes the clinical domain as a separate category from the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. Clinicians carry out the clinical and administrative missions of the College of Osteopathic Medicine. Clinical Expertise comprises activities related to patient care, healthcare delivery, bedside education, and clinical research.

1. Criteria:
   a. Faculty engages in clinical care that benefit the health care facility, the community, the college, the University, and the profession. The faculty member plays a key role in activities that influence clinical practice and the delivery of healthcare. As a *Clinician*, one might see movement from managing individual cases to managing larger groups, and from influencing one s individual patients to influencing clinical and social health practice policies f* q 0.00000912 0 612 792 re W* n Q EMC /P <</MoRPvities

often national, committees developing guidelines and policies for management in area of clinical expertise

m. Service as peer reviewer for clinical journals; Membership on editorial boards in area of clinical expertise
n. Peer-reviewed funding to support innovations that influence clinical practice locally; Peer reviewed funding to support innovations that influence clinical practice regionally, and most often nationally
o. Local, regional or national awards for contributions and/or innovation in the area of clinical expertise

3. Scholarship in the clinical arena may take varied forms:
    a. Publication of first or second authorship of original research, review articles or chapters related to area of clinical expertise; may include publication of research that assesses the effectiveness of innovative approaches to clinical care
    b. Development of guidelines and/or protocols for patient treatment or delivery of care that are adopted locally
    c. Commentary written about the healthcare field.

4.

ATTACHMENT 2 - EXCERPT

University Timeline for Annual Reviews and the RPT Process

	Tenure Track Classifications
Deadline	Action
March 1	Dean informs candidate of required review for reappointment and/or ter or eligibility for promotion to associate level, or promotion to professor level.
May 1	1. Candidate declares their intent to apply for promotion in writing to their chair/director and dean. If a candidate wishes to be considered for pron from the associate level to professor level, they must submit a petition t their chair/director and dean. 2. Candidate submits the names of three UNE COM Faculty members to their Department Chair for Subcollege RPTC consideration. 3. Names for external reviewers shall be submitted to the dean for tenure review and promotion.
May 15	1. The dean will send a list of candidates to the College RPT Committee a Provost
	2. The Department Chair will inform the candidate of the final compositi of the Subcollege RPTC
June 1	Subcollege RPTC members will select a chair of their committee
	MORE- See handbook

	Non-Tenure Track Classifications
Deadline	Action
March 1	Dean informs candidate of required review for reappointment and/or ter or eligibility for promotion to associate level, or promotion to professor level.
May 1	1. Candidate declares their intent to apply for promotion in writing to their chair/director and dean. If a candidate wishes to be considered for pron from the associate level to professor level, they must submit a petition t their chair/director and dean. 2. Candidate submits the names of three UNE COM Faculty members to their Department Chair for Subcollege RPTC consideration.
May 15	1. The dean will send a list of candidates to the College RPT Committee Provost
	2. The Department Chair will inform the candidate of the final composi of the Subcollege RPTC
June 1	Subcollege RPTC members will select a chair of their committee
	MORE- See handbook

COLLEGE OF DENTAL MEDICINE
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

I. General Statement

This document sets forth the criteria and procedural guidelines to be used in the College of Dental Medicine (CDM) for the appointment of new faculty, and the interim and final reviews toward the recommendation for reappointment and promotion of non-tenured faculty. Each of these shall be conducted in accordance with the policies set forth in the University of New England *Faculty Handbook*. All faculty hired by the College should be provided a copy of the *Faculty Handbook* and asked to read the document carefully prior to a formal meeting with the CDM Faculty Assembly Chair. At this meeting, the Chair will discuss the UNE RPT process in detail and answer any questions the new faculty member may have regarding the *Faculty Handbook*. This meeting will normally take place within the first month of being hired as part of the new faculty orientation. The faculty orientation will also include an introduction to Um, Blackboard, CoursEval, VitalSource, the CDM Faculty Handbook, the Clinic Manual and the clinic system in addition to the orientation conducted by Human Resources for all new UNE employees. The CDM Faculty Affairs and Development Committee will oversee the new employee orientation and assign faculty and staff to conduc the orientation.

A. Overview

In developing these Guidelines, the College of Dental Medicine has made certain basic assumptions. These are:

1. University salaried faculty appointments are made by the President upon recommendation of the Provos

c. “Excellence in scholarship” is demonstrated by the faculty member s accomplishments/expertise, attainment of regional, national and/or international recognition, through impact to the profession and/or ar of specialty practice, and/or equivalent level of acknowledgement. Scholarship as defined by the UNE Faculty Handbook is “evidence of a creative program of independent inquiry constituting a credible body of work that is peer-reviewed and disseminated”. Scholarship and specifically research is not a formal requirement for reappointment or promotion for non-tenure track faculty but scholarship conducted by faculty members in the CDM will be evaluated during the reappointment and promotion process.
d. “Excellence in Service” is demonstrated by attainment of institutional, regional and/or national recognition in areas including, but not limited to; College service, University service, patient care and service in state, regional or national organizations.

3. The Guidelines in this document are specific to the University of New England, College of Dental Medicine and are valid to the extent that they comply with the University of New England, University Faculty Handbook.

B. Academic Ranks

Academic ranks used in the College of Dental Medicine will be consistent with Section Two of the most current version of the University of New England, Faculty Handbook, (The Nature of Faculty Appointments and Academic Ranks and Classifications).

II. Initial Appointments (Also reference UNE Faculty Handbook, Section Two IV.)

A. Academic Rank- The criteria for appointment at a particular rank are the same as those for promotion to that rank.

B. Half-Time and Full-Time Faculty Appointments Salaried, Non-Tenure Track

1. Appointment Criteria - Full-Time Faculty
Members of the faculty appointed to this track will be individuals who devote the majority of their time to teaching, scholarship, service and patient care.

2. Appointment Criteria - Half-Time Faculty
These are individuals who maintain a regular weekly schedule on campus. Half-time faculty members must meet the same criteria as full-time, non-tenure track faculty members for appointment.

3. Initial half-time and full-time, faculty appointments will not exceed three years.

III. Procedural Guidelines for Half-Time and Full-Time Faculty (Also reference UNE Faculty Handbook, Section Three)

A. Reappointment
Half-time and full-time faculty will participate in a college-level review in the third full year of employment and then every three years until promotion to the associate level. Once the Clinical Associate Professor level

has been achieved, this review will occur every six years and whenever a promotion is being sought. After promotion to Clinical Professor, a reappointment review will occur every six years. Reappointment and promotion are based on merit and earned by achievement as evidenced by the faculty member s total contribution to the overall mission of the College.

B. Promotion

Promotion of half-time and full-time faculty is based on merit and is earned by achievement of excellence as defined by the College for the faculty member s particular rank and evidenced by the faculty member s total contribution to the overall mission of the College. Half-time and full-time faculty must normally hold each academic rank for a minimum of six full years prior to being promoted.

Decisions regarding individual recommendations for promotion in the College of Dental Medicine are made at four successive levels: (1) Subcollege Reappointment Promotion and Tenure Committee (RPTC); (2) Assistant/Associate Dean/Department Chair; (3) College RPTC; and (4) Dean. Specific requirements for the Subcollege and College RPTC s can be found under Section IV. of this document. Additionally, the following evaluations and potential time factors leading up to a review will be considered:

1. Annual Evaluation - Each full-time and half-time faculty member participates in an annual evaluation and development process consistent with the policies of UNE that is structured to support the faculty member s professional growth including reappointment and/or promotion. This evaluation is performed by the faculty member s direct supervisor or supervisors (for faculty who have both didactic and clinical responsibilities). The direct supervisor will schedule a meeting to discuss and assess the faculty member s teaching and/or clinical responsibilities. The faculty member will receive a notice prior to the evaluation in accordance with the policies of UNE s Human Resources department. A signed digital copy of the annual evaluation will be provided to the faculty member for inclusion into their reappointment and promotion portfolio. This process is goal-oriented and ensures that each faculty member:

a. Establishes and accomplishes goals and objectives that contribute to the UNE s and CDM s mission, vision, values and goals;

Faculty members applying for promotion must demonstrate excellence in assigned areas. Non-tenure track faculty will be expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching and service including patient care as applicable

A. Teaching Activities - It is assumed that all faculty members will participate in the teaching program and mission of the College.

1. Criteria and Achievements
The degree of involvement in pre-doctoral and post-doctoral dental education will vary from one individual to another

A. Visiting Adjunct F aculty Appointment – A

APPENDIX D

Faculty Grievance Procedures

A. Coverage

This set of procedures is intended for use by currently employed University of New England faculty who are salaried. These Faculty Grievance procedures are NOT applicable to faculty whose contracts have already been terminated or community clinicians or others who may serve the University or work with UNE students but who are not employed by the University of New England. In all cases of proposed dismissal, the faculty member has full recourse to this faculty grievance process, except those resulting from a formal reappointment, promotion, or tenure review. In cases of dismissal resulting from a formal reappointment, promotion, or tenure review, there is a separate appeal process described near the end of SECTION THREE.

B. Justification for Grievance

1. Justification for a grievance may include:

   a. violation, misinterpretation, or inequitable application of any University policy;

   b. unfair or inequitable treatment resulting from any act or condition that is contrary to established policies or practices affecting faculty, including complaints arising from perceived violation of Equal Employment laws or regulations.

2. Excep612 790000215p00000477blisheuo0.000009123(i)7(e)-3(van)4(c)-S Q Ev THREE.

E. Informal Grievance Process

A faculty member seeking to resolve a grievance must take the following actions before proceeding to the formal grievance process.

1. If possible, the aggrieved party (grievant[s]) should resolve the grievance through direct interaction with the person(s) involved (respondent[s]).

2. If this action is unproductive, the grievant should discuss the complaint with her/his immediate supervisor.

3. If the grievant is still unsatisfied, or if the supervisor is a party to the grievance, then the grievant should discuss the complaint with the appropriate college dean. The dean should make every effort to resolve the dispute, rather than let it become the business of the Faculty Assembly through its "Formal Grievance Process."

4.

b. Immediately upon receiving a request for a grievance hearing, the Chair of the Faculty Assembly will forward copies of all documents submitted by the grievant to the respondent/s and the Associate Vice President for Human Resources (AVPHR). If the AVPHR is party to the grievance, has served as an investigator in cases of sexual harassment claims (see Personnel Handbook), or is unable to serve for another reason, the Provost, in consultation with the Chair of the University Faculty Assembly, will appoint another person to serve as facilitator.

c.

f. The first meeting of the Committee will be called and facilitated by the AVPHR (or the appointed facilitator if the AVPHR is a party to the grievance) within 10 working days of all documents having been received by Committee members. A quorum will be a majority of members plus one for this and all subsequent meetings. The Committee's first tasks will be to select its own Chair and judge the merit of the request for a hearing. In particular, the Committee will attempt to verify that:

i. all information necessary to judge the merit of the request has been provided,
ii. the request has substantive merit (see SECTION FOUR, II), and
iii. all informal processes have been exhausted.

g. If the written request fails to satisfy any of the above criteria, the Committee will inform both parties to the grievance and will recommend to both a course for further action. This may include a request for additional information or a suggestion that additional informal measures be taken. The Committee also may declare that a formal hearing is not warranted.

h. For all subsequent meetings, the AVPHR (or the appointed facilitator if the AVPHR is a party to the grievance) will serve as an advisor and facilitator of Committee process and function. Ordinarily, the AVPHR (or the appointed facilitator if the AVPHR is a party to the grievance) will not attend meetings of the Committee. At the Committee's discretion, however, tee

will no

d. Audio recording of the hearing or Committee deliberations is prohibited. Committee members will not share the substance of a hearing or Committee deliberations, or any written record, with anyone outside the Committee.

e. Witnesses will include the grievant and respondent. Both parties to the grievance will be asked to provide names of additional relevant witnesses and a description of their expected testimony. The witnesses to be heard, and the order and length of their appearance, will be determined by the Committee. The Committee will consider reasonableness, relevance, need and confidentiality when it decides what witnesses to hear and what questions to examine.

f. When witnesses are unable to appear, but the Committee determines that the interests of justice require admission of their statements, the Committee will accept a written, signed statement. The Committee may pose written questions to be asked of the witness for consideration.

g. When called as witnesses, the grievant and respondent will be heard separately, unless it appears to the Committee that their simultaneous presence is crucial to the success of the fact finding mission. No attorneys or other representatives will be present for any part of the hearing without the Committee's agreement.

h. When other witnesses are heard, in no case will more than one be present at a time and neither grievant nor respondent will be present. Any witness, including grievant and respondent, may be recalled if necessary.

i. The Committee will gather information, analyze that information, and make recommendations for redress if they believe facts indicate the grievance has merit. Confidentiality must be maintained throughout the grievance process, and after the process has been concluded.

j. The Committee will make every effort to hold a hearing, reach its findings, and make its recommendation within 15 working days of its first meeting.

3. Disposition of Committee Findings

a. The Faculty Grievance Committee will send its written recommendations to the Chair of the Faculty Assembly, who will forward them immediately to the President, with copies to the Provost, the AVPHR, and both parties involved in the grievance.

b. If dissatisfied with recommendations of the Faculty Grievance Committee, either grievant or respondent may file a dissenting opinion to the President within five working days after receiving the written recommendation.

c. After giving both grievant and respondent five days to file a dissenting point of view, the President will formulate a decision, which is final.

d. The President will transmit a decision to the Chair of the Faculty Assembly, the AVPHR, and both grievant and respondent as expeditiously as possible.

e. The Committee will deliver all materials of record accumulated during the hearing to the AVPHR, who will maintain necessary records of the event and destroy unneeded materials.

G. Review of RPTC Recommendations

Faculty seeking to resolve a dispute regarding a decision not to grant reappointment, promotion, or tenure should proceed with the process described near the end of SECTION THREE.

ATTACHMENT 1

RPT Checklist

_____ 1) cover sheet with candidate's name, department, home college, action expected of RPTC, and date
_____ 2) RPT Binder

The candidate s Dean will be responsible to ensure that the written evaluations from at least three external peer reviews are inserted prior to the subcollege RPTC review. These letters will be inserted in a separate tab marked "External Letters of Review" following all sections that the candidate has compiled.

If the candidate has a joint appointment in more than one college and the effort in the secondary college is 20% or more, the Dean from the primary college will request a letter from the Dean of the secondary college and this letter will be inserted by the Dean of the primary college prior to the subcollege RPTC review.

After each level of review (subcollege RPT committee, chair/director, college committee, dean), the written letter of the committee/reviewer will be inserted in the final tab of the portfolio marked "Current RPT Evaluations" for inclusion at the next level/s of review with this checklist being checked off and signed at the appropriate place below.

Written evaluations from each level of the current review inserted at the appropriate stage of review

Subcollege RPTC _____
Signature date

Chair/Director _____
Signature date

College RPTC _____
Signature date

Dean
_____
Signature date

University RPTC _____
Signature date

September 2	The sub-college RPTC, the chair/director, the college RPTC, and the dean will have access to the electronic portfolios at noon.
September 21	Sub-college RPTC inserts their letter in the e-binder by 5:00 p.m.
October 15	Chair/Director inserts his/her letter in the candidate s e-binder by 5:00 p.m.
November 15	College RPTC inserts their letter in the candidate s e-binder by 5:00 p.m.

Chair of the University Faculty Assembly within two working days will transmit all materials (including reports deriving from grievance or discrimination investigations) to the candidate, academic dean(s), supervisor(s), the Provost, and the President.

February 1	University RPTC provides recommendations to the Provost for all portfolios reviewed.
March 1	[redacted]

ATTACHMENT 3

Sabbatical Leave Process

A. Summary of Sabbatical Leave Process

1. The faculty member reconfirms with their immediate primary supervisor as applicable and Dean that they are eligible to apply.

2. The faculty member submits a sabbatical proposal to their primary supervisor. In cases where a faculty member has a joint appointment, the secondary supervisor should be notified of the sabbatical leave proposal submission as applicable.

3. The primary supervisor submits the proposal along with their recommendation to the Dean and the relevant college-level review committee(s) (e.g., the college RPT committee) as determined by the faculty member's college.

4. The college review committee submits their recommendation to the Dean.

5. The secondary supervisor submits to the Dean a statement confirming whether there is coverage for course and other responsibilities with budget support in place in the secondary college/department to support the sabbatical leave.

6. The Dean submits the proposal along with their recommendation to the Provost, including a statement confirming there is course coverage and budget support in place in the primary and secondary (if applicable) college/department to support the sabbatical leave.

7. The Provost determines the number of sabbatical leaves that can be supported in a given year. The Provost ensures that there is equitable distribution of sabbatical awards across the eligible colleges, assuming that the proposals from different colleges are of equal quality.

8. The Provost sends written notification to the candidate, their immediate primary supervisor, their secondary supervisors (as applicable) and the Dean, regarding the approval or non-approval of their sabbatical request, including a statement of rationale for the decision.

9. When the faculty member returns from sabbatical the primary supervisor and Dean will document in the faculty member's Annual Review, their evaluation of whether the expectations, performance and outcomes from the sabbatical were met by the faculty member.

B. Request for Approval for Sabbatical Leave

The faculty member submits a sabbatical proposal to their primary supervisor, according to the timeline in Attachment 3.

The proposal will include the following items in the order given:

1. Title Page: Containing name and contact information of faculty member applying for sabbatical (including department and college); date of submission; and a descriptive title for the project, not to exceed 180 characters
2. Statement: A description of purpose, significance, and nature of the sabbatical leave, intelligible to (a)

(see Attachment 3). This letter will include the letter(s) from the Primary

SABBATICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION SUMMARY WORKSHEET

REVIEWER NAME_____ **APPLICANT NAME** _____

3. Express your overall opinion

COMPOSITE opi

III. Definitions and Guidelines for Ownership of Intellectual Property

IP shall be determined by examining the intent and purpose of its origination, the sources and terms of external sponsorship, if any; and the extent that University

property may be negotiated as a part of the sponsored program agreement.

B. The IPC shall be a standing committee appointed by the Vice President for Research and Scholarship. One faculty member from each college will serve on the committee at any given time. Ordinarily, the faculty members will serve a two-year term with a rotation schedule that staggers the turnover of its members. The Provost will serve as the Chairperson of the IPC and have full voting rights. One representative from the Office of Sponsored Programs/Technology Transfer and one representative from the Office of Institutional Advancement will also serve on this committee. One member of the Board's R&D committee will serve as well for a one-year term. If additional expertise is needed in the consideration of a particular IP matter, the Chairperson may appoint *ad hoc* members. These *ad hoc* members are non-voting members. The board must have a quorum, equal to the majority of its members, to conduct any business, which requires a vote of the committee.

C. The legal interests of the University and its staff, faculty, and students in any IP, except traditional scholarly works as described in Section IV 2. shall be determined in accordance with this policy by the IPC.

D. The pr

The Office of Sponsored Programs and Technology Transfer will have full authority to manage the patent prosecution and licensing of all disclosed IP. When an entity is not the potential licensee, the Originator will be asked to participate in the licensing process, as he/she is often the person most familiar with the resear commercial applications, and potential licensees. However, to avoid conflict of interest, the Originator(s) may not participate in the selection of the licensee or in the license negotiation process.

A. In seeking and developing commercialization of IP, the Office of Sponsored Programs and Technology Transfer shall be guided by the following principles:

1. A primary objective and responsibility of the University shall be to assure that the products of its intellectual activity are brought into the widest possible use for the general benefit of society;
2. IP should be treated as an asset and an appropriate return should be sought. Responsibility for this provision of the document rests with the IPC;
3. Universities are required to give preference for technology developed with federal funding to small businesses;
4. Actively encourage Originator participation in the commercialization efforts.

B. In some situations, it may be in the best interests of the University, the general public, and the Originator to enter into commercialization arrangements with entities who are partially owned or controlled by employee who originated the invention. Due to the potential of such arrangements for contributing to th economic development of the state and local areas, such arrangements may be considered and accep provided these are not specifically prohibited by law and that adequate provisions, including full disclosure of interests, are made to avoid or otherwise protect against conflict of interest on the part of those involved. Such negotiations for the creation of new commercial entities arising directly from the University's IP or arising from a potential collaboration between the University's employees and some outside entity will be handled by the IPC in consultation with the University s legal counsel.

C. Commercialization of IP is a process that may take a considerable amount of time. This process may involve discussions and negotiations over months or sometimes years and, based on national data, more o fails than succeeds. Timing, market conditions, and many other factors enter into the process. Quick success is rare. However, to protect 9(e)4(nti)of 1 0 0 1 0 6ow45(e)4(s aof no c)5(0 l0 612 792 re W* n BT /F1 1

D.

D. Where there is more than one Originator, the persons shall determine among themselves the percentage of the Originator s royalty share each shall receive. If the Originators cannot reach such agreement

5. BMTA for non-signatories to the UMBTA
6. Beta Test Site Agreement
7. Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form
8. Visiting Scholar Agreement (HR)
9. Consulting Agreement (HR)

ATTACHMENT 5

University of New England
Investigator Significant Financial Interest Disclosure Policy for Sponsored Projects

https://www.une.edu/sites/default/files/20200
12/UNE%20Investigator%20Financial%20Disclosure%20Policy%20Nov2020%20Revision%20Final.
pdf

policy and procedural requirements. This amended UNE policy document implements those regulatory changes.

Requirements

Federal regulations require institutions to have policies and procedures in place to ensure objectivity in research by establishing standards that provide a reasonable expectation that the design, conduct, and reporting of research funded under Public Health Service (PHS) grants or cooperative agreements will be free from bias resulting from Investigator financial conflicts of interest. To achieve this goal, UNE is required to assess potential Investigator financial conflicts of interest related to the Investigator s institutional responsibilities. UNE must also develop appropriate specific mechanisms by which conflicts of interest will be satisfactorily managed, reduced, or eliminated, prior to award or acceptance of an award. The institution must also maintain appropriate records. If a new reportable significant conflict of interest arises at any time during the period after the submission of the proposal through the period of the award, the filing of a disclosure is also required. Furthermore, UNE must require certain Investigators to complete an appropriate training at least once every four (4) years.

Definitions

Disclosure of significant financial interests means an Investigator s disclosure of significant financial interests to an Institution.

Financial conflict of interest (FCOI) means a significant financial interest that could directly and significantly affect the design, conduct, or reporting of funded research.

FCOI report means an Institution s report of a financial conflict of interest to a PHS Awarding Component.

Financial interest means anything of monetary value, whether or not the value is readily ascertainable.

HHS means the United States Department of Health and Human Services, and any components of the Department to which the authority involved may be delegated.

Institution means any domestic or foreign, public or private, entity or organization (excluding a Federal agency) that is applying for, or that receives, PHS research funding.

Institutional responsibilities mean an Investigator s professional responsibilities on behalf of the Institution, and as defined by the Institution in its policy on financial conflicts of interest, which may include for example: activities such as research, research consultation, teaching, professional practice, institutional committee memberships, and service on panels such as Institutional Review Boards or Data and Safety Monitoring Boards.

Investigator means the project director or principal Investigator and any other person, regardless of title or position, who is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of funded research or research proposed for such funding, which may include, for example, collaborators, consultants and subcontractors.[4]

[4] At UNE, the PI is generally the individual best able to decide who meets this definition. The UNE PI must ensure that all personnel who meet this definition be apprised of the Investigator Significant Financial Disclosure Policy and prepare the UNE Financial Interests Disclosure Form, if applicable.

Applicability

This policy has two distinct components: internal disclosure of Significant Financial Interests and external reporting of Financial Conflicts of Interest. All UNE Investigators must disclose Significant Financial Interests when submitting a "pink sheet" to the Office of Sponsored Programs and within thirty (30) days of acquiring or discovering a Significant Financial Interest.

As required by the individual funding entity reporting requirements, UNE will report Financial Conflicts of Interest to the funder. For PHS, UNE will be subject to the August 25, 2011 Final rule, including its disclosure requirements, as to any Notice of Award issued on or after August 24, 2012 and all award renewals, made by PHS or any subsidiary entity, including but not limited to:

1. NIH;
2. National Cancer Institute ("NCI");
3. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services ("CMMS");
4. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality ("AHRQ");
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC"); and
6. Food and Drug Administration ("FDA").

This overall policy applies to the following entities and individuals:

1. The University of New England;
2. Any Investigator, as defined above, planning to participate or participating in the research;
3. Any individual applying for or receiving research funding; and
4. SBIR/STTR Phase II applicants and awardees. Phase I SBIR/STTR applicants and awardees are exem
5. Subcontractors and subawardees are subject to the same disclosure and reporting requirements.

Policy

1. UNE requires each Investigator submitting a proposal for external funding to submit all required financial disclosures at the time of proposal submission and to update this information at least annually. However, Investigators must submit an updated disclosure of significant financial interests within thirty (30) days of discovering or acquiring (*e.g.*, through purchase, marriage, or inheritance) a new significant financial interest.

a. Initial disclosure of significant financial interests shall be made to the Director of Research Administration by submitting a packet of information consisting of the UNE Financial Interest Disclosure Form, all required supporting documentation (in a sealed envelope marked *confidential*), the proposal, and

2. In accordance with Federal regulations, a complete initial disclosure must be made by the Investigator prior to submission of the proposal.

3. The procedure to review disclosures, assess their potential conflicts of interest, and develop resolution strategies to "manage, reduce or eliminate" such conflicts shall be incorporated with the standard proposal signature process and integrated into the normal proposal submission process.

4. The Director of Research Administration, or official designee, will review UNE Investigator FCOI Disclosure Forms to determine whether an actual or potential conflict of interest exists. If an actual or potential conflict of interest is found, the matter will be referred to the UNE Financial Conflict of Interest Review Committee to determine what conditions or restrictions, if any, should be imposed by the institution to manage, reduce, or eliminate such conflicts of interest; and as necessary, recommend sanctions.

5. The Office of Sponsored Programs shall be responsible for appropriate follow-up reporting and records management procedures.

6. By law, information regarding the UNE FCOI policy and its implementation must be publicly available.

a. UNE will make this policy available to the general public by posting it on the University of New England's Research & Sponsored Programs website.

b. As required, UNE will make certain information about FCOIs related to federally funded research by Senior/Key Personnel available to the public. UNE will do so by responding to any request for information about these specifically covered FCOIs within five (5) business days. The Requestor will be informed that the information a) is up to date as of the date of disclosure and b) is subject to update as follows:

i. at least annually; and
ii. within 60 days of a newly discovered FCOI; and
iii. will remain available for 3 years after the most recent update.

c. Information that must be made available is:

i. Investigator's name;
ii. Investigator's title and role with respect to a research project;
iii. Name of the entity in which the SFI is held;
iv. The nature of the SFI;
v. and the approximate dollar value of the SFI (dollar ranges are permissible: $0 - $4,999; $5,000 - $9,999; $10,000 - $19,000; $20,000 - $100,000 by increments of $20,000; amounts above $100,000 by increments of $50,000), or a statement that the interest is one whose value cannot be readily determined through references of public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value.

and at least every four years thereafter. In addition, training must be completed by any PHS funded Investigators under the following circumstances:

a. UNE FCOI policies change in a manner that affects Investigator requirements;
b. A PHS funded Investigator is new to UNE and brings current PHS funding to UNE; or
c. UNE finds an Investigator noncompliant with the institutional policy or his/her Management Plan.

This training requirement may be satisfied through face to face sessions offered by UNE and/or through online training modules approved by UNE.

Procedure & Implementation

1. Financial Conflict of Interest Review Committee. UNE will maintain a Financial Conflict of Interest Review Committee (FCOIRC). Committee members will be appointed by the President. The committee shall contain, at a minimum, researchers representing a cross section of disciplines, a research administrator, and other appropriate UNE personnel. The committee shall determine what conditions or restrictions, if any, should be imposed by the institution to manage actual or potential conflicts of interest arising from disclosed significant financial interests. Recommendations for committee members will be made to the President by the Director of Research Administration.

2. Investigator Disclosure. When making a new, annual, or 30-day disclosure under this policy, each Investigator is required to complete the UNE Financial Interests Disclosure Form and attach any required supporting documentation. For initial disclosures, the completed disclosure form must be submitted with the proposal and the

current PHS standards. If the subrecipient cannot provide such certification, the agreement shall state that subrecipient Investigators are subject to UNE s financial conflicts of interest policy for disclosing significant financial interests that are directly related to the subrecipient s work for UNE;

c. If the subrecipient s Investigators must comply with the subrecipient s financial conflicts of interest policy, the agreement referenced above shall specify time period(s) for the subrecipient to report all identified financial conflicts of interest to UNE. Such time period(s) shall be sufficient to enable UNE to provide timely FCOI reports, as necessary, to PHS;

d. Alternatively, if the subrecipient s Investigators must comply with UNE s financial conflicts of interest policy, the agreement referenced above shall specify time period(s) for the subrecipient to submit all Investigator disclosures of significant financial interests to UNE. Such time period(s) shall be sufficient to enable UNE to comply timely with its review, management, and reporting obligations under this subpart.

e. UNE will provide FCOI reports to the PHS Awarding Component regarding all financial conflicts of interest of all subrecipient Investigators according to the timeframe for reporting UNE Investigator FCOIs set forth below (*e.g.* prior to the expenditure of funds and within 60 days of any subsequently identified FCOI).

5. Disclosure Form Review. The Director of Research Administration or official designee shall conduct an initial review of all financial disclosures (Initial, 30 day and Annual) to determine if any disclosed significant financial interest could affect the design, conduct, or reporting of the proposed sponsored project. If the initial review indicates that there may be a potential conflict of interest covered by this policy, the investigator will be notified and the disclosure will be referred to the FCOIRC.

6. Review of Untimely Disclosure. Within sixty days of learning that a) an Investigator failed to make a timely disclosure, or b) UNE had not previously reviewed an Investigator s disclosure in a timely manner, the Director of Research Administration shall review the disclosure of the significant financial interest in order to:

a. Determine whether it is related to PHS-funded research;

b. Determine whether a financial conflict of interest exists; and, if so,

At a minimum the resolution plan shall address such issues as public disclosure of significant financial interests, review of research protocol by independent reviewers, and monitoring of research by independe reviewers.

Within a reasonable time period, the FCOIRC shall review the resolution plan and approve it or add conditions or restrictions, including but not limited to the following:

(i) Public disclosure of financial conflicts of interest (e.g., when presenting or publishing the research);
(ii) For research projects involving human subjects research, disclosure of financial conflicts of interest directly to participants;
(iii) Appointment of an independent monitor capable of taking measures to protect the design, conduct, and reporting of the research against bias resulting from the financial conflict of interest;
(iv) Modification of the research plan;
(v) Change of personnel or personnel responsibilities, or disqualification of personnel from participation in all or a portion of the research;
(vi) Reduction or elimination of the financial interest (e.g., sale of an equity interest); or
(vii) Severance of relationships that create financial conflicts.

The approved resolution plan shall be incorporated into a memorandum of understanding that details the conditions or restrictions imposed upon the Investigator in the conduct of the project or in the relationship with the business enterprise or entity.

The memorandum of understanding shall be developed by the Office of Sponsored Programs and signed by the Investigator and the Investigator's chair and dean. Actual or potential conflicts of interest will be satisfactorily managed, reduced, and eliminated in accordance with these guidelines prior to accepting an award, or they will be disclosed by the Office of Sponsored Programs to the sponsoring agency as may be required.

9. Record Retention. Records of Investigator financial disclosures and actions taken to manage actual or potential conflicts of interest shall be retained by the Office of Sponsored Programs until three (3) years after the later of 1) the submission of the final expenditures report to PHS or 2) the resolution of any government action involving those records. All records, forms, correspondence, and all copies thereof shall be returned to the Investigator at the determination of award or resolution of government action involving those records.

10. UNE Reporting to PHS. UNE shall report any identified FCOI to the PHS Awarding Component. Timeframes for filing reports are as follows:

a. Prior to the expenditure of any funds;
b. Within sixty (60) days of identifying an Investigator who is newly participating in the project;
c. Within sixty (60) days of identifying any new, or newly identified FCOIs, for existing Investigators;
d. At least annually until the completion of the project; or
e. Following a retrospective review to update a previous report, if indicated.

each public presentation of the results of the research and to request an addendum to previously publishe

ATTACHMENT 6

University of New England - Office of Research Integrity
Policy on Research Misconduct
(Last Updated April 06, 2021)

1. Introduction and Applicability

The reputation of the University of New England (UNE or University) and its scholarly and academic endeavors require that all members of its community maintain the highest ethical standards in their professional activities. In recognition of this need, UNE has adopted the following policy to respond to allegations of Research Misconduct and to inform members of the community of the appropriate channels for bringing such matters to the attention of the University[5]. This policy applies to any person who, at the time of the alleged Research Misconduct, was employed by, was agent of, or was affiliated by agreement with UNE, including faculty, staff and students.

2. Definitions[6]

a. *Complainant*. The individual, department or entity who in good faith makes an allegation of Research Misconduct.

b. *Inquiry* means preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding consistent with Section 3 of this policy and applicable provisions of 42 CFR §§ 93.307 309.

c. *Investigation* means the formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record leading to a decision not to make a finding of Research Misconductor to a recommendation for a finding of Research Misconduct which may include a recommendation for other appropriate actions, including administrative actions.

5

d. *Research Misconduct*

to the Respondent along with a copy of this policy. The RIO or deputy RIO shall, at the same time, inform Respondent s department head or other immediate supervisor of the nature of the claims alleged and immediately arrange to take appropriate actions to obtain and secure all Research Records and evidence needed to conduct the Research Misconduct Inquiry. Respondent shall have an opportunity to respond in writing to the RIO or deputy RIO to any allegations raised. Responses must be received by the RIO or deputy RIO within ten (10) business days, but upon reasonable request, the RIO or deputy RIO may choose to grant additional time.

c. After Respondent has been notified and has had an opportunity to respond, the RIO or deputy RIO, in consultation with the department head or program director and, if the RIO or deputy RIO deems appropriate, the APRS, Provost, the Institutional Compliance Officer, and/or such other persons as the RIO or deputy RIO decides would be helpful to the Inquiry process (the "Inquiry Committee"), shall determine whether a Investigation is

f.

c. The RIO or deputy RIO will request that the Chair of the University Faculty System recommend a fact-finding committee of five (5) tenured faculty members who are unbiased in the investigation ("the Committee"). Upon approval of the membership of the committee by the RIO or deputy RIO, the Committee shall elect its own chair who shall be responsible for determining the manner in which witness interviews are handled by the Committee. The Committee shall have one hundred twenty (120) days from the date of beginning the formal investigation to complete it.

d. The Committee will be provid

ii. Respondent shall have the opportunity to present a defense to the Committee, to present witnesses for interview by the Committee, and to respond to all allegations of Research Misconduct. The Federal/State Court Rules of Evidence will not formally apply to this proceeding.

iii. UNE will take reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased Investigation to the maximum extent practicable, including participation of persons with appropriate scientific expertise who do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved with the Inquiry or Investigation. Respondent may challenge the composition of the Committee, if he or she believes that one or more of its members is not unbiased, has a conflict of interest, or should otherwise recuse himself or herself. The Committee, in consultation with the RIO or deputy RIO, shall determine whether bias or conflict of interest exists and shall request that the Chair replace a committee member as appropriate.

iv. Respondent has the right to appear at a preliminary conference with the Committee to set an interview schedule. The Committee shall endeavor to provide Respondent with a reasonable amount of time to prepare for the investigation consistent with the overall time constraints on the investigation process.

v. At the request of Respondent, the Committee shall use its authority to obtain documents and evidence and to interview witnesses who have information relevant to the defense of Respondent.

vi. Respondent is entitled to a presumption of innocence and need not prove his or her innocence[16] to the Committee.

vii. Respondent shall receive a copy of the draft Investigation report of the Committee and shall have an opportunity to provide a written response to such report. Respondent shall receive a copy of the final report at the time it is provided to the RIO or deputy RIO.

h. Once the investigation is completed, the Committee will prepare a draft Investigation report[17] stating whether or not Respondent has committed Research Misconduct and summarizing the facts and analysis that support that conclusion and, if appropriate, addressing the merits of any reasonable explanation or defense provided by Respondent. Findings of Research Misconduct shall only be made if a majority of the members of the Committee agree that there has been a significant departure from accepted practices of the

[16] The respondent bears the burden of proving any affirmative defenses raised (e.g., honest error or difference of opinion) or mitigating factors. (See 42 C.F.R. § 93.106.)

[17] If applicable, the investigation report shall comply with the requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 93.313

ATTACHMENT 7

Policy on Distribution of F&A Recovery Funds for FY 2012/2013

https://sites.google.com/a/une.edu/fa-policy/

ATTACHMENT 8

UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND

Annual Faculty Member Performance Evaluation
for Calendar Year XXXX

Part A (Completed by Faculty Member undergoing evaluation)

Content of this form serves as the minimal protocol and can be supplemented by individual units. This form is to be completed by each faculty member, and submitted to and discussed with her/his supervisor. The UNE Faculty Handbook states that every member of the faculty will be reviewed annually as part of the Annual Review, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure process. All reporting of teaching, scholarship and service will align with departmental criteria established for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

When completed and signed by the candidate, supervisor, and dean, Faculty Member will add Parts A and of this form to their RPT portfolio to be considered in multilevel RPT reviews.

Name of Faculty Member:

Pronouns

Date of Hire:

Due Date of Faculty Member s Portfolio for next Multilevel RPT Review:

Faculty Classification (*Teaching*, *Research, Clinical or Tenure track)* (indicate one):

Rank: *(eg. Assistant, Associate, Professor, as appropriate)*

Date of appointment to current rank:

Date tenured *(if appropriate)*

Total Full-Time Equivalency (FTE; full-time regular, half-time regular, full-time visiting, half-time visiting or other (indicate one)):

Supplemental UNE contract/Overload? YES/NO (indicate one): Please describe:

Annual contract length: (eg. 9 mo., 10 mo., 11 mo., 12 mo. (indicate one):

Percent Time (Effort), to total 100% (or equivalent workload quantification system):

funded, as well as work in progress such as grant applications, articles in preparation, etc.

3 How would you rate your overall performance in the area of scholarship for the year under review? (Using these categories: did not meet expectations, met expectations, exceeded expectations). Justify your response (e.g., what are your strengths and weakness, reflection on whether goals were met).

4. What are your scholarship-related goals for the upcoming year of review and beyond?

SERVICE

1. What were your service goals for the year under review (refer to last year's annual review or other

2. List other notable activities, awards, etc. with a brief description of each (3 sentences maximum).

3. Do you have any faculty development goals for the next academic year?

_____

1. Signature of Supervisor Date

2. Faculty Member:
I have received these comments and ratings from my immediate supervisor. I understand that I have the right to respond to these comments and ratings in writing within five (5) working days after receipt of this document.

_____

Signature of Faculty Member Date

3. Optional Comments by Faculty Member
I would like to add these comments:

_____

Signature of Faculty Member Date

_____

4. Signature of Dean Date

5. Optional Comments by Dean:

_____

Signature of Dean Date

Date of Faculty Member s next Multilevel Review: _____

SIGNATURES

_____

1. Signature of Supervisor Date

2. Faculty Member

I have received these comments and ratings from my immediate supervisor and that I have the right to respond to these comments and ratings in writing within five (5) working days after receipt of this document.

_____

1. Signature of Faculty Member Date

3. Optional Comments by Faculty Member

I would like to add these comments:

_____

Signature of Faculty Member Date

_____

4. Signature of Dean Date

ATTACHMENT 9

Faculty Hiring Process

Preamble

The following protocol is designed for full-time, tenure track faculty positions, and should also serve as a general guideline for other academic appointments. It is recognized that in exceptional situations, e.g., when negotiations include the possible hiring of a domestic partner, the protocol might need to be adjusted but

The Search Committee will evaluate candidates systematically and document the process which was followed in order to provide recommendations according to the Dean s charge. Communication with persons providing reference information for finalists is required.

Offers

The Dean, in consultation with others in the university administration will craft an offer letter and negotiate with the selected candidate. The faculty classification/rank cannot exceed that which was advertised. The offer letter must include responsibilities and expectations of the faculty member (e.g., initial percent effort in teaching, research/scholarship, service, and/or clinical appointments), and any resources which will be provided by the institution. At the time employment begins, a formal Letter of Hire must be provided to the new faculty member.

Follow-up

The Search Committee Chair is responsible for ensuring that all unsuccessful candidates are notified.