

**The Department of
Advertising & Public Relations
FACULTY BYLAWS**

As amended on:

January 22,
2013

Faculty Bylaws

Department of Advertising and Public Relations
College of Communication Arts & Sciences

Table of Contents

1. THE FACULTY	2
1.1 Composition of Department Faculty.....	2
1.2 Voting Faculty.....	2
1.3 Modes of Participation in Academic Governance.....	2
1.4 Faculty Meetings.....	2
2. DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION	3
2.1 Chairperson	3
2.2 Associate Chairperson	4
2.3 Department Committee Structure.....	4
2.4 Standing Committees of the Department.....	5
2.5 Special Committees	5
3. PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.....	7
3.1 Appointment of Faculty	7
3.2 Annual Faculty Evaluation and Merit Raise Recommendations.....	8
3.3 Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Actions.....	9
3.4 Dismissals.....	13
3.5 Grievance and Hearing Procedures	13
3.6 Amendment of Bylaws	14
APPENDIX A Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.....	15
APPENDIX B Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures	25

FACULTY BYLAWS

Department of Advertising and Public Relations College of Communication Arts & Sciences

1. THE FACULTY

1.1 Composition of Department Faculty

- 1.1.1 The regular faculty shall consist of all persons appointed under the rules of tenure, holding the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor.
- 1.1.2 The fixed term faculty shall consist of all persons holding the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer who are not appointed under the rules of tenure.
- 1.1.3 Other faculty shall include persons designated as visiting professors, adjunct professors and professors emeriti.
- 1.1.4 Unless otherwise stated, the word Chairperson refers to the chairperson of this department.

1.2 Voting Faculty

- 1.2.1 The voting faculty shall consist of all regular Department faculty, plus full-time fixed-term faculty, in accordance with University policies.

1.3 Modes of Participation in Academic Governance

- 1.3.1 There are four modes of faculty participation in academic governance: **consultation, advisory, shared responsibility, and delegated authority**. These modes of participation are defined in Section 1.3 of the University's Bylaws for Academic Governance.

1.4 Faculty Meetings

- 1.4.1 Meetings of the Faculty shall be open to all regular and fixed term faculty of the Department.
- 1.4.2 Regular meetings of the Faculty shall be held monthly during fall

and spring semesters. Notice of the tentative schedule of regular meetings shall be provided to faculty via electronic mail, prior to the start of each semester.

- 1.4.3 The Chairperson or designee shall preside over regular meetings.
- 1.4.4 Robert's Rules of Order (The Modern Edition) shall govern the conduct of all Faculty and committee meetings, except as modified by these bylaws.
- 1.4.5 Agenda and minutes of Faculty meetings shall be distributed to all the faculty of the Department.
- 1.4.6 A majority of the voting members of the Faculty constitutes a quorum. Action on matters of official business requires that a quorum be present.
- 1.4.7 With the exception of votes on bylaw amendments (see Article 3.6), all matters requiring faculty vote will be decided by a simple majority of the voting faculty in attendance at a regular meeting of the Department.
- 1.4.8 Special meetings to vote on special issues may use asynchronous communication if confidentiality is preserved.

2. DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

2.1 Chairperson

- 2.1.1 The Chairperson shall be appointed in accordance with College and University Bylaws and have such powers and responsibilities as set out therein. Matters regarding review of the Chairperson's performance and her/his reappointment are set forth in the *Bylaws for Academic Governance, Section 2.1.4* (<https://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/bylaws/index.html>).
- 2.1.2 The Chairperson shall be responsible for the implementation of educational, research, and service functions of the Department. This responsibility pertains to matters of budget, course scheduling, physical facilities, and personnel (including appointment of graduate assistants). In performing these duties, the Chairperson shall take into account advice given by all standing committees, the faculty and the students of the Department.
- 2.1.3 The Chairperson shall review each faculty member annually in

accordance with the *MSU Faculty Handbook*. The Chairperson shall conduct a face-to-face interview with each faculty member before the end of spring semester.

- 2.1.4 The Chairperson shall be an ex officio member of all Department committees with voice but no vote.
- 2.1.5 The Department Chairperson shall not serve as a Department committee Chair.
- 2.1.6 The voting faculty of the Department shall have **shared responsibility** with the Dean to determine procedures for the selection of a Chairperson.
- 2.1.7 The Chairperson can delegate any official function to an Associate Chairperson(s).

2.2 Associate Chairperson

- 2.2.1 The Advertising and Public Relations Department (ADPR) Associate Chairperson, appointed by the Chairperson with approval of the Dean, shall assist the Chairperson in the orderly management of the Department and in the performance of tasks that are related to the academic administration of the Department and that cannot be appropriately delegated to supervisory and support staff.
- 2.2.2 An Associate Chairperson for departmental programs, with permanent duties on an official MSU campus overseas, can be appointed to perform such duties on behalf of the Chairperson as stipulated by agreement, with concurrence of the Dean and Director of the overseas unit.

2.3 Department Committee Structure

- 2.3.1 Standing and ad hoc committees of the Department shall be formed to facilitate the operation of the Department. Existing standing committees include the Graduate Studies Committee and Undergraduate Studies Committee. Members on all standing committees shall be volunteers and appointed by the Chairperson. Members on ad hoc committees and subcommittees shall be appointed by the Chairperson and confirmed by the faculty at the next faculty meeting.
- 2.3.2 The usual term of membership for each member of a standing

committee shall be two years commencing the fall semester following each spring appointment, with approximately half of the members of each committee appointed each year.

2.4 Standing Committees of the Department

A standing committee is any committee whose function is deemed so important, and the permanent continuity of whose activity is so essential to effective faculty government, that the faculty establishes it under that title.

2.4.1 General Rules Governing Standing Committees

- 2.4.1.1 The term of office of members of all standing committees shall be two years with at least one new member selected each year; student members may serve for one or two years. The term of office shall begin on August 15 and terminate on August 14.
- 2.4.1.2 Each standing committee shall consist of at least three members of the voting faculty. Additionally, the Graduate Studies Committee and the Undergraduate Studies Committee shall have one student member each, to be elected by the appropriate student constituency (see 2.4.1.3).
- 2.4.1.3 The Chairperson, with the advice and consent of the faculty, shall select the faculty members of each standing committee at the last departmental meeting of the spring semester. The Graduate Studies Committee shall select a graduate student representative to serve on the committee. The Undergraduate Studies Committee shall select an undergraduate student representative to serve on the committee.
- 2.4.1.4 The Chairperson with the advice and consent of faculty shall select the Director of Graduate Studies.
- 2.4.1.5 The Director of Graduate Studies shall serve as the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee. All other standing committees shall select their Chair and establish procedures for operation.
- 2.4.1.6 If a member of a standing committee is unable to serve for an academic semester, the Chairperson, with the advice and consent of the faculty shall select a

replacement to serve the remainder of his or her term of office. If an elected student member of a standing committee is unable to serve for an academic semester or longer, the appropriate student constituency may elect a replacement to serve the remainder of his or her term of office.

- 2.4.1.7 Standing committees shall meet formally at least once a semester and will report about the activities of the committee at regular faculty meetings.

2.4.2 Department Advisory Committee

- 2.4.2.1 The Committee shall advise the Chairperson of the Department on departmental matters. Three faculty members that are elected by the faculty shall serve as members of the committee, to be chosen by majority vote of the faculty members at their respective ranks.

2.4.3 Graduate Studies Committee

- 2.4.3.1 The Committee shall review all changes in graduate level courses, degree requirements, and other curricular matters, and advise the departmental voting faculty. Proposals for the development, elimination, or modification of courses, course sequences, or program emphases shall be voted upon by the Department faculty prior to submission to the college Curriculum Committee. The departmental faculty shall operate in the **shared responsibility** mode with the Chairperson to implement curricular decisions.
- 2.4.3.2 The Director of Graduate Studies shall make admission recommendations and take other action necessary in the operation of the graduate program, including administering scholarships for graduate students.

2.4.4 Undergraduate Studies Committee

- 2.4.4.1 The Committee shall review all changes in undergraduate courses, degree requirements, and other curricular matters, and advise the departmental voting faculty. Proposals for the development, elimination, or modification of courses, course sequences, or program emphases shall be voted upon by the Department faculty prior to submission to the college Curriculum Committee. The departmental faculty shall operate in the **shared responsibility** mode with the Chairperson

to implement curricular decisions.

- 2.4.4.2 The Committee is responsible for administering the scholarships application and selection process for undergraduate students.

2.5 Special Committees of the Department

Special committees are the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Review Committee and search committees. Additionally, the department is represented on the College Advisory Committee and the Media and Information Studies Ph.D. Executive Committee.

- 2.5.1 RPT Review Committee- see Section 3.3.2 for the description of this committee

2.5.2 Search committees shall be appointed by the Chairperson.

2.5.3 The Department is represented on the College Advisory Council by two tenure-stream faculty members who each serve a two-year term. In order to assure that there is always one returning representative, faculty, with the advice and consent of the Chairperson, will elect one new representative each spring semester.

2.5.4 Media and Information Studies (MIS) Ph.D. Executive Committee. The Department is represented on the MIS (Media and Information Studies) Ph.D. Executive Committee by the Chairperson and the Director of Graduate Studies.

3. PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

3.1 Appointment of Faculty

3.1.1. Tenure-system appointments.

- 3.1.1.1 The Department policies and procedures shall be in accordance with University *Faculty Handbook* and *Handbook for Faculty Searches*.

- 3.1.1.2 The Search Committee, in **consultation** with faculty, shall prepare the position announcement and work with support staff to appropriately advertise the open position. Subsequent to receiving applications, the search committee shall give the Chairperson its recommendations and a ranking of candidates for campus visitations.

- 3.1.1.3 The Search Committee shall **consult** with the Chairperson to arrange a list of invitees and visitation schedules.
- 3.1.1.4 Visitation schedules shall include meeting time with faculty members in the interest area, the search committee, administrators, and students. A public presentation for faculty and students is included during the visitation.
- 3.1.1.5 The Search Committee shall seek evaluations from all those meeting with the candidates.
- 3.1.1.6 The Search Committee shall submit its recommendation in the form of a written report to the Chairperson who subsequently submits her/his recommendation and the report of the search committee to the Dean.
- 3.1.1.7 The terms and conditions of employment shall be provided by the Chairperson, in writing, to the faculty member at the time of appointment. These terms should include:
 - a) The time period covered by the appointment.
 - b) Salary provision.
 - c) The general expectations in regard to the professional responsibilities of the person being appointed.
 - d) Conditions other than the appointee's performance of his or her responsibilities that may make a further appointment inadvisable.
 - e) University mandated information
- 3.1.1.8 The Chairperson shall provide to the faculty member at the time of appointment, a copy of the bylaws of the department, which specify the department's personnel procedures.
- 3.1.2 Fixed Term appointments shall be made by the Chairperson with consultation of appropriate faculty.

3.2 Annual Faculty Evaluation and Merit Raise Recommendations

- 3.2.1 As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, each tenure-system faculty member shall provide the Department Chairperson with a completed Professional Accomplishments form and a narrative of additional information on instruction or other related

issues in January of each year. If a faculty member does not provide the required material on time, that faculty member may not be eligible for a merit raise the following academic year.

- 3.2.2 Annually, the Chairperson shall provide a written evaluation of each tenure-system faculty member's performance, relative to the Department's RPT standards, as part of the merit raise and salary adjustment process. The Chairperson shall also meet with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation.
- 3.2.3 Within thirty days of receiving the written evaluation, the faculty may append it with written response for permanent records.
- 3.2.4 The Chairperson shall share with each faculty member a summary of the evaluation distribution statistics of the Department.

3.3 Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Actions

The overarching general criteria (specifics articulated in the Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure in Appendix A) to be employed in all faculty evaluations include:

- a) Excellence of Research/Creative Scholarship, including grantsmanship.
- b) Excellence of Instruction.
- c) Service/Citizenship to the department, the college, and the university.
- d) Service/Citizenship to professional and public communities.
- e) Needs of the department.

3.3.1 In evaluating candidates, the greatest weight in the review process shall be given to Research/Creative Scholarship, followed closely by Instruction, with Service/Citizenship deemed a significant but lesser criterion. In evaluating candidates, consideration shall be given to their assigned percent of effort in each area.

3.3.2 RPT Review Committee Structure

3.3.2.1 At the department level, the reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) reviewing body shall be the RPT Review Committee. For non-tenured faculty, the RPT Review Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty members. The RPT Review Committee for tenure-

stream assistant professors shall consist of all tenured associate and full professors. The RPT Review Committee for tenured associate professors shall consist of all tenured full professors. The RPT Review Committee, operating in the **advisory** mode, will advise the Chairperson regarding RPT decisions. Faculty members under consideration for promotion or tenure shall not take part in that specific deliberation.

- 3.3.2.2 Should fewer than three eligible Departmental faculty members be available for review of faculty in either the promotion category (to associate or to full professor), rank-eligible faculty members from other departments within the college will be asked by the Chairperson to serve on the Committee? The Chairperson and rank-eligible departmental faculty will **share** the responsibility for selecting the additional member or members. In the event no eligible departmental faculty member is available to help form the RPT Review Committee, the Chairperson shall forward his/her recommendation regarding the reappointment, promotion, or tenure action to the Dean.
- 3.3.2.3 If the candidate under review is a woman and/or a minority and there is no rank-eligible woman and/or minority person from within the Department, the Chair of the RPT Review Committee and the candidate shall consult and agree on a list of knowledgeable persons who might be invited to observe the review, to speak at the reviews, but not to vote. The Chair of the RPT Review Committee shall decide whom to invite to fulfill this role.
- 3.3.2.4 Although they do not participate in the decision making process in these matters, faculty who are not included in the RPT Review Committee and departmental undergraduate and graduate students may be solicited for appropriate comment relating to the faculty member(s) being considered for RPT.
- 3.3.2.5 The RPT Review Committee will be chaired by a departmental faculty member eligible to serve on the committee. The Chair of the RPT Review Committee will be selected from among the members at its initial meeting each year. The Department Chairperson may attend and speak at meetings of the RPT Review Committee, but shall not vote.

3.3.3 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Review Procedures

- 3.3.3.1 Recommendations for RPT will be in accordance with the university policy as outlined in the *Michigan State University Faculty Handbook* (<http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/index.htm>) Faculty members should carefully review the University Tenure System Policies (<http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/TenurePolicies.htm>) particularly, the Faculty Guide for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure: (<http://www.hr.msu.edu/promotion/facacadstaff/FacGuideTenure.htm>) ADPR criteria are included in the Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (Appendix A) to the Bylaws.
- 3.3.3.2 By August, the Department Chairperson shall distribute a calendar of important dates and deadlines for the reappointment, tenure and promotion of regular faculty. A faculty member appointed in the tenure system, who is required by University regulation to be reviewed for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, shall inform the Chairperson in writing no later than September 1 whether he or she wishes to commence the evaluation process. A regular faculty member who is not required by University regulation to be reviewed in the ongoing academic year may request an evaluation for purposes of promotion and/or tenure. Such a request shall be made in writing to the Chairperson no later than September 1.
- 3.3.3.3 The candidates being reviewed for promotion or tenure will also submit a list of three to five persons from whom letters of recommendation may be sought by September 1. External referees must be professionally capable to evaluate the candidate's scholarly work objectively and to comment on its significance in the discipline. Letters must represent persons other than collaborators and in no case faculty formerly serving on the equivalent of the candidate's guidance committee when the candidate was a graduate student. Title, email address, phone number, and mailing address for each should be included.
- 3.3.3.4 By October 1, the Department Chairperson, in consultation with the RPT Review Committee, will select three individuals from the tenure/promotion candidate's list from whom to request information. The RPT Review

Committee and Department Chairperson will identify two additional individuals relevant to the candidate's field, not on the tenure/promotion candidate's list to evaluate the candidate's work. The Chairperson will solicit letters on behalf of the candidate. Reviewers will be sent the candidate's vita and three to five published, scholarly works and will be asked to evaluate only this component of a candidate's portfolio. Should the extra reviewers have evidence of other performance, they may also comment.

- 3.3.3.5 External review letters will be due on or before December 1. The Chairperson will request letters from additional individuals if responses are not received from the original reviewers. Each file should contain at least four letters from reputed and recognized external reviewers from peer institutions, i.e., "...leading research-intensive, land-grant universities of international scope" or their equivalent. A brief biographical profile of each reviewer must be included.
- 3.3.3.6 The Chair of the RPT Review Committee shall work in a timely fashion with each candidate under review by the Committee in order to facilitate the development of candidate materials required in the evaluation process.
- 3.3.3.7 On or before the first day of classes for the spring semester, faculty members being considered for RPT will complete the University Recommendation-Action Form (Form D: http://www.hr.msu.edu/forms/faculty_forms/FormInfoRPTPages.htm) and submit it electronically to the Chairperson and RPT Review Committee Chair, along with supporting documentation (one copy).
- 3.3.3.8 The candidate also submits electronically a current curriculum vitae along with a reflective statement in accordance with the University RPT requirements. This includes a statement of the nature of the appointment, program of research, instruction philosophy/ accomplishments, service/outreach activities, and any special circumstances that should be noted.
- 3.3.3.9 The Committee, at its discretion, may solicit evidence, judgments, and opinions concerning the candidate, not presented by the candidate. The Committee must inform the candidate when additional requests are made

and the nature of this material must be described in the Committee report to the Chairperson.

- 3.3.3.10 Each person considered for RPT will be invited to confer with the RPT Review Committee, acting in his or her case before a final recommendation is made to the Chairperson.
- 3.3.3.11 Recommendations of the RPT Review Committee are to be made on the basis of majority vote of all Committee members.
- 3.3.3.12 The RPT Review Committee shall forward its advice to the Department Chairperson. The Chairperson will then meet individually with the faculty member involved to discuss the recommendation before forwarding it to the Dean. The Chairperson shall inform members of the RPT Review Committee about the recommendation prior to it being sent to the Dean.
- 3.3.3.13 If the faculty member up for review for RPT believes that the decision has been made in a manner that is at variance with the established evaluation procedures, she/he may initiate an appeal in accordance with the Faculty Grievance Procedures.

3.4 Dismissals

- 3.4.1 Procedures for dismissal of tenured faculty members are set forth in the *MSU Faculty Handbook* under "Dismissal of Tenured Faculty For Cause" dated May 5, 2006, or any revision or replacement of that document.
- 3.4.2 Procedures relating to the dismissal of non-tenured faculty who are in the tenure system are the same as those for tenured faculty, as approved by the Board of Trustees on April 17, 1970, unless revised or replaced by the Board of Trustees.

3.5 Grievance and Hearing Procedures

- 3.5.1 Any grievance initiated by any faculty member of the ADPR Department shall be processed according to the procedures outlined in the *MSU Faculty Handbook* under "Faculty Grievance Procedure," as approved by the Board of Trustees on April 5, 1991 and revised June 28, 2002, or any revision or replacement of that

document (<https://www.msu.edu/~fgo/fgp.html> for the most full and current version)

3.5.2 Student rights and responsibilities, including grievance procedures, shall be protected by this department. These are detailed in the Spartan Life publication (<http://www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/index.htm>), specifically the section titled “Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State” and in the section titled “Graduate Students Rights and Responsibilities.” See Appendix B for the Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures for the Department of Advertising and Public Relations.

3.6 Amendment of Bylaws

3.6.1 Proposed amendments of Bylaws shall be provided in writing at least seven days in advance of a faculty meeting; amendments require a 2/3 vote of those regular faculty present at the meeting.

Adopted February 10, 1969

Revised January 17, 2003

Revised February 6, 2009

Revised February 22, 2013

APPENDIX A

Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure

Preamble

These guidelines are presented in order to operationalize the evaluation criteria identified in the bylaws of the Department, specifically Research/Creative Activities, Instruction, and Service/Citizenship.

While guidelines can be neither exhaustive nor complete, they are intended to be deeply illustrative. As such, the guidelines provide minimum quantitative standards to attain satisfactory ratings on the evaluation criteria. The significance of an individual's work is not necessarily indicated by its quantity, therefore, once the minimum levels have been demonstrated, ratings beyond satisfactory shall be more dependent on assessment of quality. Meeting minimum standards does NOT guarantee the awarding of Reappointment, Promotion or Tenure.

The academic community has long maintained that all scholarship, and especially research and creative activities, must be supported by evidence of positive, independent, external peer review. The type of evidence or review may vary, but not the principle. This document supports that view.

At the same time, it must be noted that any candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure (RPT), shall be given full opportunity to present any evidence he or she wishes to provide and to make a case for the merit of her or his accomplishments. The candidate may propose equivalencies to the specified minimum standards in all areas of evaluation.

In the spirit of the University guidelines for RPT: The essence of scholarship is the thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge, including creative activities, that is based in the ideas and methods of recognized disciplines, professions, and interdisciplinary fields; and that is recognized by peers. What qualifies an activity as scholarship is that it be deeply informed by the most recent knowledge in the field, that the knowledge is skillfully interpreted and deployed, and that the activity is carried out with intelligent openness to new information, debate, and criticism.

The RPT guidelines that are in effect at the time a faculty member enters the tenure system will be submitted as evidence of expectations at the time the faculty member submits credentials for RPT. However, when guidelines are amended, the new guidelines will form the basis for expectations in subsequent promotion decisions.

In the case of jointly appointed candidates whose primary appointment is in another unit, the Department Chairperson will request materials from the unit

in question, including the agreed upon expectations, standards, criteria, practices and procedures for individual cases. The committee must accept that documents may differ from unit procedures if those of the other unit are selected. Faculty may not be required to prepare two different sets of documents to accommodate unit practices. Also, for faculty with joint appointments, the Memorandum of Understanding and letter of offer must be considered when evaluating Research/Creative Scholarship, Instruction, and Service/Citizenship.

judy osbun 2/25/13 1:56 PM
Formatted: Font:Gotham Book, Font color: Auto

1. Research/Creative Activity

In parallel with University guidelines, dimensions of research and creative activities recognized by the Department include but are not limited to:

- a) Discovery of new knowledge, including creative activities, and originality of approach;
- b) Development of innovative problem-solving strategies or methodologies;
- c) Application and dissemination of knowledge;
- d) Research and creative activities in outreach, professional/clinical, extension, international, or urban arenas.

1.1. The following evidence shall be considered in assessing Research/Creative Activity. These activities shall be evaluated and reviewed by peers:

a) Research: Definition

Publicly observable research made available through, but not limited to, online and print publications, either published or clearly shown to be "in press."

b) Creative Works: Definition

Publicly observable creative works may take the form of, but are not limited to audio, print, video, film, scripts, treatments, computer-generated products, installations, exhibitions or performances.

c) Fiscal Entrepreneurship: Definition

Fiscal entrepreneurship in support of Research/Creative Activity shall include but not be limited to efforts to receive or secure funding from external sources for Research/Creative Activity and various efforts directed toward securing funding.

1.2. Minimum Standards for Research/Creative Activity. These activities shall be evaluated and reviewed by peers.

Non-peer reviewed research and creative works can contribute to an individual's productivity, but peer review of research activity or evaluation of creative activity in the amounts specified below is central to meeting the minimum standards in these categories. Candidates are expected to provide evidence regarding the competitiveness and prestige of the mechanisms by which their research and creative works were peer reviewed.

1.2.1. For reappointment as assistant professor:

On the average, two refereed research works, or an authored scholarly book, or two evaluated creative

activities, per year.

1.2.2. For promotion to associate professor with tenure:

On the average, two refereed research works, or an authored scholarly book, or two evaluated creative activities, per year, within the prior six years, including at least three in which the candidate is a major contributor. Candidates submitting research/creative works may suggest, with appropriate justification, the substitution of one larger, more significant work for several smaller ones.

Evidence of fiscal entrepreneurship in the form of grant proposals submitted for external funding.

Evidence that the faculty member demonstrates the capacity to become an expert of national stature and is on a trajectory of long-term, high quality professional achievement.

For those who come to the Department with the rank of associate professor, work in the three years prior to their Michigan State University appointment shall be considered as equivalent to work accomplished while at Michigan State University.

1.2.3. For promotion to professor with tenure:

On the average, two refereed research works, or an authored scholarly book, or two evaluated creative activities, per year, including at least nine research works or creative activities in which the candidate is a major contributor. Candidates submitting research/creative works may suggest, with appropriate justification, the substitution of one larger, more significant work for several smaller ones.

Evidence of fiscal entrepreneurship success as a principal or co-principal investigator in securing external funding for research or creative activity.

Evidence that the faculty member is an expert of national stature and demonstrates a commitment to continued high quality professional achievement.

1.2.4. Peer-reviewed work is essential in evaluation. However, non-peer reviewed research and creative works can be considered in all reappointment, promotion and tenure

judy osbun 2/25/13 1:56 PM

Deleted:

decisions.

1.3. Performance in Research/Creative Activity shall be based on the professional judgment of the RPT Review Committee, regarding the degree to which a candidate meets the expected standards, listed above. Evidence the Committee shall consider includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- a) Overall quality and quantity of refereed publications and evaluated creative works
- b) the prestige of the site of publication or evaluated creative activity
- c) evidence of significant contribution consistent with the standards of the relevant field
- d) the visibility of a candidate's work in the field as indicated by frequency of citation, awards or prizes from academic and professional associations
- e) the extent of audience reach of creative works, the quantity, prestige and scholarly-creative impact of the candidate's work
- f) the number of fellowships, grants, contracts, or consultantships awarded, sought or undertaken
- g) conference activities, including peer-reviewed papers, peer-evaluated projects, and invited participation
- h) the presentation of colloquia, invited lectures, and demonstrations
- i) editorship of peer-reviewed journals or books
- j) participation on editorial boards, grant review teams or as peer-evaluator of publications or creative work.
- k) letters of support from significant collaborators.

Although evaluating the significance and quality of creative activities is often difficult and subjective, the RPT Review Committee shall consider the following non-exhaustive list of possible ways creative works are evaluated:

- a) positive reviews by qualified academic and professional external judges;
- b) acceptance rates
- c) academic and professional commissions, honors, prizes, and awards received for the activity;
- d) audience reach and impact;
- e) invited showings, peer reviewed conference exhibits and case studies, museum or gallery exhibits;
- f) selection of the materials for commercial or non-profit distribution

In general, the selectivity and/or prestige of the entity evaluating a creative activity shall also be taken as an indicator of the overall quality of the project. Thus, for example, selection for a national festival or conference shall be considered more significant than for a regional event; a national network broadcast shall be valued more highly than a local telecast; and a juried showing or competition shall carry greater weight than a non-juried event.

2. Instruction

2.1. Evidence the committee shall consider can include but is not limited to:

- a) Student ratings of classroom performance (required);
- b) Academic advising activities;
- c) Contributions to curriculum, including overseas studies programs;
- d) Teaching portfolio (a narrative in which candidates describe their teaching philosophy, goals, and strategies);
- e) In the year preceding a reappointment, tenure or promotion decision, the chairperson or a faculty member appointed by the chairperson shall formally observe a class taught by the candidate and provide the candidate and chairperson a written evaluation to be included in the omnibus file. The candidate has the option to veto one observer choice.
Other evidence may include:
- f) Peer assessment of instruction materials
- g) Published works related to pedagogy
- h) Scholarly or creative activities designed to enhance or develop instruction goals
- i) Fiscal entrepreneurship in support of instruction including but not limited to efforts to receive funding from internal and external sources for instructional activities
- j) Other evidence of instruction excellence (e.g. testimony from past students, instruction/advising awards, and letters of support from industry or collaborators)
- k) Equivalent evidence of instruction strength at other institutions may be provided, depending on the candidate's length of service in the Department at the time of her or his candidacy. In evaluating a candidate on Instruction, committees shall assume, unless evidence to the contrary has been presented, that the candidate has adhered to the MSU "Code of Teaching Responsibility."

- judy osbun 2/25/13 1:57 PM
Formatted: Font:Gotham Book, No underline, Font color: Auto
- judy osbun 2/25/13 1:57 PM
Formatted: Font:Gotham Book, Font color: Auto
- judy osbun 2/25/13 1:57 PM
Formatted: Font:Gotham Book, Font color: Auto
- judy osbun 2/25/13 1:57 PM
Formatted: Font:Gotham Book, Font color: Auto
- judy osbun 2/25/13 1:57 PM
Formatted: Font:Gotham Book, Font color: Auto

2.2. Minimum Standards for Instruction.

2.2.1. For reappointment as assistant professor:

- a) SIRS scores averaging Satisfactory or better for each “composite profile factor.” Average aggregate SIRS scores of Below Average or Inferior shall require the RPT Review Committee to independently seek further evidence in evaluating instruction quality.
- b) A Satisfactory or better rating of candidate instruction by the in-class observer.
- c) A Satisfactory or better evaluation of course materials by the RPT Review Committee

2.2.2. For promotion to associate professor with tenure:

- a) For all courses taught since initial appointment, aggregate SIRS scores averaging Satisfactory or better for each “composite profile factor” and evidence of mentoring graduate students on research projects. Average aggregate SIRS scores of Below Average or Inferior will prompt the review committee to independently seek further evidence in evaluating instruction quality.
- b) A Satisfactory or better evaluation of candidate instruction by in-class observer.
- c) A Satisfactory or better evaluation of course materials by RPT Review Committee.

2.2.3. For promotion to professor with tenure:

- a) For all courses taught for six semesters prior to current review, aggregate SIRS scores averaging Satisfactory or better for each “composite profile factor”; and evidence of substantial contributions to and outcomes of the academic work of graduate students. Average aggregate SIRS scores of Below Average or Inferior will prompt the review committee to independently seek further evidence in evaluating instruction quality.
- b) A Satisfactory or better evaluation of candidate

instruction by in-class observer.

- c) A Satisfactory or better evaluation of course materials by RPT Review committee.
- d) Factors that may be considered include but are not limited to the number of different class preparations during the review period, the number of new, self-developed courses taught during the review period, the number of student credit hours generated, and any other evidence of instruction effort and quality offered by the candidate.

3. Service/Citizenship

3.1. Six categories of performance define the principal evidence to be considered in assessing a candidate on the dimension of Service/Citizenship:

- a) Outreach service, operationalized as application of research findings, creative projects and other works to benefit local, state, national, and international external publics; presentations and consultations with government agencies, community organizations, and other relevant businesses and organizations; dissemination of research/creative works to the professional community and the general public; service on committees in areas of professional expertise; international service activities.
- b) Academic-Professional service, exemplified by activities such as editing, reviewing, and judging research/creative works for journals, conferences, exhibits, shows, prizes, awards; leadership positions in academic-professional associations and organizations.
- c) University Service/Citizenship, including participation in academic governance; leadership positions on University committees and advisory boards; involvement in interdisciplinary or trans-collegiate activities; contributions to the University's diversity mission; participation in non-Departmental programs; and membership on non-Departmental search committees.
- d) Departmental Service/Citizenship, evidenced by activities

including: positive contributions to departmental life; professionalism in departmental governance; membership and/or leadership roles on departmental committees; seeking and obtaining funding support for students; organizing and/or participating in departmental workshops and colloquia; efforts to recruit and retain diverse undergraduate and graduate students; nurturing alumni and corporate relations in support of Instruction and Research/Creative activities; representing the Department at conferences, meetings, etc.; and mentoring junior faculty.

- e) Student-oriented service, including: academic and/or career guidance to individual students and student associations; sponsorship of student organizations; arranging student internships; advising students from the MSU Honors College; recruiting students to the department; and recruiting and training undergraduate teaching assistants and graduate assistants.
- f) Fiscal entrepreneurship in support of any of the prior categories of Service/Citizenship activities including but not limited to efforts to receive funding from internal and external sources for Service/Citizenship activities.
- g) Service-oriented fiscal entrepreneurship, including: application to (or “efforts to receive”) funding from both internal and external sources for instruction, and service; funding from both internal and external sources for instruction, and service; collaboration on grant writing and funded projects with researchers within and across disciplines at MSU and other institutions; creativity in exploring diverse funding opportunities tied to categories of Service/Citizenship.

3.2. Minimum Standards for Service/Citizenship: being a good citizen of the department suggests a history of active participation in Department and College ceremonies and other collegial activities.

3.2.1. For reappointment as assistant professor:

At least one substantial activity in one of the categories above, in which the candidate performed a primary leadership role.

3.2.2. For promotion to associate professor with tenure:

At least two substantial activities in one or more of the categories above, in which the candidate performed a primary leadership role.

3.2.3. For promotion to full professor:

At least four substantial activities in two or more of the categories above, in which the candidate performed a primary leadership role.

4. Fiscal Entrepreneurship and Engagement with Society

4.1 Depending on the individual's expertise and interest, fiscal entrepreneurship may relate to research and creative works, instruction, and/or Service/Citizenship. Fiscal Entrepreneurial efforts are those that intend to bring some financial benefit to the Department and MSU. Often fiscal entrepreneurship will be collaborative and often it will be multidisciplinary. Evidence of fiscal entrepreneurship will be evaluated in terms of the number of entrepreneurial efforts and magnitude of amounts sought. For reappointment as assistant professor, promotion to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to professor with tenure, efforts to engage and/or success in fiscal entrepreneurship are expected.

Developed/approved April 4, 2008

Approved in Bylaws Revision February 6, 2009

Approved in Bylaws Revision February 22, 2013

APPENDIX B

Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures for the Department of Advertising and Public Relations

Each right of an individual places a reciprocal duty upon others: the duty to permit the individual to exercise the right. The student, as a member of the academic community, has both rights and duties. Within that community, the student's most essential right is the right to learn. The University has a duty to provide for the student those privileges, opportunities, and protections that best promote the learning process in all its aspects. The student also has duties to other members of the academic community, the most important of which is to refrain from interference with those rights of others which are equally essential to the purposes and processes of the University. (See AFR, Article 1.)

The Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University (AFR) and the Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR) documents establish the rights and responsibilities of MSU students and prescribe procedures for resolving allegations of violations of those rights through formal grievance hearings. In accordance with the AFR and the GSRR, the Department of Advertising and Public Relations has established the following Hearing Board procedures for adjudicating academic grievances and complaints for graduate and undergraduate students. (See AFR Article 6 and 7; GSRR 5.4.1.)

I. JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEARING BOARD:

- A. The Hearing Board serves as:
 - 1. The initial Hearing Board for academic grievance hearings involving *graduate* and *undergraduate* students who allege violations of academic rights and for *graduate* students who seek to contest an allegation of academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards, or falsifying admission and academic records). (See AFR 6.1.A and 7.1.B; GSRR 2.3.9 and 5.1.1.)
- B. Students may *not* request an academic grievance hearing based on an

allegation of incompetent instruction. (AFR 2.II.A-D; GSRR 2.2.2 and 2.2.4.)

II. COMPOSITION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEARING BOARD:

- A. The Department shall constitute a Hearing Board upon receipt of a student's request for a hearing. The pool from which the Board is constituted shall consist of undergraduate seniors and graduate students with a grade point average of 3.5 or higher, and all Voting Faculty in the Department, as defined by its bylaws. (See AFR 6.I.B, C, and D; GSRR 5.1.3 and 5.1.6.)
- B. For hearings involving **graduate** students, the Hearing Board shall include a Chair of the Hearing Board, plus two (2) graduate students and two (2) faculty. (See GSRR 5.1.2, 5.1.5 and 5.1.6.)
- C. For hearings involving **undergraduate** students, the Hearing Board shall include a Chair of the Hearing Board, plus two (2) undergraduate students and two (2) faculty.
- D. All members of the Hearing Board shall vote except the Chair of the Hearing Board, who shall vote only in the event of a tie.
- E. In hearings involving **undergraduate** students, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall be the Department Chair. In hearings involving **graduate** students, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall be the faculty member with the most senior rank. (See AFR 6.1.B; GSRR 5.1.5.)
- F. At the time a Hearing Board is convened, all members will be trained about these procedures and the applicable sections of the AFR and GSRR in advance of the scheduled hearing. (See AFR 7.IV.C; GSRR 5.1.3.)
- G. No faculty member or other party involved in the incident(s) at issue, or involved in any prior judgment related to such incident(s), will be a part of the Hearing Board.

III. REFERRAL TO DEPARTMENT HEARING BOARD:

- A. After consulting with the instructor and the Department Chair, *undergraduate* or *graduate* students who remain dissatisfied with their attempt to resolve an allegation of a violation of student academic rights may request an academic grievance hearing. (See AFR 7.III.A; GSRR 5.3.2.)
- B. After consulting with the instructor and the Department Chair, *graduate* students who remain dissatisfied with their attempt to resolve an allegation of a violation of student rights or academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards or falsifying admission and academic records) may request an academic grievance hearing before the Department Hearing Board. When appropriate, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, may waive jurisdiction and refer the request for a hearing to the College Hearing Board. (See AFR 7.III.B and 7.IV.B; GSRR 5.3.2 and 5.3.6.2.)
- C. In cases of ambiguous jurisdiction, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education will select the appropriate unit Hearing Board for hearings involving *undergraduate* students, and the Dean of The Graduate School will select the appropriate unit Hearing Board for cases involving *graduate* students. (See AFR 7.III.B; GSRR 5.3.)
- D. Usually, the deadline for submitting the written request for a hearing is the middle of the next semester in which the student is enrolled. In cases in which a student seeks to contest an allegation of academic misconduct, and the student's dean has called for an academic disciplinary hearing, the student has 10 class days to file a written request for a hearing before the appropriate hearing board. (See AFR 7.III.C and 7.V.C; GSRR 5.3.6.1 and 5.5.2.2.)
- E. If either the student (the complainant) or the respondent (usually, the instructor or an administrator) is absent from the university during that semester, or if other appropriate reasons emerge, the Hearing Board may grant an extension of this deadline. If the university no longer employs the respondent before the grievance hearing commences, the hearing may proceed. (See AFR 7.III.C; GSRR 5.3.6.1 and 5.4.9.)
- F. A written request for an academic grievance hearing must (1) specify the alleged violation(s), (2) identify the individual

against whom the grievance is filed (the respondent) and (3) state the desired redress. Anonymous grievances will not be accepted. (See AFR 7.III.B and C, AFR footnote 35.)

- G. At any time in the grievance process, either party may consult with the University Ombudsperson. (See AFR 7.IV.H; GSRR 5.3.2)

IV. PRE-HEARING PROCEDURES

- A. After receiving a student's written request for a hearing, members for a Department Hearing Board – including a Chair of the Hearing Board – will be drawn by the Department Chair, or a designee of the Chair. The Chair of the Hearing Board will promptly forward the student request to the members of the Hearing Board. (See AFR 7.III.B and 7.IV.D.1; GSRR 5.1.5, 5.3.2, 5.4.3.)
- B. Within 5 class days, the Hearing Board Chair will:
 - 1. forward the request for a hearing to the respondent and invite a written response;
 - 2. send the names of Hearing Board members to both parties and, to avoid conflicts of interest between the two parties and the Hearing Board members, request written challenges, if any, within 3 class days of this notification;
 - 3. rule promptly on any challenges, impanel a Hearing Board and send each party the names of the Hearing Board members. If the Chair of the Hearing Board is the subject of a challenge, the second faculty chair will be appointed instead. If there is a challenge with regards to the second chair, it shall be filed with the Dean of the College, or designee (see AFR 7.IV.D; GSRR 5.1.7.); and
 - 4. send send all parties a copy of these procedures.
- C. Within 5 class days of being established, the Hearing Board shall review the request, and, after considering all requested and submitted information:
 - 1. accept the request, in full or in part, and promptly

schedule a hearing.

2. reject the request and provide a written explanation to appropriate parties; e.g., lack of jurisdiction. (The student may appeal this decision.)
3. invite the two parties to meet with the Hearing Board in an informal session to try to resolve the matter. (Such a meeting does not preclude a later hearing.)

(See AFR 7.IV.D.4 and AFR footnote 35; GSRR 5.4.6.)

- D. If the Hearing Board calls for a hearing, the Hearing Board Chair shall promptly negotiate a hearing date, schedule an additional meeting only for the Hearing Board should additional deliberations on the findings become necessary, and request a written response to the grievance from the respondent.
- E. At least 5 class days before the scheduled hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall notify the respondent and the complainant in writing of the (1) time, date, and place of the hearing; (2) the names of the parties to the grievance; and (3) a copy of the hearing request and the respondent's reply. (See AFR 7.IV.D.5; GSRR 5.4.7.)
- F. At least 3 class days before the scheduled hearing, the parties must notify the Chair of the Hearing Board of the names of their witness(es) and advisor, if any, and request permission for the advisor to have voice at the hearing. The Chair may grant or deny this request. The Chair will promptly forward the names given by the complainant to the respondent and visa versa. (See AFR 7.IV.D.6; GSRR 5.4.7.1.)
- G. In unusual circumstances and in lieu of a personal appearance, either party, or either party's witness(es), may (1) request permission to submit a written statement to the Hearing Board or (2) request permission to participate in the hearing through an electronic communication channel. Written statements must be submitted to the Hearing Board at least 3 class days before the scheduled hearing. (See AFR 7.IV.D. 9 and 10; GSRR 5.4.9c.)
- H. Either party to the grievance hearing may request a postponement of the hearing. The Hearing Board may either grant or deny the request. (See AFR 7.IV.D.8; GSRR 5.4.8.)

- I. At its discretion, the Hearing Board may set a reasonable time limit for each party to present its case (e.g., 20 minutes), and the Hearing Board Chair must inform the parties of such a time limit in the written notification of the hearing.
- J. Hearings are closed unless the student requests an open hearing, which would be open to all members of the MSU community. The Hearing Board may close an open hearing to protect the confidentiality of information or to maintain order. (See AFR 7.IV.D.13; GSRR 5.4.10.4.)
- K. Members of the Hearing Board are expected to respect the confidentiality of the hearing process. (AFR 7.IV.D.13, 7.IV.F; GFSRR 5.4.10.4 and 5.4.11.)

V. HEARING PROCEDURES:

A. The Hearing will proceed as follows:

1. *Introductory remarks by the Chair of the Hearing Board:*
The Chair of the Hearing Board introduces hearing panel members, the complainant, the respondent and advisors, if any. The Chair reviews the hearing procedures, including announced time restraints for presentations by each party and the witnesses, and informs the parties if their advisors may have a voice in the hearings and if the proceedings are being recorded. Witnesses shall be excluded from the proceedings except when testifying. The Chair also explains:
 - In academic grievance hearings in which a student alleges a violation of academic rights, the student bears the burden of proof.
 - In hearings involving graduate students seeking to contest allegations of academic misconduct, the instructor bears the burden of proof. [Note: *Undergraduate* students must contest allegations of academic misconduct before the University Academic Integrity Hearing Board.]

- All Hearing Board decisions must be reached by a majority of the Hearing Board, based on a "preponderance of the evidence."

(See AFR 7.IV.D.14, Footnote 37; GSRR 5.4.10.1. For various definitions, see AFR Article 11 and GSRR Article 8.)

2. If the complainant fails to appear in person or via an electronic channel at a scheduled hearing, the Hearing Board may either postpone the hearing or dismiss the case for demonstrated cause. (See AFR 7.IV.D.11; GSRR 5.4.9a.)
3. If the respondent fails to appear in person or via an electronic channel at a scheduled hearing, the Hearing Board may postpone the hearing, hear the case in the respondent's absence, or dismiss the case. (See AFR 7.IV.D.11; GSRR 5.4.9b.)
4. If the respondent is absent from the University during the semester of the grievance hearing or no longer employed by the University before the grievance procedure concludes, the hearing process may still proceed. (See AFR 7.III.C; GSRR 5.3.6.1.)
5. To assure orderly questioning, the Chair of the Hearing Board will recognize individuals before they speak. All parties have a right to speak without interruption. Each party has a right to question the other party and to rebut any oral or written statements submitted to the Hearing Board. (See AFR 7.IV.D.16; GSRR 5.4.10.2.)
6. *Presentation by the Complainant:* The Chair recognizes the complainant to present without interruption any statements relevant to the complainant's case, including the redress sought. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the complainant by the Hearing Board, the respondent and the respondent's advisor, if any.
7. *Presentation by the Complainant's Witnesses:* The Chair recognizes the complainant's witnesses, if any, to present, without interruption, any statement directly relevant to the complainant's case. The Chair then

recognizes questions directed at the witnesses by the Hearing Board, the respondent, and the respondent's advisor, if any.

8. *Presentation by the Respondent:* The Chair recognizes the respondent to present without interruption any statements relevant to the respondent's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the respondent by the Hearing Board, the complainant, and the complainant's advisor, if any.
9. *Presentation by the Respondent's Witnesses:* The Chair recognizes the respondent's witnesses, if any, to present, without interruption, and statement directly relevant to the respondent's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the witnesses by the Hearing Board, the complainant, and the complainant's advisor, if any.
10. *Rebuttal and Closing Statement by Complainant:* The complainant refutes statements by the respondent, the respondent's witnesses and advisor, if any, and presents a final summary statement.
11. *Rebuttal and Closing Statement by Respondent:* The respondent refutes statements by the complainant, the complainant's witnesses and advisor, if any, and presents a final summary statement.
12. *Final questions by the Hearing Board:* The Hearing Board asks questions of any of the participants in the hearing.

VI. POST-HEARING PROCEDURES

A. Deliberation:

After all evidence has been presented, with full opportunity for explanations, questions and rebuttal, the Hearing Board Chair shall excuse all parties to the grievance and convene the Hearing Board to determine its findings in executive session. When possible, deliberations should take place directly following the hearing and/or at the previously scheduled follow-up meeting. (See Section IV.D above.)

B. Decision:

1. In grievance (non-disciplinary) hearings involving undergraduate and graduate students in which a majority of the Hearing Board finds, based on a "preponderance of the evidence," that a violation of the student's academic rights has occurred and that redress is possible, the Hearing Board shall direct the Chair of the Department to implement an appropriate remedy, in consultation with the Hearing Board. If the Hearing Board finds that no violation of academic rights has occurred, it shall so inform the Chair. (See AFR 7.IV.D and E; GSRR 5.4.11.)
2. In grievance (non-disciplinary) hearings involving graduate students in which the Hearing Board serves as the initial hearing body to adjudicate an allegation of academic dishonesty and, based on a "preponderance of the evidence," the Hearing Board finds for the student, the Hearing Board shall recommend to the Chair that the penalty grade be removed, the Academic Dishonesty Report form be removed from the student's records and a "good faith judgment" of the student's academic performance in the course take place. If the Hearing Board finds for the complainant (instructor), the penalty grade shall stand and the Academic Dishonesty Report form regarding the allegation will remain on file, pending an appeal, if any, to the College Hearing Board within 5 class days of the Hearing Board's decision. If an academic disciplinary hearing is pending, and the Hearing Board decides for the complainant, the graduate student's disciplinary hearing before either the College Hearing Board or the Dean of The Graduate School would promptly follow, pending an appeal, if any, within 5 class days. (See GSRR 5.4.12.3.)

C. Written Report

1. The Chair of the Hearing Board shall prepare a written report of the Hearing Board's findings, including recommended redress or sanctions for the complainant, if applicable, and forward a copy of the decision to the Chair of the Department within 3 class days of the hearing. The administrator, in consultation with the Hearing Board, shall then implement an appropriate remedy. (See AFR 7.IV.E; GSRR 5.4.11.)

2. The report shall indicate the rationale for the decision and the major elements of evidence, or lack thereof, that support the Hearing Board's decision. The report also should inform the parties of the right to appeal within 5 class days following notice of the decision. (See AFR 7.IV.E and 7.IV.F; GSRR 5.4.11 and 5.4.12.3.)
3. The Chair of the Hearing Board shall forward copies of the Hearing Board's report and the Department Chair's redress, if applicable, to the parties involved, the University Ombudsperson and the Dean of The Graduate School. (See AFR 7.IV.F; GSRR 5.4.11.)
4. All recipients must respect the confidentiality of the report and of the Hearing Board's deliberations resulting in a decision. (See GSRR 7.IV.F; GSRR 5.4.11.)

VII. APPEAL OF DEPARTMENT HEARING BOARD DECISION:

- A. In hearings involving *undergraduate* students, either party may appeal the decision of the Department Hearing Board to the University Academic Appeal Board in cases involving alleged violations of student rights, including grade appeals. (See AFR 6.IV.A and 7.VII.)
- B. In hearings involving *graduate* students, either party may appeal a decision by the Department Hearing Board to the College Hearing Board for cases involving (1) academic grievances alleging violations of student rights heard initially by the Hearing Board and (2) alleged violations of regulations involving academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, professional standards or falsification of admission and academic records). (See GSRR 5.4.12.)
- C. All appeals must be in writing, signed and submitted to the Chair of the University Academic Appeal Board for *undergraduate* students or the College Hearing Board for *graduate* students within 5 class days following notification of the Hearing Board's decision. While under appeal, the original decision of the Department Hearing Board will be held in abeyance. (See AFR 7.VII.A; GSRR 5.4.12, 5.4.12.2 and 5.4.12.3.)
- D. A request for an appeal of a Hearing Board decision to either

the University Academic Appeal Board or the College Hearing Board must allege, in sufficient particularity to justify a hearing, that the Hearing Board failed to follow applicable procedures for adjudicating the hearing or that findings of the Department Hearing Board were not supported by the "preponderance of the evidence." The request also must include the redress sought. Presentation of new evidence normally will be ignored. (See AFR 7.VII.A and B; GSRR 5.4.12.1, 5.4.12.2 and 5.4.12.2.)

VIII. RECONSIDERATION:

If new evidence should arise, either party to a hearing may request the Hearing Board to reconsider the case within 30 days upon receipt of the hearing outcome. The written request for reconsideration is to be sent to the Chair of the Hearing Board, who shall promptly convene the Hearing Board to review the new material and render a decision on a new hearing. (See AFR 7.IV.G; GSRR 5.4.13.)

IX. FILE COPY:

The Chair of the Department shall file a copy of these procedures with the Office of the Ombudsperson and with the Dean of The Graduate School. (See AFR 7.IV.A.; GSRR 5.4.1.)

Approved by Department of Advertising and Public Relations February 22, 2013.