

## UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, March 21, 2017  
4 p.m., Hovey 401D

### MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro, Diane Dean, Nerida Ellerton, Christopher Horvath, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Rick Boser, Joe Goodman, Doris Houston, Sheryl Jenkins

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In the minutes that follow, "URC" refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; "Caucus" refers to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University; "ASPT" refers to appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure policies; "ASPT document" refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* effective January 1, 2017; and "DFSC" refers to department faculty status committee and school faculty status committee.

#### I. Call to order

Chairperson Diane Dean called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. A quorum was present.

Dean noted that minutes of the prior two URC meetings were distributed prior to the meeting; however, their approval has been deferred to the next URC meeting to maximize the amount of time available to the committee at this meeting to discuss disciplinary processes.

#### II. ASPT disciplinary articles

##### Dismissal processes

Dean reviewed the status of the disciplinary actions flow chart as of the end of the March 9, 2017, URC meeting (see attached).

Christopher Horvath noted that URC had previously discussed whether the committee should draft separate dismissal policies for probationary faculty members and tenured faculty members. He asked if, at its previous meeting, the committee decided whether dismissal processes illustrated in the flow chart apply only to tenured faculty members or to both tenured and probationary faculty members. Dean explained that dismissal processes illustrated in the flow chart are intended to apply to both tenured and probationary faculty. She said the non-reappointment process (set forth in Section XI.A of the ASPT document) would be followed when considering whether to terminate a probationary faculty member for reasons related to quality of work, while the dismissal process would be followed when considering whether to terminate a probationary faculty member for other reasons. She added that, in practice, ASPT committees would be more likely to terminate a probationary faculty member using the non-reappointment process rather than the dismissal process. Nerida Ellerton advised caution in defining terms and processes and expressed concern about making it too easy to dismiss a probationary faculty member.

Sam Catanzaro said it might make more sense if probationary faculty members are subject to the non-reappointment process but not to the dismissal process. Suggesting that academic freedom may be the fundamental issue in non-reappointment decisions, Catanzaro noted that a probationary faculty member is permitted to appeal to AFEGC if the faculty member believes her or his academic freedom has been violated. Catanzaro said ASPT documents have provided for non-reappointment of probationary faculty members, but not dismissal, for many years. Dean asked for direction from committee members regarding the issue. The consensus of committee members present was to not provide for dismissal of probationary faculty members, only non-reappointment.

Dean pointed out the question mark on the flow chart, relating to appeals in suspension cases in which imminent harm is an issue. Catanzaro said he is checking with legal counsel for guidance regarding appeals in such cases.

Catanzaro recalled that URC, in its August 2015 ASPT recommendations, provided that the Provost would consult with the DFSC in such matters and appeals would be heard by the President. The committee then discussed whether the President should be assigned a role in the disciplinary processes illustrated in the flow chart. Dean said she is pleased with the symmetry of the processes thus far set forth by URC (i.e., without reference to the President), adding that the processes illustrated in the flow chart involve ASPT bodies as they were intended to be involved. Horvath said if URC wants to involve the President in the disciplinary processes, one option for doing so would be to provide that the Provost consult with the President to confirm the Provost's decision in each disciplinary case. Catanzaro cautioned that if URC decides that appeals in suspension cases should be heard by the President, the committee would not likely want the President to consult with the Provost regarding the decision being appealed. Ellerton urged clarity regarding the party charged with making a decisions in disciplinary cases; she said if a provision is added to the processes providing for consultation between the Provost and President regarding a decision, it will not be clear who is making the decision. Horvath stressed the importance of having a faculty body like the Faculty Review Committee hear appeals from faculty members rather than administrators. He cited a recent case at Northwestern University in which a faculty member appealed to a faculty-based body, which decided to support the faculty member. Dean asked for direction from the committee whether the President should be assigned a role in the disciplinary processes. The consensus of committee members present was not to do so. Sarah Smelser suggested that omitting reference to the President may provide a measure of flexibility in the processes.

Referring to the sanctions processes illustrated in the flow chart, Horvath asked if a faculty member could be sanctioned for not publishing enough or for publishing in journals deemed by the DFSC to be inappropriate for scholarly publishing in the discipline. Dean responded that a faculty member could not be sanctioned in such cases, that sanctioning processes relate to behavior while the performance evaluation process relates to performance. Ellerton agreed, noting that it would be a decision of the DFSC whether to rate performance of the faculty member in such instances as unsatisfactory. Horvath said he supports the interpretation that the disciplinary policies distinguish between behavior and rule breaking versus performance (i.e., that disciplinary policies are not be used in cases involving performance). Catanzaro cautioned about an exception to that interpretation. He noted that URC, in its August 2015 ASPT recommendations to the Caucus, provided for the possibility of dismissing a tenured faculty member in certain circumstances related to performance. Catanzaro cited a hypothetical case in which a tenured faculty member is determined by a DFSC to have had a history of poor performance, is then required by the DFSC to participate in the cumulative post-tenure review process, but thereafter continues to be evaluated by the DFSC as exhibiting poor performance. Catanzaro said the faculty member in such a case could be subject to dismissal proceedings. Angela Bonnell asked Catanzaro whether dismissal proceedings could apply to a tenured faculty member between post-tenure reviews. Catanzaro responded in the affirmative.

#### General considerations (beginning with XI.B.4)

Dean then directed the discussion to issues in Article XI (General Considerations) yet to be discussed by URC (see attached). She said they include stop-the-clock extensions, access to records of disciplinary processes, temporary reassignments of faculty members, and engagement of security officers in disciplinary matters. Bruce Stoffel reminded the committee that also yet to be discussed by committee members is the manner of communication in disciplinary cases, which, he said had been raised by Smelser when General Considerations were discussed by the committee last calendar year. Smelser reminded the committee that the issue of communication had been set aside until the committee outlined the disciplinary processes (as the committee now has done).

Dean began the discussion with consideration of Section XI.B.3 regarding stop-the-clock extensions. Horvath said it not full on sensible that someone who is not exonerated in a disciplinary case should get the right to ask for a stop-the-clock extension. Catanzaro pointed out that the August 2015 version of the passage recommended by URC did not include the phrase "or not" but provided that a probationary faculty member facing disciplinary actions and required to complete corrective actions would also be eligible to request a stop-the-clock extension.

Catanzaro noted that the Caucus subsequently removed the reference to corrective action and inserted the phrase “or not.” Ellerton said it may be a concern if a probationary faculty member is simultaneously stressed with completing corrective action related to a disciplinary case and working toward tenure but not allowed to ask for a stop-the-clock extension. Consensus of committee members present was to reinstate the reference to corrective action in Section XI.B.3. Dean then reminded the committee that it had set aside the stop-the-clock question last year due to concern that there might be an undesirable conflict if the party deciding whether to grant a stop-the-clock extension is the same party deciding the disciplinary action that precipitated the stop-the-clock extension request. Catanzaro explained that stop-the-clock requests are decided by the Provost in consultation with the dean and department chairperson. Horvath said, with that explanation from Catanzaro, he is agreeable to the stop-the-clock provision as suggested by the committee.

Next, Dean directed the committee discussion to the records access issue. She noted that the issue was addressed by URC beginning with the second sentence of XI.D of its August 2015 version of the disciplinary articles. Dean and Catanzaro reviewed changes to the passage suggested by the Caucus.

Ellerton said the passage regarding records access is intended to protect the faculty member who has applied for tenure and promotion from rumors. Catanzaro said the passage is also meant to protect a faculty member from being punished twice for the same actions (once through the disciplinary process and a second time through a negative decision in the tenure and promotion process). Ellerton suggested that the word “affirm” in the Caucus re-write of the passage might not be the correct word choice for the intended meaning of the sentence.

Horvath expressed concern about the clarity of the Caucus version of the records access passage. He said he interprets the passage to mean that the only reasons records from a disciplinary case can be viewed by a DFSC when considering a tenure or promotion application is to confirm or clarify, that a DFSC can only look at a disciplinary file if the committee has a question about it, and that the disciplinary file is not a usual part of the tenure or promotion process. Catanzaro said that is not the case, that the disciplinary file is always part of the tenure or promotion process, to help guide the committee in its deliberations. Horvath noted an apparent contradiction in the last sentence of the Caucus version of the section; he pointed out that the last sentence indicates that that documented facts are to be considered but also that the documented facts are not to be held against the faculty member.

Horvath expressed concern regarding the clause, “as it bears on the faculty members’ performance in teaching, research, and service” (which appears in the URC version and the Caucus version of the records access passage). He said inclusion of the clause suggests that a DFSC cannot consider behavioral issues when considering a tenure or promotion request and then deny tenure based on those issues; he said the clause could lead to confusion among parties to the tenure and promotion process if not clarified. Catanzaro said the clause was written into the section so behavioral issues are considered only in terms of their impact on teaching, research, or service, acknowledging the challenges in doing so.

Dean expressed the opinion that wording of the URC version of the passage is clearer than the Caucus version. Ellerton agreed. The consensus of committee members present was to retain the passage (the second and third sentences of Section XI.D) as URC had recommended it in August 2015.

#### Next steps

Dean said she still hopes URC can complete its work on the disciplinary articles by the end of the academic year and then submit its recommendations to the Caucus for its consideration in 2017-2018. She suggested forming three subgroups to expedite re-writing the articles regarding sanctions, suspensions, and dismissal now that the processes have been preliminarily decided. Smelser said the committee would not likely save much time re-writing the articles in subgroups, because the committee of the whole would need to review and revise the articles drafted by the subgroups. Ellerton added that the committee of the whole will also need to check for consistency in structure and style across the three articles.

Horvath recommended that URC instead meet more often between now and the end of the academic year, perhaps asking two committee members to come prepared to lead a committee discussion of one of the three articles at each meeting. Dean suggested assigning the two committee members asked to lead the discussion of a

particular article the task of making sure the elements and processes illustrated in the flow chart are incorporated in the re-written article. Dean asked Stoffel to poll members regarding their availability for additional committee meetings. She asked committee members to let her know which disciplinary article discussion they would be willing to co-facilitate.

III. Other business

There was none.

IV. Adjournment

*Horvath moved to adjourn the meeting. Smelser seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.* The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

ATTACHMENTS:

*Flow Chart, End of University Review Committee Meeting, March 9, 2017 (2 parts)*

*Disciplinary Actions: Article XI. General Considerations through 12-13-16 URC Meeting*

Flow Chart, End of University Review Committee Meeting, March 9, 2017, Part 1 of 2



Flow Chart, End of University Review Committee Meeting, March 9, 2017, Part 2 of 2



**Disciplinary Actions: Article XI. General Considerations  
Through 12-13-16 URC Meeting**

<b>VERSION A: URC 2015</b>	<b>VERSION B: Faculty Caucus 2016</b>	<b>VERSION C: URC 2016-2017</b>
<p>A. Types of Disciplinary Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty may be subject to discipline of varying levels. Disciplinary actions include Sanctions, Suspension, and Dismissal.</li> <li>2. Sanctions may be imposed for such adequate causes as violations of laws or University policies, including the Code of Ethics and its appendices. Specific policies related to sanctions are provided in ASPT XII.</li> <li>3. Suspension occurs when a faculty member is temporarily relieved of academic duties, such that the faculty member is not engaged in any teaching, research, or service activities at the University. The faculty member could be on paid or unpaid status. Specific policies related to suspensions are provided in ASPT XIII.</li> <li>4. It is understood that suspension (with or without pay) of faculty members will only be contemplated in circumstances when there is a reasonable threat of imminent harm to the University, including the faculty member in question, students, and other employees or when credible evidence of adequate cause for dismissal is available. The administration of the University will inform the faculty member of its rationale for judging that suspension is indicated.</li> <li>5. Dismissal of a tenured faculty member may be effected by the University for such adequate causes as lack of fitness to continue to perform in the faculty member's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher; failure to perform assigned duties in a manner consonant with professional standards; malfeasance; or demonstrable University financial exigency or program termination. Specific policies related to termination of tenured faculty appointments are provided in ASPT XIV.B.</li> </ol>	<p>A. Types of Disciplinary Actions; Conditions under which they may be applied</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty may be subject to discipline of varying levels. Disciplinary actions include Sanctions, Suspension, and Dismissal.</li> <li>2. Sanctions: As defined by the American Association of University Professors' 1971 guidelines regarding progressive discipline, sanctions that can be imposed upon a faculty member are: oral reprimand, written reprimand, recorded reprimand, requirement to make restitution, loss of prospective benefits for a stated period, fine, reduction in salary for a stated period, and disciplinary suspension for a stated period without other prejudice.  Sanctions may be imposed for such reasons as violations of felony and ethics laws pertinent to a faculty member's responsibilities or of University policies, including the Code of Ethics and its appendices.  Specific policies related to sanctions are provided in ASPT XII.</li> <li>3. Suspension: Suspension occurs when a faculty member, as a result of disciplinary findings or allegations, is: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. temporarily relieved of academic duties, such that the faculty member is not engaged in any teaching, research, or service activities at the University and is excluded from all or parts of campus and its privileges (e.g. access to email services); or</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>A. Types of Disciplinary Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty may be subject to discipline of varying levels. Disciplinary actions include Sanctions, Suspension, and Dismissal. The University normally uses progressive discipline to address possible misconduct. Progressive discipline is intended to be corrective, not punitive in nature. It is designed to provide faculty with notice of deficiencies and an opportunity to improve. However, some violations of policies and procedures, or continued negative behavior, may be of such serious nature that suspension or dismissal may be appropriate.</li> <li>2. Sanctions are minor disciplinary actions of varying degrees undertaken to address behavioral or performance problems or issues. Sanctions are intended to be corrective.  Sanctions may be effected for such reasons as violations of laws or of University policies, including the Code of Ethics and its appendices. Specific policies related to sanctions are provided in ASPT XII.</li> <li>3. Suspensions are major disciplinary actions of varying degrees undertaken to temporarily relieve a faculty member from teaching, research, or service activities; on paid or unpaid status; with or without exclusion from campus or parts thereof. Suspensions may be effected for such reasons as when there is a reasonable threat of imminent harm to the University, including the faculty member in question, students, and other employees, or University property; or as a next step in a progressive disciplinary process; or when credible evidence of adequate cause for dismissal is available. Specific policies related to suspensions are provided in ASPT XIII.</li> </ol>

Disciplinary Actions: Article XI. General Considerations  
Through 12-13-16 URC Meeting

VERSION A: URC 2015	VERSION B: Faculty Caucus 2016	VERSION C: URC 2016-2017
<p>6. Termination of faculty due to financial exigency or program termination will follow the process outlined in the ISU Constitution (Article III, Section 4.B.2) and all applicable policies.</p> <p><i>[Article XI continues below]</i></p>	<p>b. temporarily relieved of academic duties, such that the faculty member is not engaged in any teaching, research, or service activities at the University but is not excluded from campus; or</p> <p>c. reassigned out of one or more of these three categories of faculty activity, with or without exclusion from campus or parts thereof; or</p> <p>d. reassigned out of some portion thereof (e.g. reassignment out of a particular class for the remainder of a semester; exclusion from a laboratory space).</p> <p>Suspension of faculty members will only be contemplated (i) in circumstances when there is a reasonable threat of imminent harm to the faculty member in question, students, other employees or university property, or (ii) as a sanction under Article XII for a stated period without other prejudice.</p> <p>Specific policies related to the first type of suspension are provided in ASPT XIII. The second type of suspension follows the same process as described for dismissal in ASPT XIV, with due consideration to the protections provided for in ASPT XIII, and may be proposed as an alternative to dismissal or as a penalty unrelated to dismissal.</p>	<p>4. Dismissals are major disciplinary actions terminating the appointment of a probationary or tenured faculty member. Dismissals are effected under extraordinary or egregious circumstances or when other recourses of disciplinary action have been exhausted without effect. They should rarely if ever need occur.</p> <p>Dismissals may be effected for such reasons as lack of fitness to continue to perform in a faculty member's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher, failure to perform assigned duties in a manner consonant with professional standards, or malfeasance. Specific policies related to dismissals are provided in ASPT XIV.</p> <p>5. Recommendations for non-reappointment of probationary faculty for non-disciplinary, performance concerns will follow the process outlined in ASPT XV.</p> <p>6. Termination of the appointment of a probationary or tenured faculty member due to demonstrable University financial exigency or program termination is not disciplinary in nature, and will follow the process outlined in the Illinois State University Constitution (Article III, Section 4.B.2.), the Governing Document of the Board of Trustees (Section C) and all applicable policies.</p> <p><i>[Article XI continues below]</i></p>



Disciplinary Actions: Article XI. General Considerations  
Through 12-13-16 URC Meeting

VERSION A: URC 2015	VERSION B: Faculty Caucus 2016	VERSION C: URC 2016-2017
<p><i>[Article XI continues below]</i></p>	<p>4. Dismissal as a disciplinary action: Dismissal is the termination of the appointment of a probationary or tenured faculty member for cause. Dismissal for cause of a probationary faculty member must be distinguished from non-reappointment for academic reasons and follows different procedures.</p> <p>Dismissal as a type of disciplinary action is one form of dismissal that may be effected by the University under extraordinary circumstances.</p> <p>As noted in the AAUP Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings (last updated in 1990), “A dismissal proceeding is a symptom of failure; no amount of use of removal process will help strengthen higher education as much as will the cultivation of conditions in which dismissals rarely, if ever, need occur.” The statement goes on to indicate that a “necessary precondition of a strong faculty is that it have first-hand concern with its own membership [which] is properly reflected both in appointments to and in separations from the faculty body” and that the “faculty must be willing to recommend the dismissal of a colleague when necessary. By the same token, presidents and governing boards must be willing to give full weight to a faculty judgment favorable to a colleague.”</p> <p>Dismissal of a probationary or tenured faculty member may be effected by the University for such adequate causes as lack of fitness to continue to perform in the faculty member's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher; failure to perform assigned duties in a manner consonant with professional standards; malfeasance; or demonstrable University financial exigency or program termination.</p>	<p><i>[Article XI continues below]</i></p>

Disciplinary Actions: Article XI. General Considerations  
Through 12-13-16 URC Meeting

VERSION A: URC 2015	VERSION B: Faculty Caucus 2016	VERSION C: URC 2016-2017
<p><i>[Article XI continues below]</i></p>	<p>Specific policies related to dismissal are provided in ASPT XIV, the ISU Constitution (Article III, Section 4.B), ISU Board of Trustees Governing Documents and all applicable policies including the right of appeal.</p> <p>5. Note regarding dismissals that might be considered under non-disciplinary circumstances: Termination of a faculty member's appointment due to financial exigency or program termination follows the process outlined in ASPT XIV, the ISU Constitution (Article III, Section 4.B), ISU Board of Trustees Governing Documents, and all applicable policies including the right of appeal, and must not be used, construed or disguised as a disciplinary action process. Faculty may appeal termination proceedings on the basis that disciplinary issues are being alleged in order to effect a dismissal for reasons of financial exigency or program termination, or vice versa.</p> <p>Non-disciplinary termination of a faculty member's appointment on the grounds either of lack of fitness to continue to perform in the faculty member's professional capacity as a teacher or researcher or failure to perform assigned duties in a manner consonant with professional standards also follows the process outlined in ASPT XIV, the ISU Constitution (Article III, Section 4.B), ISU Board of Trustees Governing Documents, and all applicable policies including the right of appeal.</p>	<p><i>[Article XI continues below]</i></p>

**Disciplinary Actions: Article XI. General Considerations  
Through 12-13-16 URC Meeting**

<b>VERSION A: URC 2015</b>	<b>VERSION B: Faculty Caucus 2016</b>	<b>VERSION C: URC 2016-2017</b>
<p>B. Faculty Rights</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disciplinary actions (including suspension or termination) or the threat thereof may not be used to restrain faculty members' exercise of academic freedom. Faculty members shall retain their right to file a grievance with the Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee, if they believe that their academic freedom or the Code of Ethics has been violated.</li> <li>2. In all disciplinary proceedings, faculty members have the rights to due process, to timely notice, to seek advice, to respond to developments in the disciplinary process, and to have an advisor and/or counsel present at discussions, hearings, and appeals. Such advisor/counsel is advisory to the faculty member only.</li> </ol> <p>C. Faculty members' duties may be reassigned temporarily while possible causes for disciplinary actions are being investigated or while the due process for a disciplinary action is being followed. The reasons for such reassignment of duties will be provided to the faculty member. Such reassignments shall be made to prevent reasonable threats of harm to the University, the individual faculty member, or other members of the University community; when required by law; or when necessitated by pending criminal investigation or legal proceedings.</p>	<p>B. Faculty Rights</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disciplinary actions (including suspension or dismissal for disciplinary reasons) or the threat thereof may not be used to restrain faculty members' exercise of academic freedom. Faculty members shall retain their right to file a grievance with the Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee, if they believe that their academic freedom or the Code of Ethics has been violated. See the ISU Constitution, Article III, the Academic Freedom Ethics and Grievance policy and the Proceedings in Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-reappointment Cases policy.</li> <li>2. Suspension, as defined in XI.A.3, shall not be effected without a recommendation to the President from a three-member hearing committee of the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee convened by the chairperson of that committee. The written recommendation from the hearing committee shall including i) a recommendation for or against suspension, ii) a recommendation regarding the length of any recommended suspension, and iii) recommendations regarding other aspects of any recommended suspension, including the nature and scope of the suspension (e.g. restriction only from a single course, banishment from campus pending felony criminal investigation, etc.). If immediate action must be taken due to a reasonable threat of imminent harm, consultation with the AFEGC must occur within 24 hours and a preliminary written recommendation formulated within 3 business days. The faculty member shall have the same rights to a full hearing and set of appeals as in other AFEGC cases.</li> </ol>	<p>B. Faculty Rights</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disciplinary actions (including sanctions, suspensions or dismissals) or the threat thereof may not be used to restrain faculty members' exercise of academic freedom. Faculty members shall retain their right to file a grievance with the Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee, if they believe that their academic freedom or the Code of Ethics has been violated. See the Illinois State University Constitution (Article III) and the Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance policy (University Policy 3.3.8).</li> <li>2. In all disciplinary proceedings, faculty members have the right to academic due process, to timely notice, to seek advice, and to respond to developments in the disciplinary process. Faculty members also have the right to have an advisor present and/or to have counsel present at discussions, hearings, and appeals. Such advisor/counsel is advisory to the faculty member and to no other party.</li> <li>3. Probationary faculty who face disciplinary actions whether exonerated or not may request a one year "stop-the-clock" extension of their probationary period, as described in IX.B.3.</li> </ol>

Disciplinary Actions: Article XI. General Considerations  
Through 12-13-16 URC Meeting

VERSION A: URC 2015	VERSION B: Faculty Caucus 2016	VERSION C: URC 2016-2017
<p>D. Probationary faculty who face disciplinary actions and are either exonerated or required to complete corrective actions may request a one year “stop-the-clock” extension of their probationary period, as described in IX.B.3. The records of the disciplinary process, including documentation of exoneration and completion of any required corrective actions, may be reviewed in the tenure and promotion process as it bears on the faculty member’s performance in teaching, research, and service. The purpose of such review will be to ensure that only the documented facts of the individual’s exoneration and/or corrective actions are considered.</p>	<p>3. In all disciplinary proceedings, faculty members have the right to academic due process, to timely notice, to seek advice, and to respond to developments in the disciplinary process. Faculty members also have the right to have an advisor present and/or to have counsel present at discussions, hearings, and appeals. Such advisor/counsel is advisory to the faculty member and to no other party.</p> <p>4. Probationary faculty who face disciplinary actions whether exonerated or not may request a one year “stop-the-clock” extension of their probationary period, as described in IX.B.3.</p> <p>5. The records of the disciplinary process, including documentation of exoneration and/or imposition of sanctions, may not be reviewed in the tenure and/or promotion process except when necessary to affirm exoneration or imposition of sanctions, and then only as it bears on the faculty member’s performance in teaching, research, and service. The purpose of such review will be to ensure that only the documented facts of the individual’s exoneration and/or sanctions are considered and not held against the faculty member.</p> <p>6. Only in cases of alleged criminal misconduct shall uniformed police or security officers be engaged in enforcing a preliminary suspension or a suspension recommended or reviewed and affirmed by the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee. Faculty shall not be denied access to materials stored on campus property that they might need to exonerate themselves; if access to such material poses a high risk to campus security, alternative arrangements shall be made to provide the faculty member with all reasonable access to materials to be used in his or her defense.</p>	