evaluated by peers both within and without the University. Evaluation of service will be based upon the candidate’s record of service contributions.

Tenured associate professors are expected to make steady progress in meeting the institution’s stated criteria for promotion to professor. Potential candidates for promotion are urged to consult with their department head or dean for an evaluation of their own progress toward promotion.

b. **Time in rank:** Associate professors normally must complete five years of service at the associate professor rank at Bucknell or elsewhere to be eligible to stand for promotion to full professor. In exceptional cases, candidates may be considered as early as after completion of three years at the rank of associate professor. In such cases the candidate may stand for promotion following a consultation with their dean.

c. **Degrees:** The candidate for promotion to professor will normally hold the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree.

d. **Procedure:** It is the individual who will initiate a review for promotion, following consultation with the department chairperson and/or dean. This meeting will occur on or before the first day of classes of the fall semester of the academic year in which they wish to apply for promotion. No later than October 1, and in accordance with the DRC’s approved procedures statement, an annotated list of potential external reviewers who can assess the quality of the candidate’s scholarly work will be created, and a list of past and current students to be contacted to evaluate the candidate’s teaching will be developed. At the same time, the candidate will provide the DRC chair with copies of the scholarly work that is to be sent out to external reviews. No later than November 1, the material should be sent to external reviewers and letters solicited from students. By the first day of the spring semester, the candidate will provide the DRC with their full promotion packet. The case for promotion will then be evaluated by the DRC (see Section III.L.1 and 2.) with the same materials and procedures as used for tenure reviews except as modified within an approved DRC procedures statement. No later than February 1, the DRC will provide the candidate with their evaluation and redacted copies of all student letters and external reviews if they have not already been made available, permitting the candidate to respond to the DRC’s evaluation and recommendation. The department chair will forward the candidate's materials and DRC report to the dean no later than February 15 for submission to the URC. The URC will formulate its own recommendations to be reported to the president. The president shall exercise the authority set forth under Section II.C.6 and will forward the URC’s recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The Deans of the colleges will send a letter of notification of the University Review Committee’s actions to the candidate on or before April 15.

N. PROCEDURES FOR IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS OTHER THAN DISMISSAL

1. **Severe Sanction**

If the administration believes that the conduct of a faculty member, although not constituting adequate cause for dismissal, is sufficiently grave to justify imposition of a severe sanction, the administration may institute a proceeding to impose such a severe sanction; the procedures outlined in Regulation 5 of the AAUP Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure (1999) will govern such a proceeding.

Severe sanctions include a penalty that has severe adverse financial consequences for a faculty member and/or a penalty that significantly abridges the faculty members normal rights and responsibilities within the University. Specifically, a severe sanction is defined as follows:

a. Any raise below the minimum raise permitted by the merit procedures (normally ½ of CPI) is considered a severe sanction. In particular, a sanction that reduces base salary is considered a severe
sanction. A loss of merit pay through the review process for any reason, including failure to participate in the merit review process, is a review consequence, not a sanction.

b. In a one year period, a financial penalty greater than $1000 or 1% of annual salary, whichever is lesser, is considered a severe sanction; a smaller amount is considered a minor sanction. Financial penalties are above and beyond reimbursement for theft, misuse of University property or funds, or other transgressions for which restitution is appropriate. Financial penalties may be deducted from pay over a 12-month period at the request of the sanctioned party.

c. Sanctions that significantly impair an employee’s ability to perform essential professional duties will be considered severe. Examples of such severe sanctions would include the loss of office space, suspension from meeting classes, and sanctions that significantly impair a faculty member’s ability to engage in research.

2. Minor Sanction
If the administration believes that the conduct of a faculty member justifies imposition of a minor sanction that does not impair essential professional duties, such as a letter of reprimand, it will notify the faculty member of the basis of the proposed sanction and provide the faculty member with an opportunity to persuade the administration that the proposed sanction should not be imposed. A faculty member who believes that a major sanction has been incorrectly imposed under this paragraph, or that a minor sanction has been unjustly imposed, may, pursuant to Section III.R.3. of the Faculty Handbook, petition the Faculty Hearing Committee (see III. O.) for such action as may be appropriate.

O. TERMINATION OF CONTRACT
Bucknell may terminate an appointment with continuous tenure, or a provisional or temporary appointment before the end of the specified term, but only for adequate cause established by following the procedures and standards prescribed for the cause alleged. The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the University.

Should the cause alleged be (a) bona fide financial exigency, or (b) discontinuance of a program or department of instruction upon educational considerations, or (c) incapacity of the faculty member to continue to fulfill the terms and conditions of an appointment for medical reasons, then the procedures and standards to be followed are those stipulated in the appropriate section of Regulation 4 of the AAUP Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure (1999). The Faculty Council shall recommend to the faculty for its approval appropriate faculty committees or bodies to execute the tasks assigned in (c) and (d) of Regulation 4.

If the cause alleged is related, directly and substantially, to the fitness of a faculty member in his or her professional capacity as teacher or scholar or researcher, the termination of the appointment is considered dismissal for cause, and the procedures to be followed are those stipulated in Regulations 5 and 6 of the Recommended Institutional Regulations. The willful failure to fulfill obligations for teaching, sexual harassment of students or colleagues (see definition in Section III.S), conviction for a serious crime, and physical interference with students or colleagues in the exercise of their civil or academic rights are examples of adequate cause for dismissal. The informal inquiry that is mandated in Regulation 5 (b) will be conducted by the Faculty Council. The Faculty Hearing Committee shall discharge the several tasks which are assigned to faculty committees by Regulation 5 (c), and as described in III.N.2. and III.R, and in accordance with the procedural regulations stipulated therein.

P. GUIDELINES ON POLITICAL ACTIVITIES
Bucknell University intends to maintain a climate in which each member of the University community is free to exercise the rights of citizenship. Under Section 501 (C) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, tax-exempt organizations are, however, constrained from substantial activities directed toward influencing legislation, participating in any political campaign on behalf of a candidate, or contributing to a Federal election. Thus, under the law, a line must be drawn between scholarly inquiry and open discussion, on the