

Note: You'll need Attachment E from April 27 agenda!!

1999-2000
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, May 4, 2000
Foothill Suite, University Union

Immediately following 2000-2001 Senate Organizational Meeting--3:30 -5:00 p.m.

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 00-42/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposal:

M.A. Education—Educational Technology Option: A 30-unit, 18-24 month program focusing on technical, curricular and leadership skills with the goal of producing educational strategists who embrace the concept of the lead teacher/presenter and who direct teachers toward a greater appreciation and practical understanding of technological and educational issues and methodologies. Teachers will be admitted into cohorts of 24 students and will move through the course sequence as a group.

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 00-41/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of April 27 (#14), 2000.

SECOND READING

Carried over
FS 00-45 Resolution of Commendation - Jolene Koester
[Action may be taken]

Carried **FS 00-28/FPC, Ex. PEDAGOGY ENHANCEMENT AWARDS PROGRAM**

[Note: The following reflects amendments made following the Senate's April 27 discussion and based on clarification received from the chair of the Pedagogy Enhancement Awards Committee.]

The Faculty Senate approves amendment of the Guidelines for the Pedagogy Enhancement Awards Program as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition]:

II.C.2: Evaluation of the Proposal: ~~Eligible proposals will be evaluated by a peer review panel consisting of five faculty members from departments in the area of the proposed project, except those electing to be evaluated by the Interdisciplinary Panel. A representative from Pedagogy Enhancement Subcommittee will chair the panel. An interdisciplinary peer review panel consisting of five faculty members will evaluate eligible proposals. A member of the Pedagogy Enhancement Subcommittee will serve as a member of each panel and as chair. The additional four members of each panel will be recruited from all seven colleges, and no more than two reviewers from a college will be assigned to each panel.~~

Carried FS 00-38/APC, Ex. ^{FIR.} GRADE APPEAL PROCESS (Amends FS 00-30)

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the CSUS Grade Appeal Process (FS 00-13), as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition]:

VII. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES IN DETAIL

- A. ...
- B. Formal Procedures
 - 1. ...
 - 2. Grade Appeal Panel.

a. Selection of Faculty Members.

- (1) The unit chair shall randomly select ~~eight~~ four prospective panel members (who shall be numbered in order of selection) from the list of full-time tenured or tenure track faculty members within the academic unit (excluding those on sabbaticals or other leaves and those involved in the appeal), ~~or~~ related units as determined by the unit chair in those cases where there is an insufficient number of eligible faculty members from the unit. If any faculty member selected is unwilling or unable to serve, due to extenuating circumstances, random selection shall continue until the names of ~~eight~~ four faculty members willing and able to serve have been drawn.
- (2) The unit chair shall inform the student and the instructor of the ~~eight~~ four names on the list. During the 48 hours following, each of the parties shall then have the right to challenge ~~up to two~~ one names on the list for any reason or no reason at all. The first ~~two~~ unchallenged names on the list shall be the faculty panel members from the unit and the other unchallenged faculty shall be alternates from the unit.

Additional panel members to bring the number to four shall be selected from

- (3) In each instance of a grade appeal, the academic unit in which the appeal is filed shall forward to the Dean of the College to whom the unit reports a copy of the grade appeal form. When received by the Dean, this copy shall constitute notice of a unit's need of a faculty member of the College who is not a member of the unit to serve on a grade appeal panel. That faculty member shall be selected as provided below.
- (4) Upon receiving the grade appeal form forwarded by the unit, the Dean of the College to whom the unit reports shall randomly select four prospective panel members from the list of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members within the College excluding those holding appointments or joint appointments in the unit hearing the grade appeal, those on sabbaticals or other leaves and those involved in the appeal. If any faculty member selected is unwilling or unable to serve, due to extenuating circumstances, random selection shall continue until the names of four faculty members willing and able to serve have been drawn.
- (5) The Dean of the College shall inform the student and the instructor of the four names on the list. During the 48 hours following, each of the parties shall then have the right to challenge one name on the list for any reason or no reason at all. The first unchallenged name on the list shall be the faculty member of the panel from the College and the other unchallenged faculty members shall be alternates from the College.

FS 00-39/Ex. BUDGETARY PROCESS, FACULTY SENATE INFORMATION ABOUT THE CSUS

- WHEREAS, Budgetary decisions are central to the ability of the University to fulfill its academic mission; and
- WHEREAS, Widespread concern has been expressed by CSUS faculty members about lack of understanding of the current budgetary process; and
- WHEREAS, A Faculty Senate governance group met during the 1999-2000 academic year to discuss ways to improve faculty involvement in the campus budgetary process; and
- WHEREAS, The governance working group developed a set of recommendations aimed at enhancing faculty knowledge about the budgetary process and ability to provide input about the budget under consideration; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate endorses the proposals contained in the governance working group's "Recommendations Regarding Faculty

Senate Input on the Budgetary Process;" (April 27, 2000, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment E) and, be if further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate urges that, to the extent feasible, the CSUS Administration and the Faculty Senate Chair implement for the 2000-01 academic year the recommendations contained in the above report.

FIRST READING

[Discussion only—unless extended by majority vote; no action.]

FS 00-43/FPC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM, CSUS
(Amends FS 99-56)

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of a statement of principles, providing the rationale for the campus "Procedures for Implementing the Faculty Merit Increase (FMI) Program" (to be distributed at meeting). The Faculty Senate recommends three areas of revision to the current CSUS FMI Procedures (Attachment A). Those three areas would be incorporated as amendments to the CSUS FMI procedures (amends FS 99-56) as shown (to be distributed at meeting).

FS 00-44/APC, Ex. GRADE APPEAL PROCESS—APPEAL OF VIOLATIONS OF
PROCEDURE (Amends FS 00-13)

[Note: See Attachment B-1 for background.]

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the CSUS Grade Appeal Process with the addition of Section VIII, Appeal of Violations of Procedure (Attachment B-2).

INFORMATION

1. Report on Budget
Time Certain: 4:30 p.m., Provost Jolene Koester
2. Update on timeline for adoption of CSUS Learning Goals
3. Tentative Spring 2000 Faculty Senate meeting schedule [Note: Additional meetings may be scheduled]:
May 11, 18
4. Senate Home Page: <http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page then Administration and Policy then Administration then Faculty Senate

Ex Com.
Postponed
to 5/11/00
Mtg

Recommended Revisions to the current FMI Policy

MOVING MONEY

It is expected that normally deans and the President will defer to the judgment of the departmental review committees with respect to FMIs. Under some circumstances, fairness and equity across departments will require that deans and the President make different judgments. Examples of this include: 1) when a department has an unduly large amount of money to distribute because few department faculty members have applied for a FMI; 2) instances in which the deans or the President has determined that department or college has failed to give adequate compensation to someone on the basis of that person's demonstrated performance. When money is moved by either the deans or the President, a published, written explanation must go out to the campus community detailing what amounts have been moved, from where to where, and the rationale for doing so. Deans or the President shall not systematically reduce the potential for part-time faculty with in a unit to receive FMIs simply because of their part-time status.

CHOICE OF CATEGORIES

Within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, each faculty member may decide how to be evaluated. Faculty may chose to be evaluated for: 1) the quality of teaching alone; 2) teaching and scholarship; 3) teaching and service to the University and community; or 4) teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community. Each department shall devise a system for ranking the applicants within the categories chosen by the applicant and the department committee shall publish this system before the applications are turned in.

FEEDBACK

Each level of review (department, dean, and president) must indicate their priorities and criteria to faculty before FMI applications are submitted and evaluated. In rare instances when decisions are made by the dean or president to lower awards from those recommended by the department, a written explanation must be provided by the dean or president to the individual whose FMI was reduced.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

APR 10 2000

MEMO

To: Bob Buckley, Faculty Senate Chair

Faculty
413

Senate Received

From: *Greg Wheeler*
Greg Wheeler, Academic Policies Committee Chair

Date: April 10, 2000

Subject: Procedure to govern procedural appeals

The Academic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate has completed work on the procedural appeals portion of the grade appeals policy recently passed by the Senate. I have included the original letter of conveyance from the University Grade Appeals Procedural Appeals Board with the policy. Note that this document begins with Roman numeral VIII, since it is the last part of the larger document on grade appeals.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

FACULTY SENATE

Memo

Date: February 16, 2000

To: Greg Wheeler, Chair
Academic Policies Committee

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "William A. Dillon".

From: William A. Dillon, Presiding Member
University Grade Appeals Procedural Appeals Board

Re: Procedure to govern procedural appeals

The Procedural Appeals Board recommends adoption of the attached amendment of the University Grade Appeals Process. This amendment completes the revision of the process by specifying how procedural appeals shall be conducted, who may bring them and what may be appealed. It codifies the practice of the Board during the past two and one-half years and fills up the silences of the current document about the conduct of procedural appeals. It also provides for summary disposition of procedural appeals arising at the end of the last term of a student about to complete a degree.

As to remedy following from a successful procedural appeal, the Board recommends nothing but rehearing in the unit because the jurisdiction to decide grade appeals has been put in the unit and no where else by the Senate. Generally, in these sorts of cases, a procedural mistake does not deprive the agency making it of its jurisdiction in the matter. Instead, mistake established on appeal brings on the necessity of exercising that jurisdiction correctly under the relevant procedures.

The Board hopes the Committee will recommend this amendment to the Senate. I am, of course, available to meet with the Committee to discuss the proposal.

WD;j
Attachment
cc: B. Buckley, Faculty Senate Chair

6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95819-6036 • (916) 278-6593 • (916) 278-5358 FAX

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY • Bakersfield • Chico • Dominguez Hills • Fresno • Fullerton • Hayward • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles • Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

CSUS GRADE APPEAL PROCESS

(1)	CLEAR AND CONCISE NARRATIVE OF ITS UNDERSTANDING OF THE FACTS	
(2)	CLEAR AND CONCISE STATEMENT OF ITS UNDERSTANDING OF THE OBJECTIONS TO THE DISPUTED GRADE	
(3)	CLEAR AND CONCISE STATEMENT OF DECISION	
(4)	AWARD OF GRADE, IF ANY, AND REASONS FOR IT	
t.	PANEL SHALL SUBMIT ITS WRITTEN DECISION TO THE CHAIR	13
u.	CHAIR SHALL CHANGE GRADE.....	13
v.	SUMMARY REPORT OF THE NUMBER OF CASES HEARD AND DISPOSITION OF EACH	13
C. SUMMARY OF GRADE APPEAL DEADLINES		13
D. SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS BY PARTIES		14
VIII. APPEAL OF VIOLATIONS OF PROCEDURE:		
A. PROCEDURAL APPEALS BOARD		16
B. APPEAL OF VIOLATIONS OF PROCEDURES		16
1.	STANDARD OF REVIEW OF THE CONDUCT OF GRADE APPEALS	16
2.	WHO MAY APPEAL	16
3.	GROUND FOR APEAL	16
4.	NO CHANGE OF GRADE PENDING RESOLUTION OF AN APPEAL	17
5.	WHEN TO APPEAL.....	17
6.	LETTER OF INTENT.....	17
7.	LETTER OF APPEAL.....	18
8.	ORDINARY APPEALS.....	18
9.	EXPEDITED APPEALS.....	20
10.	ORAL HEARING	20
11.	SUMMARY REVIEW.....	20
12.	DISPOSITION OF APPEALS.....	20
C. SUMMARY OF PROCEDUAL APPEALS DEADLINES		21

VIII. APPEAL OF VIOLATIONS OF PROCEDURE

A. Procedural Appeals Board

1. A Procedural Appeals Board shall be appointed ~~annually~~ by the Faculty Senate to decide questions of violation of these procedures raised in appeals from final decisions of grade appeals panels. It shall ~~serve throughout the academic year of its appointment~~ be a continuing body.
2. The Board shall be composed of three members of the full-time instructional faculty, each of whom shall serve for a term of three years. The terms of service shall be staggered so that each year the Senate shall appoint a member of the Board to fill an expired three-year term. Each member shall remain eligible for reappointment from term to term.
3. Election of a Chair shall be the Board's first order of business on convening for the first time during the year of its appointment.
4. A member of the Board may decline to hear and decide an appeal by reason of conflict of interest. In that case, the Board shall proceed to hear and decide the appeal with a quorum of two. In case of an evenly divided Board, the decision of the panel giving rise to the appeal shall stand. If the Board cannot proceed for want of a quorum of two, the Faculty Senate shall appoint at once alternates up to the number of at least two. The alternate member or members shall join the Board to hear and decide the appeal giving rise to his, ~~or her~~ or their appointment and then shall give place to the member or members appointed for ~~the~~ three-year terms who declined in that case to serve.

B. Appeal of Violations of Procedure

1. **Standard of review of the conduct of grade appeals.**
 - a. University policy recognizes that a procedurally perfect process is impossible to achieve and therefore not required to satisfy due process. It also recognizes that, at root, due process is satisfied by a showing that the University's written procedures and its practice under them produce a final substantive decision by a process that, as a whole, is fundamentally fair. A process, as a whole, is fundamentally fair when each element of it that is analytically critical, basic or essential to fairness is present in a way that makes for fairness in the course of reaching the final decision from which an appeal is taken.
2. **Who may appeal.**
 - a. Either the student or the instructor, parties to a grade appeal, may appeal procedural violations occurring during the grade appeal process provided that the violations appealed give rise to an actual denial of fundamental fairness in the course of reaching a final decision of a grade appeal adverse to the party appealing.

3. Grounds for appeal.

- a. To prevail on appeal, the party appealing shall allege and show:
- (1) that the party appealing expressed either verbally or in writing an objection to the policy or action appealed from when it occurred or when the party appealing first learned of it or could reasonably be expected to have known of it and had the objection rejected by the chair of the academic unit, the chair of the panel, or both,
 - (2) that the policy or action giving rise to the appeal deprives the grade appeal process as a whole of fundamental fairness as defined in VIII.B.1 above and
 - (3) that the deprivation of fundamental fairness has had an actual and not merely a speculative adverse effect on the final decision of the grade appeal.

4. No change of grade pending resolution of an appeal.

To preclude the possibility of more than one change of grade arising from the grade appeal process, any change of grade ordered by a grade appeal panel subject to a procedural appeal shall not be executed until the procedural appeal has been concluded by the publication of a final decision of the appeal.

5. When to appeal.

Procedural appeals of the final decision of a grade appeal panel made under the policies and practices defining the grade appeals process as a whole shall be begun no later than five (5) business days from the date on which the party appealing knew or could reasonably be expected to have known of the final decision of the panel. No appeal may be begun before the panel has published its final decision of a grade appeal.

6. Letter of intent.

- a. A party wishing to begin an appeal shall file a letter of intent to appeal with the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Sacramento Hall, Room 226.
- b. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall deliver to the academic unit whose decision has been appealed and to the Procedural Appeals Board a copy of the letter of intent.
- c. Having received a letter of intent to appeal, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall at once deliver to each member of the Procedural Appeals Board a copy of the Grade Appeal Form, the written submissions of the parties and their witnesses, if any, to the panel, the panel's written announcement of its final substantive decision in the case and whatever other writings, exclusive of any associated with informal attempts to resolve the dispute, that may appear in the panel's or the chair's case file. The object of the delivery shall be to provide the Procedural Appeals Board with as complete a record of the transactions before and within the panel as may be had. An academic unit's inability or unwillingness to provide the materials comprising the record in a case

before a panel shall be grounds for a decision of an appeal against the unit if the absent materials prevent either of the parties to the appeal from perfecting his or her part in it or the Board from perfecting its ability to decide it.

7. Letter of appeal.

- a. Within five (5) business days of filing a letter of intent to appeal, a party appealing shall submit a letter of appeal to the Provost who shall at once deliver a copy of it to (1) each member of the Procedural Appeals Board, (2) the other party, (3) the members of the academic unit's grade appeal panel, and (4) the academic unit's chair.
- b. The letter of appeal shall contain: (1) a narrative of the facts that in the mind of the writer describe the policies or actions giving cause for a procedural appeal and the action taken by the writer to object to them in the academic unit, (2) the writer's reasons for believing that the policies or actions giving cause for the appeal have actually denied to the writer fundamental fairness as defined in VIII.B.1 above, and (3) the writer's reasons for believing that the panel's final decision would have been otherwise but for the procedural violation appealed.
- c. The party appealing shall confine the contents of the letter of appeal to the three points specified in 7.b.1, 2 and 3 above. He or she shall write to the point.

8. Ordinary appeals.

- a. If the Procedural Appeals Board finds itself unable to discern from the letter of appeal the writer's version of the facts and reasons for appealing or the statement of an appeal consistent with section VIII.B.1, 2 and 3.a(1), (2) and (3) of this document, the Board may return the letter to the writer and invite revisions that comply with 7.b, 1, 2 and 3 above or with the "writing to the point" requirement of section 7.c above. The Board shall allow up to ten (10) business days for completion of the revisions. If after reviewing one (1) attempted revision for clarity and pertinence, the Board remains unable to make out a statement of an appeal consistent with this document from the writer's description of it, the Board shall dismiss the appeal without leave to refile it.
- b. If the Procedural Appeals Board is able to conclude from the letter of appeal that an appeal as defined by this document has been stated, however clumsily, the Board shall identify and state for the party appealing the issues of practice and policy raised by the letter. It shall schedule written argument on those issues.
 - (1) The statement of issues, invitation to argue, and schedule of argument shall be addressed to each party to the appeal, the chair of the academic unit's grade appeal panel, (with copies to the members of it) and the chair of the academic unit.
 - (2) The Board shall invite the party appealing to argue in writing the issues stated for it by the Board and to submit those written

- arguments within ten (10) business days of delivery of the invitation to argue to a campus address designated by the party.
- (3) In the course of its invitation to argue, the Board shall direct each party to the appeal to provide copies of each argument or response submitted to the Board to every other addressee and shall publish a mailing list of all addressees to facilitate the circulation of arguments and responses to all addressees.
 - (4) Students appealing may choose to have documents delivered to them in the academic unit's office or the Provost's office. ~~If they choose home delivery, the delay worked by mailing off campus shall come at the expense of their time for argument.~~ If a student cannot arrange to receive documents in the academic unit's office or the Provost's office between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. of a business day, the student shall arrange with the Provost an alternative to delivery at one of those campus addresses. If the student chooses home delivery, the student's time for argument shall be tolled from 5:00 p.m. of the second day following the date of depositing the document in campus mail.
- c. Having received the arguments of the party appealing, the party or parties against whom the appeal has been taken may respond in writing. The written response shall invariably and at a minimum contain each of the following:
 - (1) a narrative of the facts that in the writer's mind define the appeal, unless one has already been submitted or has been made unnecessary by the existence of a record of fact made by other means or a statement of fact agreed to by the parties to support the appeal, and
 - (2) an argument or arguments that the policy or policies, practice or practices set forth in the narrative of fact and in dispute on appeal did not cause an actual denial of fundamental fairness, as defined in section VIII.B.1 above, or that even if it did, the denial did not adversely affect the final decision of the panel.
 - d. Responses may confirm or dispute in whole or in part the appealing party's narrative of fact. They may argue in a way that agrees or disagrees in whole or in part with arguments submitted by another party.
 - e. Each writing submitted as initial argument or response shall confine itself to the points at issue between the parties as defined in 7.b.1, 2 and 3 above. The Procedural Appeals Board may disregard as irrelevant submitted material that is beside the point.
 - f. The Board shall permit the party appealing to submit a rebuttal to the response or responses submitted by the other parties. The rebuttal shall be confined to the points at issue between the parties as defined in 7.b.1, 2 and 3 above.
 - g. When scheduling written argument, the Board shall allow ten (10) business days between delivery of its invitation to argue to the party appealing at a campus address and submission of arguments in response to that invitation. It shall allow ten (10) business days

between the deadline for submitting initial arguments and submitting responses to them. It shall allow five (5) business days between the deadline for submitting a response and submitting a rebuttal to it by the party appealing. It shall meet to consider the arguments, responses and rebuttals submitted to it five (5) business days after the deadline for filing rebuttals or as soon thereafter as may be convenient. Having determined its schedule for filing initial arguments, responses, rebuttals and meeting, the Board shall publish it to the parties in its invitation to argue as provided in 8.b.1 and 2 above.

9. Expedited appeals.

- a. If the Procedural Appeals Board is able to discern clearly from the letter of appeal the facts giving rise to the appeal and the writer's objections for want of fundamental fairness and furthermore, if it is able to conclude that an appeal as defined by this document has been stated and argued, the Board may proceed at once to invite responses from the other party, the chair of the academic unit's panel and the chair of the academic unit. The Board shall allow ten (10) business days for the submission of a response.
- b. Responses shall be confined as described in 8.d and e above.
- c. The Board shall invite a rebuttal to the responses and allow five (5) business days for its submission.
- d. The duty to provide copies set forth in section 8.b.3 above shall apply to every submission to the Board by the parties to an expedited appeal.

10. Oral hearing.

The Procedural Appeals Board may hold an oral hearing if, in its judgment, the initial arguments, responses and rebuttals submitted in writing by the parties are insufficient to enable the Board to decide the appeal.

11. Summary review.

- a. When time or other circumstance does not permit an ordinary or expedited appeal under these procedures, a party appealing may apply to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for summary determination of a procedural appeal arising from a panel's final decision of a grade appeal. If, in the judgment of the Provost, a summary determination is warranted by time or other circumstance, the Provost shall act at once and in consultation and collaboration with the Chair, or convenor of the Procedural Appeals Board if a Chair has not yet been chosen, to invoke the jurisdiction of the Procedural Appeals Board, schedule an immediate oral hearing and deliver written notice of intent to appeal to each of the parties together with notice of time and place of hearing. Thereafter the Provost shall support with staff assistance the Board's action to decide the appeal.
- b. If the Procedural Appeals Board is unavailable to act in a case of summary determination by reason of the absence of a quorum of two members, the Provost shall immediately ask the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to appoint at least two faculty members to decide

the appeal summarily after notice to the parties and a hearing of them in one another's presence on the question of a denial of fundamental fairness raised by the appeal.

- c. In the absence of a quorum of the Board, no appeal shall be decided.

12. Disposition of appeals.

- a. The Procedural Appeals Board shall decide appeals before it in a prompt and expeditious manner.
- b. The Board may:
 - (1) find that a procedural violation amounting to a denial of fundamental fairness did not occur or did not adversely affect the final decision of the panel even if it did occur.
 - (2) find that a procedural violation amounting to a denial of fundamental fairness occurred and adversely affected the final decision of the grade appeal panel.
- c. A finding of no violation or no adverse effect shall conclude the appeal; and the panel's decision shall stand.
- d. A finding of a procedural violation amounting to a denial of fundamental fairness and adversely affecting the final decision of the panel shall cause that decision to be set aside. In that case, a new panel shall be formed and the grade appeal process or so much of it as shall have been infected by the lack of fundamental fairness found on appeal shall be repeated.
- e. Having decided an appeal, the Procedural Appeals Board shall not entertain petitions for rehearing.

C. Summary of Procedural Appeals Deadlines

1. By the end of the fifth business day following the date on which the party appealing knew or could reasonably be expected to have known the final decision of the unit panel, the party appealing shall file a letter of intent to appeal with the Provost.
2. The Provost shall at once deliver the letter of intent and the unit chair's case file to the Procedural Appeals Board.
3. By the end of the fifth business day following the day of delivery of the letter of intent to the Provost, the party appealing shall have delivered to the Provost a letter of appeal explaining the appeal in detail.
4. The Provost shall at once deliver a copy of the letter of appeal to each member of the Procedural Appeals Board, the other party, the members of the unit's panel and the unit chair.
5. By the end of the period permitted by the Board for revision, if needed, of a letter of appeal for clarity and pertinence, the party appealing shall have delivered a copy of the revision to each member of the Board and each of the other parties to the appeal.

6. By the end of the tenth business day following the day of delivery of the Board's invitation to argue to a campus address designated by the party appealing, the party appealing shall have submitted a copy of his or her written arguments to each member of the Board and each of the other parties.
7. By the end of the tenth business day following the last day on which the arguments of the party appealing might have been delivered, the party or parties responding, if choosing to make a response, shall have delivered a copy of that response to each member of the Board and each of the other parties.
8. By the end of the fifth business day following the last day for delivering responses, the party appealing, if choosing to make a rebuttal, shall have delivered a copy of it to each member of the Board and each of the other parties.
9. In the case of an expedited appeal, a copy of each response shall have been delivered to each member of the Board and each of the other parties by the end of the tenth business day following the day of delivery of the Board's invitation to respond to a designated campus address.
10. In the case of an expedited appeal, the copy of each rebuttal shall have been delivered to each member of the Board and each of the other parties by the end of the fifth business day following the day of delivery of the response to the designated campus address of the party appealing.
11. In the case of summary determination of an appeal, relevant deadlines shall be determined and published by agreement of the Provost and the chair of the Procedural Review Board.
12. The Board shall decide appeals in a prompt and expeditious manner and publish its decision as soon after making it as is practical.

Note: If everyone acts at the last minute in an ordinary appeal, the Board will be able to decide the appeal eleven or twelve weeks after the letter of intent is delivered to the Provost. The length of this period includes the two or three weeks during which the Board will be reviewing the letter of appeal initially and corresponding with the parties.

If everyone acts at the last minute in an expedited appeal, the Board will have the matter before it in seven weeks. The length of the period includes two weeks for action and correspondence by the Board.