UNITED ACADEMICS PROPOSAL

ARTICLE 20. TENURE REVIEW AND PROMOTION

Section 1. This Article applies only to bargaining unit faculty members in the Tenure-Track and Tenured classifications. Tenure is in the University, and not in a college, school, department, program, or discipline. The award of tenure requires an express grant by the Provost communicated in writing to the bargaining unit faculty member and signed by the Provost. There is no de facto tenure. Tenure means that the bargaining unit faculty member’s employment may be terminated only for cause (Article 24), or in case of program eliminations or reductions (Article 25).

Section 2. Eligibility for tenure review. Except as authorized in writing by the Office of the Provost or designee, a bargaining unit faculty member is entitled to a decision on tenure only after six consecutive academic or fiscal years of employment at 1.0 FTE per year or the equivalent of consecutive part time employment at or above 0.5 FTE per year. An appointment is considered consecutive even if interrupted by one or more approved leaves of absence. The period of an approved leave of absence does not count toward consideration for tenure unless the bargaining unit faculty member elects otherwise.

General Provisions Related to the Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Process

Section 3. Accelerated Review. An accelerated tenure review may occur in particularly meritorious cases as determined by the Office of the Provost or designee in consultation with the appropriate dean, department or unit head, and affected bargaining unit faculty member.

Section 4. Credit for Prior Service. When credit for prior service is agreed upon, the terms of hire will state the number of years of credit granted, the earliest date for tenure consideration, and the required date for tenure consideration. With Provost or designee approval from the Office of the Provost, credit for prior service may also be negotiated within the first year of employment. Any negotiated credit will be documented and placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. Scholarship, research, creative activity, and teaching completed by the bargaining unit faculty member during the period of prior service will receive full consideration during the promotion and tenure process if the bargaining unit faculty member elects the earliest date for tenure review. Should a bargaining unit faculty member who received credit for prior service at the time of hire choose to delay the review for the full six years of full-time appointment at the University of Oregon, teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity completed prior to arrival at the university will be of secondary consideration during the promotion and tenure process. Should the bargaining unit faculty member choose to use some, but not all of the credit for prior service, the focus of the review of teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity will adjust appropriately so that, for example, four years of full-time appointment at the University would mean that at most two years of prior service will receive full consideration.

Section 5. Joint Appointments. For bargaining unit faculty members holding multiple or joint appointments, a memorandum will be completed at the time of hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion and tenure review and identifying how the tenure and promotion
process will be handled among the units. Such memorandum memoranda is are not valid unless approved in writing by the bargaining unit faculty member, the department or unit(s) heads involved, and the Office of the Provost or designee.

Section 6. Notice of Meetings. A bargaining unit faculty member will receive at least three days’ notice of any meeting or hearing which the member is invited or required to attend with a dean or the Office of the Provost or designee regarding recommendations or decisions on promotion or tenure. The bargaining unit faculty member may have a colleague or Union representative present at the meeting as an observer.

Section 7. Waiver of Access to Materials. Bargaining unit faculty members have the right whether to waive in advance in writing their access to see any or all of the evaluative materials (see Article 8, Personnel Files). The choice by the bargaining unit faculty member to waive or not waive access to evaluative materials shall not be considered during the evaluation process. Such waivers, however, shall not preclude the use of redacted versions of these documents in a denial review process. The redacted versions are intended to protect the identity of reviewers, who are informed about the faculty member’s waiver choice.

Section 8. Stopping of the “Tenure, Promotion and Review Clock.” The “tenure, promotion, and review clock” may be stopped in the following circumstances, at the bargaining unit faculty member’s discretion. The bargaining unit faculty member must decide whether to stop the tenure review clock at the start of the leave or absence, or the tenure review clock will not be stopped during the leave or absence. The bargaining unit faculty member, however, may later opt to restore the period when the clock was stopped and may apply for tenure review at the time the bargaining unit faculty member would have become eligible without the stopping of the clock.

The tenure review clock may be stopped: (1) for one year upon the birth or adoption of a child; (2) for up to two years for approved leaves of absence without pay lasting two or more terms during each year of the approved leave; or (3) in other extraordinary circumstances as approved by the Provost or designee.

If a bargaining unit faculty member decides to stop the tenure review clock before the mid-term review required in Sections 7-11, the mid-term review will also be delayed.

All reviews clocks may will be stopped: (1) for one year upon the birth or adoption of a child; (2) for up to two years for approved leaves of absence without pay lasting two or more terms during each year of the leave; or (3) in other extraordinary circumstances as approved by the Office of the Provost.

If a bargaining unit faculty member decides to stop the tenure review clock before the mid-term review required in Sections 7-11, the mid-term review will also be delayed.

Bargaining unit faculty members will be informed of the stopping of the review clock(s) when they apply for leave and of their option to not stop the clock(s).

Section 9. Report to the Union. The University will send the Union an annual report of all promotion and tenure decisions concerning bargaining unit faculty members in the Tenure-Track
and Tenured Professor classification made by the Office of the Provost during the preceding academic year no later than the following September 1 and in accordance with applicable confidentiality requirements.

Section 10. Criteria Changes. If criteria for review, promotion, and/or tenure change during the course of a TTF bargaining unit faculty member’s employment, the bargaining unit faculty member may elect among current criteria and any in effect during the period of time specified by the appropriate section of this Article prior to the initiation of a given review or promotion process.

Section 11. Deadline for Decisions. All tenure decisions will be made by May 1. All promotion, Teaching Professor, and post-tenure/promotion decisions will be communicated by June 15 of the year in which the review takes place. For every day the decisions are late, the bargaining unit faculty member will receive a bonus of $384 until the bargaining unit faculty member receives notification from the Office of the Provost.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Section 12. The University follows the same general timetable, process, and standards of performance for evaluation and promotion as do many other public research universities, particularly AAU institutions. The University also considers AAUP guidelines for tenure review and promotion.

The tenured faculty in each department or unit will begin the process of developing a written policy setting forth tenure and promotion criteria that are consistent with university-wide criteria, by first considering any input provided by the department or unit head, dean, vice president, Provost, or designee. The faculty will submit their recommended policy to the appropriate dean, vice president, or designee for review. The dean, vice president, or designee will document and discuss any revisions they make to the policy with the faculty before submitting their recommended policy to the Provost or designee. The Provost or designee will have final authority to establish the policy for each department or unit. If the dean, vice president, Provost, or designee materially alters the faculty-recommended policy, they will provide a written explanation for the change(s) to the faculty in the department or unit. The department or unit head, dean, vice president, Provost, or designee may initiate changes to established policies by informing the appropriate faculty of the change being considered, thereby initiating the process described in this Section. Units should periodically review their promotion and tenure policies. Generally, policies should be reviewed at least once every five years.

Faculty-initiated revisions will follow the process set forth in Article 4, Section 4.

Section 13. Each department’s or unit’s promotion and tenure criteria are intended to be consistent with those of other major research universities and shall include expectations, including the proportional weights, for each of the following, as defined by each department or unit:

a. Sustained high-quality, innovative scholarship in the faculty member’s discipline,
demonstrated through a record of concrete, accumulated research or creative activity;

b. Effective, stimulating teaching that meets university-wide teaching standards, to the extent applicable, in courses taught and in contributions to ensuring academic success for undergraduate and graduate students, as applicable;

c. Ongoing, responsible service and leadership to the faculty member’s students and department, the university, the community, and the faculty member’s professional discipline more broadly.

These criteria will be available on the Academic Affairs Office of the Provost website and in the department or unit.

Reviews

Section 14. Reviews for bargaining unit faculty members in the Tenure-Track and Tenured classification will consist of (1) annual reviews for faculty not holding tenure; (2) mid-term reviews between appointment and tenure review for the faculty without tenure; (3) tenure and promotion review; (4) third-year post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in the third year following a tenure or promotion decision or following a sixth-year post-tenure review; (5) promotion-to-full-professor review for tenured faculty in their sixth year or later after receiving tenure; and (6) sixth-year post-tenure review for tenured faculty in their sixth year following a tenure and/or promotion decision or following a previous sixth-year review.

Section 15. Annual Reviews. Each tenure-track bargaining unit faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review will have an annual review conducted by the department or unit head or designee. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate the tenure-track bargaining unit faculty member’s performance and offer an opportunity to address problems and to support faculty members in their progress toward the mid-term and tenure reviews.

Section 16. Peer Reviews. Each bargaining unit faculty member in the Tenure-Track and Tenured classification who has not achieved tenure will have at least one peer review of teaching in each year they have a teaching assignment. Peer reviews will be scheduled by the department or unit head or designee. Peer reviews will be a written assessment of a class observation and the contextual material informing that observation (e.g., syllabus, faculty member’s self-assessment, other framing information provided by the faculty member). Peer teaching reviews should be aligned with the university-wide teaching standards against which all teaching faculty are evaluated after those standards are in effect.

Mid-Term Reviews

Section 17. Timing. Each bargaining unit faculty member in the tenured and tenure-track classification who has not received tenure will have a mid-term review approximately half way between appointment and eligibility for tenure. The timing of this review generally will be established at the time of appointment, in that this review will usually take place during the last
year of the bargaining unit faculty member’s initial contract. A successful review is one prerequisite for contract renewal. Review decisions will be made and communicated at least one month before the end of the initial contract.

Section 18. Initiating the Mid-Term Review. To initiate the mid-term review process, the department or unit head or designee will contact the bargaining unit faculty member during the fall term of the year in which the review will take place and request the following:

- **Election of Criteria:** The criteria the bargaining unit faculty member chooses to be reviewed under, if there has been a change in criteria since the time of hire, as per Section 29.10.

- **Curriculum vitae:** A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae that includes the faculty member’s current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, including publications, works in progress, appointments, presentations, and similar activities.

- **Scholarship portfolio dossier:** A comprehensive portfolio dossier of scholarship, research, and creative activity during the review period; and appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact.

- **Personal statement:** A 3-6 page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit faculty member evaluating their performance measured against the applicable criteria for tenure and promotion. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research, and creative activity; and service contributions to the academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community. The statement should also shall include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

- **Teaching portfolio dossier:** Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations for courses taught by the bargaining unit faculty member, descriptions of courses developed examples of class assignments and exams, and similar material.

- **Service portfolio dossier:** As available, evidence of the bargaining unit faculty member’s service contributions to their academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community. Such evidence could include white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, commendations, awards, op-ed pieces, and/or letters of appreciation. The portfolio dossier may also include a short statement on the faculty member’s unique service experiences or obligations.

Section 19. Department or Unit Head’s Role: The department or unit head will obtain and place in the evaluation file copies of summary reports from the student evaluation process, including Student Experience Surveys. The file must also include a recent peer evaluation all peer reviews of the bargaining unit faculty member’s teaching that is aligned with the university-wide teaching standards against which all teaching faculty are evaluated as of the date those
standards take effect.

Once the department or unit head has obtained all of the appropriate documents and information, they will establish a committee of tenured faculty and provide the committee with access to the documents and information. The department or unit head will then:

a. Obtain a report from the faculty committee including an assessment of the bargaining unit faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion; and

b. Prepare their own independent evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion; and

c. Provide the department or unit head’s written report to the bargaining unit faculty member and allow the faculty member 10 14 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file; and

d. Submit the evaluation file to the appropriate dean.

If a department or unit has or develops a policy or practice of providing the report of the faculty committee to the bargaining unit faculty member, the department or unit head shall do so.

**Section 20. Dean’s Role.** The dean will review the file and may consult with appropriate persons and may obtain and document additional relevant information. Once the dean deems the file complete, they will prepare a separate report and recommendation assessment.

If the dean’s assessment differs from that of the department or unit committee or the department or unit head, the dean will provide a full and detailed explanation of the reasons underlying their judgment.

The dean will share their written report and recommendation assessment with the bargaining unit faculty member and allow the faculty member 10 14 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file.

The dean then will submit a summary report including dean’s recommendation assessment, department head’s recommendation assessment, faculty committee report, and faculty member’s curriculum vitae, statement, and responsive material or information to the Office of the Provost or designee.

**Section 21. Provost’s Role Decision.** The Provost or designee will consider the cumulative recommendations assessments received from department faculty, the department or unit head, and the dean, and then will decide the terms and duration of any subsequent appointment of the bargaining unit faculty member. Upon Provost review, the summary report will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental or college personnel file.

By May 1, the bargaining unit faculty member will be notified in writing of the Provost’s
decision. If the Provost deems the review unsuccessful, the Provost’s letter will contain a full and detailed explanation of the reasons underlying their judgment.

In the event of an unsuccessful review, the bargaining unit faculty member will meet with their department or unit head to discuss the unit’s tenure expectations, deficiencies in relation to the standards to tenure and promotion, resources that can be made available to the bargaining unit faculty member, and mentoring opportunities.

Tenure Review Process

Section 22. Initiating the Tenure Review Process. To initiate the tenure review process, the department or unit head will contact the bargaining unit faculty member no later than winter term of the year preceding the year in which a tenure decision is required and request the following:

- **Election of Criteria:** The criteria the bargaining unit faculty member chooses to be reviewed under, if there has been a change in criteria since the time of hire, as per Section 30 10.

- **Curriculum vitae:** A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae that includes the faculty member’s current research, scholarly, and creative activities and accomplishments, including publications, *works in progress*, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments. This document should clearly differentiate between accomplishments that occurred during the review period and those that did not.

- **Scholarship portfolio dossier:** A comprehensive portfolio dossier of scholarship, research and creative activity during the review period; and appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact.

- **Personal statement:** A 3-6 page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit faculty member evaluating their performance measured against the applicable criteria for tenure and promotion. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research, and creative activity; and service contributions to the academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

- **Teaching portfolio dossier:** Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations for courses taught by the bargaining unit faculty member, descriptions of any new courses developed, examples of class assignments and exams, and similar material.

- **Service portfolio dossier:** As available, evidence of the bargaining unit faculty member’s service contributions to their academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community. Such evidence could include white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, evidence of community...
contributions, commendations, awards, op-ed pieces, and/or letters of appreciation. The portfolio dossier may also include a short narrative elaborating on the bargaining unit faculty member’s unique service experiences or obligations.

- **External reviewers:** A list of qualified outside reviewers provided by the bargaining unit faculty member.

**Section 23. Schedule for Review of Tenure and Promotion Files.** The Office of the Provost or designee will establish a schedule for the compilation and review of tenure and promotion files. If the bargaining unit faculty member fails to comply with the timeline established by the Provost for submission of materials, the department or unit head will notify the faculty member of the missed deadline by university email and the primary phone on record in the Banner system. If the faculty member does not respond within 14 days, tenure may be denied. If the faculty member responds within 14 days, the department or unit head will establish a new deadline for submission of all materials.

The new deadline must allow the University adequate time to complete the tenure review process by **June 15 May 1.** If the bargaining unit faculty member misses the new deadline, tenure will be denied.

**Bargaining unit faculty members and/or the university may submit relevant information during a review.** Information is initially submitted to their department head through the final decision. Late submissions of information after the date the file is initially submitted may result in additional questions to the faculty member or to reviewers at the previous levels.

Only significant information relevant to the review shall be included in the tenure file during the course of the review. Information not relevant to the review or information that contains allegations that have not been fully reviewed by the appropriate office (research misconduct, Office of Investigations and Civil Rights Compliance, Employee and Labor Relations, etc.) shall not be included in the file initially, although Allegations that relate to relevant information may be included if they are sustained after an appropriate review. Relevant information is information that relates to promotion and tenure criteria as defined in this agreement the candidate’s ability to meet the promotion and tenure criteria. Relevant information may include disciplinary action taken against the bargaining unit faculty member, if the underlying acts relate to or affect the faculty member’s ability to meet the promotion and tenure criteria.

Previous reviews – annual and mid-term - shall not be included in the Tenure Review File.

**Section 24. External reviews.** The department or unit head will prepare a list of qualified external reviewers, with input from the department or unit faculty eligible to vote on a tenure and promotion case.

The department or unit head will select a majority of the external reviewers from this independently prepared list, but the department or unit head’s primary responsibility is to obtain
the best judgments from the most highly qualified experts in the appropriate areas. A minimum of five substantive external evaluations is required for a tenure case to move forward.

The department or unit head will recruit external reviewers from this list and the list provided by the bargaining unit faculty member. An absolute majority of external reviewers must be independently selected from the department or unit head’s list. If an external reviewer is named on both lists, and that reviewer is selected, that person will be considered to be from the department or unit head’s list.

Most, if not all, of the external reviewers should be at the rank or above for which the candidate is being considered or above (i.e., associate professor or professor for tenure and promotion to associate professor; professor for promotion to professor). Reviewers generally should come from comparable institutions or programs. The suggestions regarding rank and affiliations of external reviewers apply to the majority of the reviewers and are not strict prohibitions, so there is flexibility to meet particular circumstances. The department or unit head’s primary responsibility is to obtain the best judgments from the most highly qualified experts in the appropriate areas. A minimum of five substantive external evaluations is required for a tenure case to move forward.

The department or unit head will provide each external reviewer with the candidate’s signed and dated curriculum vitae, signed and dated personal statement, the candidate’s scholarship portfolio dossier, which may be a sample of the scholarship compiled by the faculty member, and the department’s or unit’s written criteria for promotion and tenure. External reviewers will not be asked whether candidates would be granted tenure at the external reviewer’s institution but can be asked whether the reviewer believes the candidate should be granted tenure at the University of Oregon.

**Section 25. Faculty Review.** The eligible faculty in the candidate’s department or unit, or a personnel committee comprised of a subset of the eligible faculty (if the department’s or unit’s internal policy specifies the creation of such a committee), will review the file and the external reviews, prepare a report, and vote to recommend or not recommend tenure and promotion. In cases where there are too few eligible faculty members to form a personnel committee within the candidate’s department or unit, the department or unit head will work with the appropriate dean to establish a committee including appropriate faculty members from outside the department. A final vote will be conducted by signed ballot, and the ballots will remain confidential to the extent permitted by law. A de-identified vote tally, however, will be provided to the faculty member by the department or unit head forthwith.

**Section 26. Review by Department or Unit Head, College or School Personnel Committee, and Dean.** The department or unit head will prepare an independent report and recommendation, and then forward the entire file to the appropriate dean.

If the department or unit head’s recommendation differs from that of the department or unit committee, the department or unit head will provide a full and detailed explanation of the reasons underlying their judgment.
The file then will be reviewed by a school- or college-level personnel committee appointed by a process determined by the dean. The committee will prepare an independent report and vote; and will forward the entire file to the dean. This step may be bypassed in schools or colleges whose deans choose not to convene a personnel committee.

The dean will then prepare an independent report and recommendation, and then meet with the candidate to discuss the case, and review the recommendations made by the department committee, department or unit head, and the school or college-level personnel committee (if applicable), and the dean’s own recommendation.

If the dean’s recommendation differs from that of the department or unit committee, the department or unit head, or the school- or college-level personnel committee, the dean will provide a full and detailed explanation of the reasons underlying their judgment.

The candidate will be provided with a copy of the dean’s report that has been redacted in accordance with the waiver status to protect personally identifiable information. The dean will notify the candidate that they may provide responsive material for the file within 14 days of the meeting with the dean or the receipt of the redacted report, whichever is later. The dean will then forward the entire file to the Office of Academic Affairs or the Provost.

Section 27. Provost’s Review of the File. The Office of the Provost or designee will review the promotion and tenure file for completeness and general presentation; and may request additional information from the dean. The file forwarded to the Office of the Provost or designee should include the following:

- Promotion and tenure checklist
- Voting summary
- Criteria for tenure and promotion
- Dean’s evaluation and recommendation
- School- or college-level personnel committee recommendation, where applicable
- Department or unit head’s evaluation and recommendation
- Department committee recommendation
- Letters of evaluation section, including:
  - A single copy of each letter used to solicit an external review
  - A list of the materials sent to the external reviewers
  - A brief biographical sketch of each reviewer, including indication of any
relationship with the candidate and whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate

- The external letters evaluating the candidate’s materials
- Documentation of declinations to review (typically copies of email notifications)
- Any solicited internal letters of evaluation, solicited or unsolicited

- Curriculum vitae (signed and dated by the candidate), as seen by the external reviewers. Updates may be provided by the candidate in the form of a list of specific changes rather than as a full additional curriculum vitae
- Personal statement (signed and dated by the candidate), as seen by the external reviewers
- Statement of waiver, partial waiver, or non-waiver (signed and dated by the candidate) (see Article 8, Personnel Files)
- Statement of duties and responsibilities that summarizes including a summary of any unique or unusual expectations associated with the faculty member’s appointment
- Conditions of appointment, including a copy of the current notice of appointment and any memoranda in the case of joint or multiple appointments
- Teaching evaluations, including:
  - UO checklist for the evaluation of teaching
  - List of all courses taught, including term, and enrollment, and instructor and department mean scores for required questions drawn from the system of student evaluation of teaching that was in effect prior to Fall 2019; summary information drawn from the Student Experience Surveys that were effective in effect as of Fall 2019
  - List of any/all teaching awards, including awards from the department, school or college, university, and external sources
  - List of all supervised dissertations, theses, and undergraduate honors papers
  - Sample course evaluation questions
  - Statistical summary page for each course taught, drawn from the system of student evaluation of teaching that was in effect prior to Fall 2019 and summary information drawn from the Student Experience Surveys that were effective in
effect as of Fall 2019

- All Peer evaluations of teaching: A minimum of three such evaluations is required. These should be aligned with the university-wide teaching standards against which all teaching faculty are evaluated when the standards are effective.

- An index of supplementary binder material

- Additional materials deemed necessary or advisable by the dean or Office of the Provost or designee

- A supplementary file, including a table of contents, which typically includes:
  - Full curriculum vitae of each external reviewer, if provided
  - Evidence of professional activities, including publications, as provided in the Scholarship Portfolio dossier
  - Evidence of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion
  - Signed written student evaluations of teaching drawn from the system of student evaluation of teaching that was in effect prior to Fall 2019
  - Student Experience Surveys

  - A teaching portfolio dossier, commonly including sample course materials such as syllabi, exams, homework assignments, etc. This material should be representative, not comprehensive, and may include other submissions, such as electronic websites for courses and other presentations of teaching efforts and innovations

  - A service portfolio dossier, commonly including evidence of the candidate’s service contributions to his or her their academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community. As available, such evidence could include white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, commendations, awards, op-ed pieces, and/or letters of appreciation. The portfolio dossier may also include a short narrative elaborating on the faculty member’s unique service experiences or obligations

**Section 28. University Faculty Personnel Committee Review.** After the Office of the Provost or designee has reviewed the file and deemed it complete, the file is sent to the University Faculty Personnel Committee. The committee will review the file, request additional information from the Office of the Provost or designee, or previous levels of review, if necessary, and then discuss and record a vote by the name of each person voting. The committee will prepare a written summary of its discussion, which will include the outcome of the vote to recommend or not recommend tenure and promotion.
Section 29. Provost’s Decision. The Provost has plenary authority to award or deny tenure. The candidate will be notified in writing of the Provost’s decision. The letter accompanying the decision will contain an explanation of the reasons underlying the Provost’s decision, if the decision is to deny tenure or promotion. If the Provost denies tenure and promotion, the Provost’s letter will contain a full and detailed explanation of the reasons underlying their decision.

A tenured appointment may not be less than 0.50 FTE. If tenure is granted, the letter will include a statement indicating the FTE of the tenured appointment. The letter will be placed in the candidate’s personnel file. The foregoing does not preclude a subsequent written agreement between the Office of the Provost or designee and the candidate adjusting the FTE of the appointment, so long as the appointment is at least 0.50 FTE.

Successful candidates are granted tenure and assume their new classification and rank at the start of the next academic year, or sooner at the discretion of the Provost.

Candidates who are denied tenure will receive a notice of appointment, which expires at the end of the academic or fiscal year following the one in which the application for tenure was submitted.

Section 29. Withdrawal of Application. A bargaining unit faculty member may withdraw an application for tenure in writing to the Provost and the dean at any time before the Provost’s decision. Upon withdrawal, a bargaining unit faculty member will receive a notice of appointment which expires at the end of the academic or fiscal year following the one in which the application for tenure was submitted.

Promotion Review

Section 21. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. The process and timelines for review and evaluation for promotion from associate professor to professor are the same as those for promotion to associate professor and tenure, except:

a. There is no requirement to initiate the promotion process to professor.

b. Bargaining unit faculty members with tenure who are denied promotion from associate professor to professor will remain employed at the associate professor rank.

c. The election of criteria bargaining unit faculty members may choose to be reviewed under, if there has been a change in criteria, is limited to the preceding six years.

d. Department heads are not obligated to give associate professors notice that they are eligible for promotion.

e. To the extent they exist, sixth-year post-tenure reviews will be included in the promotion file.

f. The review window for research and scholarship assessment will reach back to incorporate all activity after the tenure review.

Section 30. Department or unit criteria for promotion to professor must be consistent with the
general principles stated in those sections and must require that the candidate have engaged in significant service demonstrating leadership and commitment both within and outside the candidate’s department or unit.

Post-Tenure Reviews

Section 31. The primary function of post-tenure review is faculty development. Post-tenure review is not a process to reevaluate the award of tenure. The failure of a faculty member to make substantial progress toward meeting the goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may be evidence of inadequate performance and may result in modifications to the faculty member’s employment, as outlined below. The post-tenure review process, however, may not be used to shift the university’s burden of proof in a proceeding to terminate a tenured faculty member for cause.

Section 31. Third-Year Review. Tenured bargaining unit faculty members will have an interim review in the third year following promotion and a sixth-year major post-tenure review. The third three-year review is conducted jointly by the bargaining unit faculty member and the appropriate department or unit head. As a result of the review, the department or unit head will prepare a brief statement and share it with the bargaining unit faculty member, who may respond in writing. The statement and any response will be placed in the bargaining unit faculty member’s personnel file.

In general, a faculty member meets expectations in a third-year review if they are on track to meet or exceed expectations in their next sixth-year major review.

Informal development plans may be implemented after a third-year review when the department head believes that such a plan would help ensure that the faculty member will meet expectations at the sixth-year review.

Section 32. Sixth-Year Review. Tenured bargaining unit faculty members will have a review in the sixth year following a promotion or a sixth-year post-tenure review.

In cases where a tenured faculty member has a workload other than the standard tenure-track workload in the unit (e.g., with larger teaching and smaller research FTE) or is working under a Performance Improvement Plan, the standard for meeting expectations in a sixth-year review will be established by these alternate arrangements. Absent a written agreement specifying otherwise, post-tenure reviews will consider the work of the faculty member in light of the balance of activities established in the unit’s tenure-track professional responsibilities policy.

In some departments or units, it may be appropriate to take into consideration the need of newly tenured faculty members to start a new research project. Consequently, the standards for meeting expectations may need to be adjusted for faculty undergoing their first third-year and sixth-year post-tenure reviews.

Additionally, the focus of a faculty member's professional activities may shift over time. As
tenured full professors move through their careers some may redirect their energies. Some may wish, for example, to devote proportionately more time to teaching, advising, administration, and university service than they did as assistant professors. If that is the case and if the desired shift in balance is consistent with the academic program area’s, department’s, unit’s, and college’s needs, a balance of activities not specified in the standard workload of the unit may be established by a written agreement between the bargaining unit faculty member and the department and approved by the appropriate dean, as provided for in Article 17. Consequently, expectations and goals for individual faculty members may be changed to reflect the resulting balance of activities.

Section 33. Criteria for the Sixth-Year Review. The following criteria will be used in post-tenure review:

a. Maintenance of high quality of teaching.
b. Continuing professional growth, scholarly activities, creative and artistic achievement.
c. Exercise of leadership in academic and administrative service.
d. Service and activities on behalf of the larger community.
e. Additional criteria as may be established by the faculty in individual departments or units.

Bargaining unit faculty members will exceed expectations when they meet the standards for tenure and/or promotion as described in a department or unit’s TTF Promotion and Review policy. Bargaining unit faculty members will meet expectations when they demonstrate they have fulfilled the above criteria over the period since their last sixth-year review. Bargaining unit faculty members will not meet expectations when they have not maintained high-quality teaching, continued their scholarly growth, have not exercised leadership in academic and administrative service, nor performed service on behalf of the larger community.

Section 34. Initiating the Sixth-Year Review. To initiate the review process, the department head, or unit head or designee will contact the bargaining unit faculty member during the fall term of the year in which the review will take place and request the following:

a. Clarification of Criteria: The post-tenure review criteria are outlined below in Section xx. Prior to June 2021, units must review the below criteria and determine whether the criteria need to be supplemented based on the individual needs of that unit. Development and amendment of unit level rules should follow the process outlined. The unit criteria in existence before June 15, 2020, the criteria listed in Section 33, or criteria if there has been a faculty-approved change in criteria after June 15, 2020.

b. Curriculum Vitae: A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae that includes the faculty member’s current research, scholarly, and creative activities and accomplishments, including publications, works in progress, appointments, presentations and similar activities. This document should clearly differentiate between accomplishments that occurred during the review period and those that did not.

c. Personal Statement: A 3-6 page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit
faculty member evaluating their performance measured against the applicable criteria for post-tenure review. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research, and creative activity; and service contributions to the academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community. The statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

d. **Sabbatical portfolio dossier**: A report of the accomplishments and benefits resulting from sabbatical, if applicable.

**Section 35. Joint appointments.** Tenured faculty members who hold joint appointments will be reviewed by the primary unit. Input from appropriate reviewers (e.g., faculty, chair, dean) of the secondary unit, including performance reviews, teaching evaluations, service and research evaluations, must be considered by the primary unit as part of the review process.

**Section 35. Department or Unit Head’s Role.** The department or unit head or designee will obtain and place in the evaluation file copies of summary reports drawn, as appropriate, from the system of student evaluation of teaching evaluation that was in effect prior to Fall 2019 and the Student Experience Surveys that were effective in effect as of Fall 2019. The file must also include all peer reviews of the bargaining unit faculty member’s teaching during the review period. Peer teaching reviews should be aligned with the university-wide teaching standards against which all teaching faculty are evaluated after those standards are effective.

Once the department or unit head has obtained all of the appropriate documents and information, they will establish a committee of tenured faculty members and provide the committee with access to the documents and information. The department or unit head or designee will then:

a. Obtain a report from the faculty committee including an assessment of the bargaining unit faculty member’s performance specifying whether they believe the faculty member has exceeded, met, or not met expectations based on the review criteria; and

b. Prepare their own independent evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member’s performance specifying whether they believe the faculty member has exceeded, met, or not met expectations based on the review criteria; and

c. Provide the department or unit head’s report to the bargaining unit faculty member and allow them 40 14 days from the date of the receipt of the report to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file; and

d. Submit the evaluation file to the appropriate dean.

If a department or unit has or develops a policy or practice of providing the report of the faculty committee to the bargaining unit faculty member, the department or unit head shall do so.

**Section 37. Dean’s Role.** The dean will review the file and may consult with appropriate persons and may obtain and document additional relevant information. Once the dean deems the file
complete, they will prepare a separate report and independent recommendation assessment specifying whether they believe the faculty member has exceeded, met, or not met expectations based on the review criteria.

The dean will share his or her written report and recommendation assessment with the bargaining unit faculty member and allow them 14 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive material and information, which shall be included in the evaluation file. The dean will then submit the complete evaluation file to the Office of the Provost or designee.

Section 38. Provost’s Role. The Office of the Provost or designee will consider the cumulative evaluations received from the faculty committee, the department or unit head, and the dean.

If the Provost or designee concludes that the bargaining unit faculty member’s in the highest rank in their category has an overall performance that meets or exceeds expectations, the bargaining unit faculty members will receive an increase in their base salary per Article 26.

If the Office of the Provost or designee concludes that the bargaining unit faculty member’s overall performance is unsatisfactory, does not meet expectations, meaning that the faculty member does not meet expectations overall, the dean and the department or unit head shall consult with the bargaining unit faculty member and recommend to the Provost a development plan for demonstrable improvement in the area(s) at issue. The goal of the plan is to put the faculty member on track to meet expectations in that area or areas at the next third-year review. The development plan should be implemented as soon as practicable after a determination of unsatisfactory performance. If the faculty member fails to meet expectations in the area or areas covered by the development plan at the next third-year post-tenure review, the Provost may reduce the faculty member’s FTE associated with those duties that did not meet expectations at the last review. For example, if a faculty member fails a development plan with respect to research, then their FTE may be reduced to .6 FTE (.4 FTE for teaching and .2 FTE for service). Future reviews will be based solely on the faculty member’s remaining duties.

If the Provost concludes that the bargaining unit faculty member’s overall performance meets expectations but that improvement is still needed in one or more areas, the Provost can direct the faculty member to work with the faculty member’s dean and department head to develop an improvement plan related to that particular area, with the goal of meeting expectations in that area at the next third-year review. Failure to meet expectations after this type of plan may result in an overall rating of “does not meet expectations” at the subsequent review. A Performance Improvement Plan should be developed in accordance with the provisions of Article XX, Performance Improvement Plans.

Section 39. Post-Tenure Review Criteria. Department or unit specific criteria for post tenure review will serve as a basis for assessing: (1) instruction, including teaching, advising, mentoring, and supervision of student clinical and research experiences and creative work; (2) research, scholarship, creative, or artistic achievements; and (3) ongoing, significant service and leadership to the faculty member’s students and department, the University, the community, and the faculty member’s professional discipline more broadly. Unless or until department- or unit-specific post tenure review criteria are established, the following default post tenure review criteria apply:
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criteria shall apply to post-tenure reviews. Unit-level criteria must be consistent with the below.

Absent a written agreement specifying otherwise, post-tenure reviews will consider the work of the faculty member in light of the balance of activities established in the unit’s tenure-track professional responsibilities policy. However, the focus of a faculty member’s professional activities may shift over time. The nationally recognized criteria for obtaining indefinite tenure place approximately equal emphasis on meeting or exceeding expectations in teaching and research, and considerably less emphasis on service.

As tenured full professors move through their careers, however, some may redirect their energies. Some may wish, for example, to devote proportionately more time to teaching, advising, administration, and University service than they did as assistant professors. If that is the case and if the desired shift in balance is consistent with the academic program areas, department’s, unit’s, and college’s needs, a balance of activities not specified in the standard workload of the unit may be established by a written agreement between the faculty member and the department and approved by the appropriate dean, as provided for in Article 17.

Consequently, expectations and goals for individual faculty members may be changed to reflect the resulting balance of activities.

Criteria for post-tenure reviews, unless modified in light of any written agreement with the faculty member, are listed below. Only those criteria relevant to a given discipline will apply in a review in that discipline, and the criteria will be weighted in light of any guidance set forth in the unit’s promotion and tenure guidelines.

In general, a faculty member meets or exceeds expectations in a third-year review if they are on track to meeting or exceeding expectations in their next sixth-year major review and in light of any guidance received during the previous third-year post-tenure review. In cases where a tenured faculty member has a workload other than the standard tenure-track workload in the unit (e.g., with larger teaching and smaller research FTE) or is working under a development plan, the standard for meeting expectations in a third-or sixth-year review will be established by these alternate arrangements.

1. **Teaching:** Teaching standards and criteria shall be as established by the Teaching MOU and related guidance signed by the parties on August 2, 2019, as of the date these are implemented.

2. **Research, scholarship, creative, and artistic achievement:** In general, research, scholarship, and creative achievement is demonstrated in the following categories. Each category applies in a given case only if that category is specified in the unit promotion and tenure policy. The standards of evaluation, unless otherwise specified by the unit policy, will be the standards established for promotion to full professor.

   a. publications and/or creative activities of significance and;
b. externally funded research;
e. patents, intellectual property developed; technologies licensed, companies spun-off;
d. adoptions of research innovations by other researchers, organizations, or the public;
e. research awards and prizes;
f. membership in the national academies or other selective research societies;
g. research in progress and substantially planned work (including grant proposals);
h. translational research or scholarship that influences public policy or contributes to societal benefits;
i. participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings;
j. professional peer review, holding office in academic and professional organizations, serving on committees and/or on editorial boards;
k. association with organizations and groups that will result in professional improvement of the faculty member and bring recognition to the university;
l. research or professional consultation for federal agencies, foundations, or other research sponsors;
m. recognized evidence of scholarly and professional visibility, such as special awards, scholarly citations, and the republication of work;
n. scope and depth of scholarship as revealed in public lectures, book reviews, and in special circumstances, discussions;
e. works of art, such as painting, sculpture, design, planning, musical composition, poetry, fiction, drama, dance, photography, and film disseminated or exhibited in recognized venues of quality and distinction;
p. public performances: musical recitals, concerts, conducting, theater performance and production, dance performance and production, radio or television production disseminated/exhibited in recognized venues of quality and distinction;
q. public recognition: exhibitions, commissions, acceptance of work for permanent collections, awards.

3. Service: Consistent with promotion to full professor as specified in the collective-bargaining agreement, senior faculty are expected to engage in significant service demonstrating leadership and commitment both within and outside the candidate’s department or unit. Service must include some of the following:

r. leadership in academic and administrative roles:
i. academic program area or departmental administration and curriculum;
ii. personnel and policy committees or activities;
iii. college or school administration and committees or activities;
iv. university or state system administration and committees or activities.
s. service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national, and international governmental bodies, NGOs, etc.);
t. academic contributions to community activities, either as an individual or as a representative of the university;
u. service to professional and disciplinary organizations;
v. academic service on behalf of the public interest.