Academic Affairs Working Lunch
TTF Professional Responsibilities
TTF Review and Promotion
March 12, 2015

Materials presented are for general informational purposes only and do not constitute official University rules, policies or practices or interpretations of summaries of such rules, policies or practices. No warranties or representations are made as to the accuracy of any information presented. Any discrepancy between the information presented here and the official rules and policies of the University of Oregon is not intended to and does not alter or amend the official rules and policies.

Table of Contents:

Policy Implementation Timeline for AY ’14 -’15 3

Article 17. Assignment of Professional Responsibilities 5

Provost/AA Guidelines for Assignment of Professional Responsibilities 8

Article 20. Tenure Review and Promotion 12

Summary of CBA Article 20 22

Provost/AA Guidelines for TTF Evaluation and Promotion 26

Post-Tenure Review: Guidelines for Unit Policy Development 28
POLICY IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

The color system utilized below is a guide for threads of tasks (for example, everything that relates to the development of internal governance is in blue).

Color key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal governance policy development</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTTF professional responsibility policy development</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTF review and promotion</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTF professional policy development/TTF promotion and tenure</td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1/9 Deans provide any alterations to NTTF professional responsibility and NTTF review and promotion policies to faculty with explanation

By 1/20 Deans submit NTTF professional responsibility and NTTF review and promotion policies to Academic Affairs

By 3/2 Academic Affairs approves policies and requests edits on a rolling basis

3/12 Academic Affairs hosts an open forum for deans, associate deans, and department and unit heads, to answer questions and discuss the work of TTF professional responsibility and promotion and tenure policies.

By 4/1 Deans provide Academic Affairs with NTTF renewal/non-renewal decisions

By 4/6 Deans and department/unit heads provide input to faculty inclusive of Provost/Academic Affairs/vice president recommendations on TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure policies, copy to Academic Affairs

By 5/1 Notice provided to NTTF on renewal/non-renewal

By 5/25 Faculty submit proposed TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure policies to deans

By 6/8 Deans provide any alterations TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure policies to faculty with explanation

By 6/17 Deans submit TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure policies to Academic Affairs

* Each College can determine its own internal timeline for developing NTTF professional responsibility and NTTF review and promotion policies, which can begin anytime after Provost/Academic Affairs’ guidance is provided in October. Faculty should have at least five
weeks to develop the policies. They must be reviewed by the deans prior to submission to Academic Affairs by January 20.

** Each College can determine its own internal timeline for developing TTF professional responsibility and TTF promotion and tenure, which can begin anytime after Provost/Academic Affairs’ guidance is provided in January. Faculty should have at least five weeks to develop the policies. They must be reviewed by the deans prior to submission to Academic Affairs by June 17.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:**

Policy development for Article 18 (Summer Session) and Article 35 (Professional Development) will occur in fall 2015. There will be guidelines for summer session ’15 provided in the fall of 2014.
17. ASSIGNMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Preamble. The University and the Union recognize that, given the diverse nature of the work performed by bargaining unit faculty members, the varying types of appointments, and the needs of the university, the weighting of assignments and the particulars of individual assignments will vary both between and within units. The University and the Union also recognize that each bargaining unit faculty member has the obligation to devote his or her best efforts to the university, and particularly to students; to perform all duties with professionalism and diligence and in accordance with the standards appropriate in AAU institutions; to act ethically and in compliance with the accepted professional standards; to account for all money or property received; to use money and property only for lawful purposes and in accordance with policy; to treat confidential information as confidential; to cooperate with the university with regard to investigations, audits, and legal proceedings; and to represent the university with professionalism.

Section 1. Assignment of professional responsibilities may consist of some combination of instructional activities (including class preparation, classroom teaching, evaluation of student work, advising and mentoring, and various forms of communication with students); research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service within the department, school, college or institute, and the university, and to external organizations, and communities.

Section 2. The faculty in each department or unit will begin the process of developing a written policy for the assignment of professional responsibilities and stipends or academic support resources, 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 he or she makes to the policy with the faculty before submitting his or her 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 Provost or designee materially alters the faculty-recommended policy, he or she 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.

Section 3. The workload policy shall define a 1.0 FTE workload for all academic instructional classifications and ranks employed by the department or program, and shall address how each of the following items contribute to the overall FTE. For noninstructional classifications or where tenure-related or non-tenure track faculty are not primarily instructional, specific job descriptions should be developed to address the particular workload, of the bargaining unit faculty member. Instructional faculty workloads will, in general, address the following:
(a) Course load
(b) Service expectations
(c) Research, scholarship and creative activity
(d) Professional development related to teaching, research and service
(e) Undergraduate and graduate advising
(f) Student contact and communication

Section 4. Workload policies should also describe a process for accounting for individual faculty needs when assigning workload. Factors to consider include, but are not limited to:
(a) New course preparations
(b) Balance of workload components based on faculty review, promotion and tenure, professional development expectations and agenda for research, scholarship and creative activity
(c) Administrative duties
(d) Timing of activities (e.g., publication and grant deadlines, course load in given terms, and promotion review dates)
(e) Job description

Section 5. An individual’s particular professional responsibilities shall be assigned in accordance with the departmental or unit policy. Assignments shall reflect:
(a) The instruction, research, and service needs of the university and its departments, institutes, centers and other academic units;
(b) The bargaining unit member’s qualifications and expertise and potential to acquire the appropriate expertise;
(c) The bargaining unit member’s evolving professional interests;
(d) Generally accepted practices in the field; and
(e) A realistic balance of duties consistent with the criteria for review.

Section 6. The Provost or designee shall be responsible for the scheduling and assignment of all bargaining unit faculty members’ professional responsibilities. A bargaining unit faculty member shall be afforded the opportunity to meet with his or her dean, director or designee at least annually, before responsibilities are assigned, to discuss the bargaining unit faculty member’s preferences regarding assignments for teaching, research, service and other professional responsibilities as set forth in this Article, and the member’s anticipated resource needs. The Provost or designee may modify scheduled assignments, provided that the department or unit head discusses changes with the faculty member before they are made and that changes are not made for arbitrary or capricious reasons. Faculty members may request to adjust schedules or assignments.

Section 7. Each bargaining unit faculty member must be fully engaged in teaching, research, and service work for the university to the extent of his or her appointment, and must be engaged in work or reasonably available for work for the entirety of the term for which the bargaining unit member is employed unless on approved leave.

Section 8. An overload assignment is (1) an assignment that is in addition to the bargaining unit faculty member’s regular assignment and FTE status; (2) a one time or limited assignment, made or approved by the Provost or designee, that is in addition to or different from regular or usual assignments for the member’s classification and rank; or (3) assignments unrelated to the bargaining unit member’s primary job responsibilities.

Section 9. Overload appointments will be assigned an FTE percentage commensurate
with normal workload duties and compensated accordingly. Faculty may request that overload compensation take the form of class release. No bargaining unit faculty member may be disciplined or terminated for refusing an overload assignment.

Section 10. Appointments for which compensation is paid, in whole or in part, with federal funds may be ineligible for overload compensation.
Provost/AA Guidelines for Assignment of Professional Responsibilities

Article 17 starts with a preamble, summarized here:

- Given the diverse nature of work performed by faculty, varying types of appointments, and needs of the university, the weighting of assignments and particulars of assignments will vary between and within units.

- Each faculty member is obligated to devote his or her best efforts to the university, particularly to students; to perform all duties with professionalism and diligence and in accordance with standards appropriate to AAU institutions.

- Each faculty member is obligated to act ethically and in compliance with the accepted professional standards; to account for all money or property received; to use money and property only for lawful purposes and in accordance with policy.

- Each faculty member is obligated to treat confidential information as confidential; to cooperate with the university with regard to investigations, audits and legal proceedings; and to represent the university with professionalism.

Process

- Faculty in the Tenure-Track and Tenured Professor classification and Career NTTF consider input by appropriate department or unit head, dean, VP, Provost or designee.

- Initial guiding principles from the Provost and Academic Affairs are included in the following pages. Additional principles may be provided before faculty begin developing policy.

- In accordance with the department or unit’s internal governance policy, faculty will then develop a written policy for the assignment of professional responsibilities and stipends or academic support resources.

- Faculty will submit their recommended policy for review to the appropriate dean, vice president, or designee, who will provide a written explanation to the faculty and an opportunity to discuss any alterations he or she makes to the recommended policy before submission to Provost or designee.

- Provost or designee will have final authority to establish policy for each department or unit. If the Provost or designee materially alters the faculty-recommended policy, he or she will provide a written explanation for the change(s) to the faculty in the department or unit.

- Department or unit head, dean, VP, Provost or designee may initiate changes to established policies by informing the appropriate faculty of the change being considered, thereby initiating this process.

Policies

*Article 17 states the following:*

- The workload policy shall define 1.0 FTE workload for all academic instructional classifications and ranks employed by the department or program.

- The workload policy shall address how each of the following items contribute to the overall FTE for instructional faculty:
(a) Course load  
(b) Service expectations  
(c) Research, scholarship and creative activity  
(d) Professional development related to teaching, research and service  
(e) Undergraduate and graduate advising  
(f) Student contact and communication  

- Workload policies should describe a process for accounting for individual faculty needs when assigning workload. Factors to consider include, but are not limited to:  
  (a) New course preparations  
  (b) Balance of workload components based on faculty review, promotion and tenure, professional development expectations, and agenda for research, scholarship and creative activity  
  (c) Administrative duties  
  (d) Timing of activities (e.g. publication and grant deadlines, course load in given terms, and promotion review dates)  
  (e) Job description  

- Assignment of professional responsibilities may consist of some combination of instructional activities (including class preparation, classroom teaching, evaluation of student work, advising and mentoring, and various forms of communication with students); research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service within the department, school, college or institute, and the university, and to external organizations, and communities.  

- For non-instructional classifications or where tenure-related or non-tenure track faculty are not primarily instructional, specific job descriptions should be developed to address the particular workload of the faculty member.  

- An individual’s particular professional responsibilities shall be assigned in accordance with the departmental or unit policy. Assignments shall reflect:  
  (a) The instruction, research and service needs of the university and its departments, institutes, centers and other academic units;  
  (b) The faculty member’s qualifications and expertise and potential to acquire the appropriate expertise;  
  (c) The faculty member’s evolving professional interests;  
  (d) Generally accepted practices in the field;  
  (e) A realistic balance of duties consistent with the criteria for review.  

- The Provost or designee shall be responsible for the scheduling and assignment of all faculty members’ professional responsibilities. A faculty member shall be afforded the opportunity to meet with his or her dean, director or designee at least annually, before responsibilities are assigned, to discuss the faculty member’s preferences regarding assignments for teaching, research, service and other professional responsibilities, and the faculty’s anticipated resource needs.  

- The Provost or designee may modify scheduled assignments, provided that the department or unit head discusses changes with the faculty member before they are made and that changes are not made for arbitrary or capricious reasons.
• Faculty members may request to adjust schedules or assignments.

• Each bargaining unit faculty member must be fully engaged in teaching, research, and service work for the university to the extent of his or her appointment, and must be engaged in work or reasonably available for work for the entirety of the term for which the bargaining unit member is employed unless on approved leave.

• An overload assignment is (1) an assignment that is in addition to the bargaining unit member’s regular assignment and FTE status; (2) a one time or limited assignment, made or approved by the Provost or designee, that is in addition to or different from regular or usual assignments for the member’s classification and rank; or (3) assignments unrelated to the bargaining unit member’s primary job responsibilities.

• Overload appointments will be assigned an FTE percentage commensurate with normal workload duties and compensated accordingly. Faculty may request that overload compensation take the form of class release. No bargaining unit faculty member may be disciplined or terminated for refusing an overload assignment.

• Appointments for which compensation is paid, in whole or in part, with federal funds may be ineligible for overload compensation

**Provost and Academic Affairs Guiding Principles**

• Overall teaching loads must meet the full curricular and enrollment needs of the department or unit, school or college, and university.

• There must be a shared understanding among administrators and faculty of the components of workload and, ideally, agreement on a common workload measure that allows comparison of workloads across organizational units and different kinds of work.

• Each faculty member’s assignment should be clear as to the proportion of FTE expected to be allocated to teaching, scholarship, creative activities, research, administrative duties and service.

• The expectations in each category should be specific and clear. That is, not just the percentage expected for each category, but also the way in which “types” within categories count. For example, it should be clear how different kinds of service contributions are viewed. This will entail describing service to the university, department, students, discipline, and community, and the varying levels of commitment of each. The same is true for other categories as well. For example, there may be particular productivity expectations within a particular field, productivity at different career stages, and marketplace considerations.

• Student advising and supervision need to be carefully detailed. Do some categories fall into “service,” while others fall into “teaching?”

• There must be clear criteria about how “courses” count toward FTE. For example, are large courses treated the same as small? Is graduate level the same as undergraduate? Upper division the same as
lower division? Does it matter if a faculty member has multiple new preps? How should classes with special features like studio, field or lab components be counted? How does the supervision of internships fit in? How will re-assignment occur if a course is cancelled due to low enrollment?

- There must be clear criteria guiding decisions on course release, overload, and stipends. Among other considerations, these criteria should address typical service/administrative duties, and those that are extraordinary.

- There must be clear criteria and guidelines concerning the “banking” of course releases.

- There must be clear guidelines on grant buy-outs for courses.
ARTICLE 20. TENURE REVIEW AND PROMOTION

Section 1. This Article applies only to bargaining unit faculty members in the Tenure-Track and Tenured Professor 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 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 .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.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Section 3. The University follows the 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 he or she makes to the policy with the faculty before submitting his or her 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, he or she 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.

Section 4. 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 in courses taught and in contributions to ensuring academic success for undergraduate and graduate students, as applicable;

(c) On-going, 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 website and in the department or unit.

Reviews

Section 5. Reviews for bargaining unit faculty members in the Tenure-Track and Tenured Professor 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) three-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 6. 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.

Mid-Term Reviews

Section 7. 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 8. 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:

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

- **Scholarship portfolio:** A comprehensive portfolio of scholarship, research and creative activity; 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 his or her 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:** Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations for courses taught by the bargaining unit faculty member, examples of student work and exams, and similar material.
• **Service portfolio:** Evidence of the bargaining unit faculty member’s service contributions to his or her 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 may also include a short narrative elaborating on the faculty member’s unique service experiences or obligations.

**Section 9. 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. The file must also include a recent peer evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member’s teaching. Once the department or unit head has obtained all of the appropriate documents and information, he or she 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;

(b) Prepare his or her own evaluation of the bargaining unit member’s progress toward tenure and promotion;

(c) Provide both the faculty committee’s report and the department or unit head’s own report to the bargaining unit faculty member and allow the faculty member 10 days from the date of the receipt of the reports to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file; and

(d) Submit the evaluation file to the appropriate dean.

**Section 10. 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, he or she will prepare a separate report and recommendation. The dean will share his or her report and recommendation with the bargaining unit faculty member and allow the faculty member 10 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 the complete evaluation file to the Provost or designee.

**Section 11. Provost’s Role.** The Provost or designee will consider the cumulative recommendations 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.

**Tenure Review Process**

**Section 12. 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:

- **Curriculum vitae:** A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae that includes the faculty member’s current research, scholarly and creative activities and accomplishments, including publications, appointments, presentations, and similar activities and accomplishments.
• **Scholarship portfolio:** A comprehensive portfolio of scholarship, research and creative activity; 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 his or her 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:** Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations for courses taught by the bargaining unit faculty member, examples of student work and exams, and similar material.

• **Service portfolio:** Evidence of the bargaining unit faculty member’s service contributions to his or her 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 may also include a short narrative elaborating on the faculty member’s unique service experiences or obligations.

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

**Section 13. Schedule for Review of Tenure and Promotion Files.** 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 15th. If the faculty member misses the new deadline, tenure will be denied.

**Section 14. 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, 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. Most, if not all, of the external reviewers should be at the rank 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. 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 provide them with the candidate’s signed and dated curriculum vitae, signed and dated personal statement, the candidate’s scholarship portfolio and the department’s or unit’s adopted criteria for promotion and tenure.
Section 15. 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 committee), will review the file and the external reviews, prepare a report, and vote. In cases where there are too few eligible faculty members to form a review 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.

Section 16. 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. 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, 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. The candidate will be provided with a redacted copy of the dean’s report upon request. The candidate may provide responsive material for the file within 10 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.

Section 17. Provost’s Review of File. 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 Provost or designee should include the following:

- Promotion and tenure checklist
- Voting summary
- 36
- 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 of review
• Documentation of declinations to review (typically copies of email notifications)
• Any internal letters of evaluation

• 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 (see Article 8, Personnel Files)

• Statement of duties and responsibilities

• 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, enrollment, and instructor and department mean scores for required questions
  • 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
  • Peer evaluations of teaching

• Evidence of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion (optional)

• Additional materials deemed necessary or advisable by the dean or Provost or designee

• A supplementary binder, which typically includes:
  • Full curriculum vitae of each external reviewer, if provided
  • Evidence of professional activities, including publications, as provided in the Scholarship Portfolio
  • Signed written student evaluations of teaching
A teaching portfolio, 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, commonly including evidence of the candidate’s service contributions to his or her 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 may also include a short narrative elaborating on the faculty member’s unique service experiences or obligations.

Section 18. University Faculty Personnel Committee Review. After 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 Provost or designee 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.

Section 19. 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. A tenured appointment may not be less than .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 Provost or designee and the candidate adjusting the FTE of the appointment, so long as the appointment is at least .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 20. 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.

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 that bargaining unit faculty members with tenure who are denied promotion from associate professor to professor will remain employed at the associate professor rank. The criteria for promotion from associate professor to professor will be developed as described in Sections 3-5 of this Article. 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.

General Provisions Related to the Tenure Review Process
Section 22. Accelerated Review. An accelerated tenure review may occur in particularly meritorious cases as determined by the Provost or designee in consultation with the appropriate dean, department or unit head, and affected bargaining unit faculty member.

Section 23. 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. 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 member elects the earliest date for tenure review. Should a bargaining unit 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 24. Multiple or Joint Appointments. For bargaining unit 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 is not valid unless approved in writing by the bargaining unit faculty member and the Provost or designee.

Section 25. 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 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 26. Waiver of Access to Materials. Bargaining unit 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 the reviewer. If redactions are insufficient to do so, the University may prepare a suitable summary.

Section 27. Stopping of the “Tenure Review Clock:” The “tenure 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 opt 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; or (3) in other extraordinary circumstances as approved by the Provost or designee.
Section 28. 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 Provost during the preceding academic year no later than the following September 1 and in accordance with applicable confidentiality requirements.

Post-Tenure Reviews

Section 29. The primary function of post-tenure review is faculty development. Posttenure 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. 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 30. 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 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.

Section 31. 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.

Section 32. Initiating the Sixth-Year Review. To initiate the review process, the department head, 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:

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

- **Personal statement:** A 3-6 page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit faculty member evaluating his or her 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.

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

Section 33. Joint or multiple appointments. Tenured faculty members who hold joint or multiple appointments will be reviewed according to the criteria, and by the tenured faculty of equal or higher rank, of 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 34. 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 from the student evaluation process. The file must also include a recent peer evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member’s teaching. Once the department or unit head has obtained all of the appropriate documents and information, he or she 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;

(b) Prepare his or her own evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member’s performance;

(c) Provide both the faculty committee’s report and the department or unit head’s own report to the bargaining unit faculty member and allow him or her 10 days from the date of the receipt of the reports to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file; and

(d) Submit the evaluation file to the appropriate dean.

Section 35. 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, he or she will prepare a separate report and recommendation. The dean will share his or her report and recommendation with the bargaining unit faculty member and allow him or her 10 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 Provost or designee.

Section 36. Provost’s Role. 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 overall performance is unsatisfactory, 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 restoring the bargaining unit faculty member’s performance to a satisfactory level.
SUMMARY OF CBA, ARTICLE 20
TENURE REVIEW AND PROMOTION

This summary is provided as a guide to Article 20, which is quite lengthy. Most of the article describes eligibility and review processes mandated by the CBA. The policy development work to be done by the departments/units relates only to criteria, found in sections 4 and 21, which are marked with an asterisk.

Eligibility (Sections 1 and 2)

Tenure is in the University (not in college, school, department); must be expressly granted by Provost in writing. Except as authorized by Provost or designee, faculty member entitled to a decision on tenure only after six consecutive years of employment at 1.0 FTE or the equivalent or consecutive part-time employment at or above .5 FTE per year. Appointment is consecutive even if interrupted by approved leaves of absence, but leaves of absence do not count toward consideration for tenure unless faculty member elects otherwise.

* Criteria (Section 4)

Each department/unit’s criteria are intended to be consistent with those of other major research universities and shall include expectations, including proportional weights, for each of the following, as defined by each department or unit (emphasis added):

(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 in courses taught and in contributions to ensuring academic success for undergraduate and graduate students, as applicable;
(c) On-going, 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 made available in the department or unit (as well as on Academic Affairs website)

Annual Reviews (sections 5 and 6)

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of receiving tenure will have an annual review conducted by department or unit head or designee. Goals to evaluate performance, opportunity to address problems and support faculty in progress toward mid-term and tenure reviews.

Mid-Term Reviews (sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)

*Timing:* approximately half way between appointment and eligibility for tenure; generally established at time of appointment

*Initiating:* department or unit head or designee contacts faculty member during the fall term of the year in which the review will take place and request the following (see CBA for more details): curriculum vitae, scholarship portfolio, personal statement, teaching portfolio, and service portfolio.

*Department/unit head’s role:* to obtain and place in the evaluation file copies of summary reports from the student evaluation process and a recent peer teaching evaluation; to establish a committee of tenured faculty and provide committee with access to information; obtain a report from the committee including an assessment of the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion; provide committee report and
his or her own report to the faculty member and allow ten days for response, include response in evaluation file and submit to dean.

Dean’s role: to review file, may consult with appropriate persons and may obtain and document additional relevant information; prepare a separate report and recommendation; share with faculty member and allow ten days for response, include response in evaluation file and submit to Provost or designee.

Provost’s role: consider cumulative recommendations and decide terms and duration of any subsequent appointment.

Tenure Review Process (sections 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18)

Initiating: department or unit head contacts faculty member no later than winter term of the year preceding the year in which a tenure decision is required and request the following (see CBA for more details): curriculum vitae, scholarship portfolio, personal statement, teaching portfolio, service portfolio, and external reviewers.

Schedule: Provost or designee establishes schedule; if faculty member fails to comply, will be notified by department or unit head and given 14 days to respond. If no response, tenure can be denied; if materials submitted within the 14 days, new timeline established. If deadline missed again, tenure will be denied.

External reviews: department/unit head prepares list with input from faculty eligible to vote on promotion/tenure; most, if not all, reviewers at the rank for which the candidate is being considered, or higher and from comparable institutions or programs. Suggestions re: rank and institutions apply to majority of reviewers, to allow for flexibility. Minimum of five substantive external evaluations required for case to move forward. Department/unit head recruits from the list and provides them with signed and dated personal statement, scholarship portfolio, and the department/unit’s adopted criteria for promotion and tenure.

Faculty review: Eligible faculty or subset (if specified in department/unit’s internal governance policy), will review file, with external reviews, prepare report and vote. If there are too few eligible faculty within department/unit to form committee, department/unit head will work with dean to establish committee with faculty from outside department. Final vote conducted by signed ballot, with ballots remaining confidential as permitted by law.

Review by department/unit head, college or school personnel committee and dean: department/unit head prepares independent report and recommendation, forwards entire file to dean. File reviewed by school or college personnel committee, appointed by process determined by dean (or bypassed if dean chooses not to create committee). If there is a committee, it prepares an independent report and vote and forwards to dean. Dean then prepares independent report and recommendation and meets with candidate and discusses case and all recommendations. Candidate receives redacted copy of dean’s report upon request. Candidate can provide responsive material within 10 days of meeting with dean, or receipt of redacted report, whichever is later. Dean forwards entire file to Academic Affairs.

Provost’s review of the file: Provost or designee reviews file for completeness and presentation, and may request additional information from the dean. The file forwarded to 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/unit head’s evaluation and recommendation, department committee recommendation, letters of evaluation section (see CBA for details), curriculum vitae (see CBA for details), personal statement, statement of waiver, partial waiver, or non-waiver (see Article 8), statement of duties and responsibilities, conditions of appointment, teaching evaluations (see CBA for details), evidence of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion (CBA states this is optional in this section, but in the
section describing personal statements, indicates personal statements should include this information),
additional materials deemed necessary or advisable by dean or provost or designee, and a supplementary
binder (see CBA for details; included are a teaching portfolio and a service portfolio).

University faculty personnel committee review: once file is deemed complete, University personnel
committee review, requests additional information if necessary, discusses and records vote by the name of
each person voting. Committee prepares written summary, including vote.

Provost’s decision and withdrawal (sections 19, 20)

Provost’s decision: Provost has plenary authority to award or deny tenure. Candidate notified in writing; if
denial, letter will provide an explanation. Tenured appointment must be at least .5 FTE and letter granting
tenure will state the FTE. There can be subsequent written agreement modifying FTE, though not below .5
FTE. Successful candidates assume new classification and rank at start of next academic year, or sooner at
discretion of the Provost. Candidates who are denied tenure receive one more year of appointment.

Withdrawal of application: Faculty member may withdraw application for tenure in writing to the Provost
and dean, anytime before provost’s decision; receives one more year appointment.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor (section 21)

* Criteria for promotion from associate professor to professor will be developed by department/units
(emphasis added). Criteria for promotion to professor must be consistent with the general principles
developed as in section 4 (above) and must require that the candidate has engaged in significant service
demonstrating leadership and commitment both within and outside the candidate’s department/unit.
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 faculty member with tenure who is
denied promotion to professor will remain employed at associate professor rank.

General provisions related to the tenure review process (sections 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27)

Accelerated review: in particularly meritorious cases as determined by the Provost or designee in
consultation with the dean, department/unit head, and faculty member.

Credit for prior service: when credit for prior service is agreed upon, terms of hire will state the number of
years of credit granted, earliest date for consideration and required date for consideration. If earliest date
chosen, work performed by faculty member during period of prior service receives full consideration. If
faculty member elects to delay review for full six years, prior work will be of secondary consideration.
Should the faculty member choose to use some, but not all credit for prior service, the focus of review will
be adjusted appropriately (see CBA).

Multiple or joint appointments: memorandum to be signed by faculty member and Provost or designee at
time of hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion and tenure review and identifying how
the process will be handled among units.

Notice of meetings: faculty member to receive at least 3 days’ notice of any meeting or hearing which the
member is invited or required to attend with a dean or provost or designee regarding recommendations or
decisions on promotion and tenure.

Waiver of access to materials: faculty member right to waive in advance in writing access to see any or all
of the evaluative materials (see Article 8). Choice concerning waiver not considered during the evaluation
process. Waiver does not preclude using redacted versions in denial review process. Redactions intended to
protect identity of reviewer; if redaction is insufficient to do so, University may prepare suitable summary.
**Stopping of the ‘tenure review clock’**: clock may be stopped at the start of a leave of absence, at the faculty member’s discretion. Faculty member may later opt to restore the period when the clock was stopped and apply for tenure at the time s/he would have become eligible without stopping the clock. Clock may be stopped: (1) for 1 year upon birth or adoption of a child; (2) for up to 2 years for approved leaves of absence without pay; or (3) in other extraordinary circumstances as approved by the Provost or designee.

**Post –Tenure Reviews (29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36)**

**Purpose**: primary function of post-tenure review is faculty development, not reevaluation of the award of tenure.

**Third-year review**: faculty member will have review in 3rd year following promotion; conducted jointly by faculty member and department/unit head. As a result of review, department/unit head prepares brief statement and share with faculty member, who may respond in writing. Statement and any response placed in personnel file.

**Sixth-year review**: tenured faculty members will have a review every six years following tenure and/or promotion.

**Initiating sixth-year review**: department/unit head or designee contacts faculty member during the fall term of the year in which the review will take place and request the following (see CBA for details): curriculum vitae, personal statement, and sabbatical portfolio.

**Joint or multiple appointments**: faculty with joint or multiple appointments reviewed according to the criteria, and by the tenured faculty of equal or higher rank, of the primary unit. Input from appropriate reviewers (e.g. faculty, chair, dean) of secondary unit must be considered.

**Department or unit head’s role**: department/unit head or designee to obtain and place in evaluation file summary reports from student evaluation process and a recent peer teaching evaluation; establishes a committee of tenured faculty members and provides them with access to information. Department/unit head obtains report from the committee, including assessment of faculty member’s performance; prepare his or her own evaluation; provide committee and own report to the faculty member and allow him or her 10 days from receipt of reports to provide responsive materials, which is then included in evaluation file; and submit file to appropriate dean.

**Dean’s role**: dean will review file and may consult with appropriate persons and obtain and document additional relevant information; then prepares own separate report and recommendation; share with faculty member and allow him or her 10 days from receipt of report to provide responsive materials, which is then included in evaluation file; and submit to the Provost or designee.

**Provost’s role**: the Provost or designee will consider cumulative evaluations; if conclusion is that the faculty member’s overall performance is unsatisfactory, the dean and department/unit head shall consult with faculty member and recommend to the Provost a development plan for restoring performance to a satisfactory level.
Virtually every academic unit has an approved document on file. These documents, however, predate the development and ratification of the CBA. Please ensure that your policy is consistent with the requirements of the CBA, and please note the following specific issues.

Tenure and Promotion Review

1. Processes
   a) Your policy may simply refer to the CBA for descriptions of the tenure and promotion review processes, allowing you to focus on evaluation criteria.

2. Revision of criteria
   a) We will be providing further guidance about a candidate’s choice of evaluation criteria in cases where criteria has been revised during a faculty member’s review period.

3. Proportional weights for scholarship, teaching, and service
   a) The CBA requires the unit to establish its expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service, including the proportional weights for each.
   b) The expectations will need to be in accord with the unit’s Professional Responsibilities policy. There is no expectation that each unit will establish the same proportional expectations.
   c) Recognize that there is an expectation of a significant proportional focus on research/creative activity.
   d) Some flexibility to accommodate individual circumstances is both acceptable and advisable.

4. Publication status
   a) A book, chapter, or article does not count as evidence of completed scholarship unless it is in final, accepted form, with no further substantive changes by the author expected or allowed. A manuscript that has not reached this stage by the time of the Provost’s decision will not be counted as evidence of completed scholarship, but will be viewed as evidence of research in progress.
   b) A book is considered complete when it is under final, signed contract with a publisher and accepted in final form, with no further authorial input expected or allowed beyond indexing or correction of galley proofs.

5. Research/creative activity guidelines
   a) The issue of quality vs. quantity should be addressed with some specificity.

Regarding the issue of funded research/creative activity, ensure that the statement is sufficiently clear regarding expectations and the impact a lack of support might have on a tenure recommendation.

Your policy should also cover pre-tenure and post-tenure annual reviews. Please refer to the CBA and also consider the following comments as you prepare your policy.

Annual Reviews and Midterm Review (Contract Renewal)

Clearly establish what materials the candidate is expected to provide for evaluation as well as how and when the evaluation will be carried out.
Post-Tenure Reviews

As the CBA lacks detail, particularly regarding the third-year post-tenure review, Academic Affairs has provided a comprehensive guide to post-tenure review. Please refer to that document, reproduced on the following pages, for information as you prepare your policy.
Post-Tenure Review

Guidelines for Unit Policy Development

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

December 19, 2014
prepared by Kenneth M. Dozier
Office of Academic Affairs
Throughout this document, reference is made to the unit, the unit committee, and the unit head, in an attempt to provide guidance equally relevant to those schools and colleges that work with a departmental structure and those that do not.

Post-Tenure Review

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) establishes expectations for periodic reviews of all tenured members of the bargaining unit. In short, a review is expected every three years following the awarding of tenure, in an alternating cycle of an interim (third-year) review and a major (sixth-year) review. This document provides further information about the conduct of these periodic post-tenure reviews, which are to continue throughout a faculty member’s tenure at the University of Oregon. Please note that these periodic reviews are required for all tenured faculty, regardless of their status with respect to the bargaining unit, and thus the guidance provided in this document is equally relevant to faculty within or excluded from the bargaining unit.

Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

The third-year post-tenure review is only briefly discussed in the CBA.

Article 20, Section 30. 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 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.

Unlike tenure and/or promotion reviews or the sixth-year post-tenure review, the third-year post-tenure review does not carry with it a mandatory increase in base salary (for those meeting or exceeding expectations) or a development plan (for those failing to meet expectations). However, the third-year post-tenure review occurs at a critical mid-way point en route to reviews for which such outcomes are mandated, and thus it must not be carried out in a “pro forma” fashion, but rather with thoughtfulness, consistency, and the full engagement of the unit.

This document provides additional information about the intentions of the post-tenure review and the process by which post-tenure review (hereafter PTR) is conducted.

General Comments Regarding Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

The primary intention of a third-year PTR is to provide an honest and open appraisal of the faculty member’s progress and development of his or her scholarship, teaching, and service. While many of our faculty seek and receive input from their colleagues on a regular, even day-to-day basis, the third-year PTR represents an important formal development opportunity for colleagues to whom we have offered and awarded tenure.

If a faculty member is not meeting or exceeding expectations, the third-year PTR provides a formal opportunity to provide guidance to that faculty member that, if heeded, should enhance the likelihood of being found to meet or exceed expectations when next reviewed – in a major, sixth-year PTR. In this context, please be aware of the language of Section 29 within Article 20 of the CBA, which concludes with
reference to termination for cause, a topic covered by Article 24 of the CBA. The third-year PTR is not intended to be a disciplinary proceeding in whole or in part, nor is it to justify or rationalize a change to a faculty member's regular duties (reassignment of courses or service commitments, increase in course load) without consultation and agreement with the faculty member.

**Article 20, Section 29.** 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. 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.

The third-year PTR is not intended to replace evaluations for merit increases in base salary. The process is distinct, the time frames for evaluation will not in general be coincident, and the intention is different.

Guidelines and expectations for PTR will need to be included in unit promotion and/or tenure criteria documents (which will undergo revision, review, and approval over the coming year); potential outcomes within a development plan, as called for in the event of an unsatisfactory PTR, will need to be in accord with Professional Responsibilities policies (also to be developed over the coming Winter and Spring terms). As these documents are developed, please consider the following specific guidelines.

**Specific Guidelines Regarding Third-Year Post-Tenure Review**

- Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the unit head.
- The third-year PTR should be commenced by the unit head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate’s third-year post-tenure.
- The unit head should contact the faculty member and request the following.
  - A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae.
  - A 3-6 page personal statement by the faculty member discussing his or her professional activities over the period since the last tenure, promotion, or post-tenure evaluation. The personal statement should explicitly address scholarship activity, teaching, and service contributions and accomplishments and should also include a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

  With respect to the latter, note that the University broadly interprets institutional equity and inclusion.

  - Contributions may address a wide range of equity and inclusion issues.
  - These contributions may be made through scholarship, teaching, and/or service.
  - Activities are relevant whether carried out at the UO or externally – *e.g.*, within academic or professional associations, non-profit, governmental, and/or private sector organizations.
  - Impacts may be at the individual level (work with individual students, faculty, community members, or organizations), programmatic level (establishment or
provision of leadership to a formalized program), or institutional level (strengthening of institutional policy or practice toward equity and inclusion).

- The unit head should add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member’s teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period.
  - Note that the unit head is responsible for ensuring that appropriate peer review of teaching is conducted.
  - Peer review of at least one course every other year is expected for tenured associate professors.
  - As peer reviews are intended to inform the faculty member’s teaching efforts, they should be shared with the faculty member, who may respond in writing if he or she wishes.

- Consistent with unit policy and practice, the file may be reviewed either directly by the unit head, who will then prepare a brief report, or first by a unit committee, which will provide a written report to the unit head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the unit head.

- The dean is not involved in third-year PTR beyond approval of the unit’s policy regarding PTR.

- For associate professors, the report should specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor.
  - Accomplishments and any concerns in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service should be addressed.
  - While the promotion to full professor is not a required review, it is the natural next stepping stone, with a “normal” timeline of six years. Ideally, then, associate professors would not undergo sixth-year PTR, but rather review in the sixth year for promotion to full professor. For this reason, the CBA does not call for a salary adjustment following a sixth-year PTR for an associate professor, regardless of the success of that review. Thus, the third-year PTR for associate professors represents a critical review, in that it provides guidance as to career trajectory that will best position an associate professor for successful consideration for full professor in as timely a manner as possible.

  - Redirection of one’s scholarship focus, movement into administrative or other service positions, etc. can naturally delay the promotion to full professor, and it is not uncommon for faculty to remain at the rank of associate professor for longer than six years. The PTR process represents a particularly valuable opportunity to engage associate professors who may be giving up on promotion to full professor. Through the process, we can provide collegial guidance toward a path leading to successful review for promotion.

  - If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member’s success in addressing concerns should be discussed.

- For full professors, while additional promotions are not possible, successful sixth-year PTR offers the possibility of a substantial salary increase. Thus, the third-year PTR for full professors represents an important opportunity to provide interim guidance regarding
accomplishments and concerns in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service that will best position a full professor for such an increase.

- As for associate professors, if the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see below), the faculty member’s success in addressing concerns should be discussed.

- The report should be signed and dated by the unit head and shared with the faculty member, who should also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if he/she desires within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the unit head.

- The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, should be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The CBA provides considerable detail regarding the sixth-term PTR process in Article 20, Sections 29 and 31 through 36. Unit policies should call for specific procedures consistent with these sections.

**Section 29.** 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. 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.** 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.

**Section 32.** Initiating the Sixth-Year Review. To initiate the review process, the department head, 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:

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

- **Personal statement:** A 3-6 page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit faculty member evaluating his or her 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.

Please note that this language of the CBA regarding the personal statement might best be interpreted in the same manner as recommended earlier for the third-year PTR, for which we suggest a 3-6 page personal statement by the faculty member discussing his or her professional
activities over the period since the last tenure, promotion, or post-tenure evaluation.

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

**Section 33. Joint or multiple appointments.** Tenured faculty members who hold joint or multiple appointments will be reviewed according to the criteria, and by the tenured faculty of equal or higher rank, of 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 34. 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 from the student evaluation process. The file must also include a recent peer evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member’s teaching. Once the department or unit head has obtained all of the appropriate documents and information, he or she 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;

(b) Prepare his or her own evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member’s performance;

(c) Provide both the faculty committee’s report and the department or unit head’s own report to the bargaining unit faculty member and allow him or her 10 days from the date of the receipt of the reports to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file; and

(d) Submit the evaluation file to the appropriate dean.

**Section 35. 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, he or she will prepare a separate report and recommendation. The dean will share his or her report and recommendation with the bargaining unit faculty member and allow him or her 10 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 Provost or designee.

The dean should submit only the reports and recommendations, providing the supporting documentation (CV, statement, sabbatical portfolio, and teaching evaluations) only upon request from the Provost or designee.

**Section 36. Provost’s Role.** 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 overall performance is unsatisfactory, 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 restoring the bargaining unit faculty member’s performance to a satisfactory level.
General Comments and Specific Guidelines Regarding Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The general comments and specific guidelines provided above regarding the third-year PTR are largely relevant to the sixth-year PTR as well. Primary differences include the following.

- The candidate is required to provide a report of the accomplishments and benefits resulting from sabbatical leave, if such leave was taken during the preceding six-year period.
- The sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member’s scholarship, teaching, and service, and individual unit policies may call for the inclusion of additional material in the evaluation file. For example, current standard practice in the College of Arts and Sciences is for the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions. Unit policies must specifically address the matter of what is to be included in the file.
- Successful sixth-year PTR of a full professor carries an expectation of an increase in base salary if it is the first sixth-term PTR for that full professor since implementation of the CBA (July 1, 2013). As noted earlier, however the CBA does not call for a salary adjustment following a sixth-year PTR for an associate professor, regardless of the success of that review.
  - A full professor placed in the academic unit’s highest category of performance for scholarship, teaching, and service is expected to receive an increase of at least 8% of base salary. Depending on the academic unit, the highest category of performance may be defined as “exceeding expectations,” “fully satisfactory,” or some related term.
  - A full professor placed in the academic unit’s next highest category of performance for scholarship, teaching, and service is expected to receive an increase of at least 4% of base salary. Depending on the academic unit, this category of performance may be defined as “meeting expectations,” “satisfactory,” or some related term.
  - A full professor placed in an unsatisfactory category of performance for scholarship, teaching, or service is not guaranteed an increase in base salary. Depending on the academic unit, this category of performance may be defined as “failing to meet expectations,” “unsatisfactory,” or some related term.
  - For a full professor receiving a range of performance evaluations for scholarship, teaching, and service (e.g., exceeding expectations for scholarship, meeting expectations for teaching, failing to meet expectations for service), the academic judgment of the unit head and/or dean will determine the magnitude of any increase in base salary.
- As noted in Section 36, a development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan should be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion, and could include restructured appointments (e.g., modification of teaching assignments) if appropriate. Ideally, there will be consensus among the faculty member, the unit head, and the dean regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean’s approval will apply.
• The reports and, if applicable, the professional development plan should be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file as maintained at the unit level and also submitted to Human Resources for inclusion in the permanent personnel file.

• If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member must include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process. As established by Section 29, failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the goals of a development plan may be evidence of inadequate performance.