

*This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.*

Proposal: UNV0005  
Date: June 9, 2020

## **ARTICLE 8D: POST-TENURE REVIEW**

Article 8D establishes procedures for post-tenure reviews for faculty.

### **Section 1. Purpose of Faculty Reviews**

Through Post-Tenure Faculty Reviews the University considers whether a faculty member performs to the standards of the University during tenure. Post-tenure reviews occur at regular intervals after the award of tenure. Post-tenure reviews provide an opportunity to: 1) reflect on post-tenure accomplishments and professional growth; 2) receive feedback; 3) identify professional development opportunities; and 4) improve performance, when necessary.

Post-tenure reviews occur every three years for Associate Professors and every five years for Full Professors.

### **Section 2. Standard for post-tenure faculty**

Achievement of the standards associated with each type of review is an academic judgment made by Personnel Review Committees (Divisional and, if appropriate, University), Deans, Provost, and the President.

Standard for Post-Tenure Review: The acceptance of the University's award of tenure commits the faculty member to continued active engagement in teaching, scholarship and service. In any given year, post-tenure faculty may elect to concentrate their energies on one area more than another but is expected to continue to meet the expectations of a tenured faculty member in their overall performance in all three areas.

### **Section 3. Resources for Faculty with Tenure**

The University supports faculty in understanding expectations and procedures, and in planning for and documenting their accomplishments in pursuit of continued post-tenure excellence.

- The Division Chair, or designee, will assist faculty in finding answers to questions they have about expectations and procedures related to review;
- Each year, tenure-track faculty submit an Annual Faculty Report to their Division Chair by June 30. Annual Faculty Reports include, at a minimum, an updated CV, a summary of accomplishments during the past year, a summary of progress towards meeting previously stated goals, and new goals for the coming year.
- ~~The Division Chair will review the Annual Faculty Report and use it to support faculty in meeting teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service requirements.~~

### **Section 4. The Faculty Review File and Evidence Presented for Faculty Review**

*This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.*

48 Tenured faculty are responsible for teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service, and are expected to  
49 provide, in their Faculty Review File, evidence of accomplishment in each area.  
50

#### 51 **A. Contents of Faculty Review File**

52 All Review Files must, at a minimum, include:

- 53 • A current Curriculum Vitae (CV);
- 54 • Annual Faculty Reports since the previous review period;
- 55 • A report from at least one peer observation of classroom or online teaching for the most recent  
56 review period;
- 57 • Data from the mutually agreed upon student course evaluation instrument (SCEI\*), provided by  
58 the University.
- 59 • For Library Faculty review files, peer and supervisor evaluations in core areas of librarianship  
60 should be submitted instead of the peer observation report and SCEI data.

#### 61 62 63 **B. Evidence Presented for Faculty Review**

64  
65 1. Evidence of effective teaching includes:

- 66 • List of classes taught by term during review period;
- 67 • Teaching Philosophy;
- 68 • Presentation of and reflection on sample syllabi from a range of courses over time (including  
69 content, organization and methods of evaluation) to demonstrate evolution of approach;
- 70 • Exams, major assignments and other assessment methods from a range of courses;
- 71 • Original instructional materials;
- 72 • Contributions to course design, development, or improvement;
- 73 • Examples of curriculum redesigns and refinements over time;
- 74 • Reflections on evidence of teaching effectiveness (i.e., impact of teaching on student learning  
75 and achievement);
- 76 • Peer and supervisor evaluation and observation reports;
- 77 • Comparative data from the mutually agreed upon student course evaluation instrument  
78 (SCEI), provided by the University;
- 79 • Professional development and updating skills and knowledge related to instruction;
- 80 • Reflections on mentoring and oversight of student scholarship or service learning;
- 81 • Additional evidence of instructional success.
- 82 • \*Any survey not mutually agreed upon, along with any results/data derived from such  
83 questions and surveys, is not to be used for purposes of official review unless a member  
84 chooses to include it.

85  
86 2. Evidence of effective librarianship includes:

- 87 • Peer and supervisor evaluations in core areas of librarianship;
- 88 • Programmatic documents and contributions to library products and services;
- 89 • Sample instructional materials;
- 90 • Data from student or faculty ratings of performance in core areas of librarianship;
- 91 • Reflections on evidence of impact of librarianship on student learning and academic success;
- 92 • Reflections on evidence of impact of librarianship on faculty scholarship;
- 93 • Evidence of professional development and updating of skills and knowledge;

*This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.*

- 94 • Personal philosophy of librarianship;
- 95 • Examples of innovations and improvements in provision of library services and products
- 96 over time.

### 98 3. Evidence of scholarship

99  
100 In the spirit of Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered (1990), one’s “scholarship” may be manifested  
101 in one or more of the following venues:

- 102 • Scholarship of discovery — investigative research and creative work of faculty in liberal,  
103 visual and performing arts;
- 104 • Scholarship of integration — scholarship connecting within and between disciplines;
- 105 • Scholarship of application — study of real world or societal problems;
- 106 • Scholarship of teaching — instructional and classroom research;
- 107
- 108

109 Regardless of the type of scholarship, all members’ work is carefully assessed, with intellectual  
110 rigor and excellence, the yardstick by which all four types of scholarship are measured.

111  
112 While scholarship can look quite different across members, it cannot be absent as it is the core  
113 of academic life. All members must be knowledgeable of developments in their fields, remaining  
114 professionally active. All members will be held to the highest standards of integrity in every  
115 aspect of their work.

- 116
- 117 a. The *Scholarship of Discovery* refers to the search for new knowledge and answers the  
118 questions: “What is to be known? What is yet to be found?”
- 119

120 Evidence for this type of scholarship may include scholarly and creative activities  
121 that involve clear goals, preparation, appropriate methods, results, and presentation on the  
122 part of the faculty as indicated by: a published book, scholarly monograph, article, book  
123 review, or essay, performed work or practice in the fine arts; a paper presented at a scholarly  
124 meeting at regional, national or international levels; creation of a process, machine,  
125 composition that leads to a patent; creation of a scholarly, artistic or scientific procedure or  
126 method; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified  
127 area; and positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

- 128
- 129 b. The *Scholarship of Integration* refers to serious disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw  
130 together and bring new insight to bear on original research including interdisciplinary  
131 connections.
- 132

133 Evidence for such scholarship may include interpretation of original research; the  
134 authoring or coauthoring of peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case  
135 studies, and integrative reviews of the literature; interdisciplinary grant awards or  
136 presentations; policy papers designed to influence organizations and governments; first  
137 research at the boundaries where field converge; and the illumination of knowledge into a  
138 larger context including the education of non-specialists.

- 139
- 140 c. The *Scholarship of Application* moves the scholar towards engagement answering the

*This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.*

question - How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?

Evidence for such scholarship may include the application of one's academic expertise to problems affecting individuals, institutions, or society; peer-reviewed publications of research, case studies, or technical applications, grant awards in support of practice; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master practitioner; and professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials.

- d. The *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* involves planning, assessing, and modifying one's teaching and applying to it the same exacting standards of evaluation that are used in research.

Evidence for such scholarship may include peer-reviewed publications of research related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes; case studies related to teaching-learning; learning theory development; and development or testing of educational models or theories; accreditation or other comprehensive program reports; successful applications of technology to teaching and learning; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area; published textbooks or other learning aids; grant awards in support of teaching and learning; outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and presentations related to teaching and learning.

#### 4. Evidence of service

Service refers to both institutional service (collegiality, service, and leadership within the department, college, and/or institution) and professional service (engagement and leadership within the community, government, or private organizations as well as professional organizations). All faculty are expected to be involved in institutional service and to demonstrate such accomplishments.

### **Section 5. Preparation and Submission of Faculty Review File**

Reviews are initiated by the faculty member's timely submission of their Faculty Review File as described by this Article. Faculty are responsible for preparing and submitting their Review Files according to University and Division procedures. Review Files must address the standard for post-tenure review (Section 2 above), and provide evidence of performance and accomplishment (Section 5 above).

Members with assignments in more than one academic Division are responsible for Review File submission in all areas of assignment. All records relevant to consideration for promotion and/or tenure, including recommendations, will be sent to the member's primary tenure home DPRC, which will act in accordance with the provisions of this Article. The recommendation of the member's primary division will prevail.

Members are responsible for submitting files to their Division Chair by the 4<sup>th</sup> Friday in February.

Extension of the post-tenure review deadline may be granted by the appropriate college dean upon written request. If an extension is granted, the due date of the Review File from the DPRC to the Dean will be delayed to no later than the second Friday in February.

*This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.*

188 **Section 6. Additional Procedures**  
189

190 Members:

- 191 • Will receive written copies of reviews at every level in a timely fashion;
- 192 • Will meet with their divisional DPRC or its representatives to receive and discuss the review  
193 in a timely fashion;
- 194 • Have the right to provide a rebuttal to any review within 10 days of receipt of the review; the  
195 rebuttal becomes a permanent part of the file;
- 196 • Have the right to grieve violations of procedures related to post-tenure review.  
197

198 **Section 7. Reviews that Indicate Faculty Member Does Not Meet Expectations**  
199

200 If a post-tenure review finds that the faculty member does not meet expectations in any area(s) identified in  
201 Appendix G, including collegiality, the University will provide the member a written report containing  
202 explicit suggestions, guidelines and a timeframe for improvement. The Provost will provide the DPRC with  
203 copies of the deans and provost level letters. Subsequent reviews will assess whether adequate  
204 improvements have been made in the areas identified and the time frame specified.  
205

206 **Section 8. University Responsibilities to the Post-tenure Review Process**  
207

208 **A. Orientation**  
209

210 All divisions are encouraged to provide their faculty with written guidance regarding: (1) the unique,  
211 area-specific expectations or standards for teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service within the  
212 division, and (2) any specific types of documentary evidence of performance reflecting the  
213 requirements of Section 4 above;  
214

215 Early in the fall term, the Provost reviews the purpose and intent of review at each stage, the roles  
216 and responsibilities of the Personnel Review Committees, the timelines and review criteria and  
217 address questions on any of the University's faculty review policies with academic deans, division  
218 chairs, chairs and members of the various Personnel Review Committees, and representatives from  
219 the Union.  
220

221 **B. Convening Personnel Review Committees**  
222

223 1. Division Personnel Review Committee  
224

225 Each academic year, each division will establish a Personnel Review Committee comprised of the  
226 Division Chair and a representative group of at least two additional tenured members. The  
227 Division Chair will serve as a voting and participating member of the DPRC, but will recuse  
228 themselves from discussion or voting on their own applications. Members who are applying for  
229 promotion must abstain from service on the DPRC in the year their own application for  
230 promotion is being reviewed. If the Division cannot seat at least three members of the DPRC, the  
231 Dean will ask the Division faculty to recommend tenured faculty from their Divisions to serve as  
232 an outside member of the DPRC. The Dean will make the final appointment of outside members  
233 to the DPRC.  
234

*This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.*

## C. Review and Transmission of Faculty Review Files and Recommendations

The University conducts post-tenure reviews at these levels:

- Level 1: Division Personnel Review Committee (DPRC)
- Level 2: College Dean

Each review is independent and considers the recommendations at previous level(s). At each level of review, the member receives written notification of the level's recommendation concurrent with the review's transmittal to the next level, if applicable. Applicant faculty members are notified of the final result of the review by the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> week in May of each academic year.

### 1. Level 1 Review: Division Personnel Review Committee

**Review.** The DPRC will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional guidance that may be provided per Section 8A and all prior recommendations at all levels of review. The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching, service and scholarship and collegiality. The DPRC will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's attainment of the standard for post-tenure review. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Review File.

**Conference.** Prior to transmitting the Review File to the Dean, the DPRC or its representatives will provide the member with a written copy of the review, signed by all DPRC members, and meet with the member to discuss it. The Division Chair will prepare a summary of the review conference and present it to the member within ten (10) days of the conference. This summary will be placed in the personnel file in the Provost's office and forwarded to the Dean and the Provost via the member's PRC binder. The member will sign the report to acknowledge receiving it.

**Transmission of the file.** The DPRC will transmit its review and the Review File to the Dean by first Friday in April.

### 2. Level 2 Review: Dean

**Review.** In their independent review, the Dean considers all issues relating to procedures and academic judgment. The Dean will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional guidance that may be provided per Section 8A and all prior recommendations at all levels of review. The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching, service and scholarship and collegiality. The Dean will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's attainment of the standard for post-tenure review. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The dean's letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Faculty Review File.

*This proposal has been prepared for purposes of collective bargaining only and does not represent the final form of the Article. The University reserves the right to amend or withdraw this proposal as bargaining requires.*

282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290

**Conference.** Prior to transmitting the file to the Provost, the Dean will provide the member with a written copy of the review, signed by the Dean and will meet with the member to discuss it prior to the required deadline.

**Transmission.** The Dean will transmit their review and the file to the Provost by 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in May. The Provost files the review in the faculty member's permanent personnel records.