1	UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDIATION PROPOSAL (1/24/2025)		
2	UNITED ACADEMICS COUNTERPROPOSAL (12/5/2024)		
3	UNIVERSITY OF OREGON COUNTERPROPOSAL (11/21/2024)		
4	UNITED ACADEMICS COUNTERPROPOSAL (11/13/2024)		
5	UNIVERSITY OF OREGON COUNTERPROPOSAL (10/17/2024)		
6	UNITED ACADEMICS COUNTERPROPOSAL (9/26/2024)		
7	UNIVERSITY OF OREGON COUNTERPROPOSAL (8/13/2024)		
8	UNITED ACADEMICS COUNTERPROPOSAL (7/15/24)		
9	UNIVERSITY OF OREGON PROPOSAL (4/18/2024)		
LO			
l1	Document Key		
L2	UA new UA deletion UO new UO deletion Accepted Deleted Status Quo Restored		
L3			
L4	[Package. This is a package proposal with Article 15, 19, 20, and 34.]		
L5			
L6	[UO Trade: 10 vs. 14 days for a faculty member to provide a review response. UO can agree to		
L7	go from 10 days to 14 days in Section 15, 16, 24, 31, 35, & 36 in exchange for moving the		
L8	decision due date to June 15 from June 1 in Section 17 & 21. Current proposal reflects 10 days		
L9	and maintains June 1.]		
20			
21	United Academics modification of trade: We agree to an extension to 14 days in Section 15		
22	16, 24, 31, 35 & 36 and moving the decision due date to June 5 in Section 17 & 21.)		
23			
24			
25	ARTICLE 20. TENURE REVIEW AND PROMOTION		
26			
27	Section 1. This Article applies only to bargaining unit faculty members in the Tenure-Track and		
28	Tenured classification. Tenure is in the University, and not in a college, school, department,		
29	program, or discipline. The award of tenure requires an express grant by the Provost		
30	communicated in writing to the bargaining unit faculty member and signed by the Provost. There		
31	is no de facto tenure. Tenure means that the bargaining unit faculty member's employment may		
32	be terminated only for cause (Article 24), or in case of program eliminations or reductions		
33	(Article 25).		
34 35	Section 2. Standards and Guidelines. The University follows the same general timetable,		
	process, and standards of performance for evaluation and promotion as do many other public		
36 37	research universities, particularly AAU institutions. The University also considers AAUP		
38	guidelines for tenure review and promotion. All department or unit review guidelines shall be		
39	established and revised by the processes set out in Article 4.		
10	established and revised by the processes set out in Article 4.		
+0 11			
12	Reviews		
13			
14	Section 3. Reviews for bargaining unit faculty members in the Tenure-Track and Tenured		
15	classification will consist of (1) annual reviews for faculty not holding tenure; (2) mid-term		
16	reviews between appointment and tenure review for the faculty without tenure; (3) tenure and		

46

- promotion reviews; (4) third-year post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in the third year following: [inserted list formatting for clarity]
 - a. a tenure and/or promotion decision, or
 - b. a previous third-year review for associate professors (if a promotion to full professor review is not taking place in the same year); or
 - c. following a sixth-year post-tenure review for full professors;
 - (5) promotion-to-full-professor review for tenured faculty in their sixth year or later after receiving tenure; and (6) sixth-year post-tenure reviews for full professors tenured faculty in their sixth year following a tenure and/or promotion to full decision or following a previous sixth-year review.

General Review Provisions

 Section 4. Accelerated Early Review. An accelerated early tenure review may occur in particularly meritorious cases as determined by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the appropriate dean, department, or unit head, and the bargaining unit faculty member.

 Section 5. 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 6. 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 an appeal process (Article 21). The redacted versions are intended to protect the identity of reviewers, who are informed about the faculty member's waiver choice.

Section 7. Stopping of the "Tenure, Promotion, and Review Clock." The "tenure, promotion, and review clock" shall be stopped for one year in the following circumstances, unless the bargaining unit faculty member specifies otherwise:

a. for one year upon the birth or adoption of a child;

 b. due to a leave of absence or intermittent leave with a duration of twelve weeks or longer as a result of an ADA or FMLA qualifying event. No more than two extensions may be granted under this subsection between any clocked review (i.e., between successive PTRs).

The review clock may also be stopped in other extraordinary circumstances, including up to two years for approved leaves of absence without pay lasting two or more terms during each year of the approved leave, as approved by the Office of the Provost.

If the faculty member opts to restore the period when the clock was stopped, they may apply for review at the time they would have become eligible without the stopping of the clock. Leaves not

resulting in a clock stoppage will be considered as a part of review periods. This Section applies to mid-term, tenure, and promotion reviews, as well as third-year and sixth-year post-tenure reviews. No more than two one-year clock extensions may be granted between reviews for reasons a. and b. above (i.e., up to two one-year clock extensions may be granted between successive third-year reviews, with the second third-year review taking place in the fifth year).

Section 8. Relevant Information. Only significant information relevant to the review shall be included in a review file. Relevant information is information that relates to the review criteria as defined in this Agreement. Relevant information may include disciplinary action taken against the bargaining unit faculty member, if the underlying acts relate to or affect the faculty member's ability to meet the review criteria. Information not relevant to the review or information that contains allegations that have not been fully reviewed by the appropriate office (research misconduct, office of investigations and civil rights compliance, employee and labor relations, etc.) shall not be included in the file initially, although allegations that relate to relevant information may be included if they are sustained after an appropriate review.

[deletion moved to next section] Reviews shall consider any lack of resources necessary to the performance of professional responsibilities that were identified in previous workload discussions.

Section 9. Review Evaluations and Considerations Recommendations. Reviews should provide justifications for their conclusion based on the file, previous levels of review, and the unit-level policy. Reviews shall consider any lack of resources necessary to the performance of professional responsibilities that were identified in previous workload discussions (Article 17, Section 3). If, at any level of review, the evaluation or recommendation regarding the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion differs materially from any previous level of review, such evaluation must clearly justify each material difference and cite specific evidence from the file to support the differing evaluation.

Section 10. Request for Clarification. If, within periods to provide responsive material or information for the evaluation file, the bargaining unit faculty member makes a good faith request for clarification or additional detail regarding the reasoning or evidentiary basis for the differing assessment of the faculty member's file, the evaluator will make a good faith effort to provide such additional detail or clarification within 14 days from the date of receiving such request. The bargaining unit faculty member will then have an additional 14 days from receipt of the response to provide supplemental responsive material or information for the evaluation file.

Pre-Tenure Reviews

Section 10. Annual Pre-Tenure 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 11. **Purpose, Outcomes and Appeals**. Mid-term reviews shall be an assessment of the bargaining unit faculty member's progress toward tenure and should assist the faculty member's development. The outcome of a mid-term review shall be either: [inserted list formatting for clarity]

a. (1)-a contract until the end of the faculty member's tenure and promotion review year, which allows for the possibility of identifying any concerns that should be addressed prior to consideration for promotion and tenure, as well as providing constructive feedback and appropriate support identified in the review; or, ; (2) a one- or two-year contract specifying an additional mid-term review; or (3)

b. a one-year, terminal contract in rare cases where the review determines the faculty member will be unable to meet the unit-level criteria for tenure and promotion by the time that the tenure decision would otherwise be expected is made and when there is consensus across all levels of review. Only a review decision resulting in a terminal contract may be appealed through the process specified in Article 21. If a two-year contract is issued under (2) and the subsequent mid-term review is not successful, the bargaining unit faculty member's employment will end with the expiration of the contract.

Section 12. Timing. Each tenure-track bargaining unit faculty member who has not received tenure will have a mid-term review approximately halfway between appointment and eligibility for tenure, except those appointed with a tenure review date three years or less from the time of their initial appointment (Article 16, Section 6). 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.

Section 13. Mid-Term Review Period. The review will include all research, teaching, and service accomplished since the beginning of the faculty member's employment in the current position in addition to other materials specified by the faculty member's hiring agreement (Article 16). Leaves are considered consistent with Section 7.

Section 14. 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:

1. **Election of Criteria:** The bargaining unit faculty member will be reviewed relative to the criteria in effect when their employment began. If the criteria have changed since the beginning of employment, the faculty member must choose either the earlier or current set of criteria.

2. **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.

187

188 189

190 191

192 193 194

199 200 201

206 207

208

209 210 211

212 213 214

215

216 217 218

219 220

221 222 223

225 226 227

224

230 231

232

228 229

233

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

- 4. **Personal statement:** A 3–6-page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit faculty member explaining how their provided material relates to demonstrates they are on track to meet meeting evaluating their performance measured against the applicable unit-level criteria for tenure and promotion. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research, and creative activity; service contributions to the academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community; and contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- 5. **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 class assignments and exams, information from student experience surveys, which will be considered in light of the response rate, and similar material.
- 6. Service portfolio: As applicable available, evidence of the bargaining unit faculty member's service contributions to their academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community. Such evidence could include white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, commendations, awards, op-ed pieces, and/or letters of appreciation. The portfolio may also include a short statement on the faculty member's unique service experiences or obligations.

Section 15. 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 teaching student evaluation process, including Student Experience Surveys. The file must also include recent peer evaluations of the bargaining unit faculty member's teaching that is aligned with the universitywide teaching standards established by the University Senate.

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

- 1. Obtain a report from the faculty committee including an assessment of the bargaining unit faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion; and
- 2. Prepare their own independent evaluation of the bargaining unit member's progress toward tenure and promotion that considers the entire file along with previous levels of review, takes into account the committee report and departmental discussion, and is consistent with Section 9; and
- 3. Provide the department or unit head's written report to the bargaining unit faculty member and allow the faculty member 14 10-days from the date of the receipt of the

report to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file; and

4. Submit the evaluation file to the appropriate dean.

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

Section 16. Dean's Role. The dean will review the file and may consult with appropriate persons and may obtain and document additional relevant information. Once the dean deems the file complete, they will prepare a separate report and recommendation. The dean will share their written report and recommendation with the bargaining unit faculty member and allow the faculty member 14 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 a summary report including dean's recommendation, department head's recommendation, faculty committee report, and faculty member's curriculum vitae, statement, and responsive material or information to the Provost or designee.

Section 17. 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. Upon Provost review, the summary report will be placed in the faculty member's departmental or college personnel file and a decision conveyed in writing to the faculty member no later than June 5 1.

Tenure Review Process

Section 18. 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 or above the FTE at which they were hired. 1.0 FTE per year or the equivalent of consecutive part time employment at or above 0.5 FTE per year. An appointment is considered consecutive even if interrupted by one or more approved leaves of absence. Leaves are considered consistent with Section 7.

Section 19. Tenure Review period. The tenure review will include all research, teaching, and service accomplished since the beginning of the faculty member's employment in the current position in addition to other materials specified by the faculty member's hiring agreement (Article 16). Leaves of absence not resulting in a clock stoppage will be considered as part of the review period.

Section 20. 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:

1. **Election of Criteria:** The bargaining unit faculty member will be reviewed relative to the criteria in effect during their last mid-term review. If the criteria have changed since the

last mid-term review, the faculty member must choose either the earlier or current set of criteria.

2. **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. This document should clearly differentiate between accomplishments that occurred during the review period and those that did not.

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

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

5. **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 class assignments and exams, information from student experience surveys, which will be considered in light of the response rate, and similar material.

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

7. **External reviewers:** At the option of the bargaining unit faculty member, A a list of qualified outside reviewers provided by the bargaining unit faculty member.

All material in this Section, along with the following items, will be included in the Tenure Review File:

8. **Additional Information**. Faculty members and/or the University may submit relevant information during a review from the date information is initially submitted to their department head through the date the Provost issues the final decision. Late submissions of information may result in additional questions to the faculty member or to reviewers at the previous levels. Additional information may include work completed during the review year, if such information or material is included, it may not be included in the review period of subsequent reviews. If detrimental information is added to their file, the

bargaining unit faculty member will be notified and may add a response or request the file go back to their department or unit faculty personnel committee for review, which may result in a decision delay. The additional faculty personnel committee report must be submitted along with the new information for inclusion in the Tenure Review File.

9. **Mid-Term Review(s)**. The dean's summary report and the Provost's final decision from any mid-term reviews conducted will be included.

Section 21. Schedule for Review of Tenure and Promotion Files. The Office of the Provost 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 5.4. If the faculty member misses the new deadline, tenure will be denied.

 Section 22. External reviews. The department or unit head will prepare a list of qualified external reviewers, with input from the department or unit faculty eligible to vote on a tenure and promotion case. The department or unit head will select a majority of the external reviewers from this independently prepared list, but the department or unit head's primary responsibility is to obtain the best judgments from the most highly qualified experts in the appropriate areas. 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 AAU and research intensive institutions or programs. The suggestions regarding affiliations apply to the majority of external reviewers and are not strict prohibitions. 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 the list prepared by the department or unit head and the separate list provided by the bargaining unit faculty member. A absolute-majority of external reviews included in the file must be provided by reviewers selected by the department or unit and not included on the list of reviewers provided by the faculty member under review. If there is overlap between the independently prepared lists, the external reviewer counts as a unit selection. The department or unit head will provide each external reviewer with the candidate's signed and dated curriculum vitae, signed and dated personal statement, the candidate's scholarship portfolio, and the department's or unit's written criteria for promotion and tenure. External reviewers may not be asked to evaluate the candidate against the standards of their own institution.

Section 23. Faculty Review. The eligible faculty in the candidate's department or unit, or a personnel committee comprised of a subset of the eligible faculty (if the department's or unit's internal policy specifies the creation of such a committee), will review the file and the external reviews, prepare a report, and vote. In cases where there are too few eligible faculty members to

form a personnel committee within the candidate's department or unit, the department or unit head will work with the appropriate dean to establish a committee including appropriate faculty members from outside the department. A final vote will be conducted by signed ballot, which may happen electronically, and the ballots will remain confidential to the extent permitted by law. The department or unit head will inform the faculty member whether the vote was positive or not. A de-identified vote tally, however, will be provided to the faculty member by the department or unit head in the event of an appeal.

Section 24. Review by Department or Unit Head, College or School Personnel Committee, and Dean. The department or unit head will prepare their own an independent report and recommendation that considers the entire file along with previous levels of review takes into account the committee report and departmental discussion consistent with Section 9 based on their own judgment of the file, 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 their own an independent report consistent with Section 9, 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 their own an independent report and recommendation based on their own judgment of the file and consistent with Section 9, 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 copy of the dean's report that has been redacted in accordance with the waiver status to protect personally identifiable information. The candidate may provide responsive material for the file within 14 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 the Provost.

Section 25. 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 contents listed in Appendix 3: Tenure Review File Checklist.

Section 26. 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 (FPC). The committee will review the file, request additional information from the Office of the Provost, or previous levels of review, if necessary, and then discuss and record a vote to recommend that tenure and promotion is either granted or denied. The committee will prepare a written summary of its discussion, which will include the outcome of the vote.

Section 27. 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 0.50 FTE. If tenure is granted, the letter will include a statement indicating the FTE of the tenured appointment. The letter will be placed in the candidate's personnel file. The foregoing does not preclude a subsequent written agreement between the Provost or designee and the candidate adjusting the FTE of the appointment, so long as the appointment is at least 0.50 FTE.

Successful candidates are granted tenure and assume their new classification and rank at the start of the next academic year, or sooner at the discretion of the Provost. Candidates who are denied tenure will receive a notice of appointment, which expires at the end of the academic or fiscal year following the one in which the application for tenure was submitted.

Section 28. Withdrawal of Application. A bargaining unit faculty member may withdraw an application for tenure in writing to the Provost and the dean at any time before the Provost's decision. Upon withdrawal, a bargaining unit faculty member will receive a notice of appointment which expires at the end of the academic or fiscal year following the one in which the application for tenure was submitted.

Promotion to Full Professor Review

Section 29. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. The criteria for promotion to full professor are those outlined in the bargaining unit faculty member's unit-level policy. 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:

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

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

3. If the review criteria have changed during the six years prior to the review, the faculty member may elect either the earlier or current set of criteria.

4. The results of post-tenure reviews during the review period will be included in the promotion file.

5. The review period for promotion reviews shall include all work accomplished since being awarded tenure.

Post-Tenure Reviews

Section 30. Tenured bargaining unit faculty members at the rank of associate professor will have a third-year review in the third year following promotion and every three years thereafter—until promotion to full professor. Tenured associate professors will not be required to complete a third-year review in a year when they are seeking a promotion to full professor. Following promotion, full professors will have alternating third-year reviews and major sixth-year post-tenure reviews. The primary function of post-tenure reviews is are to foster continued faculty professional growth and is are not a process to reevaluate the award of tenure. If a review is not successful, then a development plan may be established (Section 38 37). The post-tenure review process may not be used to shift the university's burden of proof in a proceeding to terminate a tenured faculty member for cause.

469

470

471 472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493 494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505 506

507

508 509

510 511

512

513514

515

Section 31. Third-Year Post-Tenure Reviews. Third-year post-tenure reviews will be informal reviews unless a department head and dean agree, or the Office of the Provost determines, that a formal review is necessary for the faculty member to meet expectations for a subsequent review. a. Informal Third-Year Reviews. The informal third-year post-tenure review is conducted by the appropriate department or unit head with the bargaining unit faculty member. Review Informal review materials will typically consist of a curriculum vitae, a brief personal statement (up to 3 pages) accounting for and explaining anything not clear from their CV, materials for the evaluation of teaching (where applicable), and a sabbatical report (where applicable) (Section 33). As a result of the review, tThe department or unit head will prepare a concise statement that includes an evaluation of whether the faculty member is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations under their unit level policy (or Section 39 38, as appropriate). The department head will and share their statement it with the bargaining unit faculty member, who will have 14 10 business days to respond in writing. The review materials, head's statement, and faculty member's response are then sent to the dean and then to the Office of the Provost for approval. The head's statement and any response from the bargaining unit faculty member, dean, and Office of the Provost will be placed in the bargaining unit faculty member's personnel file. If in the process of the informal review, the department or unit head and dean agree, or the Office of the Provost determines, that a formal review is necessary to meet expectations on a subsequent review, they will initiate the Formal Review process below and notify the faculty member. If a formal review is initiated, the statement and response will become part of the formal review dossier. b. Formal Third-Year Reviews. This process applies to associate and full professors who undergo a formal third-year post-tenure review. The department or unit head will convene a faculty personnel committee (if one does not already exist in the department or unit) that will review a faculty member's work in relation to the unit-level post-tenure review criteria, or the criteria in Section 38. If unit-level policies require a vote, the tenured department faculty with the same or higher rank, not including the candidate, will vote to endorse the committee's report and recommendation. The department or unit head will write a separate report in light of the materials gathered and the faculty committee's report and, if required, the faculty vote. The department or unit head will meet with the faculty member and will provide a copy of the head's report and the redacted faculty committee's report. The faculty member will have 10 business days from the date of the receipt of the report to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file. These will be reviewed by the dean and the Office of the Provost. If the unit-level review criteria (or Section 39, as appropriate) were not met by the faculty member and the recommendation is re is consensus between the head, dean, or and Office of the Provost result of the review is to recommends to implement a development plan, then the head and faculty member will develop one in consultation with the dean to be approved by the Office of the Provost (Section $38 \frac{37}{}$).

Section 32. Sixth-Year Review. Only full professors will have sixth-year post-tenure reviews, which will be . Tenured bargaining unit faculty members will have a review in the sixth year following promotion to full professor or six years after their previous a sixth-year post-tenure review.

Section 33. Sixth-Year Review Period. The review period will include all work accomplished during the previous six years, taking into account any leaves and resulting clock stoppages (Section 7).

Section 34. Initiating the Sixth-Year Review. To initiate the 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:

1. **Criteria:** Criteria for sixth-year post-tenure reviews will be as specified in Section 39 38 below unless the department or unit has approved post-tenure review criteria. If the review criteria have changed during the six years prior to the review, the faculty member may elect either the earlier or current set of criteria.

2. **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. This document should clearly differentiate between accomplishments that occurred during the review period and those that did not.

3. **Personal statement:** A 3-6 page personal statement developed by the bargaining unit faculty member explaining how their provided material relates to demonstrates meeting or exceeding evaluating their performance measured against the applicable unit-level criteria for post-tenure review. The personal statement should expressly address the subjects of teaching; scholarship, research, and creative activity; service contributions to the academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession, and the community; and contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion.

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

Section 35. Department or Unit Head's Role. The department or unit head or designee will obtain and place in the evaluation file copies of summary reports drawn, as appropriate, from the system of teaching student evaluation of teaching evaluation that was in effect prior to Fall 2019 and the Student Experience Surveys that were effective as of Fall 2019. The file must also include a recent peer evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member's teaching. Peer teaching reviews should be aligned with the university-wide teaching standards as established by the University Senate.

Once the department or unit head has obtained all of the appropriate documents and information, they will establish a committee of full professors and provide the committee with access to the documents and information. The faculty committee will prepare a report and a recommendation regarding the outcome of the review. The report and recommendation will be reviewed by the committee who will vote on the recommendation. The department or unit head or designee will then:

1. Obtain a report from the faculty committee including an assessment of the bargaining unit faculty member's performance, a recommendation regarding the outcome of the review, and the results of the faculty vote; and

2. Prepare their own independent an evaluation based on their own judgment of the bargaining unit faculty member's performance that considers the entire file along with

previous levels of review takes into account the committee report and departmental discussion consistent with Section 9; and

- 3. Provide the department or unit head's report to the bargaining unit faculty member and allow them 14 10 days from the date of the receipt of the report to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file; and
- 4. Submit the evaluation file to the appropriate dean.

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

Section 36. Dean's Role. The dean will review the file and may consult with appropriate persons and may obtain and document additional relevant information. Once the dean deems the file complete, they will prepare a separate report and independent recommendation. The dean will share their written report and recommendation with the bargaining unit faculty member, redacted as appropriate, and allow them 14 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 Office of the Provost.

Section 37. 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.

[We are postponing discussion on this provision until we come to an agreement regarding merit review provision]

If the Provost or designee concludes that the bargaining unit faculty member's performance meets or exceeds expectations in all areas of a sixth-year review, the bargaining unit faculty member will receive an increase in their base salary per Article 26.

Section 38. Development Plans. If the Provost concludes that the bargaining unit faculty member's performance does not meet expectations in one or more areas, the dean and the department or unit head shall consult with the bargaining unit faculty member and shall recommend to the Provost a development plan for demonstrable improvement in the area(s) at issue. The goal of the plan is to put the faculty member on track to meet expectations in that area or areas at their subsequent review. The development plan should be implemented no later than the first term of the academic year following the review. Development plans may require adjustment of professional responsibilities (e.g., reduced service or teaching in order to support more research) and must specify a follow-up review timeline.

If a faculty member has a development plan, the criteria in the area(s) specified in the development plan will be in effect for those areas of the subsequent review. If the faculty member does not meet expectations in the specified area(s), the Provost may reduce or reassign the faculty member's FTE associated with the specified area(s) or may establish a new development plan or both. If the faculty member's FTE is adjusted, future reviews will reflect the adjustment of duties.

[We are postponing discussion on this provision until we come to an agreement regarding merit review provision]

A bargaining unit faculty member who has had their FTE or duties adjusted as the result of an unsuccessful development plan may elect to have their standard workload restored if, on a subsequent post-tenure review, they meet or exceed expectations in the areas in which the faculty member had previously been determined not to have met expectations. If the faculty member meets or exceeds expectations as outlined in the unit policies, they may, if they so choose, resume their standard workload the Fall following the year the post-tenure review was initiated.

Section 39. Post-Tenure Review Criteria. Review criteria for third- and sixth-year post-tenure review are as follows, unless a department or unit has an approved unit-level policy establishing their own post-tenure review criteria through the process specified in Article 4.

In cases where a tenured faculty member has a workload other than the standard tenure-track workload in the department or unit (e.g., with larger teaching and smaller research FTE, or vice versa) or is working under a development plan, the standard for meeting expectations in a third-or sixth-year review will be established by these alternate arrangements and informed by the unit-level policy and the guidelines below. [moved up from below] Each of the three areas below should include contributions in teaching, research, and service that demonstrably promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.

1. **Teaching:** Teaching standards as established by the University Senate.

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

a. publications and/or creative activities of significance and;

b. externally funded research;

 c. patents, intellectual property developed; technologies licensed, companies spunoff;

 d. adoptions of research innovations by other researchers, organizations, or the public;

e. research awards and prizes;

 f. membership in the national academies or other selective research societies; g. research in progress and substantially planned work (including grant proposals);

 h. translational research or scholarship that influences public policy or contributes to societal benefits;

i. participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings;

 j. professional peer review, holding office in academic and professional organizations, serving on committees and/or on editorial boards;

- k. association with organizations and groups that will result in professional improvement of the faculty member and bring recognition to the university;
- 1. research or professional consultation for federal agencies, foundations, or other

65/	r	esearch sponsors;
658		recognized evidence of scholarly and professional visibility, such as special
659	a	awards, scholarly citations, and the republication of work;
660	n. s	scope and depth of scholarship as revealed in public lectures, book reviews, and,
661	i	n special circumstances, discussions;
662	o. v	works of art, such as painting, sculpture, design, planning, musical composition,
663	F	poetry, fiction, drama, dance, photography, and film disseminated or exhibited in
664	r	recognized venues of quality and distinction;
665	p. p	public performances: musical recitals, concerts, conducting, theater performance
666	a	and production, dance performance and production, radio or television production
667		disseminated/exhibited in recognized venues of quality and distinction;
668	q. p	public recognition: exhibitions, commissions, acceptance of work for permanent
669	C	collections, awards.
670		
671		: Consistent with promotion to full professor as specified in the collective
672	_	ng agreement, senior faculty are expected to engage in significant service
673		trating leadership and commitment both within and outside the candidate's
674	_	ent or unit. Service must include some of the following:
675	a. I	eadership in academic and administrative roles:
676		i. academic program area or departmental administration and curriculum;
677		ii. personnel and policy committees or activities;
678		iii. college or school administration and committees or activities;
679	1	iv. university or state system administration and committees or activities.
680		service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national, and
681		nternational governmental bodies, NGOs, etc.);
682		academic contributions to community activities, either as an individual or as a
683		representative of the university;
684 685		service to professional and disciplinary organizations;
685 686	e. <i>a</i>	academic service on behalf of the public interest.
687	Imoved un for a	clarity] 4. Contributions in teaching, research, and service that demonstrably
688	promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.	
	1	
	Tentative A	Agreement (1/24/2025):
	<i>州</i> よい。 Nathan Whalen (Ja	Jan 28, 2025 09:21 PST)
	Nathan Wl	halen (United Academics)
	1144114111 441	AMICAL (CARCOU LICHUCHIACS)
	A	
		Jan 27, 2025
	Chris Mea	de (University of Oregon)