

Summary of Processes for Reappointment and/or Promotion

Definition of Documents used in Faculty Evaluation and Faculty reappointment and/or Promotion

- **Evaluation Guidelines:** these are overall guidelines used by the chairs to produce “fairness” in the faculty evaluation process across the university. These are reviewed in the fall of each year and then provided to the faculty before the start of the next years evaluation cycle (Feb. 1). The document that was reviewed this fall will be finalized and distributed to faculty for use before Feb 1, 2020 and will be used for the 2020-2021 evaluation cycle. The spring 2020 evaluation will use the guideline that was in place for the 2019-20 evaluation cycle.
- **Faculty Activity Report:** defined in section 8.7 of the CBA. This is the annual evaluation document provided by the faculty member that is the primary basis for his or her evaluation. It is defined in Appendix B of the CBA and the FRC may recommend changes to the Faculty Activity Report each year before December 1.
- **University Criteria:** Defined in section 6.5 (a). These are the broad criteria that are used as a “benchmark” for reappointment and/or promotion recommendations.
- **Department Clarifications:** Defined in section 6.5 (b). These are “clarifications” that allow a department to provide guidance on how the university criteria apply to the field(s) included in each department.
- **Dossier** (formally labeled in the CBA as the “**Candidate Prepared Dossier**”). The document that a faculty member submits for consideration of reappointment or promotion. This document format is generated by the Provost office, reviewed by the FRC, and then finalized by the provost office. Current interpretation is that this is done annually in the fall. Please note that the Dossier and the Faculty Activity Report are not the same document in spite of some lack of precision in the language used in the CBA.

Appointment Terms:

Instructor – two years, renewed annually

Assistant and Associate Professor – initial three years, reappointed to three years, Assistant may only be reappointed once without change in rank

Associate Professor – six years after promotion

Promotion – six years unless initially defined to be a shorter term

Exception – faculty hired before June 1, 2017 must have shortened review by end of spring 2021

Faculty Dossier

Formal format used to consider reappointment (similar to annual evaluation)

Prepared by Candidate

Format provided annually by Provost to FRC for review

This has been done for 2019-20 year

University Criteria and Department Clarifications:

Criteria for reappointment or promotion established annually (reviewed by FRC, not mandatory). Review has been done for 2019-20 AY.

Department clarifications developed by Department Committee (clarifications offer refinement to university criteria to accommodate differences in disciplines)

Department committee is Vice Provost Academic Affairs, Division Director (or chair if there is no Division Director), two faculty members. Clarifications reviewed by department faculty.

Timeline is very formal, see section 6.5c of CBA, timeline for 2019-20 provided below.

Timeline for department clarifications:

Provost “provide a framework and formally charge” committee Formally charge effort **NOW**, noting complications of finals and winter break, committees to provide results to departments on or before **January 8**

Department faculty vote by **Jan 18**, if accepted, forwarded to Provost for review. If rejected, committee reconsider clarifications by **Jan 23**, second vote in department by **Jan 28**.

Provost Review: either accept or return to committee within ten days of receipt, if return, committee has 10 days to resubmit, subsequently, Provost has 7 days to finalize based on inputs.

Shortened Review

Review by Department committee with no external letters that is required to produce a 3 year reappointment

Program Area Evaluation Panel (PAEP) consists of all division faculty of appropriate rank (or department if not in SAM). Minimum committee size is three. See section 6.8(e) of CBA.

PAEP provides formal recommendation to Provost.

Provost creates positive or negative recommendation. Positive recommendations forwarded to President for decision.

Full Review

Shortened review with the addition of external letters and University committee review

Minimum of 4 external letters, 2 letters from individuals nominated by candidate

University Evaluation Committee (UEC) – three individuals holding full rank

UEC considers candidate dossier AND PAEP report. Provides recommendation to Provost.

Provost creates positive or negative recommendation. Positive recommendations forwarded to President for decision.