

POLICY ON PROMOTION

This document spells out policies, organizational structures, and procedures for promotions. All procedures and actions at all levels shall conform to university policies and the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The term "promotion" refers to the advancement of a probationary or tenured faculty member who holds academic or librarian rank to a higher academic or librarian rank or who holds a Student Services Professional - Academically Related (SSP-AR) classification to a higher classification.

"President" refers to the university's President or her/his designee. Unless announced otherwise, the Provost serves as the President's designee for purposes of the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process.

I. GENERAL POLICY

The period prior to promotion should be one of professional growth and development. The department and the individual faculty member share responsibility to establish clearly the goals for promotion. The faculty member should receive an informal periodic assessment of progress toward the goals as well as collegial guidance, advice, and assistance. This responsibility should be shared with the department chair, mentors, and other colleagues seeking to help the faculty member, and the faculty member seeking promotion to make the period prior to promotion as formative as possible.

Promotion shall be accompanied by salary advancement as specified by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Promotion is neither a faculty member's right nor solely a reward for past services and accomplishments. A decision in favor of promotion must be based upon evidence that indicates there is a high probability that the faculty member will assume the increased responsibilities and leadership inherent in the higher ranks.

Probationary faculty normally shall not be promoted during probation. Probationary faculty shall be considered for promotion at the time they are considered for tenure². Under exceptional circumstances, probationary faculty may be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor but not to the rank of Professor³.

Promotion of a tenured faculty member shall normally be effective at the beginning of the sixth (6th) year after appointment to his/her current academic rank or classification. In such cases, the performance review shall take place during the year preceding the effective date of the promotion. This provision shall not apply if the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be considered⁴.

Upon application and with a positive recommendation from the appropriate department or equivalent unit, a tenured faculty member (or one receiving tenure simultaneously) may be considered for promotion to Professor or equivalent rank before having satisfied the service requirements noted above. Current and prospective leave and special assignment do not affect the promotion eligibility of a faculty member⁵.

² See CBA Article 14.2.

³ See CBA Article 14.3.

⁴ See CBA Article 14.3.

⁵ Promotion eligibility is defined in Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Heading 1, Left, Widow/Orphan control

Deleted: of at least three (3) steps [seven and one-half per cent (7.5%)] on the salary schedule.

Deleted:

Deleted: 1

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: not

Deleted: of a faculty member

Formatted: Font: Arial (W1), Not Strikethrough

Formatted: Font: Arial (W1)

Deleted: that

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted: re

Deleted: /

Deleted:

Deleted: prior

Deleted: .

Deleted: member

Deleted: Service credit toward probation does not apply to eligibility for promotion

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: 2

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: October 14, 2003

Deleted: 11/9/06

Deleted: 2/1/07

Promotion shall be effective at the beginning of the academic year succeeding the academic year in which promotion is awarded. No promotion will be awarded which cannot be funded at the time the promotion is to be made effective.

Timelines for the promotion process shall be announced by the President after consideration of the recommendations, if any, of the appropriate faculty committee(s). Promotion applications shall not normally be accepted after the announced timeline for applications.⁶

II. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

- A. Terminal degree requirements are considered to have been met by virtue of the appointment to a probationary/tenured position.
- B. A positive recommendation for promotion shall be based solely upon a positive assessment of the overall quality of performance and achievement in the Scholarship of Teaching; the Scholarship of Application, Integration and Discovery; and in University and Community Service as described below : including an established pattern of productive working relationships with peers and colleagues as demonstrated through the evidence presented in the candidate's Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) File. Only achievements while a probationary or tenured faculty member at this university shall be considered for promotion. Primary consideration will be given to performance since the initial appointment or last promotion at this University.
- C. The responsibilities of all full-time faculty members include effective teaching, professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and public service.⁸ A strong record of effectiveness in the Scholarship of Teaching is essential criterion for promotion, but is not sufficient in and of itself. Professional growth and scholarly/creative activities are also important. Achievement in University and public service, while not a substitute for achievements in teaching effectiveness or professional growth and scholarly/creative activities, is considered essential in evaluating a candidate's overall qualifications for promotion.
- D. Documentation of the scholarly activities of teaching, application, integration, and discovery and university and public service should be rich and varied. It should consist of evidence gathered over time from a variety of sources, namely, self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student ratings, and other evaluation. Assessment of scholarly activities should be relevant to and fit the faculty member's field of expertise. The responsibility for documenting performance in these areas resides with the faculty member.

1. Teaching Effectiveness¹⁰

The Scholarship of Teaching (teaching effectiveness) is an essential precondition for

⁶ CBA Article 14.5.

⁷ Allegations of non-collegial working relationships by reviewers must be supported by documentation in the RTP File.

⁸ See Article 20 of the CBA. For faculty without teaching responsibilities, professional effectiveness in assigned responsibilities is substituted for teaching.

¹⁰ Non-instructional faculty such as librarians and SSP-ARS shall substitute professional effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities for the scholarship of teaching.

Strong evidence of professional effectiveness is a precondition for tenure for faculty without instructional responsibilities. It is expected that faculty with non-instructional responsibilities will demonstrate professional competence and effectiveness, including demonstration of the skills necessary to perform assigned responsibilities throughout the probationary period. A careful assessment will be made of the performance of assigned responsibilities including quality of work, soundness of judgment, willingness to initiate and complete projects, and effectiveness of professional interactions with faculty and students.

Deleted:

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: The basis for a...in the ...In T.../.../... [1]

Deleted: university ...community service ..., [2]

Deleted: And ... [3]

Deleted: ,... /... /... [4]

Deleted: the primary and

Deleted: , but not sufficient,...The criterion of p...is [5]

Deleted: next ...in ...ce...the third criterion, ...nevertheless [6]

Deleted: The responsibilities of all full-time faculty members include effective teaching, professional / scholarly / creative activities and university and public service. ⁹ A strong record of demonstrated effectiveness in the Scholarship of Teaching is the primary and essential, but not sufficient, criterion for promotion. Although there is no weighing of the other (2) categories, an overall high level of performance in both professional/ scholarly/ creative activities and university and public service and a record of excellence in at least one (1) category other than the Scholarship of Teaching must be documented.¶

Deleted: The documentation of the scholarly

Deleted: activity

Deleted: activities of teaching, application, integration, and discovery and university and public service should be rich and varied. It sh[... [7]

Deleted: evaluation

Deleted: ratings, and other [8]

Deleted: creatively constructed to be

Deleted: relevant to and

Deleted: to

Deleted: fit the faculty membe[... [9]

Deleted: activity

Deleted: . The responsibility[... [10]

Deleted: ¶ [11]

Formatted [12]

Deleted:

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted:

Deleted: October 14,

Deleted: 2003

Deleted: November 11, 2006

promotion. Teaching is considered to be a "scholarly act" that includes the clear communication of knowledge of the discipline and subject matter and the transformation and extension of that knowledge.

Deleted: disciplinary / subject matter

It is expected that the faculty member will continually improve their understanding of student learning, increase their knowledge of pedagogy, and strengthen teaching skills throughout the probationary period and will demonstrate both the accomplishment of clear, precise communication in teaching as well as the application of that knowledge.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: probationary

The "scholarly act of teaching" is demonstrated through understanding and current knowledge, including the use of measures of student learning, in such activities as:

Deleted:

- a. clearly defined student learning objectives;
- b. appropriate learning exercises;
- c. prepared exercise packets
- d. samples of student exams and essays;
- e. designed course materials;
- f. creation of course software;
- g. published research in teaching and learning;
- h. teaching portfolio analysis;
- i. experiential learning, such as service-learning.

Deleted:

Deleted: the

Deleted: evaluations

Deleted: Other academic contributions to teaching effectiveness to be evaluated by peers include:

Faculty are expected to participate in conferences, seminars, and workshops that enhance effectiveness in the scholarly act of teaching, for the purpose of:

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

- a. Acquiring theoretical and empirical research based knowledge about effective learning and teaching;
- b. Reflecting upon and practicing such knowledge in the educational setting; and
- c. Demonstrating the transformational effect from experience in utilizing various pedagogies.

Deleted: -----Page Break-----

Deleted: ,

Deleted: t

Deleted: probationary

Teaching is a scholarly endeavor demonstrated and assessed primarily through peer evaluation of classroom teaching and summary analysis of student ratings by peers. Additional requirements shall include: course syllabi and content, clearly defined learning objectives, samples of exams, learning exercises, handouts, classroom research activities, writing requirements including student exams and essays, and teaching portfolios.

Deleted: the academic

Deleted: of students.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline

Constructive and professional relationships with students are important for a strong academic program. Therefore, it is expected that the faculty member will be evaluated for demonstrated sound academic advising, effective counseling of students on course related matters, the ability to work with a diverse student population, and availability of the faculty member on a regular basis to assist students with their academic needs.

Deleted:

Deleted: A

Deleted: ,

Deleted: B

2. Professional Growth and Scholarly/Creative Activities

Deleted: which

All faculty members are expected to engage in a demanding program of professional development and scholarly/creative activities:

Formatted: Font: Bold

- a. As a teacher-scholar, strengthening and updating professional expertise for classroom instruction (Scholarship of Teaching);
- b. As a scholar, strengthening and broadening the faculty member's scholarly and

Deleted:

Deleted: below

Deleted: only

Formatted: Font: Bold

11 From the list, faculty members are expected to accomplish only those items that are appropriate to their discipline.

Deleted: below

Deleted: only

12 Faculty are encouraged to attend events such as those sponsored by the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) to strengthen and update their professional expertise in classroom instruction.

Deleted: which

Deleted: October 14, 2003

13 From the lists given, faculty members are expected to accomplish only those items that are appropriate to their discipline.

Deleted: 11/9/06

Deleted: 2/1/07

academic credentials (scholarship of discovery);

- c. As a practitioner, engaging in both theory and application (scholarship of application), and
- d. As an integrated scholar, placing specialties in a broader context (scholarship of integration).

Deleted: C
Deleted: ,
Deleted: D

The Scholarship of Discovery is documented through critically evaluated and professionally recognized activities such as:

- a. Journal articles;
- b. Monographs;
- c. Proceedings;
- d. Poems;
- e. Stories;
- f. Artistic creations;
- g. Awarded grants and evidence of subsequent work;
- h. Public performances;
- i. Published books;
- j. Public presentations.

Deleted: A
Deleted: B
Deleted: C
Deleted: D
Deleted: E
Deleted: F
Deleted: G
Deleted: H
Deleted: I
Deleted: J

The Scholarship of Application is documented by using knowledge to address demanding, substantive human problems such as:

- a. Conducting applied research and evaluation;
- b. Providing technical assistance;
- c. Developing new products, practices, clinical procedures, new artistic works, consultation with community organizations;
- d. Performing clinical service;
- e. Promoting experiential learning and professional development;
- f. Engaging in community-based research.

The Scholarship of Integration is documented by making connections across disciplines through such activities as:

- a. Designing new courses;
- b. Writing textbooks;
- c. Developing videocassettes and television programs;
- d. Writing for non-specialists;
- e. Sponsoring colloquia and forums;
- f. Shaping a core curriculum;
- g. Preparing quality computer software;
- h. Integrating professional experiences in classrooms;
- i. Critical review articles.

Deleted: A
Deleted: B
Deleted: C
Deleted: D
Deleted: E
Deleted: F
Deleted: G
Deleted: H
Deleted: Integration of
Deleted: I

The faculty member is expected to engage the scholarship of discovery, integration or application or a combination thereof appropriate to their discipline. These activities will be demonstrated through documented scholarly research activities, refereed or juried publications, public performances and exhibits, and presentations; participation in professional conferences, workshops, or seminars; activities leading to the improvement of teaching skills such as the development of innovative courseware; service learning; the development of new products; the developing new clinical procedures; grant and contract activity; participation in professional organizations; post-doctoral studies; and other creative/ scholarly activities.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold
Formatted: Font: Not Italic, No underline
Deleted: October 14,
Deleted: 2003
Deleted: November 11, 2006

3. **University and Public Service**

Faculty members are expected to participate fully, productively, collegially, and

collaboratively in the collective efforts and functions of the department, college/school, university and, on occasion, the CSU.

It is expected that the faculty member will demonstrate university and community service through such activities as:¹⁴

- a. Participation on department, college/school and university committees and commissions, including participation on the academic senate;
- b. Service to the university, profession and community;
- c. Working collaboratively and productively with colleagues;
- d. Mentoring colleagues;
- e. Participation in traditional academic functions such as convocation and commencement activities, student outreach activities, etc.;
- f. Participation in group projects directed toward department, college/school and university goals;
- g. Contributions to the community-at-large such as organizational leadership and presentations, as well as other relevant participation in groups serving the public interest. Community service contributions that relate directly to one's discipline or position will be given greater weight.

III. **CONSIDERATION FOR EARLY PROMOTION**

The following process and criteria must be met before early promotion is granted.

A. **Procedure**

An individual consultation with the Provost must take place prior to consideration for early promotion. A faculty member seeking early promotion shall provide the Provost with a letter outlining his/her accomplishments. This letter shall be sent to the Provost two weeks prior to the scheduled consultation. An RTP File is not to be submitted at this time. Encouragement from the Provost to consider applying for early promotion does not guarantee that early promotion will be awarded.

B. **Criteria for Early Promotion**

1. Faculty members seeking early promotion must provide evidence of sustained exceptional performance in all three areas: Scholarship of Teaching; the Scholarship of Application/Integration/Discovery; and university and public service as described above.¹⁷

2. **Teaching Effectiveness**

The faculty member must demonstrate a sustained pattern of teaching excellence as described in Section II above for at least four years.

Excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching shall be demonstrated through outstanding student ratings, outstanding peer evaluations, receipt of outstanding teaching awards, national or regional recognition for outstanding teaching or other applicable evidence the

¹⁴ This list is derived from faculty responsibilities described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

¹⁷ Completion of the probationary plan at an early date is not a sufficient basis for early promotion. In all cases, the documented performance in all three categories must be sustained and exceptional and distinguish the faculty member from the comparable performance of similarly situated faculty members.

Deleted:

Deleted: 1

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 15

Deleted: 6

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Deleted: 7

Deleted: 16

Formatted: Underline

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: PROCEDURE

Formatted: Underline

Deleted: p

Deleted: p

Deleted: consideration for

Deleted: -----Page Break-----

Deleted: .

Deleted: CRITERIA FOR EARLY PROMOTION

Formatted: Underline

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Space Before: 6 pt

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted: TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: evaluations

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: October 14, 2003

Deleted: 11/9/06

Deleted: 2/1/07

candidate can provide that the President deems acceptable (e.g. students the faculty member has mentored receiving meritorious recognition for art work, research and/or publications).

3. **Professional Development and Scholarly/Creative Activities**

The faculty member must demonstrate a sustained pattern of excellence in the Scholarship of Application/Integration/Discovery as described in Section II above.

4. **University and Public Service**

The faculty member must demonstrate a sustained pattern of excellence in university and public service as described in Section II above.

IV. **PROCEDURES**¹⁸

Responsibilities of departments and department chairs shall be fulfilled by programs and program coordinators when so authorized by the President.

A. **General Procedures Applicable to the Entire Process.**

Academic Personnel Services will provide instructions and forms for the preparation of the RTP File and for the preparation of recommendations on its website.

The President will issue, as part of the Academic Personnel Calendar, the deadline dates for each step in the RTP process.

1. The chair of the peer review committee at each level, department chair, and the appropriate administrators are responsible to assure that the procedures and established timelines are followed.
2. All deliberations of consultative bodies on individual personnel cases shall be conducted in executive session and remain confidential as provided by law. **Violations of this confidentiality will be considered unprofessional conduct and grounds for disciplinary action.**¹⁹
3. Only individuals authorized by University policy to discuss clarifications of evidence or recommendations with higher level committees or appropriate administrators may do so. Such discussions shall only occur in the presence of the assembled peer review committee or appropriate administrator. Such discussions shall only occur at the request of a peer review committee or appropriate administrator. **Discussion of personnel cases outside of the committee setting is prohibited.**
4. All committees designated to make recommendations in the RTP process must be elected. Vacancies can only be filled by election. Substitution of elected members by proxies is prohibited.
5. Each peer review committee recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee present and voting.²⁰

¹⁸ Procedures for Librarians: The procedures outlined in the Library's Articles of Governance shall be used in place of Section JV.D. and JV.E. Procedures for Counselors: The procedures outlined in the Counseling Area's Articles of Governance shall be used in place of Section JV.D. and JV.E.

¹⁹ It is not a violation of this confidentiality to report to appropriate administrators (i.e. the dean or the Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel) any inappropriate conduct that may have occurred.

²⁰ If there is a tie vote, the RTP File shall go forward without a recommendation from the peer review committee. (See CBA 15.39)

- Deleted: Provost
- Deleted: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SCHO ... [13]
- Deleted:
- Deleted:
- Deleted:
- Deleted:
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted: Space After: 6 pt
- Deleted: UNIVERSITY AND ... [14]
- Deleted: ¶
- Deleted: outstanding
- Deleted: _
- Deleted: Provost
- Deleted: ¶
- Deleted: The following are ... [15]
- Formatted: Font: Bold
- Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline
- Deleted: General Procedure ... [16]
- Formatted: Font: Bold
- Deleted: Provost
- Deleted: or designee
- Deleted: is ARE
- Formatted: Font: Arial (W1)
- Formatted ... [17]
- Deleted: to be
- Formatted ... [18]
- Deleted:
- Deleted: recommendations/
- Deleted: ELECTED
- Formatted ... [19]
- Formatted: Font: Bold
- Deleted: III
- Deleted:
- Deleted: III
- Deleted:
- Deleted: III
- Deleted:
- Deleted: III
- Deleted:
- Formatted: Font: Bold
- Deleted: October 14,
- Deleted: 2003
- Deleted: November 11, 2006

6. Voting by proxy or by absentee ballot is prohibited. Only those committee members who are present and voting when the recommendations are made may sign the recommendation form.

7. The faculty member is responsible for placing materials in the RTP File to document individual achievement in each category to be reviewed. The faculty member is also responsible for providing a completed and signed application form and an updated vita.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: has the responsibility to place

Deleted: that provide documentation regarding

Deleted: In addition, the

Deleted: have the responsibility

Deleted: to see

8. The department, the department chair, and the dean are responsible for ensuring that the following information is placed in the candidate's RTP File:

(a) The Access Log and Check Sheet;

(b) The Promotion Form as prepared and completed by the department peer review committee;

(c) Numerical data on student ratings including departmental and, if available, college/school norms;

Deleted: evaluations

(d) All summaries of student ratings (numerical data and, if appropriate, summaries of written comments from the student ratings process) in reverse chronological order;

Deleted: evaluations

Deleted: evaluation

(e) A copy of the student ratings instrument used by the department or college/school;

Deleted: evaluation

(f) All peer evaluations (in reverse chronological order);

Deleted: form

(g) Any letters and/or other written comments which have been signed and included in the Open Personnel File from students, colleagues, or other individuals regarding a faculty member's performance in any category to be used as evidence in the review process; and

(h) All previous Promotion Forms including written reasons (in reverse chronological order).²¹

(i) The President's final decision letter on any previous application for promotion that was denied.

Deleted: Provost

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

9. A faculty member has the right to place any information into the RTP File that s/he feels is pertinent to the evaluation process. Primary consideration will be given to performance since the initial appointment or last promotion at this University.

10. After the established deadline(s) set by the President each year, materials may not be added to the RTP File unless: (a) the material was not accessible prior to the deadline, and (b) the school peer review committee or appropriate University Board approves a written request to add additional information to the file. This provision does not affect requests for additional information or clarification from committees or administrators, recommendations, reasons, responses, etc. placed in the RTP File pursuant to university procedures in the normal course of the RTP process.²²

Deleted: ,

Deleted:

The appropriate college/school peer review committee shall handle requests to add material to the RTP File if the file is at the department or college/school level; the appropriate University Board will handle such requests if the RTP File has progressed to the University level. If the faculty member is seeking both retention/tenure and

²¹ This provision applies only if the faculty member has previously applied for and been denied promotion to the rank for which s/he is currently being considered.

Deleted: October 14, 2003

²² See Article 15.12 of the CBA.

Deleted: 11/9/06

Deleted: 2/1/07

promotion, the college/school peer review committee which makes retention/tenure recommendations or the University Board on Retention and Tenure will handle the request depending upon the level of review at the time of the request.

Deleted: COLLEGE

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

11. **Recommendations on promotion shall be based solely upon the contents of the candidate's RTP File.** Should the President make a decision on any basis not directly related to the professional qualifications, work performance, or personal attributes of the person in question, those reasons shall be stated in writing and entered into the Open Personnel File and shall be immediately provided to the faculty member.
12. Academic Personnel Services should provide a training workshop each year on retention and tenure policies and practices.
13. A faculty member may participate on a peer review committee **only at one level of review**. That is, a faculty member may not attend meetings at more than one level where recommendations for retention and tenure and/or promotion are discussed, Classroom visits/evaluations, assessments of publications and committee work, etc. and other forms of evaluation (resulting in written reports at the department level) do not constitute "participation".
14. No faculty member being considered for promotion may serve on any retention, tenure, or promotion peer review committees²³.
15. Department chairs who have not received tenure may not make recommendations in the RTP process.
16. At each step in the process, the Promotion Form completed to that point in the process and the accompanying reasons shall be added to the RTP File five (5) days after the candidate has been notified.
17. The appropriate sections of the Promotion Form and the accompanying reasons shall be prepared by the chair of the peer review committee at each level. **Under no circumstances is the candidate for promotion to be involved in the preparation of the Promotion Form.**

Deleted: Faculty

Deleted:

B. Reasons for Recommendations

Formatted: Underline

1. The burden of proof for promotion rests with the faculty member's record of achievement. It is also understood that reasonable people may disagree in the evaluation of evidence. Further, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues. The promotion process requires that the judgment of the University, through its peer review committees and administrators, be made with full and careful consideration of this peer judgment and be consistent with academic freedom and standards of fairness and due process.

Faculty assessment should be flexible, recognizing the mission of the university, the priorities of departments, the strengths of individuals, and the uniqueness of the disciplines. In evaluating the faculty member's performance, committees and appropriate administrators shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area with lesser accomplishments in another. The committees and appropriate administrators must judge whether the faculty member is engaging in activities that are sound and productive and contributing to the mission of the university. All evaluations of performance shall be based on documented

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: October 14,

Deleted: 2003

Deleted: November 11, 2006

²³ A department chair may not make a separate recommendation if he/she is being reviewed for promotion during the same academic year.

patterns of performance.

At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, the faculty member shall be given a copy of the recommendation and the accompanying written reasons. The faculty member may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation within seven (7) days following receipt of the recommendation.²⁴ (If such a meeting is requested, it shall be held within a reasonable amount of time.) A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the RTP File and also be sent to all previous levels of review. This provision shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.

Deleted:

2. The recommendation, and written explanation of the reasons for it, and all rebuttals and responses, if any, shall become part of the RTP File.

Deleted: ,

3. The faculty member is provided with the recommendation and reasons for two purposes: (a) to facilitate the faculty member's professional growth and development especially where shortcomings are identified; and (b) to enable the faculty member to respond to a recommendation.

Deleted: (2)

4. An individual faculty member may only have access to his/her own Open Personnel/RTP File.

Deleted:

Deleted:

C. Timelines

Formatted: Underline

1. If any stage of the evaluation/recommendation process is not completed within the time specified in the administrative calendar, the file shall be automatically transferred to the next level of review and the faculty member shall be so notified. In such cases, the level that failed to make the recommendation in accordance with the timeline shall make no recommendation at all.

Deleted: a

Deleted: not

Deleted: a

2. At the beginning of each academic year, deadlines for the completion of RTP Files and timelines for recommendations shall be published through the Academic Personnel Calendar.

3. The President shall notify a faculty member being considered for promotion of the promotion decision prior to the end of the academic year but no later than June 15.

4. No person shall be deemed to have been promoted because notice was not given or received by the time prescribed. It is the responsibility of the faculty member concerned to make inquiry to determine the decision of the President, who shall give notice without delay.

D. Department Level²⁵

Formatted: Underline

Deleted:

1. Departments have the primary responsibility to state, in writing, and in detail, the reasons for their recommendations. The department is responsible for preparing a complete description and analysis of the factors significant in the departmental evaluation consistent with the criteria previously described.² The probationary and tenured faculty of the department shall elect a department peer review committee (or a separate committee for each candidate) of tenured full-time faculty members. The department, if so desired, may function as a committee of the whole; that is, the department peer review committee may consist of all eligible tenured full-time faculty in the department. In either event, the recommendations of the peer review committee(s) are the recommendations of the department.

Deleted: Analyses and/or summaries of the documentation in the RTP File before the completion of the Promotion Form are not necessary.¶

Deleted: ELECT

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

²⁴ Should the faculty member wish to submit a rebuttal after the seven (7) days, s/he may do so.

Deleted: October 14, 2003

²⁵ Includes programs designated by the Provost.

Deleted: 11/9/06

Deleted: 2/1/07

Each peer review committee's independent recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee and shall be based solely on information and documentation in the RTP File. A meeting(s) of the department peer review committee which includes confidential, careful, thorough deliberations leading to a vote is the required process for arriving at a recommendation.

Department chairs may decide to submit an independent recommendation or to participate as a member of the department peer review committee.²⁶ The department chair shall make known her/his decision, in writing to the probationary and tenured faculty in the department, after consultation with the probationary and tenured faculty of the department and prior to the date beginning the campus RTP process. A copy of the notification shall be placed in the RTP File. The chair shall apply this decision to all RTP candidates in that academic year. If the department chair makes an independent recommendation, s/he shall not participate in deliberations or attend meetings of the departmental peer review committee. If the chair does not make an independent recommendation, s/he may participate as a member of the department peer review committee.

Deleted:

- 3. The department peer review committee and the department chair (if making independent recommendations) shall indicate their recommendations and the vote for the recommendations on the Retention and Tenure Form. The reasons for the recommendation shall be attached to the Promotion Form.

Deleted: the

- 4. There shall be no meetings between the department peer review committee and the department chair, if the department chair is making a separate recommendation.

- 5. Voting by proxy and/or absentee ballot is prohibited. Only those committee members who are present and voting when the recommendations are made may sign the recommendation form.

Deleted: only

- 6. At the conclusion of the department level review and by the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar, the faculty member shall be given a copy of the Promotion Form and the reasons for the recommendation (complete to this point). The Promotion Form and the reasons for the recommendation shall be added to the RTP File five (5) days after the faculty member has been notified.

- 7. The faculty member shall be given an opportunity to discuss the department's and/or chair's recommendation with the department chair.

- 8. The department chair shall forward the RTP File including the recommendations of the department peer review committee and, the department chair (if separate) to the college/school dean by the deadline specified in the academic personnel calendar.

E. College/School Level²⁷

- 1. The dean shall transmit copies of all department and department chair evaluations/recommendations and supporting materials to the appropriate college/school peer review committee. This committee shall be established and shall function according to written college/school procedures and guidelines. The college/school peer review committee shall be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty in the college/school. Only full-time tenured faculty at the rank of Professor may serve on the college/school peer review committee.

Deleted: G)

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline

Deleted:

Deleted: ELECTED

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

- 2. The procedures used in the college/school shall be made available to all members of the college/school and to the University Board on Promotion. These college/school procedures shall make available to each faculty member being reviewed for promotion a

²⁶ CBA Article 15.34 Department or college/school procedures may not limit the discretion of the department chair in this matter.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: October 14,

²⁷ For purposes of this policy, the library and the Student Services Professionals - Academically Related each constitute a separate college/school.

Deleted: 2003

Deleted: November 11, 2006

means to respond to or appeal the recommendation of the department peer review committee and/or chair.

Deleted:

Deleted: /

3. The college/school peer review committee shall examine the evaluations and recommendations of the department peer review committee and the department chair and shall make a thorough evaluation of the documentation for each faculty member being reviewed for promotion. The college/school peer review committee shall make an independent recommendation which shall include the reasons for the recommendation of the college/school committee.

Deleted: /

4. The college/school peer review committee's recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of the committee. **These recommendations shall be based solely upon the information and documentation in the RTP File.** Votes by proxy and/or absentee voting are prohibited. Only those committee members who are present and voting when the recommendations are made may sign the recommendation form.

5. Upon independent review of the department peer review committee and department chair recommendations and RTP files, the college/school dean shall make a written independent recommendation concerning promotion based solely on information and documentation in the RTP File. The recommendation shall include reasons for the action.

6. In the event that a faculty member is not recommended for promotion by the department peer review committee and/or the department chair, the faculty member shall have the right to make a separate appearance before the college/school peer review committee and the dean to present his/her case. Both the peer review committee and the dean must allow presentations of at least thirty (30) minutes in separate meetings. **Discussions must be limited to information and documentation in the RTP File.**

7. The college/school peer review committee may request clarifications of either recommendations or evidence in the RTP File. All requests for clarification shall be in writing.

8. The dean may request clarification of either recommendations or evidence in the RTP File. All requests for clarification shall be in writing.

9. At the conclusion of the college/school level review and by the date specified in the in the Academic Personnel Calendar, the faculty member shall be given a copy of the Promotion Form (complete to this point) and the reasons for the recommendations. The Promotion Form and the reasons for the recommendations shall be added to the RTP File five (5) days after the faculty member has been notified. A copy of the recommendations of the college/school peer review committee and the dean shall also be sent to the department chair and the chair of the department review committee.

10. All evaluations and recommendations from the department peer review committee, the department chair, the college/school peer review committee, and the dean shall be transmitted by the dean to the University Board on Promotion via Academic Personnel Services by the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar.

Deleted: /

F. University Level

Deleted: H

Formatted: Underline

1. The University Board on Promotion (UBOP) shall examine the evaluations and recommendations of the department and college/school levels and shall make a thorough evaluation of the documentation for each faculty member being considered for promotion. The Board shall make independent recommendations directly to the President. **These recommendations shall be based solely on information and documentation in the RTP File.**

Deleted: /

Deleted: or designee

2. UBOP is a Subcommittee of the Personnel Committee of the Academic Senate. It shall consist of five (5) full-time tenured members with the rank of Professor or equivalent who do not occupy a position of department chair or above, elected from the faculty. The election shall follow the procedures for the election of Senators in the Bylaws of the

Deleted: October 14, 2003

Deleted: 11/9/06

Deleted: 2/1/07

Academic Senate, including the requirement that the nominee meets the eligibility requirements for UBOP and agrees that s/he will serve if elected. UBOP members may not serve simultaneously on the Personnel Committee of the Academic Senate, the University Board on Retention and Tenure (UBORT) or a department or college/school level peer review committee that makes recommendations on retention, tenure or promotion. No more than one (1) UBOP member may be from any one (1) college/school. UBOP members shall serve three-year overlapping terms.

- 3. All deliberations of the Board shall be conducted in executive session. The Board's recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of the Board. Voting by proxy and/or absentee ballot is prohibited. Only those committee members who are present and voting when the recommendations are made may sign the recommendation form.
- 4. In the event that an individual is not recommended for promotion by the department peer review committee, the department chair, the college/school peer review committee, or the dean, the individual shall have the right to make an appearance before the University Board on Promotion to present his/her case. The Board must allow presentations of at least thirty (30) minutes. **Discussions must be limited to information and documentation in the RTP File.**
- 5. UBOP may request clarifications of either recommendations or evidence in the RTP File. All requests for clarification shall be in writing.
- 6. The Board shall forward recommendations from all levels to the President. Faculty members shall be notified in writing of the Board's recommendations and the reasons for the recommendation by the date specified in the Academic Personnel Calendar. A copy of the recommendation shall also be sent to the department chair, the chair of the department peer review committee, the dean, and the chair of the college/school peer review committee.
- 7. The Promotion Form shall be added to the RTP File five (5) days after the faculty member has been notified.

Deleted: COLLEGE
Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: or designee

Deleted: COLLEGE

G. President's Decision²⁸

- 1. Faculty members being considered for promotion may submit a response or appeal of the Board's recommendation to the President. The response or appeal shall be in writing only and shall be based upon information and documentation in the RTP File.
- 2. In the event that a faculty member is not recommended for promotion by the department peer review committee, the department chair, the college/school peer review committee, the dean, or the University Board on Promotion, the faculty member shall have the right to make an appearance before the President to present his/her case. The President must allow a presentation of at least thirty (30) minutes. **Discussions must be limited to information and documentation in the RTP File.**
- 3. The President shall review and consider the recommendations for promotion, relevant material and information.
- 4. The President may request clarifications of either recommendations or evidence in the RTP File. All requests for clarification shall be in writing.
- 5. The President shall make a final, independent decision on each promotion recommendation and shall notify each faculty member under review in writing²⁹ of that decision and of the reasons for the decision by the date specified by the Collective

Deleted: I
Formatted: Underline
Deleted:
Deleted: /
Deleted: or designee
Deleted: /
Formatted: Font: Not Bold
Deleted: or designee
Deleted: or designee
Deleted: or designee
Deleted: or designee
Deleted: or designee
Deleted: _____Page Break_____

²⁸ Unless announced otherwise, the Provost makes the final decision as the President's designee

²⁹ Notice of the President's decision is mailed to the home address of the faculty member return receipt requested. The university cannot mail letters return receipt requested to post boxes.

Deleted: October 14,
Deleted: 2003
Deleted: November 11, 2006

Bargaining Agreement³⁰

Deleted:

Deleted: ¶
¶

REFERENCES: _____ CBA Articles 11, 14, 15, 16, 20, 27, 28, 29, 31

_____ Final Report of the Faculty Scholar Blue Ribbon Committee (APM)

_____ Policy on the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (APM)

Approved by the President

June, 1975 (Interim)

Recommended by the Academic Senate

March, 1977

Approved by the President

June, 1977

Amended

4/83; 10/84; 6/86; 10/86; 5/87; 6/88; 10/89;

4/93; 5/94; 11/95; 11/99; 11/00; October 14, 2003.

[date]

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

³⁰

No person shall be deemed to have been promoted because notice was not given or received by the time prescribed. It is the responsibility of the faculty member concerned to make inquiry to determine the decision of the President, who shall give notice without delay.

Deleted: October 14, 2003

Deleted: 11/9/06

Deleted: 2/1/07

Page 2: [1] Deleted The basis for a	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:10:00 PM
Page 2: [1] Deleted in the	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:11:00 PM
Page 2: [1] Deleted In T	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:11:00 PM
Page 2: [1] Deleted /	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:12:00 PM
Page 2: [1] Deleted /	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:12:00 PM
Page 2: [2] Deleted university	jreddwilliams	2/16/2007 1:09:00 PM
Page 2: [2] Deleted community	jreddwilliams	2/16/2007 1:10:00 PM
Page 2: [2] Deleted service	jreddwilliams	2/16/2007 1:10:00 PM
Page 2: [2] Deleted ,	jreddwilliams	2/16/2007 1:11:00 PM
Page 2: [3] Deleted And	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:15:00 PM
Page 2: [3] Deleted	Janette Redd Williams	8/28/2006 10:47:00 AM
Page 2: [4] Deleted ,	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:15:00 PM
Page 2: [4] Deleted /	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:15:00 PM
Page 2: [4] Deleted /	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:16:00 PM
Page 2: [4] Deleted	Janette Redd Williams	8/28/2006 10:47:00 AM
Page 2: [5] Deleted , but not sufficient,	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:16:00 PM
Page 2: [5] Deleted The criterion of p	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:35:00 PM
Page 2: [5] Deleted is	Janette Redd Williams	11/9/2006 12:34:00 PM
Page 2: [6] Deleted next	CSM	2/7/2007 1:58:00 PM
Page 2: [6] Deleted in	CSM	2/7/2007 1:58:00 PM
Page 2: [6] Deleted ce	CSM	2/7/2007 1:58:00 PM
Page 2: [6] Deleted the third criterion,	CSM	2/7/2007 1:58:00 PM
Page 2: [6] Deleted nevertheless	CSM	2/7/2007 1:58:00 PM

Page 2: [7] Deleted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 1:33:00 PM
activities of teaching, application, integration, and discovery and university and public service should be rich and varied. It should consist of evidence gathered over time from a variety of sources, namely, self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student

Page 2: [8] Deleted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 1:33:00 PM
ratings, and other evaluation. Assessment of scholarly activities should be

Page 2: [9] Deleted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 1:33:00 PM
fit the faculty member's field of expertise

Page 2: [10] Deleted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 1:33:00 PM
. The responsibility for documenting performance in these areas resides with the faculty member.

Page 2: [11] Deleted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 1:34:00 PM

Page Break

Page 2: [12] Formatted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 12:50:00 PM
Font: Not Bold

Page 2: [12] Formatted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 12:53:00 PM
Font: Not Italic, No underline

Page 6: [13] Deleted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 12:54:00 PM
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SCHOLARLY / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Page 6: [14] Deleted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 12:55:00 PM
UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE

Page 6: [15] Deleted Janette Redd Williams 11/9/2006 12:53:00 PM
The following are the general procedures that apply to the entire promotion process

Page 6: [16] Deleted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 1:45:00 PM
General Procedures Applicable to the Entire Promotion Process

Page 6: [17] Formatted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 1:49:00 PM
Font: Arial (W1), Not Strikethrough

Page 6: [18] Formatted jreddwilliams 2/16/2007 1:49:00 PM
Font: Arial (W1), Not Strikethrough

Page 6: [19] Formatted Janette Redd Williams 11/9/2006 1:05:00 PM
Font: Not Bold, No underline