

Department of Sociology,
Anthropology, Social Work, &
Criminal Justice (SASC)

Reappointment and Promotion Guide

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
2016-2017

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work, & Criminal Justice

Reappointment and Promotion Guide Table of Contents

Review Timeline.....	2
Review Process.....	3
Comparison of Procedural Requirements Regarding Scholarship Across the Faculty Review Bodies.....	4
Comparison of Procedural Requirements Regarding Service Across the Faculty Review Bodies.....	6
Comparison of Procedural Requirements Regarding Teaching Across the Faculty Review Bodies.....	8
Department Dossier Checklist	9
Tenure Review Schedule.....	Appendix A
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work & Criminal Justice Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion	Appendix B
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work & Criminal Justice Departmental Review Procedures.....	Appendix C
CAP Guidelines for Dossier Preparation.....	Appendix D
College of Arts and Science Committee on Appointment and Promotion Procedures.....	Appendix E
AAUP 2015-2020 Contract Article VII (pp. 8-27).....	Appendix F
University Standards for Re-employment, Promotion and Tenure.....	Appendix G
FRPC General Statement to Candidates and Academic Units	Appendix H
FRPC Dossier Candidate Checklist.....	Appendix I

This document is to be used as a guide ONLY. Please always refer to the most recent policies as outlined by the Department, College of Arts and Sciences and University

Faculty Review Timeline – 2016-17 c.(1), c.(2), and c.(4) Reviews

Note: This is only a timeline. See departmental procedures for details.

2-May	Candidates provide list of names and contact information for external reviewers to committees (c.(4) only).
1-June	Committees send scholarship materials to external reviewers (c.(4) only).
9-Sep	Clerical staff provides necessary class rosters to candidates.
16-Sep	Candidates provide list of 10-20 students selected for survey to committees. Candidates provide list of service contacts to committees.
23-Sep	Candidates provide scholarly work with needed documentation regarding status to committees.
30-Sep	Candidates provide drafts of updated CV in OU format and self-statement to committees. Committees provide complete lists of students selected for surveys to survey coordinator, who distributes surveys to students.
14-Oct	Committees provide candidates with feedback on CVs and self-statements.
28-Oct	Candidates provide final versions of self-statements and CVs to committees. Committee chairs ensure that final versions of self-statement, CV, and all supporting scholarship and additional materials are on department E-space.
31-Oct	Committee chairs solicit collegial letters from faculty.
4-Nov	Survey coordinator sends results to committees and clerical staff.
16-Nov	Faculty submit collegial letters to committee chairs.
2-Dec	Committees provide drafts of reports to candidates.
16-Dec	Candidates and clerical staff have mostly-complete draft of back-up file.
5-Jan	Committees post final reports, and candidates' responses to reports (if any), to department E-space.
6-Jan	Survey coordinator distributes ballots to faculty at beginning of work day.
12-Jan	Survey coordinator sends results of votes to department chair at end of work day.
17-Jan	Optional response to negative department recommendation due.
19-Jan	Department chair conveys chair's letters to candidates by end of work day.
25-Jan	ALL needed documents for dossier and backup file are due to clerical staff.
30-Jan	Clerical staff provides PDF files of e-dossier documents to candidates for uploading to review E-space.
1-Feb	Clerical staff deliver backup files/dossiers to Dean's office and transition review E-space permissions.

Bird's-Eye View of Faculty Review Process

41.c.(1) review (second-year review): Dossier and backup file go to Dean on Feb. 1. Dean makes reappointment decision... unless Dean wishes to seek further advice, in which case Dean sends case to CAP by April 1.

41.c.(2) review (fourth-year review): Dossier and backup file go to CAP on Feb. 1. CAP makes recommendation to Dean by March 15... Dean makes reappointment decision... unless Dean wishes to seek further advice, in which case Dean sends case to FRPC by April 1.

41.c.(4) review (sixth-year review; tenure review): Dossier and backup file go to CAP on Feb. 1. CAP makes recommendation to FRPC by March 15... FRPC makes recommendation to Oakland by May 1... Oakland makes reappointment and promotion decision by August 14.

IDEALLY, THEN...

c.(1): Department → Dean → Done

c.(2): Department → CAP → Dean → Done

c.(4): Department → CAP → FRPC → Oakland (Board of Trustee vote) → Done

Note: All "Done" dates are "one year prior to the expiration of the faculty member's employment period." Employment periods, discussed in section 38 of the AAUP contract, are summarized in the table below:

Table 1. Employment Periods and the Timing of Faculty Reviews

First period	Year 1		
	Year 2	41.c.(1) review	8/14 = 1 year prior to expiration of employment period
	Year 3		
Second period	Year 4	41.c.(2) review	8/14 = 1 year prior to expiration of employment period
	Year 5		
Third period	Year 6	41.c.(4) review	8/14 = 1 year prior to expiration of employment period
	Year 7		

Candidate's Responsibility -Scholarship Department of SASC	Candidate's Responsibility -Scholarship CAP	Candidate's Responsibility -Scholarship FRPC
<p>1. A bibliography of published works.</p> <p>2. A copy of all written material to be used in the evaluation of scholarship; the candidate shall identify each written document submitted to the committee as: (a) published, (b) accepted for publication (source of publication to be specified) but not yet published, (c) currently being reviewed for publication, but not yet accepted, (d) other written work identified as to its purpose.</p> <p>3. A statement explaining the extent and nature of the candidate's contribution to co-authored work, if any, as well as any explanation the candidate deems useful or necessary regarding the nature and purpose of the written material submitted to the committee (see IV, A. 2 from the Departmental Review Procedures).</p> <p>4. For tenure and professorial reviews, the candidate shall provide the names of persons outside the university who can be contacted for an evaluation of his/her scholarly activities, explaining in each case the relationship of the proposed evaluator to the candidate.</p>	<p>1. All publications should include complete journal titles (unabbreviated) and pagination. (D)</p> <p>2. There should be a clear indication of which publications and presentations are refereed and/or invited. (D)</p> <p>3. The candidate should indicate his/her contributions to multi-author publications, grant applications, presentations, and other joint activities. The candidate should indicate the significance of the order of authorship, if any. The candidate should identify those publications and presentations that have students as co-authors. (D)</p> <p>4. Copies of all the candidate's publications, pending submissions, electronic publications, or recordings or video tapes of performances, as appropriate (S)</p> <p>5. Copies of funded, pending, and unfunded (O) grant proposals (S), and include award letters</p> <p>6. Copies of manuscripts of conference presentations, if available (S)</p> <p>7. Copies of manuscripts of work in progress, if available (S)</p>	<p>1. Evaluations from at least three outside experts in the candidate's field of scholarship with whom the candidate has not had a direct working or personal relationship, i.e., who are not Oakland or former colleagues, research collaborators, co-authors, mentors, etc. If there is any question as to whether a reviewer falls into one of these excluded classes, the reviewer may not be used to meet this requirement for impartial external reviewers.</p> <p>2. The procedure for selection of all outside reviewers should be fully described. All persons solicited as reviewers should be identified and all responses should be included in the dossier.</p> <p>3. Letters of evaluation should be solicited in a formal, documented manner. One sample letter of solicitation should be included in the dossier.</p> <p>4. Solicitation letters should request a Curriculum Vitae (CV) from each reviewer. A statement of any affiliations of the reviewers with the candidate should be included in the dossier. All other procedures employed in scholarly evaluation should be fully described in the dossier.</p>

	<p>8. Sample letter for solicitation of external review (D)</p> <p>9. List of external reviewers with brief identification, including relationship to the candidate, if any (D) (External letters may be optional for some departments for c.1 and c.2 reviews.)</p> <p>10. Vitae of external reviewers (S)</p> <p>11. Letters from external reviewers (D)</p> <p>12. Internal letter(s) of review of scholarship (OD)</p> <p>13. Letters (or e-mails) of acceptance of unpublished papers listed in the vita as accepted for publication (S)</p> <p>14. Evidence of external recognition of scholarship such as professional reviews of performances, discussion of research in news articles, and awards (DS)</p> <p>15. Published reviews of candidates work, if available (DS)</p>	<p>5. In cases of joint authorship of scholarly work, the candidate's contribution must be made clear and documented either in the CV or in a document immediately following the CV.</p> <p>6. Candidates should recognize that members of the FRPC might not be highly knowledgeable about a given candidate's discipline. Therefore, general summary descriptions or annotated bibliographies by the candidate of his/her work would be very helpful.</p>
The above information is from Department Of Sociology And Anthropology Departmental Review Procedures	The above information is from CAP Guidelines For Dossier Preparation – Revised 2009	The above information is from FRPC General Statement To Candidates And Academic Units September 2012

The materials noted in these sections are to ONLY be used a guide. Please refer to the policies located in the appendices of this Guide. For the CAP Guidelines D = must be in the dossier; DS = must be present either in the dossier or in the supplementary file; S = must be in the supplementary (Also known as back up file); O = optional in accordance with department traditions; OD = optional item which should be in the main dossier; OS = optional item which should be in the supplementary file.

Candidate's Responsibility -Service Department of SASC	Candidate's Responsibility -Service CAP	Candidate's Responsibility -Service FRPC
<p>1. A list of his/her departmental, college, university, professional and public service activities.</p> <p>2. A statement regarding the nature, purpose and extent of the activities (Optional)</p> <p>3. For tenure and professorial reviews, the candidate shall provide the names of persons who can be contacted for an evaluation of his/her significant service activities since the last review; this requirement is optional for all other review candidates. Although electronic mail communications are acceptable in order to expedite committee review, external reviewers shall be asked to provide a copy of their comments printed on institutional letterhead stationery for inclusion in candidates' dossiers.</p>	<p>1. Sample of solicitation letter for comments on external service (D)</p> <p>2. Letters from chairs or colleagues (where candidate is chair) of all committees on which the candidate made a significant contribution (D)</p> <p>3. Letters from colleagues regarding significant service that is not in committee format (D)</p> <p>4. Letters of appreciation for major service activities on or off campus (D)</p> <p>5. Letters commenting on service that does not fall into the above categories (DS)</p> <p>6. Evidence for standard professional service (S)</p> <p>7. Evidence for unusual professional service (D)</p> <p>8. Departmental evaluation of service if not already given (D)</p> <p>9. The candidate should indicate his/her role in joint service activities. (D)</p> <p>10. Flyers, announcements, or other publicity for community programs (OS)</p>	<p>1. The candidate's contributions to departmental, school, or university committees as well as other forms of service should be evaluated. The means used to evaluate the quality of this service should be fully described in the dossier.</p>

The materials noted in these sections are to ONLY be used a guide. Please refer to the policies located in the appendices of this Guide

Candidate's Responsibility -Teaching Department of SASC	Candidate's Responsibility -Teaching CAP	Candidate's Responsibility -Teaching FRPC
<p>1. The candidate shall supply the committee with evidence of teaching ability and performance. Specifically, the candidate shall: supply the committee with the department's end of term <i>summaries of</i> course evaluations for all courses taught since his/her last review;</p> <p>2. prepare a statement interpreting the results of the student evaluations (Optional);</p> <p>3. prepare a list of at least ten, but no more than twenty, students in the university during the preceding two regular semesters in which the candidate taught classes at Oakland, whom the candidate would like to have contacted concerning his/her teaching (submission for earlier semesters back to the time of last review optional)</p> <p>4. submit class lists for all courses taught during the preceding two regular semesters (submission for earlier semesters back to the time of last review optional);</p> <p>5. submit syllabi for all courses taught during the preceding two regular semesters during which the candidate was in residence (other descriptive material may also be submitted)</p>	<p>1. Statements by faculty who have observed candidate's classes[†] (D)</p> <p>2. Sample student end-of-term questionnaire (D)</p> <p>3. Department's assessment of results of questionnaires, if not already given in review committee letter (D)</p> <p>4. Any other departmental assessment of teaching (D)</p> <p>5. End-of-term questionnaires for all classes (if available) for c.1, c.2, c.3, c.4, and H reviews and for all classes since last review (or as required by department procedures) for I reviews (S)</p> <p>6. Sample solicitation letter to obtain letters from students[†] (D)</p> <p>7. Statement on how students solicited for letters were selected (D)</p> <p>8. Summary of contents of student letters (OD)</p> <p>9. Student letters (D) (S only if previous item is available)</p> <p>10. Samples of course materials (S)</p> <p>11. Assessment of course materials[†] (D)</p> <p>12. Summaries of interviews with students[†] (D)</p>	<p>The FRPC strongly urges units to give serious thought to developing a variety of indicators of effectiveness; such measures should reflect performance over the entire period under review rather than merely the most recent semester of teaching activity. Some possibilities might include:</p> <p>1. Analysis of course syllabi and examinations;</p> <p>2. Description and analysis of new courses developed;</p> <p>3. Description of the range/diversity of courses offered;</p> <p>4. Description of directed studies, theses, dissertations, and/or special projects;</p> <p>5. Description of participation in teaching related seminars, workshops, grants, conferences, etc;</p> <p>6. Peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching.</p>

The materials noted in these sections are to ONLY be used a guide. Please refer to the policies located in the appendices of this Guide

Department Of Sociology Anthropology Social Work & Criminal Justice Dossier Checklist

GENERAL INFORMATION

- ☐ FRPC checklist (C-4 & full)
- ☐ CV in OU format
- ☐ C-1, C-2 memos from Dean (C-2, C-4 & full)
- ☐ Department Review Procedures
- ☐ Department Criteria for Reappointment & Promotion
- ☐ Chair's memo initiating review with timeline
- ☐ Chair's memo to the CAP
- ☐ Certification of Procedures
- ☐ Committee report
- ☐ Sample ballot
- ☐ CV at time of hire (C-4 & full)
- ☐ CV for C-1 & C-2 reviews (C-4 & full)

SCHOLARSHIP

- ☐ List of external reviewers & relationship (C-4 & full)
- ☐ Statement of co-authorship
- ☐ Sample letter/email soliciting external reviewers (C-4 & full)
- ☐ Letters & vitae from external reviewers (C-4 & full)
- ☐ Sample letter soliciting collegial support
- ☐ Collegial letters – signed

TEACHING

- ☐ Sample letter/email requesting student evaluation
- ☐ Student evaluations with questions

SERVICE

- ☐ List of service contacts
- ☐ Sample letter/email requesting service
- ☐ Service letters – signed

SUPPLEMENTAL (Back-up) FILE CHECKLIST

Supplemental file will follow the CV exactly beginning with 4.d. – articles published, etc.

- ☐ Copies of all publications, pending submissions, electronic publications, recordings, etc.
- ☐ Copies of funded, pending and unfunded grant proposals & award letters
- ☐ Copies of manuscripts of conference presentations, if available. If not available, please type out a short reason why there is no evidence for each file.
- ☐ Letters/emails of acceptance of unpublished papers listed in the vita
- ☐ External recognition of scholarship
- ☐ End of term course evaluations for all reviews
- ☐ Sample course materials – syllabi, handouts, quizzes, exams
- ☐ Evidence of professional service – officers, reviewer, etc.
- ☐ Include all thank you letters for giving a talk, serving on a committee
- ☐ Include flyers advertising your talk or participation in a panel, etc.

Appendix A
AT A GLANCE TENURE REVIEW SCHEDULE

NAME: _____

HIRED AS	YEAR 1 <small>Fall Winter</small>	YEAR 2 <small>Fall Winter</small>	YEAR 3 <small>Fall Winter</small>	YEAR 4 <small>Fall Winter</small>	YEAR 5 <small>Fall Winter</small>	YEAR 6 <small>Fall Winter</small>
38.a DEPT. OAKLAND						
Instructor		41.b.(1) Review				
Year:						
38.b.1 DEPT. OAKLAND DEPT. OAKLAND DEPT. OAKLAND						
Asst Prof/0		41.c.(1) Review		41.c.(2) Review		41.c.(4) Review
Year:						
38.b.3 DEPT. OAKLAND DEPT. OAKLAND						
Asst Prof/2				41.c.(2) Review		41.c.(4) Review
Year:						
38.b.4 DEPT. OAKLAND DEPT. OAKLAND						
Asst Prof/3				41.c.(3) Review		41.c.(4) Review
Year:						
38.c DEPT. OAKLAND						
Assoc Prof			41.d. Review			
Year:						

NOTES:

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology sets forth below its criteria for reappointment and promotion, as agreed to by its full-time and tenure track faculty members.

A. GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology offers majors in both named disciplines leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts, as well as a modified major with a concentration in Linguistics. Liberal Arts Minors in Sociology and Anthropology are also offered. The department also offers an accredited Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) major. In addition, its faculty members participate, by offering course work in and/or assisting in the administration of, the International Studies Program, the Women and Gender Studies Program, the Bachelor of Integrative Studies Program, the Honors College and the following Concentration Programs in the university: Archaeology, Criminal Justice, Environmental Studies, Religious Studies, and Urban Studies.

B. DELIMITATION AND DEFINITIONS REGARDING AREAS OF PERFORMANCE TO BE REVIEWED

1. General Considerations.
 - a. The department recognizes the following areas of professional performance as being subject to review: instruction, scholarly activity and accomplishment, and university, professional and public service. It sets forth below its understandings as to what each of these implies in the context of its overall mission and the expectations commonly held in the academic disciplines to which its members belong.

The mission of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology is to generate and disseminate knowledge in the two major social science disciplines and the social work program which is administratively housed within it. Its members regard the research and teaching aspects of its mission as intertwined and mutually enriching. These activities are central to the departmental mission, all members seek to be as productive and effective as they can in attending to both. The department recognizes that members may vary in their balance of teaching, research, and service activities over time. With respect to the teaching mission, the department offers a full range curriculum in its majors contributes courses that satisfy the university's general education curriculum and diversity requirements, and provides core courses for several College concentrations. Departmental faculty are also expected to offer service activities as a routine phase of departmental and College citizenship, to contribute to university life, to participate as fully as possible in relevant capacities in professional scholarly societies, and to participate professionally in the university's outreach efforts in local, state, and national venues.

The various review criteria for each level described below have been developed with a sense of cross-university standards being currently applied, yet with sufficient flexibility as to allow for reviews in each individual case to be sensitive to individual's particular mix of accomplishment and activity. The members of this department understand, however, that the evaluation of candidates' records of accomplishment must be broadly comparative across the university at any point in time at the relevant review levels.

2. Instruction

- a. One of the primary missions of the department is undergraduate instruction. All department members are expected to be able to teach satisfactorily, at least one of the several introductory and/or required courses offered in its curricula, and to do so when so called upon, if not regularly. In addition, all department members are expected to develop and offer on a reasonably regular basis, as modified by scheduling and student enrollment trends in any given semester, courses in their specialties at the 200 level and above.
- b. Department members also teach courses which are either cross-listed with or otherwise part of extra-departmental curricular programs within the university. Teaching performance in these courses is also subject to review.
- c. The quality and effectiveness of the following activities will be assessed, as relevant, in evaluating the candidates' instructional performance, based on student questionnaire data, student letters solicited and received, faculty peer review of candidate syllabi and course materials, and/or classroom observations and/or student interviews (if implemented).
 - i. new course and/or curriculum development
 - ii. preparation of individual course content and structure
 - iii. classroom lectures and discussions, as well as accessibility to students at other than class meeting times
 - iv. grading practices and fairness
 - v. extra-classroom instruction, as in, e.g., offering independent study courses, supervising internships and field experiences, sponsoring special sessions

3. Scholarly Activity and Accomplishment

- a. Department members are expected to demonstrate productive scholarly activity and accomplishment related to their disciplines and their particular interests therein. The department shall make an assessment of the scholarly quality of all work reviewed. While such factors as the prestige of the journal or publishing house in/with which it appears, etc. may play a role in the departmental evaluation, such criteria shall not be arbitrarily applied a priori to consideration of the work under review.

- b. It should be noted that the department makes no a priori distinction between applied and basic research. Scholarly activity of all sorts described below shall be evaluated.
- c. Where a review candidate submits in evidence jointly authored work, the extent of his or her contribution will be ascertained and made explicit in the review and recommendation.

It is important to note that while the quantity of publication expected at each level of review is not necessarily specified, at the post-initial levels the rate of candidates' publication should be regular and sustained over time. The quantity of candidates' publications shall be assessed in balance with judgments regarding their quality and impact on the field of research they address.

- d. At each separate review, attention will be given to the cumulative record of the candidate's scholarly accomplishment, with appropriate emphasis placed upon achievement since the last successful review.

The department seeks to maintain a faculty whose members are productive and recognized scholars. To that end, candidates for reappointment and promotion at all levels are expected to present evidence of growth and accomplishment in the area of scholarship. Primary evidence in this regard, especially at levels beyond the initial reappointment review, shall consist of (in no rank order):

(i) articles in peer reviewed scholarly journals. In addition, publication of books, book chapters, or monographs that have undergone peer evaluation represent scholarship. Books or monographs can be authored or edited, but should be published by established publishing institutions.

Note: formal acceptance of an item for publication will be regarded as publication.

In addition to publication as described below for each review level, additional evidence of scholarly recognition to be considered may consist of:

(ii) other published works, such as research notes and comments, published book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and technical reports as commissioned or prepared for public or private agencies.

(iii) success in attracting external funding support for candidates' research; published comments in symposium formats or in multiple book review essays requiring expert or original assessment of the work discussed; or presentation of research at scholarly venues, such as professional conferences, invited academic lectures and in similar settings.

(iv) depending on the candidates' body of work, evidence of scholarship may include miscellaneous evidence of scholarship such as films, video tapes, computer programs, exhibitions and published photographs.

Where candidates' performance in any of the above activities has occurred jointly with others, the extent of the candidates' individual contribution shall be specified.

4. University, Professional and Public Service

a The department shall review evidence of candidates' performance in the areas of university, professional and public service. In general we take this to mean evidence of review candidates' willingness to contribute activities to university governance, administration and representation, at all levels and in both internal and external contexts, and otherwise to engage in activities which contribute positively to the life of the profession, as well as the university, its reputation, its faculty, its students and the public which the university serves. Service activities to be considered by the department may be divided into intra-university and extra-university activities, as summarized below.

b. University Service

1. Departmental service, including service on departmental committees or engaging in other activities, which contribute to the life of the department and the fulfillment of its mission. Service as an academic student adviser, either as a matter of formal assignment or as a matter of informal regular activity, shall be given special weight. So will assigned or self-assumed responsibility for the administration of any curricular programs (e.g., concentrations) for which the department has sole or primary responsibility.
2. Service on college bodies of administration and governance, or activities that contribute to the life of the college.
3. Service on university bodies of administration and governance including inter-college/school bodies, or activities that contribute to the life of the university.

c. Professional Service

1. The organization of panel sessions at scholarly conferences, the organization of scholarly conferences in entirety, or otherwise officiating in some administrative capacity at scholarly or other professional conferences.
2. Service as a member of the governing body of a professional association or as a member of a committee established by same for whatever purpose.
3. Service as an editor of a journal, newsletter or any like ad seriatum (serial) publication, directly related or of interest to the profession; service as an editor of a published volume of scholarly research reports, articles or findings.
4. Service as a reader of manuscripts for a journal or a publishing company.

d. Public Service

1. Any activities which the review candidate is called upon to perform, either as an official university representative or because of his/her professional/academic expertise, to serve an extra-university body or community group, in the public or private sector.
2. Other general representational activities, such as speaking on a particular topic as a departmental, college or university representative at an extra-university gathering.

e. In general the department shall recognize, as evidence for a review of candidate performance, honorary or other awards received for meritorious service in any capacity, or any service designation of the sort described in 4.a.1, 2, and 3, 4, resulting from past meritorious accomplishments as a scholar, teacher or academic administrator.

5. Other Areas of Professional Performance

In addition to performance in instruction, scholarly activity and university service, other professional activities in which the candidate may have engaged will be given due note at all review levels. These may include remunerated consultancy or lecturing activities to extra-university bodies, insofar as these may be deemed consonant with the candidate's professional expertise and with the enhancement of the reputation of the university and the department.

C. APPLICATION OF REVIEW CRITERIA AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF REVIEW

1. General Considerations. The department expects good performance at all levels of review for tenure track faculty. It will recommend all faculty members who develop and sustain good performance in all three areas of review. The unit recognizes, however, that members' contributions to its work may vary in emphasis and quality according to individual interests and predilections. The standards set forth below at the different review levels represent what the department normally will consider adequate in this connection. Performance in each area at each level must exceed these minima to be considered good or outstanding.
2. The Initial Review for Candidates with No Prior Counted Professional Experience (41c.1). At this review level, it is understood that candidates new to the profession may experience some difficulties of adjustment to the demands of full time instruction, may as yet not be prepared to publish their research, and cannot be expected to be assigned or engage in significant university service. Hence, although this review will take due note of all accomplishments of candidates by the time of its initiation, it will also allow, more so than will subsequent reviews, more latitude for credit for evidence of future promise in all areas. The standards of performance at this review level will generally be as follows:
 - a. Instruction: At the initial level of review at the rank of assistant professor, candidates shall have offered a mix of introductory and/or required courses and

courses in their specialty areas, where possible. There must be evidence of effective course preparation and classroom teaching. If any instructional difficulties are noted at this review level, the candidate will be expected to address these, and improvement should be demonstrated at the next review.

- b. Scholarly Activity: At the initial level of review for reappointment at the rank of assistant professor, actual publication is welcome but not required. However, candidates must at a minimum display evidence that they are making progress toward scholarly accomplishment in their chosen field(s) of research. Such evidence should consist of, but is not necessarily limited to, manuscripts presented at scholarly conferences.

Note: Any candidate who may not have completed the Ph.D. degree or otherwise attained its equivalent by the time of this review shall normally not be recommended for reappointment.

- c. Service: Candidates must have demonstrated an active interest in departmental matters and a willingness to be of assistance in the conduct of departmental business, even though they may not have been given any regular service assignment. Candidates at this level will not ordinarily be expected to have performed significant departmental, university, professional or public service, but if they have done so this will be duly noted.

3. The Pre-Tenure Review for Candidates with Prior Counted Experience (41.c.2 or c.3).

At this review level there must be demonstrable professional accomplishment and the candidate's record to date should indicate such promise of continued professional development as to warrant the reasonable expectation of an award of tenure at the subsequent review. The standards of performance at this review level shall generally be as follows:

- a. Instruction: Candidates for a second reappointment at the rank of assistant professor shall continue to have offered and demonstrated effective teaching in both introductory and/or required courses as well as specialized course work. Creation of new courses at any level that meets department and/or college and university needs will be welcome, as will evidence of mentoring individual students. They shall also demonstrate efforts to remedy any difficulties in teaching that may have been noted at the time of their initial review.
- b. Scholarly Activity: Candidates for a second reappointment at the rank of assistant professor must display evidence of some accomplishment as scholars in their chosen field(s) of research. Evidence must include success in publication and persuasive indications that sufficient publication will be forthcoming. (Note: Candidates should be aware of the requirements of tenure and promotion at the C.4 level.)
- c. Service: By the time of this review, a candidate should have made regular contribution to departmental service. Contributions to university, professional and public service will also be duly noted and evaluated.

4. Early Promotion: Candidates who, at the time of their first or second pre-tenure review,

demonstrate a level of performance far superior in instruction, scholarship and service that clearly meets the standards of the 41.c.4 review, as set forth below, can be recommended by the department for early promotion with tenure.

5. The Tenure Review (41.c.4 or 41.d). This review is regarded by the department as the most important. As such, it must show demonstrated evidence of professional accomplishment, as well as the promise of future professional development. The standards of performance at this review level shall generally be as follows:
 - a. **Instruction:** Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure shall have continued to demonstrate effective teaching and developed a range of introductory and/or required courses as well as advanced course offerings that meet departmental and/or college and university needs. They should have evidence of mentoring individual students. Candidates at this level should also have to some extent integrated their own scholarship into their course content, as relevant. Difficulties in teaching noted at earlier levels of review should have been substantially resolved.
 - b. **Scholarly Activity:** Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure must display consistent accomplishment in their chosen field(s) of research. Evidence must include a pattern of consistent scholarly activity that results in regular publication (as designated in list i, page 3, this document) and scholarly accomplishment and recognition (as designated in lists ii, iii, and iv, page 3 this document). Ordinarily, the department would expect, on average, at least one publication (list i) per year, and regular and continuing scholarly accomplishment and recognition (lists ii, iii, and iv). In addition, the candidate must show promise of continuing future success in publications (list i) and scholarly accomplishment and recognition (lists ii, iii, and iv). The candidate's commitment to high standards of scholarship would be confirmed by outside peer evaluation.
 - c. **Service:** Regular service in the department is continued to be expected. At this level it is expected that the candidate will have contributed some extra-departmental university service, and/or professional service, and/or public service, or else significant departmental service.
6. Promotion to the Rank of Professor (41.i). Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must display evidence of significant and continuing scholarly and instructional accomplishment as delineated in paragraphs a. and b. below. Overall, evidence also must include outstanding achievement and recognition in either: (1) teaching, or (2) publications (list i) and scholarly accomplishments (lists ii, iii, and iv). Evidence of leadership and regular participation in service related activities must also be demonstrated, but it will not be recognized as a substitute for outstanding accomplishment in scholarship or teaching. In addition, candidates must display a pattern and expectation of continuing future success in scholarship, instruction and service.
 - a. **Instruction:** Depending on the evaluation of instructional performance at the time of the previous review, further instructional improvement is expected at this level. At

a minimum, candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor must demonstrate that they have maintained over time the standards or performance operant at the c-4 level. This minimum level of performance will be assessed as an indicator of future teaching competence and effectiveness. Candidates must demonstrate that they have kept their courses current with ongoing standards of knowledge and scholarly interpretation in their fields. They should also have further integrated their scholarship in their course content. In order to be recognized as outstanding, candidates will have taken some leadership in processes to improve overall teaching effectiveness. In addition, candidates will have evidence of significant mentorship with students such as, writing papers with students, helping students obtain scholarships and fellowships, and assisting them in applying to graduate school or other programs.

b. Scholarly Activity: Candidates must demonstrate substantial and sustained post-tenure achievement in publications (list i) and other scholarly accomplishments (lists ii, iii, and iv). Evidence of outstanding scholarly achievement must be confirmed by outside peer evaluation.

c. Service: Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor shall demonstrate service leadership in activities at the department level. In addition, regular activities in extra-departmental college, and/or university, and/or professional and public service is also expected.

Initial appointment at high ranks: Candidates for initial appointment in the department at the rank of professor must meet the standards of scholarly performance set forth above for internal promotion to those ranks.

7. Review for Special Instructor. In addition to tenure track faculty, the department may also hire Special Instructors who, while holding non-tenure track positions, are eligible for job security and must also come under review. Normally, Special Instructors have unique credentials to teach courses in specific areas deemed important by the department but which the department would otherwise not be able to offer on a regular basis. In general, therefore, reviews of Special Instructors will emphasize teaching performance in the specialty area(s) for which persons at this rank were initially hired. If, in addition, particular service and/or scholarly activities are also specified as aspects of expected performance in Special Instructors' most recent letter of hire, these activities will be evaluated with correspondingly appropriate emphasis in reviews. Accordingly, candidates' most recent letter of hire must be included in their dossiers and be available for inspection.

a. First and/or Second Reappointment

- i. Instruction: Special Instructors are expected to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, as measured by the methods described in the departmental procedures. In the absence of additional hiring stipulations, teaching effectiveness will be weighted more heavily than any other consideration in the review.
- ii. Service: Special Instructors are expected to have made effective contributions to any service activities that may be specified in the most recent letter of hire. The

relative weight of these service contributions in the overall review will reflect the importance assigned to them in the letter of hire. As full time faculty members, Special Instructors may also be called upon from time to time to participate in various other service activities within the department, college, or university. Such additional service contributions, which might also include community and professional service, will be taken into account in the review.

- iii. Scholarship: Special Instructors are expected to have made satisfactory progress towards fulfilling any scholarly projects that may be specified in the most recent letter of hire. The relative weight given to such scholarly work will reflect the importance assigned to it in the letter of hire. As full time faculty members, Special Instructors are generally expected to contribute in some measure to the overall research activity of the department. Therefore, any additional scholarly activity engaged in by a Special Instructor will be valued and taken into account in the review. These reviews will be done in accordance with C-1 procedures.

b. Re-employment with the Granting of Job Security

- i. Instruction: Special Instructors shall continue to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, as measured by methods described in the departmental procedures. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will normally receive greatest emphasis relative to other areas of performance.
- ii. Service: Special Instructors must continue to demonstrate effective performance of service activities that may be specified in the last letter of reappointment. Additional service contributions within the department, college, or university will continue to be taken into account.
- iii. Scholarship: Special Instructors must have successfully completed scholarly projects specified in the initial letter of hire and/or have demonstrated continued scholarly accomplishment reflecting additional scholarly projects that may be specified, recognized, or encouraged in the last letter of reappointment.

These reviews will be done in accordance with C-2 Procedures.

c. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure:

According to the Faculty Agreement (VII, 42d) a Special Instructor may be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Should the Department of Sociology and Anthropology initiate a review of a Special Instructor with job security under this provision, he or she must fulfill all requirements for a C-4 review in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

I. **PREAMBLE**

This document outlines the procedures to be followed in assessing the performance of candidates for reappointment and promotion, using the departmental criteria set forth in accordance with the University Standards for Re-Employment, Promotion and Tenure (below: see Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion).

Reappointment reviews serve two purposes: to evaluate a faculty member's contribution to scholarship, teaching and service and to guide faculty members toward a better realization of their professional potential. In the short run, the evaluative functions of reappointment reviews must necessarily have the greatest impact on the individual being reviewed, but we believe that the success of the review process should ultimately be judged on its ability to increase the faculty member's intellectual growth and professional competence and to contribute to the improvement of the department.

II. **DEFINITIONS**

As used in the following procedures:

Department member shall mean a person with primary appointment in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the time of the reappointment review.

Regular semester shall mean the Fall and/or Winter Semesters of the regular academic year.

Service shall, unless otherwise specifically designated, refer to departmental, college, and university service, as well as professional and public service.

III. **THE DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

For each candidate under review in any year, the chairperson shall appoint a review committee composed of three members and designate one of these as its chair. Review committee members shall be drawn from departmental faculty and any faculty member may serve on more than one such committee in any given year.

- A. In tenure decisions all three members of committee must be tenured.
- B. In non-tenure decisions it shall be permissible to appoint a committee with two members senior in academic rank and the third member equal in academic rank to the candidate.
- C. Where possible, two members of the committee shall be of the same discipline as the candidate (sociology, anthropology or social work).
- D. The chair shall select committee members in consultation with the candidate under review. Within the limits of the committee composition stipulated above, at least two of the members shall be appointed with the concurrence of the candidate.

IV. CANDIDATE ' S RESPONSIBILITIES

The candidate shall be responsible for the preparation of a dossier according to the guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences. This will include the following:

A. Scholarship

1. A bibliography of published works.
2. A copy of all written material to be used in the evaluation of scholarship; the candidate shall identify each written document submitted to the committee as: (a) published, (b) accepted for publication (source of publication to be specified) but not yet published, (c) currently being reviewed for publication, but not yet accepted, (d) other written work identified as to its purpose.
3. A statement explaining the extent and nature of the candidate ' s contribution to co-authored work, if any, as well as any explanation the candidate deems useful or necessary regarding the nature and purpose of the written material submitted to the committee (see IV, A. 2 above).
4. For tenure and professorial reviews, the candidate shall provide the names of persons outside the university who can be contacted for an evaluation of his/her scholarly activities, explaining in each case the relationship of the proposed evaluator to the candidate.

B. Service

1. A list of his/her departmental, college, university, professional and public service activities.
2. A statement regarding the nature, purpose and extent of the activities (Optional)
3. For tenure and professorial reviews, the candidate shall provide the names of persons who can be contacted for an evaluation of his/her significant service activities since the last review; this requirement is optional for all other review candidates. Although electronic mail communications are acceptable in order to expedite committee review, external reviewers shall be asked to provide a copy of their comments printed on institutional letterhead stationery for inclusion in candidates' dossiers.

C. Teaching

1. The candidate shall supply the committee with evidence of teaching ability and performance. Specifically, the candidate shall: supply the committee with the department' s end of term *summaries of* course evaluations for all courses taught since his/her last review;
2. prepare a statement interpreting the results of the student evaluations (Optional);

3. prepare a list of at least ten, but no more than twenty, students in the university during the preceding two regular semesters in which the candidate taught classes at Oakland, whom the candidate would like to have contacted concerning his/her teaching (submission for earlier semesters back to the time of last review optional) (see V, A below);
4. submit class lists for all courses taught during the preceding two regular semesters (submission for earlier semesters back to the time of last review optional);
5. submit syllabi for all courses taught during the preceding two regular semesters during which the candidate was in residence (other descriptive material may also be submitted).

D. Additional Material

The candidate may submit any additional material relevant to the review committee.

V. COMMITTEE 'S RESPONSIBILITIES

It is the committee 's responsibility to make a recommendation to the department documented by reference to evidence of the candidate 's scholarship, teaching and service.

- A. Teaching. It is recognized that no single approach for evaluating teaching effectiveness is completely reliable. Therefore, in evaluating the candidate 's teaching, the committee shall interpret the results of student evaluations and other student communications in the context of the nature and type of classes taught, and, if possible, the intellectual and organizational input into his/her classes, and the academic supervision or assistance given to students outside of class.
1. In addition to considering any interpretation offered by the candidate of the results of his/her student evaluation data, the committee shall conduct its own independent review of the candidate 's results and incorporate its assessment into the review document.
 2. The committee shall solicit letters from students who have been in the candidate 's courses over the two years prior to the review in process, inviting student comment on the candidate 's classroom teaching effectiveness.
 - a. An equal number of such letters shall be solicited from students on the list supplied by the candidate in accordance with the provisions of IV, C.3, above, and from students selected independently by the committee from the relevant class lists. The committee 's method for selecting students from whom letters are to be requested shall be specified in its report and recommendation.

- b. If the student response to its solicitations is less than 50% of the number of letters requested, the committee shall make a renewed good faith effort to obtain a 50% response.
3. In addition to the above procedures, the candidate may request, or the committee, in consultation and by agreement with the candidate, may decide, that information regarding teaching effectiveness shall be gathered by other means as well as those specified herein. These may include, but need not be limited to, direct classroom observation or direct student interviews, provided that the additional method to be employed be specified in advance by the committee and agreed to by the candidate.

B. Scholarship

1. The committee shall evaluate candidate 's scholarship. This evaluation will be based on candidate 's published work and other material submitted to committee by candidate. The committee may request copies of any written work listed in candidate 's bibliography and will read all material submitted.
2. In the cases of candidates under review for tenure or promotion to the rank of professor, the committee shall obtain opinion of the candidate 's scholarship from at least three impartial persons outside the university who are qualified to evaluate his/her work. Persons from whom such evaluations shall be solicited shall be selected from (a) a list compiled by the candidate and (b) a list compiled independently by the committee. Although electronic mail communications are acceptable in order to expedite committee review, external reviewers shall be asked to provide a copy of their comments printed on institutional letterhead stationery for inclusion in candidates' dossiers. Note: in the cases of pre-tenure reviews, this procedure shall be optional, and when deemed necessary, it may be implemented (a) at the request of the candidate and/or (b) by committee decision. The candidate shall be consulted, but may not veto, a committee nominee.
3. The committee shall establish procedures for determining persons who are qualified according to above criteria (V, B.2). These procedures shall be specified in the committee report.

C. Service

The committee shall evaluate the candidate 's departmental, college, university, professional and public service. It will consider in its evaluation the nature, purpose and extent of such activities based on the materials submitted by the candidate and information collected from others who have knowledge of the candidate 's activities in these areas (solicitation of such information shall be optional in cases of pre-tenure review).

D. Collegial Opinion

The candidate's dossier shall be made available to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the department.

1. Prior to preparing its recommendation to the department, the committee shall solicit written letters from departmental faculty regarding the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service. Such letters will be based on the candidate's dossier, as well as knowledge of the candidate's areas of work and experiences of the candidate as a colleague. Cooperation with the request shall be optional.
2. Upon receipt of faculty letters, the committee will incorporate collegial opinion into its recommendation.
3. The committee will make its recommendation available to the candidate, who shall be given three working days from receipt of the report to respond in writing, should he/she choose to do so, to the committee chair.

E. Committee Recommendation and Vote

1. The committee will make its recommendation, including the candidate's response, if any, to all tenured and tenure-track members of the departmental faculty. The committee shall give the faculty five working days to vote by secret ballot on whether or not the candidate meets the departmental criteria.
2. The chairperson shall be given the committee recommendation and department vote, and shall have five working days to write a letter agreeing or disagreeing with the recommendation and/or vote. A dissenting letter shall not supersede the departmental recommendation.

VI. DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

1. A simple majority of votes by eligible faculty submitted by the deadline will constitute the department recommendation. If the chairperson's letter agrees with the departmental recommendation, the chairperson shall convey the department recommendation to subsequent reviewers. In the event of a dissenting chairperson letter, a departmental colleague shall be selected, with the candidate's approval, to convey the departmental recommendation. In either event, the department recommendation will be accompanied by the Department Review Committee recommendation and the chairperson's letter.
2. In the event of a negative departmental recommendation, the candidate may choose to provide a written response, within three working days of notification of said recommendation, that will be included among materials to be sent to all subsequent reviewers for consideration.

VII. CHAIRPERSON'S RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Preparation and Scheduling

The chairperson shall:

1. prepare a time schedule for all stages of the review, list the names of all candidates being reviewed and the composition of each committee. This shall be distributed to all department members.
2. appoint the review committee in accordance with the review timetable set forth as required in (1), above.
3. supply the candidate and the members of the review committee with a copy of the reappointment review procedures and any other department or university documents which govern the review.
4. assist the candidate and the committee in collecting the materials necessary for the review.

B. Evaluation of Teaching

The chairperson shall ensure that evaluations of teaching will be administered during the twelfth week of all sociology, anthropology and social work classes during the Fall and Winter Semesters. Specifically, the chairperson shall:

1. designate person(s) other than course instructor to administer and collect instruments and see that they are analyzed.
2. make analysis available to all members of the department.
3. make available to each instructor a summary report for his/her classes only.

VIII. PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

A. Initiation of Review

1. After consultation with the department chairperson, any associate professor without stipulation of time in rank, may request a review for promotion. The consultation with the department chairperson must be conducted well in advance of the review deadline. Following this consultation, an associate professor, or the chairperson, or both, may formally request a review. Ordinarily, the department will conduct no more than one such review in an academic year
2. Request for initiation of review must be made in writing to the department chairperson, no later than nine months in advance of the date that the results of any such review must be presented to the college Committee on Appointment and Promotion. If the request is made by any person other than the candidate, it must include written authorization of candidate.

3. It shall be the responsibility of the department chairperson to convene the reviewing body.
- B. The review shall take place in the manner provided in Articles I-VII, above, except that whenever possible, the review committee shall consist of at least two persons holding the rank of professor.

IX. REVIEW OF NON-REGULAR FACULTY

A. Review of Visiting Faculty

In the event that the department can reemploy a visiting faculty member for an additional term, criteria and procedures will be followed to evaluate the candidate prior to making the employment recommendation. This process, by necessity, will not involve a dossier or formal committee recommendations, and will be done in the final month(s) of the candidate's contract. The chairperson will conduct this evaluation. The candidate must achieve a satisfactory rating in teaching as described in paragraph C.2.a of the departmental criteria document, depending on the visitor's rank and years of experience. In addition, any scholarly and/or service expectations assigned to the candidate at the time of hire should also be evaluated and satisfactory ratings achieved, again using the criteria associated with the candidate's rank and experience. If a decision is made to not reemploy a visitor on the basis of performance, the tenured faculty of the department shall be consulted.

B. Review of Part-Time Faculty

Part-time faculty (lecturers and special lecturers) are hired on a semester by semester or year by year basis. For continuation as a part-time faculty, the candidate must, as determined by the chairperson, achieve a satisfactory rating in teaching and additionally have demonstrated high professional standards, reliability, conscientiousness and availability to students. For each reemployment, the teaching criteria in paragraph C.2.a of the departmental criteria document should be applied. If a decision is made to not reemploy a part-time faculty member on the basis of performance, the tenured faculty of the department may be consulted.

CAP GUIDELINES FOR DOSSIER PREPARATION

Revised: October 2009

Philosophy: The objective of the dossier is to present the candidate's achievements in as fair and accurate a manner as possible. If the department's recommendation is positive, its case should be bolstered by evidence in the dossier. If the department's recommendation is negative, evidence for this recommendation must be contained in the dossier along with appropriate responses by the candidate in accordance with the department's procedures. At all times, the dossier should be assembled with the knowledge that some reviewers may choose not to read the material in the supplementary file. Dossiers must be submitted to the Dean's office by **February 1**. No further additions or amendments may be made to the dossier after that time without prior approval of the chair of the CAP. Unless requested by the committee, no amendments are allowed once the committee has begun a review of a dossier.

Note: The amount of supporting material should be consistent with the level of review. Reappointments usually require less supporting material than do mandated tenure reviews. Optional reviews for promotion to full professor or for early tenure require extensive documentation.

Note: Use contract conventions for writing review level, i.e., c.2.

The following are suggested contents of the dossier and supplementary file. Each item will be marked with

D = must be in the dossier
DS = must be present either in the dossier or in the supplementary file
S = must be in the supplementary file
O = optional in accordance with department traditions
OD = optional item which should be in the main dossier
OS = optional item which should be in the supplementary file

† if required by department procedures

1. Table of contents (D)
2. Vita using Dean's format (D)
3. Department's Review Statement (D)
4. Candidate's statement (D)
5. Chair's certification that procedures have been followed (D)
6. All c.4 dossiers must include a copy of the CAP recommendation from the c.2 or c.3 review.
7. All dossiers, beginning with the c.2 review, must include a copy of the reappointment letter from the Dean of the College.
8. Department's recommendation letter (D)
9. Review committee's letter† (D)

10. Departmental colleague evaluation forms or letters (D) (It is the practice of some departments to include a summary of these in the dossier and relegate the forms themselves to the supplementary file. This is acceptable.)
11. List of contents of the supplementary file (D)
12. Candidate's rebuttal when submitted (D)

Note: The first 2 items on the above list should appear in the indicated order while item 9 should appear last. The remaining items can appear in any order in the dossier. The remainder of the dossier should be divided into 3 sections for scholarship, instruction, and service. These can appear in any order although it is customary for service to be last. The items listed below can appear in any order within each category.

A. Scholarship (or creativity)

1. All publications should include complete journal titles (unabbreviated) and pagination. (D)
2. There should be a clear indication of which publications and presentations are refereed and/or invited. (D)
3. The candidate should indicate his/her contributions to multi-author publications, grant applications, presentations, and other joint activities. The candidate should indicate the significance of the order of authorship, if any. The candidate should identify those publications and presentations that have students as co-authors. (D)
4. Copies of all the candidate's publications, pending submissions, electronic publications, or recordings or video tapes of performances, as appropriate (S)
5. Copies of funded, pending, and unfunded (O) grant proposals (S), and include award letters
6. Copies of manuscripts of conference presentations, if available (S)
7. Copies of manuscripts of work in progress, if available (S)
8. Sample letter for solicitation of external review (D)
9. List of external reviewers with brief identification, including relationship to the candidate, if any (D) (External letters may be optional for some departments for c.1 and c.2 reviews.)
10. Vitae of external reviewers (S)
11. Letters from external reviewers (D)
12. Internal letter(s) of review of scholarship (OD)
13. Letters (or e-mails) of acceptance of unpublished papers listed in the vita as accepted for publication (S)
14. Evidence of external recognition of scholarship such as professional reviews of performances, discussion of research in news articles, and awards (DS)
15. Published reviews of candidates work, if available (DS)

B. Instruction

1. Statements by faculty who have observed candidate's classes[†] (D)
2. Sample student end-of-term questionnaire (D)
3. Department's assessment of results of questionnaires, if not already given in review committee letter (D)

4. Any other departmental assessment of teaching (D)
5. End-of-term questionnaires for all classes (if available) for c.1, c.2, c.3, c.4, and H reviews and for all classes since last review (or as required by department procedures) for I reviews (S)
6. Sample solicitation letter to obtain letters from students[†] (D)
7. Statement on how students solicited for letters were selected (D)
8. Summary of contents of student letters (OD)
9. Student letters (D) (S only if previous item is available)
10. Samples of course materials (S)
11. Assessment of course materials[†] (D)
12. Summaries of interviews with students[†] (D)

C. Service

1. Sample of solicitation letter for comments on external service (D)
2. Letters from chairs or colleagues (where candidate is chair) of all committees on which the candidate made a significant contribution (D)
3. Letters from colleagues regarding significant service that is not in committee format (D)
4. Letters of appreciation for major service activities on or off campus (D)
5. Letters commenting on service that does not fall into the above categories (DS)
6. Evidence for standard professional service (S)
7. Evidence for unusual professional service (D)
8. Departmental evaluation of service if not already given (D)
9. The candidate should indicate his/her role in joint service activities. (D)
10. Flyers, announcements, or other publicity for community programs (OS)

Appendix E

College of Arts and Sciences

COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES 2014-2015

- I. The committee will select a chairperson and a secretary.
- II. Minutes of various meetings will include:
 - A. Members and visitors present and times of meetings.
 - B. Names of candidates discussed and voted on by secret ballot.
 - C. The final vote count on each recommendation.
- III. Review Procedures.
 - A. All matters pertaining to the reappointment, tenuring or promotion of candidates will be held in confidence by the elected, voting members of the committee and will not be discussed outside formal meetings of the committee. During the review process, the chairperson of the committee will be the point of contact with the AAUP, FRPC, the dean, the department and the candidate, as necessary, save on purely procedural matters which will be handled by the secretary of the committee.
 - B. Reappointments and promotions with or without tenure.
 1. The committee will review all candidates at least twice. In the first review, the committee will consider:
 - a. Whether or not the dossier needs reorganization or additional documentation. However, the committee may request additional documentation at any time during the review process.
 - b. The committee may request clarification of a department's recommendation.
 - c. Should any dispute arise between the committee and a department about the procedures or deadlines for the department supplying additional documentation or clarification required by the committee, the dean will mediate the dispute. In the case of an incomplete dossier, the committee reserves the right to make a negative recommendation. The CAP letter, however, must state that this is the basis for the decision.

2. Prior to the final meeting a preliminary vote will be taken. Before CAP can recommend contrary to a department recommendation, it must invite a spokesperson from the department to defend orally the recommendation at a CAP meeting. A faculty member being reviewed by CAP shall have the right to be present when oral testimony is taken from anyone not a member of the reviewing body. A faculty member shall have the right to be accompanied and/or represented by another member of the university when such testimony is taken.
 - a. All personnel recommendations must have the support of a majority of the voting membership of the committee.
 - b. Any committee member may call for a revote on any recommendation. The revote must occur during regular meeting times. The committee will not revote after its official letter of recommendation has been sent.
 - c. When the committee votes on personnel recommendations, all voting members must be present and must vote. There shall be no abstentions. However, a vote may be made by phone conference "or if not possible" by contacting the chair of the committee in writing.
 - d. All CAP votes are by secret ballot.
- C. The committee reserves the right to recommend negatively on any dossier received after the appropriate deadline specified in the faculty agreement. When the committee recommends on dossiers received late, the committee may seek a contract exception to the mandated deadlines. It will notify the AAUP, the FRPC, the dean, the departmental chairperson and the candidate about how it will proceed.
- D. Positive recommendations made by the committee may include advice for possible areas of improvement.
- E. Negative recommendations made by the committee must include reasons.
- F. The committee will send to the dean, the departmental chairperson and the candidate copies of its recommendation, including the vote of the committee, at the same time Oakland or the FRPC is notified. In accordance with the Faculty Agreement, paragraph 41.a.(4), the committee will provide the AAUP, within three (3) days of the making of the recommendation, the name of any individual who is not being recommended for re-employment, promotion, or tenure.

compensation for the affected department, up to four additional four-credit course reductions during the term of the agreement for the purpose of collective bargaining.

31. Subject to carrier approval, the Association may designate any of its current or retired employees to participate in the medical, dental and optical insurance programs described in paragraphs 107 through 115, with no expense to Oakland.

ARTICLE VI UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

32. **General.** Subject only to terms of this Agreement, Oakland has the legal responsibility and the right to select, implement, and manage its academic and non-academic operations and programs. As part of these rights and responsibilities, Oakland shall have the right to (a) hire, assign, promote, schedule, layoff, recall, discipline and discharge its faculty members; (b) determine the schedule of the academic year; (c) locate, relocate, and remove its equipment and facilities; and (d) control all of its property.
33. **Management Practices.** Oakland's existing rights, privileges, and responsibilities to manage its academic and non-academic operations not specifically delineated by this Agreement shall continue in full force and effect. If specific terms of this Agreement conflict with such rights, privileges, and responsibilities, then the specific terms of this Agreement shall be controlling to the extent necessary to resolve such conflict; but this Agreement in all cases shall be interpreted so as not to deprive Oakland of its legal authority to control all final decisions regarding its academic and non-academic programs.

ARTICLE VII FACULTY EMPLOYMENT, RE-EMPLOYMENT, AND TENURE

34. **Employment Procedures.** Each academic unit shall have the right to make recommendations concerning initial employment within the corresponding unit of all persons with academic titles specified in Article IV, including a recommendation concerning whether such employment shall be with or without tenure, as appropriate. Each academic unit shall develop its own procedures and criteria for making such recommendations to Oakland, which shall initiate all offers of employment. In the case of employment of a faculty member with tenure, FRPC shall have the opportunity to make an employment recommendation to Oakland. In the case of employment of a faculty member with job security, the appropriate CAP shall have the opportunity to make an employment recommendation to Oakland. At the time of employment, Oakland shall determine the value of any prior experience for the purposes of paragraph 38b below; the faculty member shall be notified as to the valuation.
35. **Appointment of Department Chairpersons.** Department chairpersons are appointed by Oakland for a three-year term, which term may be renewable, or may be extended for one year. An acting chairperson may be appointed for up to a one-year term, which term may be renewable. Each academic unit will establish procedures for making chairperson recommendations to the dean.

Using these procedures, the department will recommend to the dean individuals for the position of department chairperson. After any further consultation he/she finds necessary, the dean shall appoint the chairperson of the department. If the dean chooses to appoint as department chairperson a faculty member other than one of those recommended, he/she shall meet with the department to explain the decision. In unusual circumstances, Oakland may appoint an executive officer over a department, after consultation with all other department chairpersons in the relevant school or college.

36. Oakland may withdraw its appointment of a department chairperson only after Oakland consults with all tenured faculty members in the department. In departments with fewer than five tenured faculty, the five highest ranking members of the department (or all members if there are fewer than five members) must be consulted. Oakland may also consult with such other persons as Oakland deems appropriate.
37. **Non-Tenured Employment.** A faculty member employed by Oakland shall serve without tenure or job security until granted tenure or job security by Oakland pursuant to the processes described below. These processes are not applicable to visiting and part-time faculty. However, each academic unit shall establish and publish a statement of its procedures and criteria for making recommendations on employment and re-employment of visiting and part-time faculty.
38. **Non-Tenured Employment Periods.** A faculty member subject to the Tenure Review Process may be employed and/or re-employed by Oakland in rank according to the following schedule:
- a. **Instructor.** Employment as instructor shall be for a term of three years after which an instructor not promoted to the rank of assistant professor shall not be re-employed as a full-time faculty member. A faculty member reviewed and promoted shall be further reviewed under the schedule for second and subsequent re-employments pursuant to subparagraph 38b.(1) below.
 - b. **Assistant Professor.** An assistant professor subject to the Tenure Review Process may be employed and/or re-employed by Oakland in rank according to the following schedule:
 - (1) Except as noted below, employment as assistant professor shall be for an initial term of three years. A faculty member may be reappointed to two additional terms of two years each, after which an assistant professor not re-employed with tenure shall not be re-employed as a full-time faculty member.
 - (2) Prior experience at another college or university or at Oakland may reduce the period of untenured employment by up to three years:
 - (a) Unless Oakland and the faculty member agree to a lesser value, fulltime teaching experience at another college or university or at Oakland with visiting or instructor titles shall be counted at full value.

Extensive part-time teaching experience at another college or university or at Oakland may be counted toward full-time prior teaching experience.

- (b) Extensive post-doctoral research experience at another college or university or at Oakland or other appropriate professional experience may be counted as prior experience.
 - (c) During the first year of employment, Oakland and the faculty member may agree to a lesser value for prior credit. The options in this subparagraph shall be presented in writing to the faculty member at the time of appointment. The review schedule in this paragraph also may be modified pursuant to paragraph 38f. below.
- (3) For individuals with two years of prior experience under the provisions of subparagraph 38b.(2) above, the initial term shall be waived, the second term shall be three years, and the final term shall be two years.
 - (4) For individuals with three years of prior experience under the provisions of subparagraph 38b.(2) above, the initial term shall be waived, the second term shall be two years, and the final term shall be two years.
 - (5) An assistant professor re-employed with tenure shall be promoted simultaneously to associate professor. Faculty members in the Library who were tenured as assistant professors prior to September 1, 2000 shall retain tenure at that rank.
 - (6) A faculty member employed pursuant to 38b.(1) shall be reviewed during the first term under review procedures 41c.(1), during the second term under review procedures 41c.(2) and during the third term under review procedures 41c.(4). A faculty member employed pursuant to schedule 38b.(3) shall be reviewed during the first term under review procedures 41c.(2) and during the second term under review procedures 41c.(4). A faculty member employed pursuant to schedule 38b.(4) shall be reviewed during the first term under review procedures 41c.(3), and during the second term under review procedures 41c.(4).
- c. Associate Professor. Employment without tenure in the rank of associate professor for a person not previously employed by Oakland as a faculty member shall be for an initial term of four years, after which an associate professor not granted tenure by Oakland shall not be re-employed as a full-time faculty member. No person previously employed by Oakland as a full-time non-visiting faculty member may be promoted to the rank of associate professor without being granted tenure.
 - d. Special Instructor. Employment in the rank of special instructor shall be for an initial term of three years. Such faculty member may be re-employed for two additional terms of two years after which a special instructor shall not be re-employed as a full-time faculty member unless granted job security.

- e. Transfer to Special Instructor. A faculty member employed pursuant to 38a. or 38b. above may be considered for re-employment as a special instructor rather than for re-employment as specified in those subparagraphs if the following conditions are met:

- (1) The faculty member, his or her academic unit, and Oakland agree to the transfer, and
- (2) Such agreement is reached prior to the earlier of the following: the third anniversary of the faculty member's initial full-time employment or the commencement of the faculty member's 41c.(2) or 41c.(3) review.

If these conditions are met, the faculty member will be reviewed at the next normal review date, but under provisions of subparagraph 42a. If such review results in re-employment such re-employment shall be for a term of two years or such greater period which when added to his or her previous period(s) of employment as a faculty member totals five years. During such employment term, a special instructor will be reviewed under review procedures 42b. If such review does not result in re-employment with job security, such person shall not be re-employed as a full-time faculty member.

- f. Provision for Change in Review Schedule. Circumstances may make it desirable to postpone or advance the review schedule for a faculty member. Examples of such circumstances might include extended absence due to illness, injury, or disability (including complications related to surgery or pregnancy); appointments that begin shortly after August 15; reassessment of the prior experience awarded under paragraph 38b.; unforeseen significant changes in the faculty member's activities during paid or unpaid leaves; or any partial leave. Under such circumstances, the faculty member may submit a written request to the dean to postpone or advance the review schedule by one year. The dean shall respond, in writing, to such a request within 10 working days of receiving it. Any extension granted under this provision shall also serve to extend the faculty member's probationary period by a period equivalent to the extension. If the faculty member chooses to grieve a denial of the request, then the timelines in paragraphs 190 through 193 shall be shortened by half.

39. Tenured Employment. A faculty member may be employed by Oakland with tenure according to the following schedule.

- a. Associate Professor. Employment in the rank of associate professor for a person previously employed by Oakland as a full-time non-visiting faculty member shall be with tenure from the date of his or her re-employment as an associate professor. Employment in the rank of associate professor for a person not previously employed by Oakland as a faculty member may be with or without tenure from the date of his or her employment as Oakland shall in its sole discretion determine.
- b. Professor. Employment in the rank of professor shall be with tenure from the date of a faculty member's employment in that rank.

40. **Employment With Job Security.** Employment in the rank of special instructor shall be with job security from the date of a faculty member's third re-employment as special instructor except as provided in paragraph 38e.
41. **Re-employment, Promotion, and the Tenure Review Process.** The pursuit of knowledge and learning manifests itself in different ways in various disciplines such as the sciences, arts, humanities, and professional fields. Faculty within each of these disciplines are well situated to recommend specific criteria to evaluate work within their discipline. The framework for this evaluation is a combination of the University Standards for Re-employment, Promotion and Tenure and the academic unit's criteria for implementation of those Standards. The University Standards for Re-employment, Promotion and Tenure provide the foundation for the academic unit's criteria. Academic unit criteria, therefore, must be consistent with the University Standards for Re-employment, Promotion and Tenure (see Appendix D); must specify appropriate discipline-related benchmarks; and must articulate how academic units will apply the University Standards. After proposal by the academic unit, consideration by CAP, approval by FRPC, and approval by Oakland, the written academic unit criteria together with the University Standards, and academic unit review procedures described in paragraph 41a.(3) will constitute the Review Statement that forms the basis for all evaluations. Consistent with the provisions set forth herein, the final decision as to whether or not a faculty member will be re-employed, promoted, and/or tenured, will be Oakland's. Oakland will make all decisions at the designated points in the following Tenure Review Process.

a. **General Provisions.**

- (1) Oakland shall inform each faculty member subject to the tenure review process of the area or areas of professional responsibility within which the faculty member will be judged with respect to future employment, promotion, tenure, and job security.
- (2) University Standards for Re-employment, Promotion and Tenure: see Appendix D.
- (3) Academic Unit Criteria and Procedures

Each academic unit shall propose a Review Statement which includes the University Standards, the academic unit's criteria described in paragraph 41a.(1) above, and the procedures it will use for each level of review. The procedures in the Review Statement shall be consistent with paragraph 199. In particular, the faculty member shall have access to all materials in the files generated during the review, and shall not be required and/or solicited to enter into any waiver of the right to examine any and all letters of evaluation. Until the file is submitted to the relevant CAP, the faculty member under review may add any new material to her/his file. Once a file is submitted to CAP and through the balance of the review cycle, the faculty member only may update information contained in the file (i.e., changes in publication status or approval of

grant requests previously submitted).

Each academic unit headed by a chairperson shall develop a revised Review Statement which shall be submitted to the appropriate CAP by September 15 of the academic year before the academic year in which the revised statement is to be effective. In academic units not headed by a chairperson, CAP shall develop its own revised Review Statement. If a CAP does not approve a revised statement, the unit shall have the opportunity to review and resubmit its statement. If CAP does not approve the resubmitted statement or the academic unit chooses not to further revise its statement, at least two members of each body (chosen by their own internal procedures) shall meet and try to reach agreement. Any revised statement developed through this consultation shall be submitted to both the unit and CAP for approval.

The final revised statement, whether or not approved by CAP, along with CAP's comments, shall be submitted by the unit to FRPC by November 15 of the academic year before the academic year in which the revised statement is to be effective. Initial FRPC review of any revised statement shall be completed by February 1. If FRPC does not approve of a revised statement, the unit shall have the opportunity to resubmit its statement. If FRPC does not approve the resubmitted statement, or the academic unit chooses not to further revise its statement, at least two members of each body (chosen by their own internal procedures) shall meet and try to reach agreement. Any revised statement developed through this consultation shall be submitted to both the unit and FRPC for approval. If FRPC and the academic unit are still unable to reach agreement, the final decision shall lie with FRPC, such decision to be reached by March 15.

The final revised statement as approved by FRPC shall be submitted to Oakland by March 15 of the academic year before the academic year in which the revised statement is to be effective. Initial Oakland review of any revised statement shall be completed by May 15. If Oakland does not approve of a revised statement, the unit shall have the opportunity to resubmit its statement. If Oakland does not approve the resubmitted statement, or the academic unit chooses not to further revise its statement, at least two members of each body (chosen by their own internal procedures) shall meet and try to reach agreement. Any revised statement developed through this consultation shall be submitted to both the unit and Oakland for approval. If Oakland and the academic unit are still unable to reach agreement, the final decision shall lie with Oakland, such decision to be reached by June 1.

A new academic unit shall establish and publish a Review Statement with the approval of such Review Statement following the sequence and timing noted above.

The criteria and procedures sections of each academic unit's Review Statement shall be reviewed every five (5) years. During this review,

conducted by the unit, the dean (after conferring with the provost) may request, in writing, that a unit consider changes in existing criteria and procedures. At the conclusion of its review, the unit shall inform the dean of the results of the review.

If the dean still identifies major concerns (such as those mandated by changes in standards of accreditation) with an academic unit's Review Statement, a meeting shall be scheduled with the academic unit for the purpose of discussing and resolving these concerns. If the concerns remain after this meeting, the dean may specify, in writing, her/his concerns and require the academic unit to propose changes to address these concerns in criteria and procedures, or a portion thereof, for approval using the steps articulated in this section.

If the dean identifies substantive concerns outside of the periodic review schedule, a meeting shall be scheduled with the academic unit for the purpose of discussing and resolving these concerns.

The periodic review of an academic unit's Review Statement may be waived if both the academic unit and Oakland concur that such a review is not necessary.

The academic unit shall provide each of its members with a copy of the current Oakland approved Review Statement. If an academic unit fails to establish and/or publish a Review Statement, such event shall not be grievable.

- (4) All recommendations specified in the Tenure Review Process regarding re-employment, promotion or tenuring of a faculty member shall be written and forwarded to the faculty member concurrently with forwarding such recommendations to the subsequent review step. Reviewing entities also have the responsibility to provide the Association, within three days of such recommendation, the name of any individual not being recommended for re-employment, promotion, or tenure.
- (5) Any faculty member aggrieved by any recommendation in the course of his or her review or believing a violation of an approved procedure has occurred, shall have the right to submit a written objection (including evidence the candidate deems relevant) to the subsequent review entity. A copy of the objection shall be sent to the person, committee, or entity that made the recommendation. The objection must be made within 20 working days of the recommendation. The 20 working day period shall run concurrently with the subsequent review period and failure to object during that period shall not prevent that review or subsequent reviews from occurring. The objection shall become a part of the faculty member's record for the remainder of the Tenure Review Process.

If Oakland decides not to re-employ, promote or tenure a faculty member, the faculty member shall be entitled to receive, within 20 working days of that decision, an oral statement of the reasons upon which that decision

is based, and, if requested by the faculty member, a written statement within 20 working days following said request.

If Oakland decides to re-employ a faculty member to a term appointment subject to a subsequent review for re-employment, promotion, or tenure, Oakland shall send the faculty member, within 60 working days of that decision, a statement commenting on the faculty member's record to date and Oakland's future expectations of the faculty member. A copy of the statement shall be included in the faculty member's dossier for the subsequent review.

- (6) A faculty member being reviewed by an academic unit, CAP, or FRPC shall have the right to be present when oral testimony is taken from anyone not a member of the reviewing body. A faculty member shall have the right to be accompanied or represented by another faculty member of the University when such testimony is taken.

- (7) For purposes of this Agreement, the academic units are:

Eye Research Institute
Library
School of Business Administration
School of Engineering and Computer Science
School of Education and Human Services
School of Health Sciences
School of Nursing
Department of Art and Art History
Department of Biological Sciences
Department of Chemistry
Department of Communication and Journalism
Department of English
Department of History
Department of Linguistics
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Department of Modern Languages and Literatures
Department of Music, Theatre and Dance
Department of Philosophy
Department of Physics
Department of Political Science
Department of Psychology
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Department of Writing and Rhetoric

- (8) Prior to each November 1, Oakland shall provide to the Association prior to each review round a list of faculty members who must be reviewed.
- (9) For the purposes of reviews for re-employment, promotion and tenure, recommendations by departments (and their chairpersons) that are not academic units shall be treated the same as departments that are academic units.

b. Instructor.

- (1) Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her non-tenured term as instructor to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed and promoted to assistant professor without tenure.

The decision to re-employ may be made conditional upon degree completion by the faculty member by a specified date; in the School of Nursing it may be made conditional upon matriculation in a doctoral program by a specified date.

The review shall consist of the following steps:

- (a) On or before December 1 of the year proceeding the final year of an employment term, Oakland shall notify the faculty member and his or her academic unit that the faculty member is being reviewed with respect to future employment at Oakland.
- (b) Following receipt of such notice the faculty member and/or his or her academic unit shall gather such information regarding the faculty member's professional qualifications as either of them deems appropriate, including, but not limited to, the faculty member's curriculum vitae and letters of recommendation. The academic unit shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved Review Statement and shall forward the assembled information along with its recommendation regarding re-employment to the appropriate dean (or official designated by Oakland) on or before February 1. In academic units headed by a chairperson, in the event that the chairperson disagrees with the recommendation of the academic unit, he or she may include a dissenting letter; however, such a letter is independent from the recommendation of the academic unit.
- (c) Oakland shall then review the candidate according to the approved Review Statement, considering the information and recommendation submitted by the academic unit, and, if separate, the recommendation by the departmental chairperson. Oakland may seek further advice by forwarding the assembled information and recommendation to the appropriate CAP and soliciting CAP's recommendation if the CAP has not been previously involved. Prior to rendering a decision contrary to the recommendation of the academic unit, Oakland shall solicit the recommendation of the CAP if the CAP has not been previously involved. Oakland shall then make its re-employment decision and will notify the faculty member, the academic unit, the department chairperson, if any, and the Association of its decision at least one year prior to the expiration of the faculty member's employment period.

(d) CAP solicitations shall be made prior to April 1. CAP shall conduct a review of all candidates submitted to it by Oakland in accordance with CAP's approved procedures.

- (2) A faculty member completing degree requirements normally associated with employment as assistant professor in his or her discipline shall be promoted automatically at Oakland's earliest administrative convenience to the rank of assistant professor for a term of three years, minus time served as instructor.

c. Assistant Professor.

- (1) First Re-employment for Persons Employed Pursuant to Schedule 38b.(1). Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her first non-tenured term as assistant professor to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed for a second non-tenured term.

The review steps shall be the same as those listed in 41b.(1).(a)-(d) above.

- (2) Second Re-employment for Persons Employed Pursuant to Schedule 38b.(1). Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her second non-tenured term as assistant professor subject to a 38b.(1) schedule to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed for a final non-tenured term and considered eligible for employment in a tenured position.

The review shall consist of the following steps:

- (a) On or before December 1 of the year proceeding the final year of an employment term, Oakland shall notify the faculty member and his or her academic unit that the faculty member is being reviewed with respect to future employment at Oakland.
- (b) Following receipt of such notice the faculty member and/or his or her academic unit shall gather such information regarding the faculty member's professional qualifications as either of them deems appropriate, including, but not limited to, the faculty member's curriculum vitae and letters of recommendation. The academic unit shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved Review Statement and forward the assembled information along with its recommendation to the appropriate CAP on or before February 1. In academic units headed by a chairperson, in the event that the chairperson disagrees with the recommendation of the academic unit, he or she may include a dissenting letter; however, such a letter is independent from the recommendation of the academic unit. The CAP shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved procedures and shall forward the assembled information along with its recommendation regarding re-

employment to the appropriate dean (or official designated by Oakland) on or before March 15.

- (c) Oakland shall then review the candidate according to the approved Review Statement, considering the information and recommendation submitted by the academic unit, and, if separate, the recommendation by the departmental chairperson, and CAP. Oakland may seek further advice by forwarding the assembled information and recommendation to FRPC and soliciting FRPC's recommendation. Prior to rendering a decision contrary to the CAP recommendation, Oakland shall solicit the recommendation of FRPC. Oakland shall then make its re-employment decision and will notify the faculty member, the academic unit, the department chairperson, if any, and the Association of its decision at least one year prior to the expiration of the faculty member's employment period.
 - (d) FRPC solicitations shall be made prior to April 1. FRPC shall conduct a review of all candidates submitted to it by Oakland in accordance with established procedures and shall forward the assembled information along with its recommendation to Oakland within thirty days of the solicitation.
- (3) First Re-employment for Persons Employed Pursuant to Schedule 38b.(4). Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her first non-tenured term as assistant professor subject to a 38b.(4) schedule to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed for a second non-tenured term.

The review steps shall be the same as those in 41c.(2) above except that:

- (a) The review shall begin on or before September 1.
 - (b) The unit recommendation to CAP shall be made by October 1; and CAP shall recommend to Oakland by November 1.
 - (c) Oakland's decision shall be announced following the first meeting of the calendar year of the Board of Trustees, but in no event later than March 1.
 - (d) FRPC solicitations shall be made by December 1.
- (4) Re-employment with the Granting of Tenure. Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her final non-tenured term as assistant professor to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed and granted tenure.

The review process shall consist of the following steps:

- (a) On or before December 1 of the year proceeding the final year of a faculty member's employment term, Oakland will notify the faculty member and his or her academic unit that the faculty member is being reviewed with respect to future employment at Oakland.
- (b) Following receipt of such notice the faculty member and/or his or her academic unit shall gather such information regarding the faculty member's professional qualifications as either of them deems appropriate, including, but not limited to, the faculty member's curriculum vitae and letters of recommendation. The academic unit shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved Review Statement and forward the assembled information along with its recommendation to the appropriate CAP on or before February 1. In academic units headed by a chairperson, in the event that the chairperson disagrees with the recommendation of the academic unit, he or she may include a dissenting letter; however, such a letter is independent from the recommendation of the academic unit. CAP shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved procedures and shall forward the assembled information along with its recommendation regarding re-employment to FRPC on or before March 15.
- (c) FRPC shall review the materials submitted to it regarding the faculty member's professional qualifications and, on or before May 1, shall make a recommendation to Oakland as to whether the faculty member should be re-employed with tenure, re-employed with tenure and promoted, or not re-employed as a full-time faculty member.
- (d) Oakland shall then review the candidate according to the approved Review Statement, considering the information and recommendation submitted by the academic unit, and, if separate, the recommendation by the departmental chairperson, CAP and FRPC. Oakland shall notify the faculty member, the academic unit, the department chairperson, if any, and the Association of its decision concerning re-employment with tenure at least one year prior to the expiration of the faculty member's employment period. If the decision is to tenure, the tenure (and promotion, if applicable) shall be effective on August 15 of the calendar year in which the review occurred.
- (e) If the Association is aggrieved by the decision reached by Oakland, it may, as a matter of right, demand prior to October 1 that the case be:
 - 1) Reviewed through the grievance procedure. If a grievance is pursued to arbitration, the arbitrator shall render a written decision either (a) awarding the faculty member re-employment with tenure, or (b) terminating the faculty member from further employment at Oakland as a full-time faculty member or (c)

initiating a re-review as defined in sub-paragraph 2) below, with the understanding that if such re-review cannot be completed within the year of notice, then the grievant will be re-employed pending the outcome of the re-review.

Or

- 2) Re-reviewed under the provisions of paragraph 41c.(4). (a), (b), and (c). Oakland shall notify the faculty member, the academic unit, the department chairperson, and the Association of its decision concerning re-employment with tenure.
 - a. The re-review shall take place during the year of notice following the unfavorable review; provided, however, that if an arbitrator remands a matter for re-review, and the re-review cannot take place during the year of notice, then it shall take place on an expedited basis as soon as practical.
 - b. In preparation for the re-review, the faculty member may update his/her dossier to provide information on teaching, scholarship and service contributions through October 1 of the year of the re-review; update the status of publications and grant proposals listed in the dossier; and must include any written statements requested from and issued by Oakland per paragraph 41.a(5). The CAP and FRPC recommendations rendered during the first review shall be added to the re-review materials. At Oakland's discretion, the academic unit may solicit additional letters of evaluation of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service to add to those received during the review.
 - c. The faculty member shall waive the right to further one-year notice by Oakland and the right to any further review through the grievance procedure.
 - d. The deadline dates for the recommendations in 41c.(4), (a),(b), and (c) shall be adjusted so that the chair or unit recommendation is submitted to CAP by November 1; the CAP recommendation is forwarded to FRPC by December 1; FRPC is to forward its recommendation to Oakland by January 5; and Oakland shall announce its decision by April 15.

d. Associate Professor.

Re-employment and the Granting of Tenure. Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her non-tenured term as associate professor to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed and granted tenure. That review process shall consist of the same steps identified in paragraph 41c.(4).

- e. CAP. Each of the Schools, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Library shall have a CAP. Each CAP shall be structured and shall function as determined by the faculty members holding primary appointments in its area (except in the case of the School of Health Sciences, where members of the Eye Research Institute also participate), subject to the following:
- (1) Membership shall be for three-year staggered terms commencing August 15, with elections conducted during the preceding winter semester. A majority of CAP members shall be tenured. Election results shall be submitted to the Association in writing.
 - (2) Only bargaining-unit faculty members holding academic titles described in Article IV, paragraphs 5 and 6, may be elected to serve on a CAP or vote in the election of its members.
 - (3) Oakland may designate one non-voting member to each CAP.
 - (4) Each CAP shall have a chairperson elected by and from the voting members of the CAP.
 - (5) Two or more faculty members with primary appointments in the same department may not serve concurrently on the CAP in the College of Arts and Sciences. No faculty member may serve concurrently on two CAPs.
 - (6) Each CAP shall maintain records of its deliberations.
 - (7) Each CAP shall submit annually by November 1 for Oakland's approval a statement of the procedures it will use in the Tenure Review Process. If Oakland does not approve such procedures, Oakland shall state by November 15 its reasons, and the corrections it will require to meet its objections. If a CAP fails to submit a statement of procedures by November 1, or Oakland and a CAP fail to reach agreement on a statement of procedures, such event shall not be grievable.
 - (8) Each CAP shall establish and publish its procedures and policies governing its operation by November 30 each year. A policy determination of a CAP may be overturned by a vote of the appropriate faculty in a referendum called by petition of 10 percent of the appropriate faculty members, or of four faculty members, whichever is greater. Such petition must be filed within two weeks of publication of the disputed policy. An affirmative vote of a majority of those voting is required to overturn a policy decision.
 - (9) Before a CAP can recommend contrary to a unit recommendation, it must invite a spokesperson from the academic unit to defend orally the recommendation at a CAP meeting.

f. FRPC.

- (1) The FRPC shall consist of tenured faculty members: one each elected by the School of Business Administration, the School of Engineering and Computer Science, the School of Education and Human Services, the School of Nursing, and the Library; one from the School of Health Sciences—Eye Research Institute; and five elected by the College of Arts and Sciences (one from the science and mathematics area, one from the social science area, one from the humanities area, one from the language and literature area, and one at-large member). Only full-time non-visiting faculty members may vote in FRPC elections. Faculty members are eligible to vote in elections for members to represent their school, college, institute, or library of primary appointment, as listed above. If the list of schools and other units above changes, Oakland and the Association shall meet to determine appropriate representation.

If any school or other unit listed above has fewer than two tenured faculty members, faculty members with primary appointment in such school may nominate a slate of up to six eligible tenured faculty members who have primary appointments inside or outside the school and elect from this slate a person to fill the school seat. No member of any CAP may serve concurrently on FRPC.

- (2) Membership shall be for three-year staggered terms commencing August 15, with elections conducted during the preceding winter semester. Any member whose term expires shall have the option of remaining a member until a replacement has been elected. Vacancies shall be filled by election of a replacement to serve the remainder of the term. During the period between the occurrence of a vacancy and the holding of an election, an interim replacement may be appointed by the appropriate school or college.
- (3) FRPC shall elect a chairperson and a secretary from its own membership for a one-year term commencing August 15.
- (4) FRPC shall maintain a record of its deliberations.
- (5) Seventy percent of the FRPC membership shall constitute a quorum. A quorum must be present for official action to occur, but a lesser number may adjourn meetings. A vote of the majority of those present and voting shall be required for any FRPC action.
- (6) FRPC shall establish and publish policies governing its operation, including recommended format of the dossier, by September 15 each year. A policy determination of FRPC may be overturned by a referendum called by a petition of ten percent of the faculty members eligible to vote in the FRPC election. Such petition must be filed within one month of the publication of the disputed policy. A majority of those voting is required to overturn a policy decision.

- (7) The Association shall conduct all elections and referenda required by subparagraphs (1), (2), and (6) above. Oakland shall be notified of all such elections and referenda and shall have the right to designate observers to be present at polling places, if any, and at the counting of ballots. The Association shall certify the membership and chairpersonship of FRPC for the subsequent year to Oakland no later than June 30.
- (8) No faculty member shall be entitled to file any grievance against Oakland based upon any policy, procedure, or recommendation adopted, instituted, or implemented by FRPC and neither shall any faculty member be entitled to file any grievance against Oakland as a result of any act or omission of FRPC.
- (9) Secretarial support and storage space for FRPC shall be provided by the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.
- g. Arbitration of Tenure Decisions. If a tenure decision resulting from the procedures described above in 41c.(4) results in a grievance, and such grievance goes to arbitration, the selection of an arbitrator shall follow the guidelines described in paragraph 193.
- h. Optional or Early Granting of Tenure with or without Promotion. Review of an untenured faculty member for tenure or for optional promotion and tenure may occur ahead of the schedule set forth above. The review process shall consist of the following steps, except that a negative recommendation at any two review steps shall terminate the process.
 - (1) The review shall be initiated on or before December 1 either by Oakland or the faculty member's academic unit.
 - (2) Following initiation of the review, the faculty member and/or his or her academic unit shall gather such information regarding the faculty member's professional qualifications as either of them deems appropriate, including, but not limited to, the faculty member's curriculum vitae and letters of recommendation. The academic unit shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved Review Statement and forward the assembled information along with its recommendation to CAP on or before February 1. In academic units headed by a chairperson, in the event that the chairperson disagrees with the recommendation of the academic unit, he or she may include a dissenting letter; however, such a letter is independent from the recommendation of the academic unit. The CAP shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved procedures and shall forward the assembled information along with its recommendation as to re-employment to FRPC on or before March 15.

- (3) FRPC shall review the materials submitted to it regarding the faculty member's professional qualifications and shall, on or before May 1, make a recommendation to Oakland as to whether the faculty member should be promoted and/or granted tenure.
 - (4) Oakland shall then review the candidate according to the approved Review Statement, considering the information and recommendation submitted by the academic unit, and, if separate, the recommendation by the departmental chairperson, CAP and FRPC. Oakland shall notify the faculty member, the academic unit, the department chairperson, if any, and the Association of its decision concerning promotion and/or granting of tenure by August 15. If promotion and/or tenure is granted, it shall be effective on the August 15 recommended by the academic unit.
 - (5) Oakland's decision in such cases shall be final; there shall be no right to further review in the grievance procedure or otherwise.
 - (6) A decision not to grant tenure or promotion and tenure resulting either from two negative recommendations or from Oakland's action precludes the initiation of a promotional review by the faculty member's academic unit in the subsequent year, but shall not prevent a mandated review.
- i. Promotion in the Case of Tenured Faculty. A promotion review for a tenured faculty member may be initiated by the faculty member's academic unit or by Oakland. Such a review process shall consist of the following steps, except that a negative recommendation at any two review steps shall terminate the process:
- (1) The review shall be initiated on or before September 1, either by Oakland or by the faculty member's academic unit.
 - (2) Following initiation of the review, the faculty member and/or his or her academic unit shall gather such information regarding the faculty member's professional qualifications as either of them deems appropriate, including, but not limited to, the faculty member's curriculum vitae and letters of recommendation. In case Oakland initiates such review, Oakland may provide review materials at this step. The academic unit shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved Review Statement and forward the assembled information along with its recommendation to the appropriate CAP on or before October 15. In academic units headed by a chairperson, in the event that the chairperson disagrees with the recommendation of the academic unit, he or she may include a dissenting letter; however, such a letter is independent from the recommendation of the academic unit. CAP shall conduct a review of the candidate in accordance with its approved procedures and shall forward the assembled information along with its recommendation regarding promotion to FRPC on or before November 15.

- (3) FRPC shall review the materials submitted to it regarding the faculty member's professional qualifications and shall, on or before January 15, make a recommendation to Oakland as to promotion.
- (4) Oakland shall then review the candidate according to the approved Review Statement, considering the information and recommendation submitted by the academic unit, and, if separate, the recommendation by the departmental chairperson, CAP and FRPC. Oakland shall notify the faculty member, the faculty member's academic unit, the department chairperson, if any, and the Association of its decision concerning promotion by April 15. Promotions shall be effective on August 15 of the calendar year in which the review occurred.
- (5) Oakland's decision in such cases shall be final except as provided in (7) below.
- (6) Determinations not to promote made in two successive years resulting from any combination of Oakland's actions, Internal Review Commission (see subparagraph 41j.) decisions, or negative recommendations at any two review steps preclude the initiation of a promotional review by the faculty member's academic unit in the subsequent year.
- (7) In cases involving promotion in which Oakland has twice in a five-year period not awarded a promotion recommended by FRPC, the faculty member aggrieved by such action has a right to demand within 30 days of Oakland's decision that the case be reviewed by an Internal Review Commission. (see subparagraph 41j.) The demand shall include a statement explaining why the faculty member is aggrieved.
- (8) Following a timely call to have the case considered by an Internal Review Commission, Oakland and the Association shall establish such commission no later than May 1.
- (9) Following its review, the Internal Review Commission shall render before July 1 a written decision either (a) awarding the faculty member promotion, which decision shall be binding on all parties to this Agreement, or (b) continuing the faculty member in rank.
- j. Internal Review Commission. The Internal Review Commission shall be a six-member body consisting of three members selected by Oakland and three members selected by the Association. At least two of the three members named by each party must not have participated formally at any stage of the most recent review of the case to be considered. A new commission may be appointed for each case to be reviewed, and each commission shall be entitled to establish its own rules governing procedures and presentation of evidence.
- k. To the extent Oakland's decision in this paragraph 41 is dependent on action by its Board of Trustees, and in the unusual event that the Board of Trustees requires an extension beyond the decision dates in this paragraph, Oakland

shall request of the Association an extension. When making this request, if it has not already done so, Oakland shall provide the faculty member and the Association with the recommendation pending before the Board of Trustees. The Association agrees to make every effort to accommodate such requests for extension.

42. Review of Special Instructors and the Granting of Job Security.

- a. First Re-employment for Persons Employed Pursuant to Schedule 38d. Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her first term as special instructor without job security to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed without job security. The review steps shall be those contained in paragraph 41b.(1).(a)-(d).
- b. Second Re-employment for Persons Employed Pursuant to Schedule 38d. Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her second term as special instructor without job security to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed for a final term without job security. The review steps shall be those contained in paragraph 41b.(1). (a)-(d).
- c. Re-employment with the Granting of Job Security. Oakland shall review a faculty member during his or her final term as special instructor without job security to determine whether the faculty member will be re-employed and granted job security. The review steps shall be those contained in paragraph 41c.(2). (a)-(d). If the decision is to re-employ with job security, the job security shall be effective on August 15 of the calendar year in which the review occurred.
- d. Special instructors with job security may be reviewed for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure in accordance with the procedures set forth in paragraph 41h., except that such review shall not be initiated by an academic unit if so initiated in the previous two years. This promotion provision is not available to special instructors who transferred to special instructor pursuant to subparagraph 38e.

43. Review of Faculty on Layoff. A faculty member on layoff status shall not be reviewed during the period of layoff. If recalled, a full-time non-visiting faculty member who does not have either tenure or job security shall have the employment term in which he or she was serving at the time layoff became effective extended by the smallest whole number of calendar years greater than or equal to the length of the layoff.

44. Oakland will not, during the term of this Agreement, establish a policy limiting the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty members, either in any specific academic unit or the University as a whole, to any specific number or set of numbers. However, when making a tenure decision on any specific faculty member, Oakland may consider the impact of such decision upon the tenure ratio of the respective academic unit and upon the tenure ratio of the University.

45. **Grievance Procedures.** The Association and/or an individual full-time faculty member or group of full-time faculty members shall have the right to enforce, through the grievance procedures established in this Agreement, those portions of the Tenure Review Process in which Oakland has an affirmative duty to take action. For purposes of this paragraph Oakland shall not be deemed to have any affirmative duty to take action with regard to any function of academic units, CAPs, FRPC, or the Association.

ARTICLE VIII LAYOFF AND RECALL

46. Oakland recognizes that a University achieves and maintains distinction through the excellence of its faculty and that faculty can make their greatest contribution in an environment that values academic freedom and tenure. Oakland further recognizes that when reduction of faculty positions in any academic area is contemplated, any plan will place a high priority on maintaining the quality of instructional programs and minimizing unnecessary loss of faculty. With its diversity of intellectual and professional resources, the University offers the potential for creative problem-solving through the application of the combined capabilities of its constituencies. Therefore, if Oakland determines that reductions or reallocations of faculty positions are necessary under the provisions of this Article, a committee with representation from Oakland, the Association, and the affected academic unit(s) will be established to develop a plan for addressing the problem. This plan, to be submitted to Oakland within 60 days from the date that Oakland calls for the committee to be established, shall consider such alternatives to layoff as attrition, in-load summer teaching, retraining, retirements, less-than-full-pay leaves, reassignment of teaching responsibilities, assignment of non-teaching duties, or reduced appointments. Nevertheless, having considered this plan, if Oakland determines that the alternatives do not meet the needs for reduction and reallocations in faculty positions, or if a plan is not timely submitted, layoffs of full-time faculty may be instituted in accordance with the following paragraphs of this Article.
47. Oakland may lay off and recall its faculty members and determine the academic unit or units in which such layoff shall occur. The two circumstances in which layoff may occur are described in paragraph 48, Over-Ratio Layoff, and paragraph 49, Position-Shift Layoff. However, no full-time faculty member shall cease working due to layoff in any academic unit where part-time persons other than students are doing unit work if the full-time faculty member is qualified, as determined by Oakland, to do that work. Oakland will make every reasonable effort not to lay off special lecturers during the terms of their respective individual employment contracts. For purposes of this Article, a faculty member shall be considered as holding the highest title for which he or she has been approved by Oakland on the date Oakland notifies the Association of its intention to institute a layoff, whether or not the date on which that title will become effective has been reached. However, if a faculty member is approved by Oakland for a title in paragraph 54f., g., or h. subsequent to the notification in subparagraph 57a., the faculty member will be considered as being in the categories described in subparagraphs 54f., g., or h. for purposes of paragraphs 62 and 63 only.

University Standards for Re-employment, Promotion and Tenure

In all reviews for tenure and promotion Oakland will consider the candidate's entire record, emphasizing efforts and accomplishments since attainment of current rank. The candidate's record at Oakland University generally will be of particular importance. Oakland's evaluation of the candidate will consider:

- the programmatic and institutional setting of the candidate's work at Oakland and the nature of the candidate's assignments and responsibilities;
- the quality of the candidate's accomplishments;
- the relation of all these factors to the objectives of the area or department, the goals of the college or school or institute, and the mission and long range vision of the university.

Oakland's evaluation focuses on the candidate's efforts and accomplishments in three areas:

- teaching or performance as a university librarian, as appropriate to the appointment;
- intellectual contributions such as scholarship, research, and creative activities;
- service.

Teaching and University Librarianship

The term "teaching" refers to all instruction and advising activities that affect or support the academic progress of students. These activities include classroom, laboratory, studio, field, and clinical teaching and evaluation; the supervision of research, writing, independent study, practica, and performance; individual and group advising and mentoring; preparation of courses; development of curricular and instructional materials; instructional innovations; and application of new educational technologies.

The phrase "performance as a university librarian" refers to initiating, planning, organizing, and implementing library programs, including application of technology and effective communication with and service to library users.

A candidate for tenure must show substantial evidence of achievement in teaching and/or performance as a university librarian. Such evidence must be obtained through use of systematic procedures for student and peer review. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, assessments of the instructor's preparation through peer review of syllabi, reading lists, class and library handouts, tests, examinations, and other course and library materials in all formats; student appraisals such as course evaluations and

solicited and unsolicited letters; evidence of student achievement; and success in sharing teaching philosophies and methodologies and in obtaining grant support relating to teaching and/or university librarianship.

Intellectual Contributions – Scholarship, Research and Creative Endeavors

Because of the comprehensive and diverse nature of Oakland University's mission, Oakland recognizes in its reviews a broad range of intellectual contributions. Such contributions improve theory and practice and support the present and future quality of instruction at Oakland University.

Scholarship and research include:

- basic, theoretical or applied research;
- scholarship that applies the research to the betterment of society, institutions, groups, and individuals;
- peer recognition of the above as reflected in publications in refereed journals, other peer-reviewed publications, and critical reviews as appropriate to the discipline;
- successful efforts in securing competitive or professionally significant external funding in disciplines where research is traditionally supported by grants;
- scholarship that interprets, draws together, and brings new insights to bear on original research, gives meaning to isolated facts and puts them in perspective, or creates connections across disciplinary lines;
- scholarship that involves not only transmitting knowledge but transforming and extending it as well through carefully planned and continuously examined pedagogical procedures that stimulate active learning and encourage students to be critical and creative thinkers with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over.

"Creative activities" refers to works of artistic expression, production, or performance, and includes such activities as composing, writing, directing, performing, and conducting.

The most important evidence of scholarship, research, and creative activities is that authorities in the discipline(s) or field(s), including authorities outside the institution, have critically evaluated the work as meeting high standards (e.g., publications in refereed journals, grants and other funded research proposals). A candidate for tenure is expected to have made substantial progress toward maturity as a scholar or creative artist and to have established the presumption of continued growth in these areas.

Service

The term “service” refers to the following activities:

- public, institutional, and professional service through work that grows out of the university’s programs and mission and has the potential for substantial and positive effects on a community, profession, or external perceptions of the university, and that draws upon the candidate’s professional competence. Such service includes not only contributions to the organizational work of academic professional associations and societies at all levels but also activities that extend Oakland’s scholarly and instructional capabilities into various external agencies and communities.
- university service through committee work or governance activities in the area, department, school, institute, college, or the university; for faculty, university service includes service as a role model and mentor for colleagues and students.

Documentation of the candidate’s service should recognize these distinctions and, particularly in the case of public, institutional, and professional service, should indicate the relationship of the candidate’s service activities to the programs and mission of the university and to the candidate’s instruction, intellectual contributions, and professional responsibilities. A candidate’s involvement in university service should reflect an appropriate sharing of general faculty obligations in university governance.

Evidence of service should speak to its magnitude, complexity, and duration and may be derived from the testimony of those served; from evaluations provided by others involved in service work; from reports, articles, instructional materials and other documents produced through service; and from grants and funded projects, honors, and awards received in recognition of service.

Oakland regards teaching or performance as a university librarian and intellectual contributions as the most crucial areas of development for candidates for non-tenured reemployment or for tenure. Oakland normally will expect the record of candidates for tenure to show some accomplishments in service.

Candidacy for Promotion to Full Professor

Beyond their achievements at the time of tenure all candidates for professor are expected to have continued their development in teaching or performance as a university librarian and in intellectual contributions and service. In addition, candidates for professor are expected to have demonstrated excellence and creativity in teaching or performance as a university librarian including application of technology, or to have achieved wide recognition beyond the institution as authorities or leaders in intellectual contributions or wide recognition in public, institutional, and professional service. In

disciplines where research is traditionally supported by grant support, external funding is desirable for consideration of promotion to professor. In addition, candidates for professor must demonstrate potential for sustained involvement in teaching, research, and service.

FRPC GENERAL STATEMENT TO CANDIDATES AND ACADEMIC UNITS
September 2015

Candidates should note that this *FRPC General Statement* includes a candidate checklist. Dossiers must include a completed copy of the FRPC Dossier Candidate Checklist signed and dated by the candidate prior to the CAP review. A copy of the checklist appears as page 5 of this statement.

Introduction

The Faculty Re-employment and Promotion Committee (FRPC) evaluates evidence of the candidate's performance on the basis of criteria that units, departments, and schools have developed and FRPC has approved prior to the candidate's review. The *FRPC General Statement* summarizes aspects of the review process that, for the sake of equity and quality of documentation, should be common to all unit criteria. Unit criteria and procedures need not be limited, however, to the materials discussed here. At the same time, all candidates will be evaluated according to unit review criteria **and** the *FRPC General Statement*. It is not adequate for the candidate to depend on one or the other as a complete set of instructions.

Procedures

The FRPC regards procedures as important to ensure due process to the candidate, ensure the integrity of the data, and achieve a reasonable level of procedural uniformity within a diverse university. Areas of special concern are procedures pertaining to the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service, and procedures used to communicate changes made to a candidate's dossier after it has been submitted to the FRPC. In all cases, the candidate must have the opportunity to rebut any material added to the dossier.

All deliberations of the FRPC will be made in accordance with the relevant department's criteria and information submitted in the candidate's dossier and material in the back-up file.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

1. The FRPC recognizes that good teaching has many dimensions; it looks for a variety of measures that reflect these different instructional components and is concerned about a tendency to overemphasize student evaluations. Many units recognize this same point in their own criteria statements but fail to provide documentation of other indicators of teaching effectiveness. The FRPC strongly urges units to give serious thought to developing a variety of indicators of effectiveness; such measures should reflect performance over the entire period under review rather than merely the most recent semester of teaching activity. Some possibilities might include:

- Analysis of course syllabi and examinations;
- Description and analysis of new courses developed;
- Description of the range/diversity of courses offered;
- Description of directed studies, theses, dissertations, and/or special projects;
- Description of participation in teaching related seminars, workshops, grants, conferences, etc.
- Peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

It is essential that colleagues conduct the evaluations and analyses suggested above and not the candidate. The FRPC encourages units to include in their procedures a specified process for evaluation of teaching by colleagues.

2. The FRPC recommends that the following procedures be part of the process for presenting documentation of student evaluations:

- Procedures for soliciting student evaluations should be clearly described in the dossier.
- Distribution and collection of evaluation forms must not be done by the candidate.
- Where feasible, data for a period of at least three years should be presented.
- Results should be evaluated by someone other than the candidate.
- A perspective derived from comparison with other colleagues' student evaluation data should be presented. The data for comparisons should be from the teaching of classes as similar in size and level as possible.

The procedures should be applied uniformly to all reviews.

B. Evaluation of Scholarship

1. The FRPC requires outside written evaluations of candidates' scholarship for tenure reviews and reviews for promotion to the rank of professor. Units should inform outside reviewers in the letter of solicitation that they are being asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarship and not to provide an overall recommendation concerning the candidates' promotion and/or tenure. Enough information should be provided to the reviewer to judge the quality of the candidate's work. Procedures for scholarly evaluation must include the following:

- Evaluations from at least three outside experts in the candidate's field of scholarship with whom the candidate has not had a direct working or personal relationship, i.e., **who are not Oakland or former colleagues, research collaborators, co-authors, mentors, etc.** **If there is any question as to whether a reviewer falls into one of these excluded classes, the reviewer may not be used to meet this requirement for impartial external reviewers.**
- The procedure for selection of all outside reviewers should be fully described. All persons solicited as reviewers should be identified and all responses should be included in the dossier.
- Letters of evaluation should be solicited in a formal, documented manner. One sample letter of solicitation should be included in the dossier.
- Solicitation letters should request a Curriculum Vitae (CV) from each reviewer. A statement of any affiliations of the reviewers with the candidate should be included in the dossier. All other procedures employed in scholarly evaluation should be fully described in the dossier.

2. In cases of joint authorship of scholarly work, the candidate's contribution must be made clear and documented either in the CV or in a document immediately following the CV.

3. Candidates should recognize that members of the FRPC might not be highly

knowledgeable about a given candidate's discipline. Therefore, general summary descriptions or annotated bibliographies by the candidate of his/her work would be very helpful.

C. Evaluation of Service

The candidate's contributions to departmental, school, or university committees as well as other forms of service should be evaluated. The means used to evaluate the quality of this service should be fully described in the dossier.

D. Communication of changes to the dossier

When changes or additions are made to a dossier after it has been submitted to the FRPC, the candidate's unit is responsible for communicating those changes to the Provost's office and ensuring that all copies in the Provost's office reflect the latest additions or changes.

E. Priorities and Criteria

A statement of academic unit priorities among the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service is necessary to dispel ambiguities. No statement of criteria is complete without a careful description of the different levels of expectation for the successive pre-tenure reviews and promotion to the rank of professor. This description is necessary for each of the three areas of evaluation. The FRPC cautions that terms such as "competent," "mature," "outstanding," "excellent," "superb," etc. are inherently vague unless they are indexed by specific or meaningful categories of evidence. Academic units should make clear in their criteria what accomplishments, if missing from the candidate's record, might constitute grounds for a negative recommendation.

F. Format and Contents of Dossier

To make the review process more efficient, the FRPC strongly encourages academic units to organize dossiers and back-up files carefully. The following organization and suggestions for dossier content would be most helpful:

- The **CAP letter** of recommendation should be the **first item in the dossier**.
- The **FRPC Dossier Candidate Checklist** (see page 5) should be the **second item in the dossier**.
- Table of Contents
- Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (CV). **The CV should be one document and not fragmented throughout the candidate's personal statement.** The CV should follow the format of the academic unit.
- Candidate's Personal Statement. The Personal Statement should **explain the candidate's motivation for and approach to** scholarship, teaching, and service, the significance of the candidate's work, and its contribution to the field. The **maximum** length of a personal statement is 15 pages, using 12-point type, double-spaced with one-inch margins. The FRPC strongly encourages candidates to submit concise personal statements and not feel compelled to use the maximum number of pages allowed. **The Candidate's CV and Personal Statement are two separate documents.**

- Copy of the unit criteria and procedures.
- Department's recommendation, committee reports, letter of dissent from the chair (if necessary), and 41.c(2) or 41.c(4) letters from department, chair, CAP, and Oakland (or otherwise, as appropriate for the unit) for tenure cases. These recommendations and reports should be thorough yet concise.
- A copy of the CV submitted at the time of employment at OU in the case of 41.c(4) and 41.d reviews must be included in the dossier.
- Unit's evaluation of candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. Letters evaluating scholarship by the required three impartial external reviewers should be included at the front of the total set of letters evaluating scholarship. **A full CV for each external reviewer must be included in the back-up file (not in the core dossier), and the core dossier must include a brief biographical sketch for each external reviewer.**
- Some system of coherent pagination must be used throughout the core dossier. Because late arriving documents may sometimes create considerable havoc with attempts at simple, continuous pagination, units might wish to employ a more flexible system, such as letter sections with internal continuous pagination or decimal numbering, which permits last minute additions or deletions. Tab dividers should be used to separate major sections of dossiers.
- A reference system, from the candidate's "core material" to the supporting evidence in the back-up file and vice versa is helpful. For example, the teaching record section of the core material cites "X," which contains syllabi, student evaluations, etc.; and the label of Appendix "X" cites the teaching record page of the core material.
- The back-up file must contain documentation of any scholarly work listed in the candidate's CV (e.g., articles, proceedings, grant applications, grant awards, papers under review, works in progress, musical compositions, programs from performances, announcements, or oral presentations). Publications noted in the candidate's CV must contain the exact same title and author list as those included in the back-up file.

FRPC Dossier Candidate Checklist

A completed copy of this checklist, signed and dated by the candidate must appear in the dossier before the Table of Contents.

- _____ The CV is a single document that is separate from the Personal Statement.
- _____ The maximum length of the Personal Statement is 15 double-spaced pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins.
- _____ The dossier includes a copy of the full unit criteria and procedures.
- _____ The dossier includes all required materials specified by unit criteria.
- _____ In cases of tenure reviews, the dossier includes a copy of the CV submitted at the time of initial appointment and 41.c(2) or 41.c(3) letters as appropriate for the unit.
- _____ The dossier employs a reference system linking materials cited in the dossier to the back-up file.
- _____ The dossier employs a coherent system of pagination throughout the dossier, with tab dividers separating major sections.
- _____ Scholarly work listed in the CV is available in the back-up file, including papers under review and work in progress.
- _____ In cases of joint scholarly authorship, the candidate's contribution is made clear and documented either in the CV or in a document immediately following the CV.
- _____ The dossier includes letters from at least three external reviewers who are not Oakland or former colleagues, research collaborators, co-authors, mentors, or individuals who could be perceived to have a conflict of interest in providing an impartial scholarly evaluation of the candidate's work.

Candidate Signature

Date