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FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN PERSONNEL MATTERS

11.1 The faculty shall have primary responsibility in the area of personnel matters. This shall mean the capacity to initiate or review faculty personnel recommendations, *which are and ought to be given great weight*. Academic administrative officials may make a recommendation or decision counter to the original faculty recommendation only in exceptional circumstances and with compelling reasons in written detail which shall specifically address the content of that recommendation as well as the established standards and criteria.

11.2 The faculty shall have the right to grieve based on the terms and conditions of this Agreement any modification or reversal of such recommendations.

CONSTITUTION AND ROLE OF PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

12.3.2 The faculty at the departmental level shall establish once each year, in timely fashion, a Personnel Committee to exercise the responsibilities described in this Agreement. *All members of the Department Personnel Committee must be members of the Bargaining Unit. A member of a Department Personnel Committee may also serve as a member of a College/School Personnel Committee. However they may not vote on candidates from their own department at the college/school level. A Department Personnel Committee may not delegate its responsibilities to non-committee members; however, a department's bylaws may define the membership of the Department Personnel Committee as expanding and contracting for the purpose of discharging particular responsibilities of the committee.*

12.3.5 In each college or school there shall be a Personnel Committee of the faculty to review departmental level recommendations. The committee shall be chosen by procedures established in a manner designed to represent the interests of the faculty of each college or school. *Such procedures shall be sent to the MSP and the administration to assure compliance with applicable laws, University policies and this Agreement.* Said committee shall forward its recommendation to the appropriate Dean.

PC AUTONOMY MANDATE

Faculty

12.3.7 *Each Personnel Committee shall choose its own chair, convene itself, deliberate without participation of the administration (i.e., department chair/head or dean), and formulate its own recommendations independently.*

Librarians

20.3.2 *The LPC shall chose its own chair, convene itself, deliberate without participation of non-unit administrators and formulate its own recommendations independently.*
ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEWS

21.5 Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty: The annual evaluation of all non-tenure-track faculty shall be conducted under the terms of Article 33. The department chair shall provide the job description relevant to the period of review to the department personnel committee for purposes of merit decisions and promotion.

33.1 Departmental Personnel Committees and academic administrative officials, as appropriate, shall evaluate all bargaining-unit faculty members annually in accordance with the campus’s master calendar.

33.2 For the life of this Agreement and for the purposes of this Article, the form entitled “Annual Faculty Report and Evaluation of Professional Activities” (AFR) will serve as the evaluation form for bargaining-unit faculty members whose appointments are 50% FTE or greater.

Bargaining-unit faculty members whose appointments are less than 50% FTE shall also be evaluated annually using evaluation instruments designated or devised by their Department Chairs/Heads in consultation with the relevant Departmental Personnel Committees. Should any evaluation instrument other than the AFR be devised for such use, the Administration shall provide a copy of the proposed instrument to the Union at least 60 days before its implementation. If the Union does not raise objections to the content of the instrument within 30 days of receiving the instrument, the Administration may implement it. If the union raises objections within 30 days of receiving the instrument, the Administration will either negotiate the instrument’s content or will revert to using a previously approved instrument.

33.3 The evaluation of each bargaining-unit faculty member, regardless that person’s full-time equivalency, shall address that person’s performance of his/her assigned duties and responsibilities during the year under review. All recorded union activity in an AFR shall be credited as University service.

33.4 Each department, program or other analogous unit shall develop or adopt one or several modes appropriate to the process of evaluating teaching in that unit, as well as procedures for the administration of student evaluations of teaching. Over time, the annual evaluations of teaching should attempt to capture the total contribution of the candidate to the instructional mission, both inside and/or outside the classroom, through multiple modes of evaluation, not just student evaluations. For faculty involved in graduate education, the annual evaluation should address their effectiveness in advising and mentoring graduate students.

33.5 During a faculty member’s annual review, the Departmental Personnel Committee shall present its findings at the appropriate place on the "Annual Faculty Report and Evaluation of Professional Activities" form or, in the case of faculty with
appointments less than 50% FTE, on the evaluation instrument used in that department.

33.6 Each faculty member retains the right to respond in writing to any written comments made by any individual or group of individuals on his/her evaluation and to have the response affixed to the evaluation.

33.7 For the purpose of discussing the faculty member's performance and/or the written comments already provided, each faculty member shall have the right, upon request, to meet once each academic year with each of the following:

(a) the Chair of the Departmental Personnel Committee and/or representatives of the Departmental Personnel Committee;
(b) the Chair/Head of the department, program or other analogous unit;
(c) the Dean or other analogous academic administrative official.

The Chair/Head, Dean, or other analogous academic administrative official of the department, program, or other analogous unit shall have the right to require a face-to-face meeting with a faculty member as part of the annual review process.

33.8 Student evaluations and other instruments of teaching evaluation shall be kept on file in the department or program office for a period of six years or, in the case of faculty who have not yet been promoted to the rank of Professor, for eight years.

33.9 At the time of annual evaluation, each non-tenure track faculty member who has received a continuing appointment and his/her Department Chair/Head shall meet to discuss whether the current job description accurately reflects the individual's assigned duties and responsibilities and to make any necessary revisions. This review is for the sole purpose of updating job descriptions and shall not be used in any evaluative process.

33.10 The University Administration may return an AFR to a faculty member, Personnel Committee, Chair/Head, Dean, or other contributor to that AFR for revision if the Administration has evidence that such contributor has provided erroneous, misleading, or grossly inappropriate information in the AFR. In such cases, the Administration shall simultaneously notify the Union of the AFR’s remanding.

TENURE SYSTEM FACULTY (Tenure & Promotion)

Red Book Standards

ARTICLE IV. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR PERSONNEL REVIEWS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS

Section 4.1. High professional standards must be the basis for all personnel decisions. Personnel recommendations and decisions shall be made only after a review of all of the qualifications and all the contributions of the individual in the areas of teaching; of research; creative or professional activity; and of service. All three areas must be considered, but the relative weight to be given to each may be determined in the light of the duties of the faculty member.
Section 4.2. For personnel recommendations and decisions, consideration must also be given to the relationship of the recommended personnel action to the following:

a) program plans at the department, college, campus, and University level;
b) flexibility as affected by rank and tenure distributions and anticipated retirement dates;
c) departmental affirmative action goals, considering the nature of the positive contribution that affirmative action is able to make to the diversity of perspective that is essential to the well-being of the department and the University community.

For new appointments, reappointments through the tenure decision year, and for the award of tenure, these considerations must be given in writing as established in Section 6.4 (e).

Section 4.3. The standards and criteria described in this document and any standards and criteria established in Trustee-approved campus personnel policies shall be the only standards and criteria used in making and reviewing personnel recommendations.

Section 4.5. The general criteria for reappointment at regular academic ranks shall be the following:

a) Evidence of continuing achievement and growth since initial appointment
b) Reasonable assurance of continuing professional development consistent with the ability to reach the level for eventual promotion to the next higher rank.
c) Consideration of the relationships as stated in Section 4.2.

Section 4.6. Recommendations for promotion shall be based on qualifications and contributions in the areas of teaching; of research, creative, or professional activity; and of service; and on the following considerations:

a) For promotion to Assistant Professor, the faculty member must possess the appropriate terminal degree, or equivalent professional experience, and have a record of achievement in the field of academic specialization. In addition, the candidate must show promise of continuing professional development and achievement.
b) For promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member must have a record of achievement sufficient to have gained recognition on and off campus among scholars or professionals in his or her field; and must show promise of continuing professional development and achievement.
c) For promotion to Professor, the faculty member must have a record of achievement sufficient to have gained substantial recognition on and off campus from scholars or professionals in his or her field; and must show significant potential for continuing professional achievement.

Section 4.7. All appointments and reappointments to regular academic positions without the award of tenure are probationary. The probationary period is an opportunity for the faculty member to demonstrate the qualifications for reappointment, promotion, and the award of tenure. During the probationary period, the faculty member should have access to
information on the substantive and procedural standards generally employed in decisions affecting reappointment, promotion, and the award of tenure.

Section 4.8. No regular academic appointment without tenure shall carry with it any assurance, explicit or implicit, of a reappointment, a promotion, or the eventual award of tenure. Such actions must be based on a positive recommendation in accordance with procedures and standards established in Articles II, III, IV, and VI.

Section 4.9. The award of tenure can be made only by the president with the concurrence of the Board of Trustees. Consideration of a candidate for tenure shall be based on the following:

a) Convincing evidence of excellence in at least two, and strength in the third, of the areas of teaching; of research; creative or professional activity; and of service, such as to demonstrate the possession of qualities appropriate to a member of the faculty occupying a permanent position.
b) Reasonable assurance of continuing development and achievement leading to further contributions to the university.
c) The relationships as stated in Section 4.2.

Recommendations for the granting of tenure without promotion to Associate Professor must be accompanied by compelling reasons stated in detail.

ARTICLE V. RIGHTS OF MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY IN ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MATTERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AS CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

Section 5.1. Policies, criteria, and procedural standards established herein and additional policies, criteria, or procedures established on the campuses shall not infringe upon the following rights of faculty members in personnel matters:

a) For personnel, reviews, recommendations and decisions, the right and the responsibility to present all materials which he or she believes will be essential to an adequate consideration of the case, and the opportunity to supplement the original presentation with additional relevant information in the event that a review indicates shortcomings in the presentation.
b) The right to have access to information on the current needs and long-range plans of the department, college or school, campus and University.
c) The right to have extra-departmental service contributions considered at the department level as well as at other levels of review, recommendation and decision.
d) The right to be considered for tenure if given an appointment or a reappointment through the end of the probationary period.
e) The right to equitable treatment in personnel matters so as to ensure generally consistent recognition to departmental faculty members whose chosen field, overall professional development, period of service on the campus, and quality of contributions, all taken as a whole, are judged to be approximately equal.
f) The right to discuss his or her professional progress and any personnel matter of concern with his or her Department Chairperson/Head; and, if such discussions prove unsatisfactory, with the Dean; and, if still unsatisfied, with the Provost.

g) The right to be informed of the personnel recommendation made at the department, college or school, and campus level.

h) The right to notification of non-reappointment as specified in Section 6.7.

i) The right to discuss reasons for a negative personnel decision at all appropriate administrative levels as specified in Section 6.10.

j) The right to invoke the grievance procedures, under the conditions specified in Trustee grievance policy.

**MSP Contract Language (Major Personnel Actions)**

12.1 High professional standards must be the basis for all personnel decisions. Personnel recommendations and decisions shall be made only after a review of all the qualifications and all the contributions of the individual in the areas of teaching; of research, creative or professional activity; and of service. Where applicable (see Articles 26.2.8 and 33.3) all three areas must be considered but the relative weight to be given each may be determined in the light of the duties of the faculty member. Final decisions are made only after giving serious consideration to all the materials in the basic file as well as to the professional judgments of the departmental personnel committee, which are and ought to be given great weight.

12.2 In order to maintain the academic excellence of the University, current academic standards and criteria for faculty personnel actions, except as modified in this Agreement, shall remain in effect for the duration of this Agreement.

12.4 In reviews for major personnel actions for faculty--reappointments through the tenure decision year, promotion to the ranks of associate professor and professor and the award of tenure--the procedures listed below shall be followed:

12.4.1 Notice of a personnel review for reappointment or tenure shall be sent to the faculty member no later than the end of the third calendar week of the semester in which the review is to be initiated.

12.4.2 As provided in Articles 24.4 and 24.5, a basic file shall be created for each major personnel action. This file shall be supplemented and reviewed at the departmental level and supplemented and reviewed at each successive level of recommendation or decision. The file shall contain the materials listed in Article 12.5.

12.4.3 The faculty member shall submit to the department/program chairperson/head any and all materials for inclusion in the basic file that he/she believes will be essential to an adequate consideration of the case.

12.4.4 For appointment at or promotion to the rank of associate professor and professor and for all tenure recommendations, the chair/head shall solicit outside letters of reference drawn from a list of scholars and/or professionals. The solicited referees shall include scholars and professionals from among those suggested by the faculty member (if he/she wishes to do so), but the list is not limited to those the faculty
member suggests. Prior to this solicitation, the candidate shall be provided with a
copy of the solicitation letter and the list of proposed referees and shall be given an
opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of both. *External referees shall be
provided with the candidate’s CV, personal statement(s), and any other
materials that the candidate wishes to include.*

12.4.5 At any time subsequent to the recommendation of the Department Personnel
Committee, the materials in the basic file, with the exception of letters of
recommendation to which the faculty member has voluntarily waived access, shall
be accessible to the faculty member upon request.

12.5 The basic file shall contain the following materials:

(a) When the basic file is forwarded from the departmental level it shall
contain:
1. a table of contents;
2. a current curriculum vitae (including a bibliography and/or
comparable list of professional accomplishments);
3. copies and reviews of published works and/or evidence of other
professional accomplishments;
4. evaluations of teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to
those of students;
5. letters of reference solicited by the chairperson/head and a
description of the professional standing of the writers of letters of
reference from outside the University and a statement of any
relationship the writer may have had to the faculty member;
6. evaluations of service;
7. the candidate’s five most recent Annual Faculty Report and
Evaluation (AFR) forms, including any contemporaneous
comments by Personnel Committees, academic administrators
and any responses from the candidate; if the candidate has
been employed too recently to have undergone five annual
reviews, the file should contain the number of AFRs that have
been prepared, if any,
8. any and all materials submitted by the candidate;
9. the recommendation and the numerical vote at the departmental
level;
10. the recommendation of the chairperson/head.

(b) At subsequent levels there shall be added the following:
1. the recommendation and numerical vote of the faculty, school or
college personnel committee;
2. the recommendation(s) and decision of academic administrative
officials;
3. other materials solicited, submitted or received during the review
process, including, by way of example, additional materials
submitted by the faculty member, additional letters of reference
and/or additional information received in response to the
invitations issued under Articles 12.12-12.15. When material is
added to the basic file *beyond the departmental level*, the departmental personnel committee (or other appropriate mechanism) and the chair/head shall have the opportunity to respond as to its substance and appropriateness; unless it is protected by waiver, the faculty member shall also have this opportunity.

12.6 A copy of the table of contents and the recommendation from the Personnel Committee shall be available to the faculty member when the basic file is forwarded to the Department Chair/Head.

12.7 A copy of the updated table of contents and the recommendation from the Department Chair/Head shall be available to the faculty member when the basic file is forwarded to the School or College Personnel Committee.

12.8 A copy of the updated table of contents and the recommendation of the School or College Personnel Committee shall be available to the faculty member and to the department when the basic file is forwarded to the Dean.

12.9 A copy of the updated table of contents and the recommendation of the Dean shall be available to the faculty member, the Chair of the School or College Personnel Committee and the department when the basic file is forwarded to the Provost or the Chancellor.

12.10 A copy of the updated table of contents and the decision of the Chancellor and/or the Provost shall be available to the faculty member, the Dean, the Chair of the School or College Personnel Committee and the department at the time the decision is made.

12.11 A copy of the updated table of contents and the recommendation of the Chancellor and/or the Provost shall be available to the faculty member, the Dean, the Chair of the School or College Personnel Committee and the department when the Chancellor or the Provost forwards a recommendation for tenure to the President.

12.12 A copy of the updated table of contents and the decision of the President shall be available to the Chancellor and/or the Provost, the Dean, the Chair of the School or College Personnel Committee, the department and the faculty member when the President has made a decision in the case of a recommendation for tenure forwarded by the campus.

12.13 Prior to making a recommendation that may be contrary to either of the recommendations forwarded from the departmental level, the School or College Personnel Committee shall consult *in writing* with the department. *Any response to such consultation must be in writing and must be added to the file.*

12.14 Prior to making a recommendation that may be contrary to either of the recommendations forwarded from the departmental level, the Dean shall *in writing* invite the department to provide additional information for the basic file
or clarification of the recommendation. *Any response to such invitation must be in writing and must be added to the file.*

12.15 Prior to making a recommendation or decision that may be contrary to either of the recommendations forwarded from the school or college level, the Chancellor or Provost shall *in writing* invite the Dean to provide additional information for the basic file or clarification of the recommendation. *Any response to such invitation must be in writing and must be added to the file.*

12.16 Prior to reversing the recommendation of the Chancellor and/or the Provost for tenure, the President shall *in writing* invite the Chancellor and/or Provost to provide additional information for the basic file or clarification of the recommendation. *Any response to such invitation must be in writing and must be added to the file.*

**LIBRARIANS**

**Annual Librarian Reviews (ALR)**

20.7.1 Each librarian shall be reviewed annually on the agreed-upon form entitled "Annual Librarian Report and Evaluation of Professional Activities." This review shall be in accordance with the timeline for personnel actions.

20.7.2 *Each librarian retains the right to respond in writing to any written comments made by any individual or group of individuals on his/her evaluation and to have the response included in the evaluation.*

20.7.3 The librarian shall receive a copy of the completed evaluation form.

20.7.4 Evaluations shall be based on the librarian's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities consistent with 20.10.3 (below).

20.7.5 At the time of annual evaluation, the librarian and his/her supervisor shall meet to discuss whether the current job description accurately reflects the librarian's assigned duties and responsibilities and to make any necessary revisions. *The job description shall include all assigned duties, including clear expectations around service and professional development and scholarly activities.*

20.10.3 The librarian's workload consists of the following elements: professional practice (the provision of services to library users and the technical and administrative services required to deliver these user services); scholarly and/or professional activities; and internal and external professional service. Professional practice may include the teaching of credit courses.

**Procedures for Personnel Actions**

Article 20.4

In reviews for promotions and continuing appointments, the procedures listed below shall be followed.

(a) In accordance with Sections 24.4 and 24.5, a basic file shall be created.
(b) The librarian shall submit to the designated administrator any and all materials for inclusion in the basic file that the librarian believes will be relevant to the scheduled personnel action.

(c) When the basic file is forwarded from the designated administrator (as referenced in Article 24.5) to the Librarians’ Personnel Committee, it shall contain:

(1) a table of contents;
(2) a current resume (including a list of professional accomplishments);
(3) the librarian’s Annual Librarian Report and Evaluation of Professional Activities Forms;
(4) the librarian’s description (in no more than 1,000 words) of achievements and growth accomplished since the date of appointment or last promotion;
(5) any and all materials submitted by the librarian; and
(6) For promotion to Librarian IV or V and for the review for continuing appointment, the file shall include letters of reference solicited by the Dean from individuals drawn from a list of colleagues, scholars and/or professionals that shall include but not be limited to those names suggested by the librarian, with a description of the professional standing of the referee and a statement of any relationship the referee may have had to the candidate. **The Dean shall provide the letter of solicitation to the candidate prior to distribution.** In addition, the Dean shall inform the candidate of the names of all referees prior to solicitation and shall be provided an opportunity for the candidate to comment on the appropriateness of those referees. Of those letters of reference:

a. For continuing appointment, the candidate shall have at least four with at least one from someone outside the University Libraries;

b. For promotion to Librarian IV, the candidate shall have at least four from people outside the University Libraries, though that number may include people within the University;

c. For promotion to Librarian V, the candidate shall have at least five, with at least two from people outside the University.

(7) The file may also contain, at the discretion of the candidate, any or all of the following: for a review for continuing appointment, librarians are encouraged to submit sufficient materials to enable a determination of whether they have met the established criteria for such an appointment:

a. Copies and reviews of publication and/or evidence of other professional accomplishments, such as presentations, electronic products, etc.;

b. Letters of reference or commendation;

c. Samples of work that reflect the eight areas of
evaluation identified in Article 20.7.2(d).

(d) At subsequent levels, there shall be added, as applicable at each level:

(1) the recommendation and numerical vote of the LPC;
(2) the recommendation of the direct supervisor;
(3) the recommendations of higher level supervisors; the recommendation of the DOL;
(4) the decision of the Provost; and
(5) other materials solicited, submitted, or received during the review process.

(e) The file shall be supplemented and reviewed at each successive level of recommendation or decision. When material is added to the basic file beyond the direct supervisor level, the LPC and the direct supervisor shall have the opportunity to respond as to its substance and appropriateness; unless it is protected by waiver, the candidate shall also have this opportunity.

(f) When a recommendation or decision is made at each step of the review process, the LPC shall be notified and an updated table of contents of the basic file and a copy of the recommendation shall be sent to the librarian.

(g) The materials in the basic file shall be accessible to the librarian, with the exception of any letters of reference or evaluation to which he/she has voluntarily waived access.

Recommendations:

(a) The DOL or other administrative official shall make a recommendation or decision counter to the original recommendation of the LPC only in exceptional circumstances and with compelling reasons in written detail, which shall specifically address the content of that recommendation as well as the established standards and criteria.

(b) When the DOL is considering making a recommendation or decision counter to the original recommendation of the LPC in those personnel actions specified in Article 24.4.2, the DOL shall invite the LPC to provide additional information for the basic file or clarification of the recommendation in question.

(c) When the Provost is considering making a decision counter to either the recommendation of the LPC or the recommendation of the DOL in those personnel actions specified in Article 24.4.2, the Provost shall invite the DOL to provide additional information for the basic file or clarification of the recommendation in question.
Criteria for Promotion
Article 20.8.2

(a) A promotion is defined as a change in rank as a librarian from one rank to the next higher rank.

(b) In order to be promoted in rank, a librarian must meet the requirements of the rank in question as set forth in Subsections 20.5.3(c) through (f) and the following Years of Service in Rank requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Promote to</th>
<th>Minimum Years of Service in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian IV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian V</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceptions to these minimum requirements may be granted at the discretion of the DOL, subsequent to seeking a recommendation from the LPC. Reasons for exceptions may include, but not be limited to, years of previous work experience and extraordinary professional accomplishments.

(c) Promotions will be primarily based on meritorious performance of duties and responsibilities; and secondarily on meritorious development, scholarly activities and service contributions as a professional librarian, as well as upon potential for future development, scholarly activities and service contributions as a professional librarian.

(d) Review for promotion will include, but not be limited to, evaluation of the candidate in the following categories:

(1) Education and specialization
(2) Independence, responsibility, judgment
(3) Organizational skills, planning, supervision, management
(4) Communication
(5) Creativity, initiative, vision, entrepreneurship
(6) Influence, impact
(7) Professional activities
(8) Service

(e) The characteristics allow for flexibility and choice for each individual in the development of his/her career. It is understood that no one person is likely to be at the same level in all categories, nor be active in all possible areas within a category. It is the composite picture of the individual that ultimately determines rank.

(f) Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Specific Ranks - In addition to meeting the standards and criteria in B-D above, a librarian shall be considered for promotion based upon the following standards and criteria:
(1) Librarian I to Librarian II

d. As evidenced in annual evaluations, satisfactory fulfillment of duties and responsibilities in the candidate's official position description.

e. Potential for future development, scholarly activities and service contributions as a professional librarian. Has identified appropriate professional organizations and started building connections.

(2) Librarian II to Librarian III

a. As evidenced in annual evaluations, fulfillment at an advanced level of duties and responsibilities in the candidate's official position description and satisfactory performance of duties and responsibilities which include some administrative and/or technical responsibilities and/or subject specialization.

b. Satisfactory progress in development, scholarly activities and service contributions as a professional librarian. Participates in professional organizations and activities and is active on committees and service groups.

(3) Librarian III to Librarian IV

a. As evidenced in annual evaluations, fulfillment at a specialist's level of duties and responsibilities in the candidate's official position description and excellent performance of duties and responsibilities which include major administrative and/or technical responsibility and/or subject specialization, and/or other significant library-related contributions to the academic programs of the University.

b. Substantial accomplishments in development, scholarly activities and service contributions as a professional librarian. Contributes and leads in professional activities and with service groups within Library, University and/or community.

c. Documentation showing that the candidate's knowledge of and contributions to librarianship are becoming recognized by scholars and/or professionals in his or her field on and off campus.

(4) Librarian IV to Librarian V

a. As evidenced in annual evaluations, fulfillment at an expert level of duties and responsibilities in the candidate's official position description and excellent performance of duties and responsibilities which include major administrative and/or technical responsibility and/or subject specialization, and/or other significant
library-related contributions to the academic programs of the University.
b. Outstanding contributions in development, scholarly activities and service as a professional librarian. Provides leadership and service to Libraries, University and community.
c. Documentation showing that the candidate's knowledge of and contributions to librarianship are readily recognized by scholars and/or professionals in his or her field on and off campus.

LECTURER PROMOTIONS

21.10.4 Promotion Standards and Criteria: In addition to having accrued the necessary service credit, a candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Senior Lecturer II must demonstrate evidence of:
a) Meritorious performance in the area(s) of the candidate's responsibility
b) Promise of continuing professional development and achievement

21.10.5 Review Process: Candidates for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Senior Lecturer II shall follow this review process:

a) Candidates who believe they are eligible to apply for promotion consult with the Department Chair/Head to confirm eligibility.
b) The candidate assembles a portfolio of accomplishments in his/her area(s) of responsibility, including a personal statement, a current curriculum vitae, and all other materials that he or she believes will be essential to an adequate consideration of the case and submits the portfolio to his/her Department Head/Chair.
c) If the candidate wishes to include in the portfolio letters of evaluation from scholars or professionals in other University departments or from outside the University, he/she supplies a list of such evaluators to the Department Head/Chair with the portfolio. The Head/Chair solicits evaluations from the individuals suggested by the candidate and may solicit evaluations from other relevant scholars and professionals.
d) The Department Head/Chair adds to the file all available evaluations of teaching effectiveness.
e) The Department Personnel Committee reviews the portfolio and forwards its vote and recommendation to the Department Head/Chair, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
f) The Department Head/Chair reviews the portfolio and forwards his/her recommendation to the relevant college review committee (as described in paragraph 21.10.7(g) below), simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
g) College Review Committees shall be constituted from three to five lecturers, elected by the lecturers in the respective schools and colleges. These committees review the portfolio and forward their votes and recommendations to the Dean, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
h) The Dean reviews the portfolio and forwards his/her recommendation to the Provost, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
i) The Provost reviews the portfolio and informs the candidate and all previous levels of review of his/her decision.

CLINICAL NURSING FACULTY

Appointment & Reappointment (Article 21.2C)

Appointment and Reappointment of Clinical Nursing Faculty
These provisions shall apply to all non-tenure track faculty in the College of Nursing with the titles Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor.

Initial Appointment of Clinical Faculty
For the initial appointment of a clinical faculty member, the Personnel Committee of the College of Nursing shall recommend the selection and academic rank of candidates to the Dean, who shall have, with the approval of the Provost, final discretion in the appointment and rank of such faculty. If the appointment occurs during a period of non-responsibility for members of the Personnel Committee, the Dean shall have the authority to determine the rank and to make the final selection of the clinical faculty member. Upon such determination, the Dean shall inform the Personnel Committee of the appointment and rank.

Clinical faculty initially appointed after January 1, 2015, at less than 50% full-time-equivalence shall be eligible for appointment only at the rank of Clinical Instructor.

Clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure. Faculty members in the College of Nursing shall not transfer from the tenure track to the clinical track.

Reappointment of Clinical Faculty at less than 50% FTE
All faculty members with clinical nursing titles who have appointments at less than 50% FTE and who are appointed on any funding source other than gifts, grants, and contracts and who have at least six academic years of continuous service (or who consistently have taught one semester per year for nine continuous years without a break in service as defined in Article 21.11) and who are not replacements for tenure system faculty members shall be given priority for reappointment over non-bargaining unit members and shall be provided with written reasons if they are not reappointed and an individual not previously employed by the University is appointed to their vacated position.

Clinical Faculty at 50% FTE or Greater
Except as described below, the provisions of Article 21.9 of this Agreement shall apply to all faculty members with clinical nursing titles who have appointments at 50% or greater and who are appointed on any funding source other than gifts, grants, and contracts.

(a) Appointment, Reappointments, and Notice Periods. All provisions of Article 21.9.1 shall apply to faculty members with clinical nursing titles who have appointments of 50% FTE or greater. In addition to the
reappointment factors considered under Section H of 21.9.1, the dean shall consider the faculty member’s maintenance of nursing licensure/certification (when such licensure/certification was a condition of hiring or when required by respective accrediting bodies or by applicable governmental entities) ongoing nursing practice (as applicable), and promise of continuing professional development.

(b) Continuing Appointments. All provisions of Article 21.9.2 shall apply to faculty members with clinical nursing titles who have appointments of 50% FTE or greater with the following qualification: A continuing appointment shall not be awarded solely on the grounds of reappointment, but rather a continuing appointment must result from a successful review in the academic year in which the fourth FTE year of service will be achieved. To receive a continuing appointment in his/her current rank, the individual must demonstrate convincing evidence of:

- Sustained effectiveness in clinical instruction and in related aspects of teaching, such as curriculum development;
- For faculty in the progressive ranks, sustained achievement in scholarship (as nursing scholarship is defined by AACN);
- Ongoing maintenance of nursing licensure/certification (when such licensure/certification was a condition of hiring or when required by respective accrediting bodies or by applicable governmental entities) nursing practice, and – if applicable – advanced practice certification;
- Promise of future professional development and achievement; and sustained contributions in service.

(c) Review Process.

(1) An eligible candidate assembles a portfolio of accomplishments in her or his area(s) of responsibility, including a personal statement; a current curriculum vitae; evidence of teaching effectiveness, nursing scholarship, and service; and all other materials that she or he believes will be essential to an adequate consideration of the case and submits the portfolio to the office of the Dean.

(2) The clinical faculty member shall provide to the Dean the names of at least two recognized scholars in the candidate’s area of nursing scholarship. The candidate shall provide those names in writing no later than September 1 for reviews occurring in the following spring semester. The Personnel Committee and the Dean shall each add to that list the names of two additional relevant scholars from whom evaluations of the candidate’s professional record shall be solicited. The candidate may comment on but may not require the removal of any name from the final list of six outside evaluators and may review and comment on the solicitation letter before its sent.

(3) Feedback from clinical agencies can be included in the file (assessment form to be bargained with the MSP).

(4) The College Personnel Committee reviews the file and
forwards its vote and recommendation to the dean with a copy to the candidate. The Dean reviews the file and forwards her or his recommendation to the Provost, with a copy to the candidate and all previous levels of review.

(5) The Provost reviews the file and informs the candidate and all previous levels of review of her or his decision.

(d) **Timing.** The eligible candidate will submit his or her portfolio and all other required materials no later than the first day of the spring semester of the academic year in which he or she achieves, or will achieve, four years of full-time equivalent service with an appointment of at least 50% FTE. The review process will be conducted during the spring semester of that academic year. The candidate will be notified of the Provost’s decision no later than August 15 of the summer after the academic year in which the review takes place.

(e) **Review Outcomes.** The outcome of a review for continuing appointment will be one of the following:

(1) Continuing appointment without an end date;
(2) Non-reappointment.

A faculty member with a clinical nursing title who is not granted a continuing appointment following the review process outlined above shall be given a one-year terminal reappointment.

**Promotion (Article 21.3C)**

**Eligibility for Promotion.** Eligibility for promotion shall be based on the sustained fulfillment of the promotion criteria and not on years of service although a record of performance must be sufficiently long in one rank to suggest continuing promise of development and achievement after promotion. Therefore, a clinical faculty member may apply for promotion at any time consistent with the Campus Master Calendar’s deadlines for promotion applications.

**Composition of the Personnel Committee.** For evaluation of cases involving the promotion of clinical faculty, the Personnel Committee must comprise clinical faculty equal in numbers to tenure-stream faculty. If the standing personnel committee does not include sufficient clinical faculty for that purpose, the College shall elect clinical faculty sufficient to achieve equal numbers; the additionally elected clinical faculty shall review only the cases of clinical faculty. Any clinical faculty elected to the original Personnel Committee and not added for the purpose of achieving equal numbers of clinical faculty as described in this paragraph shall participate in the review of all faculty, including tenure-stream faculty.

**Application & Review Process for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor.**

(1) A clinical faculty member who intends to apply for promotion shall notify the Dean in writing no later than June 1 for applications due the following
January to the Dean’s office.

(2) The clinical faculty member applying for promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor shall provide to the Dean the names of at least two recognized scholars in the candidate’s area of nursing scholarship. The candidate shall provide those names in writing no later than June 1 for applications due the following January. The personnel Committee and the Dean shall each add to that list the names of two additional relevant scholars from whom evaluations of the candidate’s professional record shall be solicited. The candidate may comment on but may not require the removal of any name from the final list of six outside evaluators and may review and comment on the solicitation letter before it is sent.

(3) A candidate for promotion shall compile and submit to the Dean by the deadline established on the campus’s official calendar of personnel action deadlines, a basic file that contains the materials required by Article 12.7.6; the basic file shall also contain the candidate’s three most recent AFRS (see Article 33.2.3). The candidate shall also ensure that the basic file includes evidence resulting from multiple methods of evaluation of teaching effectiveness including clinical instruction (see Article 33.4). The basic file, any subsequent additions to it, and reviewers’ recommendations, may be submitted and processed electronically.

(4) The College Personnel Committee shall review the basic file and any additions to it, evaluate the candidate’s fulfillment of the pertinent promotion criteria, write a formal recommendation for or against promotion, attach the recommendation and numerical vote to the basic file, and forward the file and committee recommendation to the Dean, simultaneously sending a copy of the recommendation to the candidate and to all previous levels of review.

(5) The Dean shall similarly review the file and any additions to it, evaluate the candidate’s fulfillment of the pertinent promotion criteria, write a recommendation, and forward the file with recommendations to the Provost, simultaneously sending a copy of the recommendation to the candidate and all previous levels of review.

(6) The Provost shall similarly evaluate the candidate’s fulfillment of the pertinent promotion criteria. Before making a decision contrary to the original faculty recommendation, the Provost shall invite that original faculty group to provide additional information for the basic file or clarification of the recommendation. The Provost shall provide to the candidate, with copies to the Dean and Personnel Committee, her/his decision, which shall be final. In the case of a positive decision the promotion shall take effect on September 1 following the decision. In the case of a negative decision, the Provost shall provide a written rationale for the denial consistent with the requirements in Article 11. A candidate denied promotion shall not be eligible for consideration for promotion for
two years from the date of the denied application. The candidate will be notified of the Provost’s decision no later than August 15 of the summer after the academic year in which the review takes place.

Promotion Criteria & Standards.

(1) Areas of Responsibility & Evaluation for Promotion to Higher Clinical Ranks. All faculty at the ranks of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor are expected to be active and to be evaluated for promotion in three areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, nursing scholarship, and service. In a practice-based discipline such as nursing, these areas of responsibility and evaluation both resemble and differ from those for tenure-stream faculty. The three areas are broadly defined as follows:

a. Teaching encompasses but is not limited to clinical, classroom, and online teaching, using various instructional and assessment methods; contributions to course and program curricula and methods; and advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students.

b. Nursing Scholarship encompasses those activities and standards defined by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing in “Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing,” published in 2013 (www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/defining-scholarship). That definition includes the “scholarship of discovery,” the “scholarship of teaching,” the “scholarship of practice (application),” and the “scholarship of integration.” Scholarship in any of these areas qualifies as scholarship for the purposes of promotion.

c. Service encompasses but is not limited to participation in governance of the college and the university; contributions to professional and nursing-related community or professional organizations; and invited presentations and consulting related to clinical expertise.

(2) Basis of Evaluation for Higher Clinical Ranks. Reviewers shall evaluate the candidate’s record in the three areas of responsibility. Baseline criteria for promotion to the ranks of Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor.

Sustained excellence and effectiveness in teaching;
Sustained participation in nursing scholarship; and
Sustained participation and effectiveness in service.

Without meeting those three criteria, a clinical faculty member does not meet the standard for promotion.

(3) Promotional Criteria. In addition to meeting the baseline criteria, a
clinical faculty member at the rank of the Clinical Assistant Professor or above must demonstrate professional development in the areas of teaching, nursing scholarship, and service.

The evidence in her/his basic file in each area, assessed holistically, must demonstrate growth in two respects: the domain of the work’s influence and the increasing leadership assumed by the individual.

For promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, the candidate’s work must demonstrate ongoing growth in influence beyond a merely local domain and must show leadership as well as participation in interdisciplinary health or health-care related activities.

For promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor, the candidate’s work must demonstrate sustained influence within the national and/or international domain and significant, sustained leadership within and impact on interdisciplinary health or health-care related activities beyond the local domain.

PERIODIC MULTI-YEAR REVIEW

** Note: Below is the PMYR process for faculty. Because the process for librarians is nearly identical it’s not been included here but can be viewed in the MSP contract at APPENDIX A(L) **

---

Appendix A
Policy on Periodic Multi-Year Review of Faculty (PMYR)
Amherst campus

PREAMBLE

The practice of regular annual review of faculty performance based upon an annual faculty report (AFR) and involving peer review by departmental personnel committees and administrative review by chairs and deans is well established on the Amherst campus. The AFR serves as the primary basis for the award of merit monies when they are available and is intended to be a mandatory yearly review of faculty performance even in the absence of merit. Because faculty members continue to review their professional activity every year of their careers at the University, including after tenure and promotion, the AFR must be a principal ingredient of any process of post-tenure review.

In addition, significant multi-year reviews of faculty performance are conducted at the time of major personnel actions: appointment through the tenure decision year, tenure, and promotion to full professor. These reviews evaluate the performance of the faculty member in the three mandatory categories of teaching, research, and service in regard to established standards for the personnel actions, including the expectation of continued professional development and performance.

A multi-year review of all faculty, which is distinct from the annual and major personnel action reviews, serves a number of internal purposes. First, such a review expands the
narrow time window of the annual reviews into an overview of a faculty member's interests, capabilities, and performance that will both inform evaluations and rewards and aid academic planning. Second, such periodic overviews make possible timely consultation, intervention, and assistance that will stimulate and encourage professional development, new initiatives, and/or changes in direction that will benefit both the faculty member and the institution. The multi-year review will also effectively account for faculty members' professional activity.

In adopting a PMYR policy, the university and the tenured faculty, represented by the Massachusetts Society of Professors, MTA/NEA, address the external concern for accountability, while upholding the integrity of tenure and academic freedom. PMYR addresses accountability by fostering continued professional development.

**PURPOSE**
The primary purpose of Periodic Multi-Year Review (PMYR) is to assist tenured faculty in their continuing professional development. A faculty member who has been awarded tenure has demonstrated excellent performance and represents a large investment on the part of the University. Tenure is awarded on the basis of an expectation that the faculty member will continue to develop professionally and demonstrate a continued high level of performance. PMYR evaluates performance over a number of years and assures that the talents of faculty members and their contributions to the University are maximized throughout their careers.

**PRINCIPLES**
1. Our present review procedures encourage short-term assessment of individual accomplishment. PMYR should foster a longer-term view of an individual's performance and contributions to the University.
2. PMYR must assure the protection of the faculty member's academic freedom, and right to full and free inquiry, as prescribed in the contract.
3. PMYR is neither retaining nor a major personnel action as defined in the collective bargaining agreement.
4. PMYR should be appropriately linked to the annual faculty reviews [AFRs] and should not involve the creation of additional unnecessary bureaucracy.
5. PMYR should include both self-assessment and internal peer review, as well as assessment by the department chair and dean.
6. Standards of evaluation in each department will be fair and consistent with departmental, college, and campus practice.
7. PMYR is intended to recognize that individual interests and abilities of faculty members may change over time, and that faculty members may meet their professional responsibilities to their department in varied and changing ways.

**TIMING OF PROCESS**
1. PMYR is to be conducted every seven years for all tenured faculty members. Persons who have indicated, in writing, their intention to retire within a three-year period will not be subject to PMYR.
2. The first formal consideration of an associate professor for promotion to full professor may be substituted for the initial PMYR unless such promotion consideration is delayed beyond seven years past the promotion to associate professor. If a person is formally considered for promotion to full professor but not promoted and is not subsequently
reconsidered for promotion in the interval before the next sabbatical, PMYR will take place two years before the scheduled year of that sabbatical.

3. The time of the PMYR may be altered, upon written agreement between the individual and the department chair, in the following circumstances:

a. When the faculty member is named to a full-time administrative appointment, the faculty member will have the option of delaying the review for up to three years following the return to normal faculty assignments.

b. When the faculty member is granted a leave without pay for an academic year. A leave of less than one academic year in duration shall not affect the time of the PMYR.

c. When the faculty member expresses in writing his or her intention to retire within three years of the time of the scheduled review, the review shall be canceled. If the intention to retire is rescinded, the faculty member shall undergo PMYR in the next annual cycle or during the annual cycle in which the faculty member had originally been scheduled to undergo PMYR, whichever is later.

d. Upon request initiated by the faculty member and approved by the department chair and the dean.

REVIEW MATERIALS
The foundation of the review will include a brief statement, typically between 1000-2000 and not to exceed 2500 words, submitted by the faculty member that summarizes and assesses his/her principal activities during the period since the last PMYR or promotion review, and his/her goals and approach to achieving such goals in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, creative and/or professional activity and service in the coming years. If the individual’s statement calls for a major new initiative or change in the direction of her/his work, the statement will include any requests for additional developmental support needed for that initiative or change in direction. In addition, the faculty member will submit a current curriculum vitae. The department chair will supply all evaluations of the faculty member’s teaching performance carried out during the previous six years, and the annual faculty evaluation reports (AFRs) for the prior six years and the current year, including any supplemental materials that normally accompany AFRs.

REVIEW PROCESS
The Departmental Personnel Committee or other elected committee [hereafter referred to as DPC] and the Department Chair will review the individual’s AFRs, curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations, and the submitted statement. After review of the materials, the DPC and the Chair will each recommend that the statement submitted by the faculty member be either:

(1) Accepted, with further comments or suggestions optional, or
(2) Revised.

A recommendation to accept the submitted statement will be made when the individual’s past performance and future goals, as documented in the materials submitted, indicates that no changes in the faculty member’s work or plans are seen as required in order to promote the continued contribution to the University and professional progress of the faculty member. A recommendation to revise the submitted statement will be made when
the individual’s past performance and future goals, as documented in the materials submitted, suggests that a significant change in the faculty member’s work or goals (one that is substantially different from that proposed by the faculty member) is indicated in order to promote the faculty member’s continued effective contribution and professional progress.

If both the DPC and the Chair recommend “Statement accepted” and the dean concurs, then no further action will be taken, and the review will be concluded. If the dean does not concur, the statement along with specific comments from the dean explaining the nonconcurrency will be returned to the faculty member, personnel committee, and chair for revision.

If either the DPC or the Chair recommends “Statement revised,” or the dean indicates nonconcurrency, the DPC and Chair both shall meet with the individual to discuss ways of optimizing the faculty member’s professional contribution through a revised statement. The faculty member shall be allowed to present any supplemental documentation about his or her performance at this time. The intent of the revised statement is to support and encourage the faculty member’s effective contribution and professional development, and it shall in no way impinge on the faculty member’s academic freedom. Opportunities to develop professionally may include, but are not limited to, consultation with colleagues to assist in problem areas, a change in department assignments to facilitate improvement in teaching, research or service, the design of a sabbatical leave which is crafted to address the identified needs, and referral to the Institute for Teaching Excellence and Faculty Development, if appropriate.

If a revised statement agreeable to the faculty member, the DPC and the chair cannot be achieved, the situation will be referred to a five-person college level appeal committee, two members of which are to be nominated and elected by the members of the faculty member’s college to serve for a staggered period of two years, two members of which are to be appointed by the dean to serve for a staggered period of two years, and one member of which will be selected by the faculty member to serve as his or her representative. In smaller colleges (Education, Engineering, Management, Nursing, and Public Health and Health Sciences), the committee will include one member elected by the faculty of the college, one appointed by the dean, and one selected by the faculty member. The faculty member shall have the right to remove any committee members (up to six) whose participation he or she deems inappropriate. The committee including the faculty member’s representative will draft a statement in consultation with the chair, the DPC and the faculty member. This will be the revised statement when adopted by majority vote of the committee.

The revised statement will address the issues identified, will include a timetable and criteria for a follow-up review to take place in three years, and will be signed by the faculty member, the department chair and the dean to signify that all parties have received copies. The revised statement may include a reallocation of the faculty member’s effort and such reallocation will itself not diminish the faculty member’s entitlement to merit funds; nor shall it impinge on his/her academic freedom. Any proposed reallocation of duties should not be designed, intended or used for the purposes of controlling, restricting or redirecting the nature of the faculty member’s research or scholarship in his/her field. The revised
statement also will indicate what resources or other support will be devoted to promoting the success of the revised statement.

Participation in the PMYR process as described above is required of all tenured faculty members.

During the three-year period after development of a revised statement, the DPC and the chair will consult as needed with the faculty member, and at least annually will comment in writing on the faculty member’s progress toward the goals set forth in the revised statement. The dean will review these comments and may comment as well. At the end of this three-year period, the DPC, the chair, and the dean each will evaluate in writing the extent to which the goals of the revised statement have been achieved. If the parties concur that the goals have been achieved, the recommendation will be that a subsequent PMYR will take place in four years, restoring the seven-year cycle. If they do not concur, other possibilities may be discussed. The dean may determine that no further efforts at faculty development are warranted and may refer the matter to the provost for disciplinary action or dismissal, consistent with the requirements of the Union contract.

The fact of a faculty member’s refusal to accept or to implement the revised statement shall not be a basis for discipline, and no aspect of the PMYR process, including but not limited to informal discussion, written recommendations, or the fact or details of any revised statements generated as part of the process shall be considered as an initial stage in any disciplinary process or be introduced as evidence or otherwise referred to in any later disciplinary procedures. This exclusion does not apply to any document or record originally intended for a use other than the PMYR, e.g. the AFR, nor to any aspect of a faculty member’s performance that may have been considered in the PMYR process and may be separately considered in a subsequent disciplinary process. Nothing in this policy changes the “just cause” standard set forth in the collective bargaining agreement under which a faculty member may be considered for dismissal.

ASSESSMENT

Each dean will prepare an annual report to the Provost on the PMYR process in his/her college. This report, which will be reviewed by the Provost to ensure that the PMYR process is being appropriately and consistently carried out across the campus, will include a summary of the number of PMYRs conducted and their results and relevant details about all instances in which a revised plan was developed.

Periodically after implementation of PMYR, the parties will jointly evaluate and report to the campus on how the policy is working.

Article 12.18

A copy of any recommendation or decision made by a personnel committee or academic administrator with respect to a faculty member’s sabbatical leave application and Periodic Multi-Year Review shall be made available to the faculty member at the time the recommendation is forwarded to the next level of review or the decision is made.
Article 26.10

Equity Review and Adjustment Process: No later than January 1, 2019, the parties agree to replace the 26.8 anomaly process with an annual “Equity Review and Adjustment Process” for equity adjustments effective September 1, 2019. A university Salary Equity Committee composed of half faculty and half non-unit administrators will develop rules and procedures for determining the existence of potential salary inequities and make recommendations for correcting them. The Equity Reviews would result in recommendations for salary adjustments to the Provost who makes final determination for equity adjustments. Decisions are not subject to the grievance procedure. A central pool of not less than $200,000, allocated to each college by FTE shall be distributed annually. Every effort will be made to de-identify the faculty members recommended for adjustments and their comparators during the review process.

Colleges may use additional funds to correct salary inequities that have not been addressed through the central process with approval from the MSP.
**Tentative Agreement**

This agreement is to modify and amend the 2017-2020 collective bargaining agreement ("CBA") between the University of Massachusetts Amherst and the MSP as permitted by the Memorandum of Understanding: "Faculty with Extension and Research Titles" appended to the CBA. The following provisions will be added to Article 21: "Non-Tenure Track Faculty."

21.10R **Provisions specific to research faculty.**

21.10.1R **Progressive Research Faculty Titles.** The progressive ranks of research faculty shall be: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Research faculty titles shall only be used for faculty members who meet all of the following criteria: (1) their salaries are paid entirely from grant funds; (2) their appointments are not considered probationary and they are not eligible for tenure; (3) their responsibilities are primarily in the area of research.

In most cases, each term of the research appointment should not exceed one year, and in no case may a single term exceed five years. Research faculty appointments may be terminated due to a reduction or elimination of grant funds with thirty days written notice. Non-reappointment at the end of a term or termination of an appointment due to a reduction of funds shall not be subject to the grievance procedure.

21.10.2R **Progression in ranks.**

(a) Research Assistant Professors who have completed six years of full time equivalent service are eligible for promotion to Research Associate Professor.

(b) Research Associate Professors who have completed six years of full time equivalent service in that title are eligible for promotion to Research Professor.

21.10.3R **Eligibility for promotion.** All Research Assistant Professors with at least six years of full-time-equivalent service or in a position, excluding student employment, with duties and responsibilities substantially the same as a Research Assistant Professor, will be eligible for consideration for promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor. All Research Associate Professors with at least six years of full-time-equivalent service as a Research Associate Professor or in a position, excluding student employment, with duties and responsibilities substantially the same as Research Associate Professor, will be eligible for consideration for promotion to the rank of Research Professor. Service in other titles not explicitly enumerated herein or service in comparable positions at other institutions may be credited towards eligibility for promotion at the time of appointment to a research faculty position if it is included in the offer letter or written agreement.

21.10.4R **Promotion Standards and Criteria:** In addition to having accrued the necessary service credit, and possession of the appropriate terminal degree, a candidate for promotion to Research Associate Professor must demonstrate evidence of:

(a) A record of achievement sufficient to have gained recognition on and off campus from scholars or professionals in the candidate's field of academic specialization; and

(b) Promise of continuing professional development and achievement
In addition to having accrued the necessary service credit, and possession of the appropriate terminal degree, a candidate for promotion to Research Professor must demonstrate evidence of:
(a) A record of achievement sufficient to have gained substantial recognition on and off campus from scholars or professionals in the candidate’s field of academic specialization; and
(b) Promise of continuing professional development and achievement

21.10.5R **Review Process:** Candidates for promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor shall follow this review process:
(a) Candidates who believe they are eligible to apply for promotion consult with the Department Chair/Head to confirm eligibility.
(b) The candidate assembles a portfolio of accomplishments in his/her area(s) of responsibility, including a personal statement, a current curriculum vitae, and all other materials that he or she believes will be essential to an adequate consideration of the case and submits the portfolio to his/her Department Head/Chair.
(c) The candidate must supply a list of scholars or professionals in other University departments and from outside the University, to serve as evaluators to the Department Head/Chair with the portfolio. The Head/Chair solicits evaluations from the individuals suggested by the candidate and may solicit evaluations from other relevant scholars and professionals.
(d) The Department Personnel Committee reviews the portfolio and forwards its vote and recommendation to the Department Head/Chair, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
(e) The Department Head/Chair reviews the portfolio and forwards his/her recommendation to the relevant College Personnel Committee simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
(f) The College Personnel Committee reviews the portfolio and forwards their vote and recommendation to the Dean, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
(g) The Dean reviews the portfolio and forwards his/her recommendation to the Provost, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
(h) The Provost reviews the portfolio and informs the candidate and all previous levels of review of his/her decision.

21.10.6 Timing: The candidate may submit his/her portfolio during the spring semester immediately prior to the academic year in which he or she will accrue the equivalent of six years of full-time service in his/her current rank. The review process will be conducted during the following academic year; resulting promotions will be effective on the following September 1st. The candidate will be notified of the Provost’s decision no later than August 15 of the summer after the academic year in which the review takes place.

21.10.7R **Effective Date of Promotion:** The promotion of a successful candidate will take effect on September 1 of the academic year following the Provost’s decision.

Agreed this 11th day of June, 2019:

MSP

By: [Signature]
Michelle Gallagher

6/11/19
By:

Michael Eagen

11/11/19
Tentative Agreement

This agreement is to modify and amend that 2017-2020 collective bargaining agreement ("CBA") between the University of Massachusetts Amherst and the MSP as permitted by the Memorandum of Understanding: Faculty with Extension and Research Titles appended to the CBA.

Promotion Criteria and Review Process for Extension Faculty

21.10E Provisions specific to Extension faculty: These provisions are applicable only to Extension faculty who have a significant portion of their time, effort and responsibility in Extension; whose salaries are supported (at least in part) by federal capacity funds (USDA/NIFA funds that include Smith-Lever, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis) or on state funds being used as the required match for these federal funds; participate in research and extension activities that are reviewed, approved and reported on in accordance with federally determined systems and procedures.

21.10.1E Progressive Extension Faculty Titles. The progressive ranks of the Extension faculty shall be: Extension Assistant Professor, Extension Associate Professor and Extension Professor.

21.10.2E Progression in ranks.

(a) Extension Assistant Professors who have completed six years of full time equivalent service are eligible for promotion to Extension Associate Professor.

(b) Extension Associate Professors who have sustained fulfillment of the promotion criteria are eligible for promotion to Extension Professor.

21.10.3E Eligibility for promotion All Extension Assistant Professors with at least six years of full-time-equivalent service or in a position, excluding student employment, with duties and responsibilities substantially the same as an Extension Assistant Professor, will be eligible for consideration for promotion to the rank of Extension Associate Professor. All Extension Associate Professors who have sustained fulfillment of the promotion criteria shall be eligible for consideration for promotion to the rank of Extension Professor.

21.10.4E Promotion Standards and Criteria: In addition to having accrued the necessary service credit, and possession of a minimum of a Masters or equivalent professional degree, a candidate for promotion to Extension Associate Professor must demonstrate evidence of:

(a) Achievement sufficient to have gained recognition on and off campus from scholars, Extension educators and professionals in the candidate's field of specialization, for a program of research that is integrated with educational outreach programs, resources, tools or technologies

(b) Successful fulfillment of all federally determined responsibilities and duties associated with their approved projects/programs and

(c) Satisfactory performance of teaching duties where appropriate and

(d) Promise of continuing academic and professional development and achievement
In addition to having accrued the necessary service credit, and possession of a minimum of a Masters or equivalent professional degree (terminal degree preferred), a candidate for promotion to Extension Professor must demonstrate evidence of:

(a) Recognition on and off campus from scholars, Extension educators and professionals in the candidate's field of specialization, as an innovator, leader for a program of research that has achieved significant and sustained public impacts through its integration with educational programs, resources, tools or technologies and

(b) Successful fulfillment of all federally determined responsibilities and duties associated with their approved projects/programs.

(c) Satisfactory performance of teaching duties where appropriate and

(d) Promise of continuing academic and professional development and achievement.

21.10.5E Review Process: Candidates for promotion to the rank of Extension Associate Professor or Extension Professor shall follow this review process:

(a) Candidates who believe they are eligible to apply for promotion to rank of Associate Extension Professor or Extension Professor should consult with the Department Chair/Head to confirm eligibility.

(b) The candidate assembles a portfolio of accomplishments in his/her area(s) of responsibility, including a personal statement, a current curriculum vitae, and all other materials that he or she believes will be essential to an adequate consideration of the case and submits the portfolio to his/her Department Head/Chair.

(c) The Department Chair/Head shall solicit outside letters of reference drawn from a list of scholars and/or professionals. The solicited referees shall include scholars and professionals from among those provided by the faculty member (if he/she wishes to do so), but the list need not be limited to those the faculty member suggests. Prior to this solicitation, the candidate shall be provided with a copy of the solicitation letter and the list of proposed referees and shall be given an opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of both. External referees shall be provided with the candidate's CV, personal statement(s), and any other materials that the candidate wishes to include.

(e) The Department Personnel Committee reviews the portfolio and forwards its vote and recommendation to the Department Head/Chair, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.

(f) The Department Head/Chair reviews the portfolio and forwards his/her recommendation to the relevant College Personnel Committee simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.

(g) A parallel evaluation is conducted by the Center for Agriculture and the Environment (CAFE) and a letter of evaluation and recommendation is provided by the Center Director. The evaluation by CAFE takes into account the specific nature of the appointment including the time and effort split among research, extension and teaching responsibilities. Input and evidence may be solicited from CAFE affiliated faculty, staff, and administration, as well as from external stakeholders. The letter of evaluation and recommendation is sent to the College Personnel Committee, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.

(g) The College Personnel Committee reviews the portfolio and forwards their vote and recommendation to the Dean,

(h) The Dean reviews the portfolio and forwards his/her recommendation to the Provost, simultaneously sending a copy to the candidate.
(i) The Provost reviews the portfolio and informs the candidate and all previous levels of review of his/her decision.

(ii) Prior to making a recommendation that may be contrary to either of the recommendations forwarded from all levels following the departmental level, the College Personnel Committee, Dean; or Provost shall consult in writing with the preceding level. Any response to such consultation must be in writing and must be added to the file.

21.10.6E **Timing:** The candidate may submit his/her portfolio during the spring semester immediately prior to the academic year in which he or she will accrue the equivalent of six years of full-time service in his/her current rank or who believe they have sustained the promotion criteria, whichever is relevant. The review process will be conducted during the following academic year; resulting promotions will be effective on the following September 1st. The candidate will be notified of the Provost's decision no later than August 15 of the summer after the academic year in which the review takes place.

21.10.7E **Effective Date of Promotion:** The promotion of a successful candidate will take effect on September 1 of the academic year following the Provost's decision.

Agreed:

MSP

By: [Signature] 6/11/19
Michelle Gallagher

UMass Amherst

By: [Signature] 6/11/19
Michael Eagen