

Proposal for changing Retention Reviews

Additions to current *Manual* language are underlined; deletions are ~~struck through~~

b. Review by the tenured faculty. The tenured faculty will review the summary submitted by the faculty member in accordance with Part I.B.1.a and, as provided in collegiate and/or departmental bylaws, solicit input from the faculty member's mentor or mentoring committee. The tenured faculty then will construct a narrative that describes and discusses both (i) the faculty member's ability to sustain a level of activity that comports with the department's expectations for faculty members at the rank of the faculty member under review and (ii) the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure in the context of the *Faculty Handbook*, this manual, his or her appointment, and departmental bylaws. The review and narrative should specifically address (among other things) the faculty member's establishment and development of teaching methods and tools, program of disciplinary research / scholarship / creative activity, and record of institutional, disciplinary, and professional service, as well as progress toward promotion (where applicable) and tenure. It is recommended that the narrative be divided into three sections: areas of strength, areas for improvement, and specific recommendations for the current academic year. The tenured faculty's review and narrative ~~only~~ shall rely on and include only documented and substantiated information available to the tenured faculty at the time of the review and shall not be based on rumor or speculation.

c. The vote of the tenured faculty. The tenured faculty will take a formal retention vote only in the year of the enhanced retention review except in instances when a majority of the tenured faculty present at a retention review and voting yes or no request that a vote be taken. ~~In the years before any enhanced retention review (as provided for in paragraph A.2.a. of this Part I), this~~ In the event that a vote is called for by the faculty before the enhanced retention review, that vote shall focus primarily (but not exclusively) on the tenure-track faculty member's ability to sustain a level of teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and service that comports with the unit's expectations for faculty members at the rank of the faculty member under review. ~~Beginning in~~ In the year in which the tenure-track faculty member is the subject of the enhanced retention review process ~~(or, for a faculty member who is exempt from the enhanced retention review process, in every year of his or her probationary period, even if he or she chooses to undergo a voluntary enhanced retention review in any year),~~ the tenured faculty's vote on retention shall focus primarily ~~(and increasingly, in succeeding years)~~ on the tenure-track faculty member's ability to meet the requirements for tenure in the department, college, campus, and University. The tenured faculty will share the vote and the written narrative with the faculty member and the department head.