Policy for Mid-term Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty

In addition to the annual Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF), all academic units will conduct mid-term intensive reviews for faculty on annual tenure-track appointments. The primary intent is to review progress toward indefinite tenure so that timely guidance can be extended to the faculty member.

Mid-term reviews are supplemental to annual PROF evaluations and to a subsequent formal promotion and/or tenure evaluation. The mid-term review provides opportunity for the Department faculty, Department Head, Dean and other supervisors to observe and comment upon an individual faculty member's performance relative to University and College promotion and tenure guidelines, and to offer appropriate advice and counsel on improving performance to meet promotion and tenure requirements. It also provides a forum for the faculty member being reviewed to ask questions about the process and criteria for granting indefinite tenure or promotion. This policy does not alter the probationary status of a tenure track appointment and the University’s rights to issue a letter of timely notice under State Board of Higher Education Rules, OAR 580-021-0110.

The following general University guidelines are to be used in conducting mid-term tenure reviews:

A. Mid-term reviews will usually be conducted during the final quarter of the third year of the initial appointment. For faculty whose probationary service has been either shortened for prior service or lengthened for extenuating circumstances, the review should be done during the year which best equates with the mid point in the faculty member’s probationary service.

B. In general, the mid-term review is to be used as a supplement to, and not as a replacement for, the annual review in the year it is given. Exceptions to this statement are possible if the mid-term review contains all the components of a regular annual review. If it does not, an annual PROF review must be done in addition to the mid-term review.

C. Colleges and/or departments must apply the process uniformly to all members of the faculty on annual tenure-track appointments.

D. All materials used in the review must be open to review by the faculty member, including any external letters of evaluation that might be solicited (unless a waiver of access has been signed).

E. The outcome of the mid-term review must be shared with the faculty member for comment and signature, and included in the individual's personnel file.
F. Colleges and Departments may write additional guidelines in order to provide extra detail on process, or that are specific to their personnel or mission. All such unit specific guidelines must be consistent with the university guidelines and must be submitted to the Provost for review and approval prior to implementation. As with any set of guidelines, units are responsible for informing their faculty of any additional guidelines they have created.

G. The guidelines for mid-term reviews should not preclude the University in issuing letters of timely notice in any of the years prior to a tenure decision; nor should they limit the purpose or intent of the annual review.

**Suggested Procedure:**

1. The mid-term review is discussed with each eligible faculty member by the department head/chair during the winter or spring of the academic year prior to a planned review.

2. The faculty member prepares a dossier for review under specifications and time guidelines provided by the department head/chair. The format for the dossier should be similar to the format used in the final promotion and tenure process. External reviews and evaluation letters for this dossier should only be sought in extraordinary cases, for example where there is insufficient expertise on campus to make an evaluative judgment of an important part of a candidate’s performance. As with the final promotion and tenure dossier, formal student or client input, and peer review of teaching reports should be included if the faculty member has a teaching and advising role outlined in their position description.

3. The dossier is reviewed by the department head/chair (and any other supervisors, if applicable) and the departmental faculty review committee. Their written evaluations are appended to the dossier and are provided to the faculty member. Their letters should include an evaluation of progress towards promotion and/or tenure, as well as recommended actions the faculty member and department should take.

4. The department head/chair schedules a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the outcome of the review and initial recommendations. The chair of the faculty review committee and other supervisors (if applicable) should also be invited to participate. The performance of the faculty member relative to University guidelines is discussed in the form of a dialogue among all parties present. P&T guidelines and procedures are reviewed to ensure that the faculty member has been informed about the process and criteria for evaluating faculty for granting of indefinite tenure, or promotion. At that time the faculty member may attach comments, explanations, or rebuttal to the review before signing to indicate that the document is complete.
5. The department head/chair forwards the dossier and any attachments to the dean for review.

6. At the discretion of the dean, the review is either signed and returned, or a meeting is scheduled with the faculty member, the department head/chair, the dean, and other appropriate administrators.

7. In the event of a meeting at the college level, the dean will send written comments to the faculty member on the performance of the individual relative to P&T guidelines. The dean's letter, including any modifications in the recommendations for the faculty member, is sent through the department head/chair to the faculty member for signature and response, if desired.

8. The department head/chair, in consultation with other supervisors, reviews the final results of the mid-term review with the faculty member and discusses issues or concerns raised during the review. A copy of the review and the recommendations, signed by the faculty member, the chair and the dean, is placed in the individual's personnel file.