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, if needed, 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 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, a PROF letter 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, including any outside letters that might be solicited, must be open to review by the faculty member.

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. The guidelines used by colleges and/or departments are to be written and available for review by members of the faculty. Prior to their formal implementation, the college and/or department guidelines are to be submitted to the Provost for review and approval.
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 are not normally sought for this dossier. Formal student or client input, based on the faculty member's position description, may be sought at the discretion of the department head/chair or the faculty review committee.

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, who may attach comments, explanations, or rebuttal before signing to indicate that the document is complete.

4. The department head/chair forwards the dossier and any attachments to the dean and schedules a meeting to be attended by the faculty member, the department head/chair, the dean, and other administrators, as appropriate.

5. At the meeting, the performance of the faculty member relative to University and College P&T guidelines (if different from the University) 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.

6. After the meeting, the dean sends written comments to the faculty member on the performance of the individual relative to P&T guidelines. If appropriate, suggestions for performance enhancement will be included. The dean's letter is sent through the department head/chair to the faculty member for signature and response, if desired. The letter is then placed in the individual's personnel file.

7. The department head/chair, in consultation with other supervisors, reviews the results of the mid-term review with the faculty member and discusses issues or concerns raised during the review. A written plan for any needed improvements will be jointly developed by the faculty member, the department head/chair, and any other appropriate supervisors and placed in the individual's personnel file.