

*California University of  
Pennsylvania*

**University-Wide Tenure  
Committee**

**CRITERIA FOR TENURE**

**REVISED  
December 1993**

*California University of Pennsylvania*  
UNIVERSITY-WIDE TENURE COMMITTEE

**The process of Tenure**  
**Guidelines for the UWTC and the Candidate**

**Tenure Packet.** The UWTC has developed a tenure packet to ensure that candidates and all others involved in the tenure process receive the same instructions and information. The defined procedures were established to ensure fair and equitable treatment for all applicants. The packet consists of:

- I. Calendar of Tenure Activities for current year
- II. Guidelines for the Applicants and the UWTC
- III. Format for the dossier of Teaching Faculty  
**Addendum: Teaching Faculty**
- IV. Format for the dossier of Non-Teaching Faculty  
**Addendum: Non-Teaching Faculty**

**I. TENURE PROCESS DUE DATES**

**CONTRACT ACTION**

	<b><u>September</u></b> <b><u>Appointment</u></b>	<b><u>January</u></b> <b><u>Appointment</u></b>
1. President sends letter to applicant, Chairperson and Dean	<b>October 1</b>	<b>February 1</b>
2. Applicant applies to President for tenure	<b>December 31</b>	<b>May 1</b>
3. Department Tenure Committee and Department Chairperson recommends applicant to UWTC	<b>February 15</b>	<b>October 1</b>
4. UWTC recommends applicant to President	<b>April 1</b>	<b>November 1</b>
5. President grants or refuses tenure	<b>May 31</b>	<b>December 31</b>

**NON-CONTRACT ACTION FOR**  
**UWTC TO FACILITATE PROCESS**

	<b><u>September</u></b> <b><u>Appointment</u></b>	<b><u>January</u></b> <b><u>Appointment</u></b>
1. UWTC Chairperson sends letter to applicant (includes enclosure of Tenure Criteria)	<b>November 4</b>	<b>February 11</b>
2. UWTC chairperson sends letter to chairman of applicants department (includes enclosure of Tenure Criteria)	<b>November 4</b>	<b>February 11</b>
3. Applicant delivers Dossier to UWTC	<b>February 15</b>	<b>October 1</b>

## **II. GUIDELINES FOR THE UWTC AND TENURE CANDIDATE**

**A. Procedures followed by the UWTC.** These procedures can be found in the Criteria for Tenure of the UWTC which is prepared at the end of each academic year. These criteria are sent to APSCUF and the university administration for comment.

**B. Tentative Calendar for the UWTC.** At the first meeting of the UWTC, the committee establishes the year's calendar. The calendar is made available to applicants and other concerned individuals

### **C. Dossiers.**

The dossier of the candidate must adhere to the following guidelines:

1. The dossier must be submitted in one or more loose-leaf binders in the other indicated by the appropriate format (binders not in acceptable form will be returned to the candidate, who has one week to resubmit the dossier in correct form).
2. The dossier must follow the format established by the UWTC. The format is explained in **Section III.** (Pp. 7-12) and **Section IV.** (Pp. 16-21) of this document
3. The dossier must include the summary sheets from student evaluations: the student evaluations are to be placed in one or more separate binders.
4. The dossier must be delivered and later retrieved by the candidate within a time frame and at a location announced by the UWTC.

**D. Meeting Minimum Qualifications for Tenure:** Tenure applicants should refer to the **tenure section** of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (**ARTICLE XV**)

**E. Supporting Documents Required:** Tenure applicants should refer to the **performance review and evaluation of faculty** section of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (**ARTICLE XII**)

**F. Tenure Committee Interview:** The interview is an option available to the candidate. However, the UWTC encourages the candidate to take advantage of it. The interview is used to give the committee members an opportunity to meet the candidate and clarify questions the members any have regarding information submitted in the candidate's dossier.

### **G. Procedures.**

1. Applications for December or May tenure must be submitted to the University President by the dates stipulated in the APSCUF Agreement.
2. Applications for tenure should receive consideration first at the department level. The candidate must use the appropriate format when compiling his/her material: **Section III. Teaching** (pp. 7-12) or **Section IV. – Non-Teaching** (pp.16-21).  
(**Note: Those with a mixed workload will use both teaching & non-teaching formats**)
3. The complete dossiers are to be delivered by the candidates and later retrieved by the candidates within a tie frame and at a location announced by the UWTC.

4. The candidate's dossier is reviewed individually by the committee members before a vote is taken.
5. The UWTC uses the appropriate Addendum in their perusal of the Dossier. Copies of the forms can be found in **ADDENDUM TO SECTION III.** (Pp. 13-15) and **ADDENDUM TO SECTION IV.** (pp.22-24) of this document. The "point system" is used by the individual reviewer as a tool to review the total person. There are no "minimum points for tenure." This guide is a method to keep a single issue from looming too large in the evaluation.
6. Each candidate is voted on individually. The results of the voting are recorded by the Secretary of the UWTC in the minutes of the meeting.
7. The majority of Yes/No votes determine whether the candidate is recommended for tenure.
8. In the case of a candidate not being recommended by the UWTC, the Chairperson asks for comments from committee members on where the candidate's dossier or credentials were inadequate. Those comments are passed on to the candidate and the university president in her/his letter.
9. The UWTC chairperson sends reports to the University President and the candidate.
10. All dossiers, either approved or denied, will be submitted to the University President.

**H. Polices:** Anyone approaching committee members regarding the application of a candidate will be directed to the University President regarding that issue.

### **III. SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF TEACHING FACULTY**

#### **COMMENT TO CANDIDATE:**

The University Wide Tenure Committee will be using these guidelines when evaluating your dossier. Presumably, your departmental committee will do the same.

**You should follow these guidelines and use them as a Table of Contents for your Dossier.**

#### **Enclose at the beginning of the First Binder of your Dossier**

1. **Copy of letter to University President requesting tenure. Letter should include statements of reasons the faculty member believes he/she should be granted tenure.**
2. **Latest vita**
3. **Letters of Recommendation from Departmental Tenure Committee and Department Chairperson**
4. **Letter of Appointment**
5. **A complete, formal job description detailing the faculty members present duties and responsibilities.**

## **PART I: EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND FULFILLMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

1. **Student evaluations:** (0) negative (1-2) see the candidate as average (3-4) see the candidate as above average (5-6) see the candidate as outstanding

[**Reminder:** Candidates should provide the student evaluations from all semesters taught. They may also include student evaluations of their own, provided they were conducted by a third party in such a way as to protect the anonymity of the student evaluators and to maintain the integrity of the evaluation sample. Candidates should not solicit letters of recommendation from students. No letters from students, regardless of any claims by the candidate that they were unsolicited, will be read by the campus-wide tenure committee.]

2. **Quality of course syllabi prepared by candidate:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) three or four examples of mixed quality (3) three or four impressive examples

3. **Reports of classroom visitations and peer evaluations:**

(0) negative (1-2) indicate satisfactory performance, perhaps with some criticism (3-4) brief and positive, indicating good performance (5-6) detailed and enthusiastically positive

[**REMINDER:** The term peer evaluation here does not pertain to the work of the departmental tenure committee; rather it refers to the five-years of departmental evaluation reports. Note also that evaluation is not the same as observation. Evaluation should be understood to refer to the final report or conclusion of the departmental evaluation committee. Candidates may include, under peer evaluations, letters from colleagues and supervisors familiar with their work, but not from students or from people the candidates supervise.]

4. **Quality of course examinations:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) three or four examples of mixed quality (3) three or four impressive examples

5. **Preparation and meeting of classes:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area

6. **Academic advisement of students:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area

(**Note:** to be used if applicable. If student advisement falls within the area of the candidate's responsibilities, the candidate must provide written documentation via supervisor's report and peer evaluations).

7. **Holding of office hours at least five (5) hours per week on no fewer than three (3) different day of the week:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area

8. **Evaluation of students fairly and reporting promptly on student achievement:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) fulfills minimum responsibilities in this area (2) goes beyond the minimum- as supported by documentation (3) goes beyond minimum-as supported by a great deal of documentation

(**Reminder: It is requested that summary data of the candidates grade Distribution Sheets accompany the documentation**)

9. **Participation in-group deliberations, which contribute to the growth and development of the students and the university:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area
10. **Acceptance of those reasonable duties assigned within the fields of competence:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area
11. **Efforts to preserve and defend the goals of the university, including the advocacy of change:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area

## **PART II: CONTINUING SCHOLARLY GROWTH**

1. **Graduate work beyond credentials at time of hiring and related to the discipline:** (0) none (1) 2-9 credits (2) more than 9 credits (3) course work completed for another degree
2. **Attendance at workshops, institutes, or short courses related to the discipline and professionally recognized:** (0) none (1) meets this requirement
3. **Participation in or planning/organization of workshops, institutes, or short courses related to the discipline and professionally recognized:** (0) none (1) a small number of impressive examples (2) many impressive examples
4. **Publications- number and quality as measured by reviews, citations, adoptions, outside referee's evaluation and stature of publisher:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples.

[**Reminder:** a book length publication might count the same as “many example” of published articles. Also, to account for certain fine arts which this university accepts as part of its academic curriculum, artistic works that have been “accepted” or “produced” or acclaimed may be considered equivalent and analogous to publications, even if the final version takes a non-print form. For example, plays which have been performed, or films which have been shown, or paintings which have been accepted for display in are shows would apply here.]

5. **Papers delivered- quantity and quality as measured by reviews, citations, adoptions, outside, referee's evaluation and stature of publisher:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples
6. **Testimony of experts in the discipline or related discipline(s):** (0) none (1) statements by department members indicating competence (2) enthusiastic statements by on-campus colleagues indicating excellent mastery of subject matter (3) enthusiastic statements as in the two-point ranking, but also statements from off-campus experts

[**Reminder:** The letters form experts must include at least at least one from outside the department in order for the candidate to be eligible for the maximum number of points in that category.]

7. **Consultant ships- number and professional importance:** (0) none (1) unimpressive example (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples
8. **The terminal degree in the discipline (submit all transcripts):** (0) no (3) yes

**9. Participation in professional organizations through membership, office holding, subscriptions to journals, and editorships:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples

**10. Development of new, scholarly, or practical insights as a result of systematic investigation:** (0) no (1) yes, but the evaluator must stretch his imagination to accept the course matches that description (2) yes, but the contribution seems small (yes, an impressive contribution to the discipline.

**11. Development of a course based upon original concepts that demonstrate new possibilities of the discipline:** (0) no (1) yes, but the evaluator must stretch his imagination to accept that this course matches that description (2) yes, but the contribution seems small (3) yes, an impressive contribution to discipline

### **PART III: CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY AND/ OR COMMUNITY**

**1. Significant contribution to university committees and self-governance:** (0) none (1) presence (2) Participation (3) Significant contributions & Leadership.

(Note: The UWTC requests a letter from the committee stating the candidate's level involvement).

**2. Special individual assignments:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples

[Note: Special individual assignments may be off-campus work done on behalf of the University or at the request of the President (such as membership on an accreditation team), or they may be on-campus work, including assignments which have become a portion of the candidate's paid work load such as administering a tutoring center, writing a catalog, or directing a testing program. Candidates should mention any assignment which might qualify, leaving it up to the evaluators to decide what deserves credit under this consideration. Candidates should also identify any assignments for which released time is received]

**3. Significant contribution to departmental committees:** (0) none (1) minimum committee work for the department (2) some impressive examples, including special assignments and/or chairpersonships (3) many impressive examples of committee membership and special assignments and/or chairpersonships

**4. Significant contribution to student organizations or activities:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples

**5. Development of proposals which benefit the university:** (0) none (1) one proposal of small benefit (2) one proposal of some consequence or several small contributions (3) several proposals of importance

**6. Participation in community work in a professional capacity that brings recognition to the university:** (0) none (1) some professional work which brings good will towards the university (2) lots of professional work which brings good will to the university (3) professional work which brings fame and glamour to the university or which directly contributes to increased student enrollment or directly results in donations to the university



**ADDENDUM TO SECTION III**  
**California University of Pa**  
**UNIVERSITY-WIDE TENURE COMMITTEE**  
**TEACHING FACULTY**

NAME OF APPLICANT \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**PART I:**

**Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities**

1.	Student evaluations	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
		(4)	(5)	(6)	
2.	Quality of course syllabi prepared by candidate	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
3.	Reports of classroom visitations and peer evaluations	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
		(4)	(5)	(6)	
4.	Quality of course examinations	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
5.	Preparation and meeting of classes	(0)	(1)		
6.	Academic advisement of students (if applicable)	(0)	(1)		
7.	Holding of office hours at least (5) hours per week on no fewer than three (3) different days of the week	(0)	(1)		
8.	Evaluates students fairly and reports promptly on student achievement	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
9.	Participation in group deliberations which contribute to the growth and development of the students and the university	(0)	(1)		
10.	Acceptance of those reasonable duties assigned within the fields of competence	(0)	(1)		
11.	Efforts to preserve and defend the goals of the university, including the advocacy of change	(0)	(1)		

**TOTAL OF PART I** \_\_\_\_\_

**PART II: Continuing Scholarly Growth**

1.	Graduate work beyond credentials at time of	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
2.	Attendance at workshops, institutes, or short courses related to the discipline and professionally recognized	(0)	(1)		
3.	Participation in or planning/organization of workshops, institutes, or short courses related to the discipline and professionally recognized	(0)	(1)	(2)	
4.	Publications – number and quality as measured by review, citations adoptions, outside referee’s evaluation and stature of publisher	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
5.	Papers delivered – quantity and quality as measured by reviews, citations, adoptions, outside referee’s evaluation and stature of publisher	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
6.	Testimony of experts in the discipline or related discipline(s)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)

7.	consultantships – number and professional importance	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
8.	The terminal degree in the discipline (submit all transcripts)	(0)	(3)		
9.	Participation in professional organizations through membership, office holding, subscriptions to journals, and editorships	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
10.	Development of new, scholarly, or practical insights as a result of systematic investigation	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
11.	Development of a course based upon original concepts that demonstrate new possibilities of the discipline	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)

**TOTAL OF PART II** \_\_\_\_\_

**PART III:**

**Contributions to the University and/or Community**

1.	Significant contribution to university committees and self governance	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
2.	Special individual assignments	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
3.	Significant contribution to departmental committees	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
4.	Significant contribution to student organizations or activities	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
5.	Development of proposals which benefit the university	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
6.	Participation in community work in a professional capacity that brings recognition to the university	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)

**TOTAL OF PART III** \_\_\_\_\_

**GRAND TOTAL** \_\_\_\_\_

**There are no “minimum points for tenure.”**

**The point- system is used by the individual reviewer as a tool to review the total person.**

**This guide is a method to keep a single issue from looming too large in the evaluation.**

**Comments:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## **IV. SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF NON-TEACHING FACULTY**

### **COMMENT TO CANDIDATE:**

The University Wide Tenure Committee will be using these guidelines when evaluating your dossier. Presumably, your departmental committee will do the same. You should follow these guidelines and use them as a Table of Contents for your Dossier

### **Enclose at the beginning of the First Binder of your Dossier**

- 1. Copy of letter to president requesting tenure. Letter should include statements of reasons the candidate believes he/she should be granted tenure.**
- 2. Latest Vita**
- 3. A complete, formal job description detailing the faculty members present duties and responsibilities.**
- 4. Letter of Appointment**

### **PART I: DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POSITION**

(Note: the categories in Part I are intended as guidelines and may vary with the individual's job description)

- 1. Supervisor's evaluation:** (0) negative (1) indicates satisfactory performance, with perhaps some criticism (2) brief and positive, indicating good performance (3) detailed and enthusiastically positive
- 2. Peer evaluation:** (0) negative (1) indicates satisfactory performance, with some criticism (2) brief and positive, indicating good performance (3) detailed and enthusiastically positive
- 3. Performs assigned duties promptly and efficiently:** (0) little evidence that he/she does this to a satisfactory degree (1) evidence suggests that he/she does the minimum (2) he/she does a better than average job (3) he/she outdoes most of his/her colleagues.

(Note: The UWTC requests the **periodic supervisor's evaluations**. These documents will become part of the dossier)

[**Reminder:** Candidates would be wise to obtain from supervisors and colleagues letters of recommendation which speak specifically to considerations 3-8 in this section. Those letters should tell the evaluators, for example, how well the candidate performs assigned duties. Detail and concrete examples are always impressive; vague generalizations generally are not.]

- 4. Communicates ideas and recommendations effectively:** (0) no evidence that he/she makes successful efforts to communicate (1) has ideas and recommendations which he/she tries to communicate (2) skillful communicator of ideas and recommendations (3) an outstanding communicator of ideas and recommendations (3) and outstanding communicator, as acknowledged by her/his colleagues and as evidenced by special assignments

- 5. Analyzes and revises programs to meet changing university goals:** (0) little evidence of performance in this area (1) some notable participation in such processes (2) regular participation leading to valuable experience and skill in carrying out such processes (3) a leader and innovator in the continuing process of program analysis and revision
- 6. Makes decisions rationally, fairly, and promptly:** (0) evidence does not clearly establish consistent fairness and rationality (1) is consistently fair and rational and for the most part does the “work” of decision making on time (2) can be depended upon for a useful opinion; never any question of fairness or rationality in regard to decisions about students or colleagues (3) considered to be exceptionally clear thinking and level headed, a person often consulted
- 7. Accepts responsibility and is helpful and cooperative with staff:** (0) little evidence of satisfactory performance in this regard (1) performs assigned duties and gets along with others (2) accepts additional responsibilities and gets along well with colleagues (3) a leader who seeks additional responsibility, while maintaining admirable interpersonal relationships with co-workers
- 8. Manages personnel and assets efficiently:** (0) little evidence of performance in this area (1) has small responsibilities along these lines which he/she carries out satisfactorily (2) a good manager of people and assets; has important responsibilities in this area which he/she carried out well (3) an outstanding manager of her/his people and how best to assign or use those who work for her/him; also an excellent manager of all kinds of resources, especially monetary, as evidenced by formal budgets included in the dossier

## **PART II**

### **A. Mastery of the Subject Matter**

- 1. Publications- number and quality as a measured by reviews, citations, adoptions, outside referee's evaluation and stature of publisher:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples

[**Reminder:** a book length publication might count the same as “many example” of published articles. Also, to account for certain fine arts which this university accepts as part of its academic curriculum, artistic works that have been “accepted” or “produced” or acclaimed may be considered equivalent and analogous to publications, even if the final version takes a non-print form. For example, plays which have been performed, or films which have been shown, or paintings which have been accepted for display in art shows would apply here.]

- 2. Papers delivered- quantity and quality as measured by reviews, citations, adoptions, outside referee's evaluation and stature of publisher:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples
- 3. Testimony of experts in the discipline or related discipline(s):** (0) none (1) statements by department members indicating competence (2) enthusiastic statements by on-campus colleagues indicating excellent mastery of subject matter (3) enthusiastic statements as in the two-point ranking, but also statements from off-campus experts

[**Reminder:** The letters from experts must include at least one from outside the department in order for the candidate to be eligible for the maximum number of points in that category.]

4. **Consultantships- number and professional importance:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples
5. **The terminal degree in the discipline (submit all transcripts):** (0) no (1) yes

## **B. Continuing Scholarly Growth**

1. **Graduate work beyond credentials at time of hiring related to the discipline:** (0) none (1) 2-9 credits (2) more than 9 credits (3) course work completed for another degree
2. **Attendance at workshops, institutes, or short courses related to the discipline and professionally recognized:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples
3. **Participation in or planning / organization of workshops, institutes or short courses related to the discipline and professionally recognized:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples
4. **Participation in organizations advancing a professional field or discipline:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive (3) many impressive examples
5. **Development of new, scholarly, or practical insights as a result of systematic investigation:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples

## **C. Contributions to the University**

1. **Significant contribution to university committees and self-governance:** (0) none (1) presence (2) Participation (3) Significant contributions & Leadership.

(Note: The UWTC requests a letter from the committee stating the candidate's level of involvement).

2. **Special individual assignments:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples

[Reminder: Special individual assignments may be off-campus work done on behalf of the University or at the request of the President (such as membership on an accreditation team), or they may be on-campus work, including assignments which have become a portion of the candidate's normal paid work load, such as administering a tutoring center, writing a catalog, or directing a testing program. Candidates should mention any assignment which might qualify, leaving it up to the evaluators to decide what deserves credit under this consideration.]

3. **Significant contribution to departmental committees:** (0) none (1) minimum committee work for the department (2) some impressive examples, including special assignments and/or chairpersonships (3) many impressive examples of committee membership and special assignments and/or chairpersonships
4. **Significant contribution to student organizations or activities:** (0) none (1) unimpressive examples (2) a small number of impressive examples (3) many impressive examples

**5. Development of proposals which benefit the university:** (0) none (1) one proposal of small benefit (2) one proposal of some consequence or several representing small contributions (3) several proposals of importance

**6. Participation in community work in a professional capacity that brings recognition to the university:** (0) none (1) some professional work which brings good will towards the university (2) lots of professional work which brings good will to the university (3) professional work which brings fame and glamour to the university or which directly contributes to increased student enrollment or directly results in donations to the university

#### **D. Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities**

**1. Confer with and advise students:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area.

(Note: to be used only if applicable. If student advisement falls within the area of the candidate's responsibilities, the candidate must provide written documentation via supervisor's report and peer evaluations).

**2. Prompt and dependable in use of scheduled work hours:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area.

**3. Participation in group deliberations which contribute to the growth and development of the students and the university:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area

**4. Attempt honestly in good conscience to preserve and defend the goals of the university, without being restricted in the right to advocate change:** (0) does not fulfill responsibilities in this area (1) does fulfill responsibilities in this area.

**ADDENDUM TO SECTION III  
California University of Pa  
UNIVERSITY-WIDE TENURE COMMITTEE**

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND NON-TEACHING FACULTY**

NAME OF APPLICANT \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**PART I: Duties and Responsibilities of the Position** (NOTE: The categories in Part I are intended as guidelines and may vary with the individual's job description)

- |   |     |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Supervisor's evaluation  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 2. Peer evaluation  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 3. Performs assigned duties promptly and effectively                | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 4. Communicates ideas and recommendations effectively               | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 5. Analyzes and revises programs to meet changing university goals  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 6. Makes decisions rationally, fairly, and promptly                 | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 7. Accepts responsibility and is helpful and cooperative with staff | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 8. Manages personnel and assets efficiently                         | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

**TOTAL OF PART I** \_\_\_\_\_

**PART II: Professional Requirements**

**A. Mastery of the Subject Matter**

- |  |     |     |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Publications-number and quality as measured by reviews, citations, adoptions, outside referee's evaluation and stature of publisher         | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 2. Papers delivered – quantity and quality as measured by reviews, citations, adoptions, outside referee's evaluation and stature of publisher | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 3. Testimony of experts in the discipline or related discipline(s)   | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 4. Consultantships – number and professional importance  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 5. The terminal degree in the discipline (submit all transcripts)  | (0) | (3) |     |     |

**TOTAL OF A** \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Continuing Scholarly Growth**

- |   |     |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Graduate work beyond the terminal degree related to the discipline   | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 2. Attendance at workshops, institutes, or short courses related to the discipline and professionally recognized                                | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 3. Participation in or planning/organization of workshops, institutes, or short courses related to the discipline and professionally recognized | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

- |  |     |     |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 4. Participation in organizations advancing a professional field or discipline, where opportunities for such participation exist | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 5. Development of new, scholarly, or practical insights as a result of systematic investigation                                  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

**TOTAL OF B** \_\_\_\_\_

**C. Contributions to the University**

- |   |     |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Significant contribution to university committees and self-governance                                | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 2. Special individual assignments   | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 3. Significant contribution to departmental committees  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 4. Significant contribution to student organizations or activities                                      | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 5. Development of proposals which benefit the university  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 6. Participation in community work in a professional capacity that brings recognition to the university | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

**TOTAL OF C** \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities**

- |   |     |     |  |  |
|---|-----|-----|--|--|
| 1. Confer with and advise students (if applicable)  | (0) | (1) |  |  |
| 2. Prompt and defensible in use of scheduled work hours   | (0) | (1) |  |  |
| 3. Participate in group deliberations which contribute to the growth and development of the students and the university                             | (0) | (1) |  |  |
| 4. Attempt honestly in good conscience to preserve and defend the goals of the university, without being restricted in the right to advocate change | (0) | (1) |  |  |

**TOTAL OF D** \_\_\_\_\_

**GRAND TOTAL (Parts I & II)** \_\_\_\_\_

**There are no “minimum points for tenure.”**

**The point -system is used by the individual reviewer as a tool to review the total person.**

**This guide is a method to keep a single issue from looming too large in the evaluation.**

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_



## **ADDENDUM - UWTC PROCESS**

### **UWTC Internal Process of Review and Voting**

#### **I. PROCEDURE (for Individual committee members and the committee as a whole)**

- A.** Obtain Tabulation Sheet
- B.** Individual committee member reviews dossier before meeting
  - 1. THE DOSSIER IS NOT REMOVED FROM THE LIBRARY.
  - 2. NO MATERIAL CAN BE ADDED OR DELETED FROM THE DOSSIER.
    - a). Any material that arrives after the CBA “turn in” date will be added by the Chair of the UWTC with copies going to the candidate
  - 3. THE DOSSIER IS NOT TO BE ALTERED IN ANY WAY.
- C.** Sign Log Sheet attesting that the committee member reviewed the dossier
- D.** Attend Meeting
  - 1. Interview Candidate (if candidate chooses to exercise his right under the CBA)
  - 2. Motion to Recommend Tenure
  - 3. Second to Motion
  - 4. Discussion of Motion
  - 5. Vote by Secret Ballot
- E.** Results recorded by Sect. and included in Minutes
  - 1. Recommendation (+ or -) is determined by majority of votes cast by those eligible to vote
    - a). There are no “minimum points for tenure.” The point- system is used by the individual reviewer as a tool to review the total person.
  - 2. UWTC Chair will not vote unless to either break a tie or create a quorum (1 more than half of UWTC)
- F.** Chair sends Recommendation Letter to University President along with all materials upon which it was based. The recommendation letter will also contain the breakdown of votes.
- G.** VOTING IN ABSTENTIA
  - 1. UWTC may vote in absentia
  - 2. Voting in absentia - procedure
    - a. The member must have the following documents in the hands of the UWTC Chairperson prior to the meeting in which the candidate in question will be considered for Tenure
      - 1). Dossier - reviewed
      - 2). Dossier Log Sheet - filled out w / signature-date-time
      - 3). Ballot obtained from UWTC Sect.
        - 4). Ballot – signed, sealed & delivered to UWTC Chairman or Sect.
  - 3. In case there is an emergency – the UWTC will accept an email from a UWTC member as a stop-gap method for voting.
    - a. The Dossier Log Sheet must be signed for the email to be considered in the vote.
    - b. The UWTC member must verify the email before the UWTC Recommendation regarding the candidate is sent to the President.