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ITEM #1
III.B.2.: Secondary and Joint Appointments (p.11) → Joint Appointment Tenure Home
- Clarification of current provision which erroneously states that tenure resides at the unit level; it resides at the University level per Sec. III.I.1.:Faculty: Contract Rules: Contractual Status (p.34).

ITEM #2
Sec. III.D.1.: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (p.12-13) → Probationary Period and Bites of the Apple
- Defines the probationary period (which the existing Manual did not clearly do), cleans up the existing text, and provides for more than one application for tenure should an initial, early, application be unsuccessful.

ITEM #3
Sec. III.D.1.: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (p.13) → Credit for Prior Service Elsewhere
- Retains the possibility of credit for three years of prior service at a comparable institution for recruiting purposes. But an agreement to count that credit does not require the faculty member to actually use it and eliminates the need for the faculty member to officially rescind that credit if s/he decides not to use it.

ITEM #4
Sec. III.D.5.: Emeriti/ae Faculty (p.16) → Emeritus Application Review
- Return to previous practice of emeritus/a applications passing directly from the Dean to the Provost, who makes the decision. Current Retired and Emeritus/a Faculty Policy will be split into two policies and the emeritus/a policy renamed so that emeritus status isn’t tied solely to retirement.

ITEM #5
Sec. III.E.1: Advancement: Applications (p.16) → Early Promotion and/or Tenure Applications AND Time in Rank Clarification
- States, per the Provost’s April 28, 2017, memo, that “Successful applicants for early tenure must demonstrate that they have met the applicable standards—not that they have exceeded them.” This should eliminate alternative interpretations of what it means to apply “early.”
- Clarifies that, with the noted exceptions, the norm is for faculty to complete five years in rank (seven for SOM faculty) prior to applying for promotion and/or tenure. Existing text is ambiguous, raising questions about the timing of applications.
- Proposed text recognizes that the Provost-approved guidelines of some units (i.e., Law) allow for shorter time in rank than the University norm.

Over →
ITEM #6
Sec. III.E.2: Policy on Extension of the Probationary Period That Applies to the Granting of Tenure (p.16)

Full policies are now to be referenced, but not appear, in the Manual. This policy had been the only policy to appear in full in the Manual and is now available on the Provost’s website. It needs major revision, which will be facilitated by the removal of its text from the Manual. The proposed text specifies the most important reasons for extensions as articulated by faculty, but makes clear that they are not necessarily the only reasons; others may be noted in the actual policy. Furthermore, the application process is modified to give both chairs/directors and deans input, with all applications coming to the Provost who is the decider—which lends greater consistency to the process. It also retains current Manual language that policy coverage extends to spouses and the point about tenure expectations.

ITEM #7
Sec. III.F.: General Norms for Appointment and Advancement (p.19-20) → Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor AND Collegiality as a Qualification for Promotion AND Time in Rank Clarification

- Eliminates the quality of “collegiality” as an additional criterion for advancement and/or tenure (as presented at the bottom of p.19 and top of p.20) because it isn’t a best practice. In accordance with the AAUP Statement, On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation (2016), evaluators should instead address the topic in the context of their reviews of an applicant’s contributions to teaching, research, and service. The new sentence that begins “Faculty members are also expected...”, added to Paragraph 3 of Sec. III.F., appears here (it also appears in Sec. III.G.5.: University Citizenship) to reinforce this point.
- Change under “Assistant Professor” gives more prominence to the fact that promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor is possible. Readers tended to overlook the text following the lettered list of qualifications that made clear this promotion in rank is possible.
- The proposed revisions to qualification “a” under both Associate Professor and Professor address the “five year” problem explained under Item #6.
- Proposed text recognizes that the Provost-approved guidelines of some units (i.e., Law) allow for shorter time in rank than the University norm.