**Guidelines for Unit-Level Committees Evaluating Career Faculty**

**Continuous Employment**

Career faculty continuous employment evaluation is a new process that launched in 2022 with the updating of the [Collective Bargaining Agreement](https://hr.uoregon.edu/ua-bargaining-agreement). Roughly analogous to the 6-year post-tenure review process for tenured faculty, and following the review process that is used for career faculty promotions, continuous employment review allows for periodic recognition of meritorious performance for career faculty who are already at their highest promotable rank. It is an elective review, meaning that the faculty member can be reviewed after 6 years of highest-rank service, or can wait longer to be reviewed. The process is briefly outlined in Article 19, Section 32-34 of the CBA, and references the processes established for career instructional faculty and career research faculty continuous employment review in [Article 19](https://hr.uoregon.edu/ua-bargaining-agreement#career-faculty-review-and-promotion).

Following are guidelines for committees evaluating career faculty undergoing continuous employment review.

* The committee should be composed of faculty members who have achieved their full rank as career or tenure track faculty members.
* The unit head will have worked with the faculty member to ensure that the committee has access to the following materials:
	+ Candidate CV, clearly noting which accomplishments occurred during the review period (candidates are encouraged to use highlighting)
	+ Candidate statement
	+ Teaching data, if applicable: Student Experience Surveys and prior student evaluations. At least one recent peer teaching evaluation.
	+ Other materials addressing professional accomplishments relevant to the faculty member’s position description.
	+ Ideally you should have the faculty member’s position description, notice of appointment or conditions of appointment.
	+ Refer to your unit’s policy on career faculty promotion for specific criteria to use when judging performance (this may include service and/or professional development).
* The committee will review the materials and prepare a brief report and recommendation (meets, exceeds, or does not meet overall performance expectations for continuous employment recognition) to the unit head, based on the materials. For each applicable category (e.g. teaching, scholarship/ creative activity, service), report whether performance in that category meets, exceeds, or does not meet expectations.[[1]](#footnote-1) The teaching category (if applicable) should include a description of performance with respect to the [four teaching competencies](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/resources/professional-inclusive-engaged-and-research-informed-teaching-uo). The committee will also note whether the faculty member is engaged in diversity, equity, and inclusion. DEI engagement is assumed to be relevant to one or more of the applicable categories of their employment – teaching, research, and service.
* Each committee member will vote on the overall committee recommendation and the committee will provide the unit head with their vote tally along with their report. The votes need not be identified by the names of the committee members: The list of committee member names can be separate from the numerical vote tally.
* Questions can be directed to your unit head, associate dean, or the vice provost for academic affairs (vpaa@uoregon.edu).
1. Following CBA stipulations: For faculty members undergoing their FIRST CE review, the distinction between meets, exceeds, and does not meet must be made because the resulting pay increase depends on the distinction. For faculty members undergoing their SECOND or later CE review, the distinction need only be “does not meet” or “meet or exceeds” expectations. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)