

**From:** [Robert Page](#)  
**To:** [Helene Ossipov](#)  
**Cc:** [Barry Ritchie](#); [Cynthia Jewett](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Senate Transmittal-Approved Motion 2015-53  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2015 11:34:57 AM

---

To: Helene Ossipov  
President, University Senate &  
Chair, University Academic Council

From: Robert E. Page, Jr.  
University Provost

Date: February 23, 2015

Re: Senate Motions 2015-53, " Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty Promotions"

I have reviewed Senate Motion 2015-53, " Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty Promotions", following review by the Office of the General Counsel.

Three requests were presented in that motion, which was adopted by the Academic Senate on February 23, 2015 and transmitted to me on February 25, 2015. As you know, on February 23, I notified Academic Senate leadership that I had issued new guidance on hiring and advancing instructional faculty members. That new guidance (a copy of which is attached at the bottom of the thread) directly addresses two of the three requests made in the motion:

1. With respect to promotion eligibility for non-tenure eligible faculty members, the new guidance addresses this topic in section 4. Promotion eligibility is not tied to contract type in this new guidance, consistent with both ACD and ABOR policy. Thus, request 1 in the motion is approved.
2. With respect to eligibility for a multi-year contract to an existing employee, the new guidance addresses this topic in section 2. The offer of a multi-year contract to an existing employee will be at the discretion of the dean with approval by the Provost. The dean of a college, based on an analysis of availability of funds and needs of the college, may elect to offer a multi-year contract. If the dean recommends conversion to a multi-year contract, then, upon approval by the Provost, a multi-year contract may be offered. Eligibility for a multi-year contract is not tied to a search process for an existing employee. With the understanding that the dean's discretion and Provost's approval are required in any case as noted in the new guidance, request 2 in the motion is approved.

With respect to the third request in the motion, I want to underscore that increasing the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty members is extremely desirable (if not absolutely essential) in and of itself, independent of any other ancillary metric tied by policy or

circumstance to that number. There is indeed an ABOR-mandated cap on the fraction of non-tenure-eligible faculty members tied to the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty members, but please understand that there otherwise is no fixed or planned correspondence between the number of non-tenure-eligible faculty members and the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty members. Those two numbers will continue to change independently based on the needs of the institution. I thus agree with – and am implementing – the third request presented in the motion, but solely because increasing the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty members is extremely desirable (if not absolutely essential), in and of itself.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Page, Jr.  
University Provost