

American University of Beirut

# Report of the Second Task Force on Tenure

November 2014

## **Members:**

Nadia El-Cheikh, Professor, Department of History and Archaeology, FAS;  
Provost Ahmad Dallal (chair), Professor, Department of History and Archaeology, FAS;  
Zaher Dawy, Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, FEA  
Arne Dietrich, Professor, Department of Psychology, FAS  
Mutasem El-Fadel, Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, FEA  
Samia Khoury, Professor, Director of Multiple Sclerosis Center, Director of Abu-Haidar  
Neuroscience Institute, FM  
Ammar Olabi, Associate Professor, Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences, FAFS  
Assem Safieddine, Professor, Finance, Accounting, and Managerial Economics Track, OSB  
Abla Sibai, Professor, Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, FHS  
Debra Callaghan, Assistant to the Provost

## **Contents**

### **Executive Summary**

#### **I. Prologue**

#### **II. Why Tenure at AUB, and Why Now?**

#### **III. A Contemporary System of Tenure for AUB**

- i. Summary of 2011 Faculty Survey Findings
- ii. Proposed Tenure System

#### **IV. Transition to Tenure**

- i. Assistant Professors
- ii. Associate Professors
- iii. Full Professors
- iv. Incoming Faculty
- v. Mechanism to Grant Tenure to Professorial Faculty in Post
- vi. Duration of Transitional Period

#### **V. Retirement and Post-Retirement**

- i. Proposed Retirement Incentive Program
- ii. Proposed Post-Retirement Program

### **Appendices**

Appendix A: Charge of the President to the Second Task Force on Tenure

Appendix B: Tenure at Local and Regional Peer Institutions

Appendix C: Retention of Full Professors across Faculties

Appendix D: Summary of Second Tenure Task Force Questionnaire Results  
(December 2011)

Appendix E: Proposed Phased Retirement Plan for AUB Faculty

## Report of the Second Task Force on Tenure

### Executive Summary

The Second Task Force on Tenure recommends that the University work toward the establishment of a tenure system. There is no world-class university that does not offer tenure, and AUB is now strongly positioned to take this definitive step forward. AUB's faculty represent its intellectual capital and primary resource, and advancing the professional environment for teaching, scholarship, and service, will further the learning conditions for our students.

AUB has created a dynamic institutional framework to facilitate the interdisciplinary research and education that is critical to addressing complex issues of regional and international urgency, and leads the Arab world in higher education, faculty productivity, and research quality when benchmarked with peer institutions. A tenure system will position AUB to attract and retain the top faculty essential to offering high-quality and high-impact research and graduate programs, key components of the University's strategic objectives. Tenure also gives faculty members the academic freedom that they need to explore new areas of inquiry, focus on innovative scholarship, and set long-term research agendas, all features that are vital for AUB's position as the premier liberal arts institution in the Middle East. Over the last decade, AUB has devoted considerable resources to reasserting its leadership role in the region. Tenure is now needed to make the University grow stronger still and fulfill its mission in a highly competitive global environment.

The proposed system, which is described in detail below, draws on the results of the Faculty Survey<sup>1</sup> conducted by the Task Force in December 2011, which demonstrated significant support for the restoration of tenure and its conferral upon promotion to the rank of associate professor. Other considerations included the Task Force's starting point, namely, the rationale for tenure's restoration at AUB at this time; tenure practices at selected institutions in the US and the region; and current University policies and procedures on the appointment, promotion, and reappointment of faculty members. This report was also modified in light of input from the Board of Deans and from initial discussions with the faculty.

### Recommendations of the Second Task Force on Tenure:

1. That AUB work toward the establishment of a contemporary tenure system in which tenure is normally conferred upon promotion to the rank of associate professor.
2. That the transition to tenure be implemented so that:
  - a) The conferral of tenure to in-post faculty is contingent upon formal review irrespective of rank;
  - b) An appropriate process is established for the granting of tenure to in-post faculty;
  - c) The existing non-tenure system remains in place alongside the proposed tenure system, for in-post full professors.
3. That AUB establish a formal and coherent retirement incentive program that includes options for phased retirement.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix D for the results. The response rate was 56.9%, with submissions from 311 of 546 eligible faculty.

4. That AUB establish a post-retirement program that builds upon existing features to encourage and strengthen the continued involvement of retired faculty in the AUB community.
5. That the Administration take immediate action to implement retirement and post-retirement programs based on the provisions described in this report regardless of whether or not the proposed tenure system materializes.

## Report of the Second Task Force on Tenure

### I. Prologue

The American University of Beirut adheres to the American philosophy and system of education, including many of the traditions and policies found at comparable institutions in the US. One exception is the system of academic tenure, which was first introduced at AUB in the 1930s and later suspended during the Lebanese civil war.

In Spring 2006, the Academic Affairs Committee of AUB's Board of Trustees commissioned Dr. Charles M. Vest, president emeritus of MIT, to study and report<sup>2</sup> on restoring tenure at the University. Dr. Vest endorsed the move and proposed two possible systems, classic tenure, which he favored for AUB, and rolling tenure.<sup>3</sup> Later that year, President John Waterbury appointed a faculty Task Force to consider the same question, and to propose guidelines for implementation, including the transition of in-post faculty to the new system.<sup>4</sup> The Task Force's recommendations were presented to the Senate for discussion in 2008 and subsequently set aside when it became clear that a consensus on the issues, particularly the process and criteria for granting tenure to full professors, was not possible at that time.<sup>5</sup>

In Spring 2011, President Peter Dorman appointed a Second Tenure Task Force and charged it with answering three questions:

- What is the rationale for reinstating tenure at AUB?
- What are the financial implications of tenure reinstatement?
- Assuming the argument for tenure is persuasive and the grounds compelling, how would a contemporary system of tenure be constructed at AUB?
- How should such a system of tenure be implemented?<sup>6</sup>

The first of these questions points to an important omission in the earlier reports: a logical and convincing argument for the restoration of tenure at AUB. The Vest Report describes the advantages and disadvantages of tenure as practiced in the US, as well as shortcomings in AUB's faculty appointment policies at the time of writing, but does not connect these issues in an explicit way. The report of the First Task Force on Tenure contains two sentences on the rationale for tenure: one briefly lists some of its generic benefits; and the other mentions AUB's goal of becoming a doctoral/research university without further discussion. Hence, an argument for tenure at this particular university and at this point in time appears in the next section of this document.

The second question recognizes that the percentage of tenured faculty at US universities has been declining in recent years. As Dr. Vest noted in his report, the tenure system has long had

---

<sup>2</sup> Charles M. Vest, "Considerations of Tenure and Long-Term Employment Contracts at the American University of Beirut: A Report to the President and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees," 11 June 2006.

<sup>3</sup> In a classic tenure system, the tenured faculty member's appointment is open-ended, with no reappointment process, and it concludes only with the faculty member's retirement, resignation (e.g., to take a position at another institution), or termination (rarely and in exceptional circumstances). All faculty undergo annual reviews for merit increases. Many universities also conduct regular post-tenure reviews for formative purposes and/or 'triggered' post-tenure reviews prompted by a series of lackluster annual reviews. The rolling tenure system described by Dr. Vest requires tenured faculty members to undergo rigorous review every six years followed by reappointment for six additional years or one terminal year.

<sup>4</sup> "Report of the President's Taskforce on Tenure," December 2007.

<sup>5</sup> An ad hoc Senate committee presented its own recommendations to the Senate; however, the recommendations and subsequent amendments were not voted on by senators due to a loss of quorum.

<sup>6</sup> The president's charge to the Second Tenure Task Force appears in Appendix A.

its detractors, including faculty and administrators who have raised concerns about the research productivity of tenured faculty. Tenure also entails a long-term financial commitment on the part of the University, and economic crises, such as the stock market crash of 2008, can affect endowment value and income, giving universities with large numbers of tenured faculty less flexibility to respond. These issues, and others, are addressed by the ‘contemporary’ system of tenure outlined in this report.

Implementation was a contentious issue in 2008 and the same may still be true today. The challenge is to devise a simple, gradual, and realistic process that addresses the main concerns of the majority of stakeholders. Restoring tenure means affirming that it is a positive – even necessary – step to strengthen the University; that it will include reasonable safeguards to protect departments and faculties; and that it will be implemented impartially and with a view to obtaining the best possible outcome for individual faculty members and for the University as a whole.

## **II. Why Tenure at AUB, and Why Now?**

Benchmarking demonstrates that AUB leads the Arab world in higher education, faculty productivity, and research quality. It clarifies that the University’s real competitors are global, and that its aspirations must encompass the global as well as the regional. To compete at this advanced level, the restoration of tenure at AUB has become critical. Without tenure, AUB is at a considerable disadvantage in attracting and retaining the best academics, given that a tenure system is a feature at nearly all of AUB’s peer institutions. Attracting top faculty is indispensable to realizing AUB’s aspirations to offer high-quality, high-impact research and graduate programs.

The presence of tenure and the rigorous review process that it entails will reinforce AUB’s reputation as the Arab world’s premier research university for decades to come. Tenure will allow for more aggressive recruitment strategies by permitting the University to match – and sometimes exceed – the terms of employment at peer institutions in Lebanon, the region<sup>7</sup> and the US. It will also support greater selectivity in recruitment as AUB departments attract more entry-level faculty with experience in new fields of scholarship, and highly credentialed faculty with established reputations. There is also an opportunity cost in the absence of tenure with pools of excellent applicants who do not even consider non-tenure positions. With tenure, scholars are more likely to remain at AUB over the long term, invigorating the University’s research environment. As Dr. Vest notes in his report, advances in faculty excellence strengthen a university’s ability to attract critical resources – resources that will assist AUB in meeting its goals.

AUB reintroduced the PhD with the stated goal of positioning itself as “an acknowledged leader in graduate education and a respected member of the global network of research institutions.”<sup>8</sup> Faculty, senior administrators, and the Board of Trustees endorsed the University’s reorientation in the direction of research, and extensive subsequent planning was undertaken with this goal in mind. A key component of AUB’s newly developed academic strategic plan is research and graduate studies in fields relevant to the region. The restoration

---

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix B for more on tenure at local and regional universities.

<sup>8</sup> See Goal Four of the Strategic Plan Overview 2009

([http://www.aub.edu.lb/osm/planning/Documents/StratPlan\\_OVERVIEW\\_Draft\\_Ver\\_3.45%20-%202020Oc09.pdf](http://www.aub.edu.lb/osm/planning/Documents/StratPlan_OVERVIEW_Draft_Ver_3.45%20-%202020Oc09.pdf)).

of tenure, a mainstay of all doctoral and research universities in the US, will further support this goal.

The current emphasis on research supports AUB's liberal arts mission, which is one of AUB's strengths and an important differentiator in its Middle Eastern environment, where universities, and even branch campuses, tend to concentrate on professional training in science, engineering, technology, medicine, and business. The reestablishment of tenure will also play a critical role in liberal arts education. It gives faculty members the academic freedom to explore new areas of inquiry, focus on innovative scholarship, and set long-term research agendas, especially in the humanities and social sciences. This protection is especially valuable in AUB's regional context, where freedom of expression is more honored in the breach than the observance.

In addition to recruitment, retention and academic freedom, a tenure system will enhance AUB's competitiveness in several other ways. Tenure builds long-term institutional loyalty, enhances effective faculty governance, supports professional integrity, and provides career recognition.

Two objections commonly raised against tenure do not seem to hold in the case of AUB.

First is the view that tenure is an expensive system. Appendix C shows that, despite the suspension of tenure several decades ago, the University's senior faculty has largely remained in post. Between AY 2005-06 and 2010-11, only seven full professors retired, all of them academic appointments in the Faculty of Medicine. An additional ten full professors resigned during the same period: seven of them left in 2006-07 and 2008-09, years notable for military and political conflict in Lebanon. These low figures indicate that AUB currently provides faculty with what might be termed 'non-intended' tenure – more or less permanent employment, with the financial commitment that this entails, while reaping none of the benefits that a purposeful tenure system will bring, such as enhanced recruitment or academic freedom. Therefore, the restoration of tenure is unlikely to place an additional financial burden on the University.

Second, tenure is often said to guarantee permanent employment regardless of performance. However, studies show that faculty productivity often increases after the granting of tenure, primarily because of factors such as institutional loyalty, academic freedom, and career satisfaction. Moreover, the minimal risk of diminished productivity upon tenure is reduced further by building appropriate safeguards into AUB's tenure system as addressed by AUB's Second Task Force on Tenure. Tenure demands rigorous review for excellence and potential, and sets explicitly higher bars, a process for which the new long-term contract system is good preparation.

Several years ago, Charles Vest observed that AUB was on the threshold of a renaissance. Poised to reinstate the PhD, the University had invested considerable resources into reasserting its leadership role in the region. It began by modernizing its infrastructure – constructing new buildings and installing first-rate laboratories and equipment. Faculty collaborated to raise AUB's research profile through enhanced research quality and productivity. They created specialized research clusters and centers, sought out new sources of research funding, revised and expanded the University's degree programs, then played leading roles in accreditation initiatives. In 2007, a year after Dr. Vest's visit, AUB reintroduced the doctorate in eight disciplines, adding a ninth in 2012. In the interim, deans

and administrators joined forces to further strengthen departments and faculties by augmenting faculty ranks, enforcing performance standards, and managing the transition to long-term contracts. New processes were created for the periodic review of programs that included departmental self-studies and external evaluations.

The restoration of tenure is essential if the University is to consolidate these achievements and make a qualitative leap forward. Tenure's potential rewards greatly outweigh any conceivable risks. Tenure will give new impetus to AUB's leadership role by making it a stronger, more competitive institution with a greater capacity to attract and retain outstanding scholars; support and sustain innovative research and programs; and maximize its impact on the region and the world.

### **III. A Contemporary System of Tenure for AUB**

The Second Task Force on Tenure recommends that the University work toward the establishment of a tenure system. The proposed system, which is described in detail below, draws on the results of the Faculty Survey<sup>9</sup> conducted by the Task Force in December 2011; the rationale for tenure's restoration at AUB at this time; tenure practices at selected institutions in the US and the region; and current University policies and procedures on the appointment, promotion, and reappointment of faculty members.

#### **i. Summary of 2011 Faculty Survey Findings**

According to the survey, there was only minimal faculty support (2.9%) for continuing with the current system of term contracts without modification. The majority of faculty favored an employment system that included tenure, choosing one of three options: tenure with an age cap (37.3%); tenure without an age cap (21.9%); or a two-track system with both tenure and term contracts (37.3%). The first option had greater support among associate (41.4%) and assistant (38.9%) professors than among full professors (33%). Full professors were more likely (41.7%) to favor a two-track system; the same was true of faculty members in disciplines normally associated with clinical and practice tracks, such as FM (63.4%), OSB (47.8%), and FHS (44.4%).

Two other survey questions focused specifically on the age cap. The first asked whether tenure at AUB should be limited by an age cap, with the possibility of continued employment based on term contracts after tenure had lapsed. This proposition received strong overall support (64.6%), particularly from full (69.6%) and associate (68.6%) professors. The second survey question asked when the cap should be effective. The average age recommended for the cap was 68, with 70 chosen by the greatest number of professors across ranks. Adding an age cap to tenure could be a possible topic for future discussion depending on suitability and legal feasibility.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> See Appendix D for the results. The response rate was 56.9%, with submissions from 311 of 546 eligible faculty.

<sup>10</sup> Note that in 2006, an MIT president emeritus, Dr. Paul E. Grey, proposed a tenure system in which "traditional, permanent tenure would last only until a certain age, after which tenure extensions would be granted in two or five-year blocks, at the discretion of senior administrators"; quoted in "Still Hanging Around," *The Tech* online edition, Vol. 126, Issue 21 (Friday, April 28, 2006), <http://tech.mit.edu/V126/N21/agingfaculty.html>.



When asked when tenure should be granted, roughly half (51.5%) of survey respondents said ‘upon promotion to associate professor,’ with the remainder choosing ‘upon promotion to full professor’ (27.7%) or ‘in a process separate from promotion’ (20.6%). Assistant (69%) and associate (62%) professors showed strong support for the first option, while full professors (50.4%) tended to favor the second one.

Faculty Survey feedback on when to grant tenure agrees with the guidelines of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which recommends making tenure decisions within six or seven years of appointment to assistant professor. Most US universities adhere to this standard. In AUB’s context, and consistent with the rationale given above for tenure’s restoration, the possibility of attaining tenure within seven years will help attract promising young faculty to the University, and ensure they benefit from some of tenure’s advantages (such as academic freedom) early in their careers when most needed. Moreover, should they be denied tenure at AUB, they will still have time to explore their options elsewhere, whether in Lebanon or abroad.

## **ii. Proposed Tenure System**

The proposed tenure system is constructed based on the points below that cover general design components, transition, and implementation guidelines.

### ***General:***

1. AUB upholds the principle of academic freedom in relation to faculty of all ranks, full- and part-time.
  - Since upholding academic freedom forms part of the argument for restoring tenure, this statement is intended to clarify that academic freedom applies equally to all faculty and not merely tenured faculty. This clarification reflects the position and recommendation of the AAUP.
2. Tenure will be granted solely to full-time, tenure-track faculty.
  - Professorial faculty whose titles contain prefixes or suffixes, such as ‘Research,’ ‘Practice,’ ‘Clinical,’ or ‘Visiting’ will not be eligible for tenure.
  - Professorial faculty with prefixes/suffixes will continue to be eligible for promotion up to the rank of associate professor and for multiple-year contracts in accordance with current practice.
  - At FM, the equivalent tenure-eligible ranks are in the Investigator Track (Track 1) and include the Scientist-Investigator Subtrack (Subtrack 1A) and the Physician-Investigator Subtrack (Subtrack 1B).
3. Tenure will normally be granted upon promotion from assistant to associate professor. During transition, tenure will be granted to in-post associate professors under review for promotion and to full professors, subject to a formal review process (see Section IV).

### ***Normal Timeline for Granting Tenure (Assistant Professors):***

4. Assistant professors who are eligible to apply for tenure will have a maximum of seven years to obtain it. Typically, assistant professors will apply for tenure at the end of the

sixth year of service, have their applications considered in the seventh year, and be appointed to an eighth year, which will be their first year in the rank of associate professor (if tenure is awarded) or terminal year (if tenure is denied).

- At present, assistant professors are normally appointed for an initial four years (terminal year built in), then three years plus a terminal year if promotion is denied.
5. Seven years of service may include years served at another higher education institution. The inclusion of prior service and the number of years counted will be agreed by the candidate, dean, and provost in writing upon appointment.
  6. Early application for promotion/tenure by assistant professors will be permitted, however, no assistant professor may apply more than twice.

### ***Tenure Criteria and Process:***

7. AUB will rigorously implement existing university-wide promotion criteria<sup>11</sup> when : a) awarding tenure; and b) promoting faculty to the next rank. Faculties/schools may develop supplementary, discipline-specific criteria for the assessment of tenure and promotion cases involving their faculty members. Criteria will be qualified to distinguish between tenure reviews and promotion reviews. The Task Force believes that AUB's existing criteria are comparable to those at US peer institutions, but it does recommend that they be rigorously observed.

Candidates must have records of outstanding and continuous scholarly achievement and promising potential in accordance with international standards in their fields; they should also be able to demonstrate their effectiveness as teachers; and contribute to the life of their departments and the University beyond their research and teaching. Criteria of distinction in research should be given the greatest weight. Research contributions will be assessed based on quality and significance, not just quantity, and should be acknowledged as such by internationally-recognized scholars in relevant fields. Depending on discipline and availability of resources, ability to attract funding for research can enable a scholar to further his or her research contributions, and can be considered as an indicator of a candidates' contributions or potential. Candidates shall also demonstrate their effectiveness as educators through a qualitative evaluation of their teaching and advising activities. Any candidate for tenure must contribute positively to the University and academic community. In addition, service to the profession and the local/regional community is a plus.

8. The procedure for awarding tenure will largely follow the current procedure for promotion in rank.

It will encourage scrutiny and validation at each of seven stages in the evaluation process and result in recommendations from the Peer Review Committee (including external reviewers), the Department including Chairperson, the Expanded Faculty Advisory Committee, the Faculty Dean, the University Rank and Tenure Committee (a new committee that will take over the promotion evaluation role of the Expanded Board of Deans), the Provost, and the President. Final approval for tenure and promotion is granted by the University's Board of Trustees (see Section IV.vi).

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.aub.edu.lb/provost/Documents/Promotion-procedures-guidelines-update-Aug2013.pdf>

External review of publications and other scholarly or creative output will be mandatory during tenure and promotion reviews. External reviewers will be asked to assess the originality, rigor, and fundamental significance of the work of the candidate; to compare the candidate to other scholars in the field; and whether the reviewer would recommend the candidate for tenure at AUB.

Rigorous implementation of the criteria for tenure as described above relies heavily on the due diligence of the peer review committee. The committee's recommendation is one of the most critical items in a candidate's dossier. It should be a closely argued document that contains a brief description of the candidate's career as well as the scholarly assessment of it, gleaned from all the documentation received from the candidate, from sources within AUB, and from external referees. The committee members are required to become intimately familiar with the candidate's dossier, including all published research materials, those that have been accepted for publication, and substantive work in progress, if submitted by the candidate. The committee members should also assess the objectivity and independence of the referee letters. Their memo should include separate sections that evaluate the candidate's research, teaching, service, and clinical practice, as appropriate, emphasizing the candidate's professional trajectory and future potential for the home department and faculty. The committee should be sure to explain the basis of its own evaluation of the case. The recommendation memo should not overly dwell on the quantitative measures of a candidate's achievement in terms of scoring, impact factors, or number of articles in print; many of these are evident from the documentation assembled and may provide base data from which an assessment can begin. What is needed is a qualitative assessment of the individual and his/her interactions and promise at AUB. Both positive attributes and negative points should be frankly acknowledged and addressed, and clear arguments should be made regarding the pertinence or relevance of such issues to job performance and future success.

9. The procedure for awarding tenure will include a process whereby an unsuccessful applicant can appeal a tenure decision on the basis of non-adherence to the University's tenure policies and procedures, discrimination as described in AUB's Non-Discrimination Policy, or new evidence of a compelling nature.

***Pre-Tenure, Merit, and Post-Tenure Reviews:***

10. A substantive, documented pre-tenure review will usually take place in the third year of an assistant professor's initial appointment. Pre-tenure reviews for assistant professors appointed with one or two years of prior service will take place in the second year at AUB. There will be no pre-tenure review of assistant professors appointed with three or more years of prior service.
11. Tenured and non-tenured faculty of all ranks will undergo annual review for merit increases, salary adjustments, and teaching assignments.
12. Post-tenure reviews will be conducted every five years to evaluate the faculty member's career trajectory for resource allocation and teaching/service load. If the review indicates that corrective action is desirable, the faculty member, departmental chair, and dean will agree on an action plan with a timeline that concludes with a second review no more than two years after the first.

- A significant percentage (73.6%) of respondents to the Faculty Survey agreed that tenure's possible drawbacks could be addressed by a thorough post-tenure review.

***Promotion of Tenured Associate Professors:***

13. Tenured associate professors may seek promotion to full professor at any time and more than once so long as at least three years have passed since the previous attempt. Tenured associate professors are not required to obtain promotion to full professor.

***Granting Tenure to Incoming Associate and Full Professors:***

14. Incoming associate and full professors leaving tenured positions at comparable institutions will usually join AUB's tenured ranks upon appointment or in their first year.
  - In cases in which a new faculty member is tenured upon appointment, the search committee oversees the recruitment process and the University Rank and Tenure Committee conducts a separate expedited tenure review before the faculty member joins AUB. Since these steps are time-consuming, departments seeking to recruit mid-level and senior faculty are advised to begin the process well in advance of the expected appointment date.
15. Incoming associate and full professors leaving non-tenured positions elsewhere may be reviewed for tenure at AUB before joining the University or at a time agreed by the candidate, dean, and provost prior to appointment and written into the contract. In the latter case, unsuccessful tenure applicants in this category will be given a terminal year.

***Stopping the Tenure Clock:***

16. The tenure clock will be automatically suspended for one year for a maternity leave unless the candidate requests its continuation in writing. In exceptional cases, it may also be suspended due to serious health issues, a significant administrative load at the University, or on humanitarian grounds.
  - According to the AUB Faculty Manual (Chapter 2, Section 3, Part 4), the promotion cycle may be suspended for these same reasons.

***Termination:***

17. Tenured faculty may only be terminated for adequate cause, in response to grave and exceptional financial circumstances affecting the soundness of the University as a whole, or in conjunction with the discontinuance of an academic unit or program.
  - A. Adequate cause includes:
    - a. Failure to carry out the obligations of the position or to meet reasonable performance standards;
    - b. Repeated failure to meet contractual obligations to AUB;
    - c. Repeated and willful disregard of the rules of academic freedom;
    - d. Bullying, sexual/discriminatory harassment, discrimination, or other criminal acts;
    - e. Violations of University policies on scholarly integrity.

- B. Termination or lesser sanctions imposed on tenured faculty for adequate cause may only be imposed following a formal investigation conducted in accordance with published University policies.
- C. The University will make every effort to reassign tenured faculty when closing a unit or program. Such faculty members will be given at least two semesters' notice and the right to be reinstated if the unit or program is revived within two years of closure.

#### **IV. Transition to Tenure**

The Task Force also recommends that the conferral of tenure to in-post associate and full professors be contingent upon formal review irrespective of rank, and that the existing non-tenure system remains in place alongside the proposed tenure system, for in-post full professors.

Essentially, this means that in-post assistant professors will be automatically evaluated for tenure as well as promotion, and will receive tenure, and remain at the University, if they advance to the rank of associate professor (see Section III.ii).

At the scheduled time of promotion review, in post associate professors will be automatically evaluated for tenure at the same rank (i.e. associate professor) or for promotion to full professor with tenure, and if approved will receive tenure and remain at the University.

In post full professors will have the option of applying for tenure, if they so wish, and of undergoing tenure review during their next evaluation for reappointment. Full professors who do not wish to apply for tenure will remain on the non-tenure system with term contracts. Those who apply for tenure, but do not receive it, will have the right to join the non-tenure system.

These recommendations are consistent with the findings of the 2011 Faculty Survey. More than half (53.7%) of all respondents said that full professors in post who seek tenure should be subject to a review process. Support for this stance was greatest in two of the larger faculties, FM (69%) and FAS (52.8%), as well as FHS (66.7%), and lowest in FAFS (47.6%), OSB (43.5%), and FEA (37.7%). The rank of respondents was also pertinent, with varying levels of support expressed by assistant (61.1%), associate (52.9%), and full (46.1%) professors. Among full professors, those with over a decade in rank were more positive (51%) about tenure review than colleagues in rank for ten or fewer years (41.9%).

What follows is a concise summary of some of the main points related to the transition to tenure. Every effort has been made to ensure that these elements are consistent with the final objective, namely, the restoration of tenure as described in Section III.ii.

##### **i. Assistant Professors**

All assistant professors in post when the new tenure system is established will automatically be eligible for tenure and will simultaneously be evaluated for both promotion and tenure. As Section III.ii indicates, the tenure criteria will be based on the current criteria for promotion, rigorously applied. If tenure is denied, the assistant professor's eighth year at AUB will be terminal.

The University evaluates assistant professors for promotion in the seventh year of appointment; however, considering that the current cohort of assistant professors joined AUB without expectation of tenure, the Task Force recommends that assistant professors in their sixth year be permitted to request, in writing, the deferral of the promotion/tenure process for up to two years, and that AUB accede to this request by extending their contracts on an exceptional basis. Lacking a formal agreement to this effect, the assistant professor will be evaluated for promotion with tenure according to the normal schedule.

## **ii. Associate Professors**

Associate professors who are in post when the new tenure system is established will be evaluated for tenure and promotion by the scheduled time of their promotion review, with three possible outcomes: i) awarded tenure only (associate professor with tenure); ii) awarded both tenure and promotion (full professor with tenure); iii) denied tenure and given one terminal year. A tenured associate professor may seek promotion to full professor at any time and more than once so long as at least three years have passed since the previous attempt.

The University evaluates in post associate professors in the seventh year of appointment; however, considering that the current cohort of associate professors joined AUB without expectation of tenure, the Task Force recommends that in post associate professors in their sixth year be permitted to request, in writing, the deferral of the promotion/tenure process for up to two years, and that AUB accede to this request by extending their contracts on an exceptional basis. Lacking a formal agreement to this effect, the associate professor will be evaluated for promotion and tenure according to the normal schedule.

## **iii. Full Professors**

In post full professors will have the option of applying for tenure, if they so wish, and of undergoing tenure review (see Section IV.v below for more details on the mechanisms to grant tenure during the transition). Full professors who do not wish to apply for tenure will remain on the existing non-tenure system with term contracts up to seven years based on the existing reappointment criteria. Those who apply for tenure, but do not receive it, will be reappointed on the existing non-tenure system; they may reapply for tenure again but with at least seven years between consecutive attempts.

Full professors who stay on the existing non-tenure system will retain current benefits and rights. Moreover, there will be no limit to the number of times they may be reappointed with terms up to seven years. They will be encouraged to participate in University governance at the departmental/track, faculty/school, and university levels, including active involvement in the University Senate. They will maintain their right to vote, stand for election, and sit on committees, task forces, and comparable bodies on all issues barring those related to the employment of tenured or tenure-track faculty (once the transition to tenure has concluded).

The members of the Tenure Task Force spent considerable time discussing the question of whether or not full professors should undergo review for tenure. The findings of the 2011 Faculty Survey were inconclusive, with 53.7% of all respondents agreeing with tenure review for senior faculty, but only 46.1% of full professors doing so. A closer look at the findings shows that half of the full professors most opposed to tenure review for their rank, namely, full professors with 10 or fewer years in rank, had been promoted to full professor in the four years preceding the survey. As is well known, AUB has reinforced its promotion procedures in recent years to ensure that faculty evaluations are conducted in accordance with published policies and that faculty research output is subject to external peer review. A similar process has been followed for reappointments. The end result has been the long-term contracts offered to most full professors. These contracts provide a strong argument for automatically granting tenure to full professors. A number of other legitimate points have been put forward, including the faculty goodwill that might be expected to accompany such a move and greater ease in implementing the transition to tenure.

There are equally strong arguments for tenure review. The recommendations of external peer reviewers are influenced by the nature of the appointment under consideration. Reviewers contacted by AUB in the past were told explicitly that tenure was not on offer. With the advent of the new tenure system, reviewers will be asked to evaluate the faculty member's contribution to the field to determine whether a tenure appointment is justified – for instance, whether it would normally result in a tenure appointment at their own institutions. 'Contribution to the field,' and a 'purposeful trajectory', existing AUB promotion and reappointment criteria, will be monitored and discussed at every stage of the tenure-granting process. Filling this important gap will help to reassure faculty, administrators, and trustees who may have reservations about the restoration of tenure and its long-term impact on the University. Moreover, the updated dossiers assembled for tenure reviews will serve as points of departure for the regular post-tenure reviews, which are built into the tenure system. As the Faculty Survey indicates, post-tenure review is generally accepted as a vital tool for alleviating the potential disadvantages of tenure as an employment system.

#### **iv. Incoming Faculty**

Once approved, the new tenure system will be applicable to all incoming faculty appointed to full-time professorial positions regardless of rank unless an exemption is requested by the dean and granted by the provost prior to the start of the search. In such rare instances, the vacancy will be advertised as a non-tenure-track position.

#### **v. Mechanism to Grant Tenure to Professorial Faculty in Post**

Tenure reviews during the transition period will be carried out in two phases as described below.

Phase I (year 1 of the transition period): during the first three months after reinstating tenure, all in-post full professors will be given the option to submit their portfolios (including CV, key publications, and teaching, and service statements) to specialized committees of external evaluators for expedited tenure review.

During the first year of the transition period, a Committee of External Evaluators (CoEE) will be formed for each faculty/school by the president and provost with the help of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The CoEE for the respective faculties will review the submitted files of in-post full professors, and will make final recommendations to the provost, president, and BoT to grant tenure to those who meet high standards in accordance with guidelines at peer US institutions. During Phase I, in-post assistant and associate professors will not be allowed to apply for tenure/promotion and will have their promotion/tenure clocks suspended.

Each CoEE will be composed of five internationally recognized external evaluators. The external evaluators must hold tenured positions as full professors in a research university of recognized distinction. They should be recognized leaders in their fields and must have had major academic administrative experience. They should be representatives of different disciplines within the faculty they are reviewing, and not drawn from extremely narrow specializations. At least one of the external evaluators must have served as a top academic



administrators, preferably as dean, provost or president. Evaluators must be ready to declare and sign a conflict of interest statement.

The CoEE will provide valuable independent recommendation from internationally renowned experts which will result in granting tenure to a critical mass of full professors in the various faculties during the first year of the transition.

Phase II will be activated one year after reinstating tenure at the conclusion of Phase I. In Phase II, the University's current promotion procedures will serve as the model for the transition to tenure whether the faculty member is an assistant professor seeking promotion with tenure, an in-post associate professor seeking tenure or promotion with tenure, or a non-tenured in-post full professor seeking reappointment or tenure.

The promotion and tenure procedures will encourage scrutiny and validation at each of the seven stages in the evaluation process, and will result in recommendations from the Peer Review Committee (including external reviewers), the Department including Chairperson, the Expanded Faculty Advisory Committee, the Faculty Dean, the University Rank and Tenure Committee (a new committee drawn from the pool of full professors tenured in Phase I, that will take over the promotion evaluation role of the Expanded Board of Deans), the provost, and the president. Final approval for tenure and promotion is granted by the University's Board of Trustees.

The use of existing mechanisms during the transition simplifies implementation and ensures uniformity and continuity in the application of tenure and promotion criteria across the University. It also means that non-tenured faculty may participate in evaluating and recommending colleagues for tenure, at least during the first few years of the transitional period, at the peer committee, departmental, and Faculty Advisory Committee levels. While this is not consistent with US norms for granting tenure in ordinary circumstances, the restoration of tenure after three decades has few precedents, and there is no generally accepted model for the University to follow or adapt to its context.

In Phase II, a University Rank and Tenure Committee (URTC) will be formed that is composed solely of tenured senior faculty without major administrative roles.<sup>12</sup> The URTC will take over the promotion evaluation role of the Expanded Board of Deans. The establishment of the URTC will bring AUB into conformity with practices at peer universities with well-developed faculty governance models.

Before the start of the transition, the provost, in conjunction with the Board of Deans and in collaboration with the Senate, will review the existing promotion and reappointment procedures in order to develop necessary guidelines for the transition to tenure. The underlying principle will be to involve the growing pool of newly tenured faculty in tenure decisions as quickly as possible. This will probably take longer to achieve in smaller academic units and in units with limited numbers of senior or even mid-level faculty. Moreover, priority will have to be given to appointing tenured faculty to the Expanded Faculty Advisory Committees. As the number of tenured faculty continues to grow, more senior faculty will gain first-hand experience in the assessment of tenure cases. This experience will be put to good use with the formation of the URTC.

---

<sup>12</sup> Guidelines for the selection of URTC members, the length of their terms, and other related considerations will be developed by the provost and president as AUB moves closer to the establishment of this body.

**vi. Duration of Transitional Period**

The transition to tenure will commence on the first day of the academic year immediately following Board of Trustees approval of the new system or on an implementation date specified by the Board in its vote. Since the process of granting tenure will be probably synchronized with the regular promotion and reappointment schedule, the transitional period is expected to take approximately seven years, the duration of most faculty contracts at AUB.

**V. Retirement and Post-Retirement**

Although many full professors, particularly those who are strongly oriented toward research, are expected to apply for tenure, some will prefer to remain on the non-tenure system, while others will be readying themselves for retirement. To date, AUB has not developed the full array of retirement mechanisms needed to balance the needs and interests of the University with those of senior faculty contemplating major life changes for personal or professional reasons. This is despite the fact that such mechanisms are essential to good planning and orderly transitions, and benefit both the institution and the faculty who have contributed to its success over the years. Like tenure itself, well-developed retirement mechanisms may also serve to attract new faculty, for a university's approach to retirement says a great deal about its approach to employment and its underlying values.

The Task Force thus recommends that AUB establish a formal and coherent retirement program, which includes options for phased retirement over one to three years. The Task Force further recommends that the University establish a post-retirement program that encourages the continued involvement of retired faculty in the AUB community. The Task Force's final recommendation is that the administrations take immediate action to implement the retirement and post-retirement provisions described below, or an improved version of them, regardless of whether or not the proposed tenure system materializes.

The specifics of the Task Force's proposed retirement and post-retirement recommendations are based on benchmarking against aspirational peer institutions; an exhaustive literature review, particularly of the outcomes of retirement programs and strategies at US universities; and adjustments to accommodate AUB's unique and complex employment environment. The Task Force's membership recognizes that some of the points mentioned below will require study by the University's human resources and legal departments to ensure conformity with AUB's employment policies, the laws of Lebanon and the United States, and the requirements of external benefit providers.

### **i. Proposed Retirement Incentive Program**

Almost without exception, private universities in the United States provide regular faculty members with *defined contribution* pension plans. Each year, the employer contributes an amount equivalent to a specified percentage of the employee's salary to a separate account in the employee's name. A percentage of the employee's salary is also deposited into the account as his/her contribution. When the faculty member retires, the total sum in the account – the original contributions and any earnings – comes under the faculty member's control.<sup>13</sup>

For a private, American-style university abroad, the situation is a little more complex. AUB has established not one, but two defined contribution plans – Plan A and Plan B. Most professorial faculty are either American or Lebanese, and the two plans recognize that they have very different circumstances and concerns (e.g., residency, taxation, social security) during and after their employment at the University. Moreover, the University itself must remain in compliance with US law insofar as it does not contradict Lebanese law.

In addition to the pension plans, AUB also continues to provide selected benefits (e.g., health insurance, AUB scholarships) after a faculty member's retirement or resignation provided certain conditions have been met. These provisions are similar to some of the post-retirement benefits provided by many US universities, yet they do not constitute a formal faculty retirement program.

In the US, the elimination of mandatory faculty retirement in 1994 and the series of economic and financial crises that followed prompted universities to explore mechanisms to encourage and support voluntary, and often early,<sup>14</sup> retirement. The most common mechanism among private universities has been phased retirement, that is, a reduction in the faculty member's teaching load over a set period of time to ease the transition to full retirement. Studies show that this gradual approach is why phased retirement programs are preferred to other retirement schemes by most faculty members. Moreover, with more advance notice of a colleague's departure, departments, faculties, and universities are able to plan more effectively for the future.

Phased retirement is recommended as the core element of AUB's formal retirement program. The three alternatives (see Table 1) proposed here will permit faculty to continue working at reduced load over one-to-three years, but with no decrease in base salary or benefits (including AUB's normal pension contributions). At the conclusion of the phase, the faculty member will also receive a bonus calculated according to his/her base salary, years of service,

---

<sup>13</sup> For many reasons, including taxation, all or part of the total amount of a *defined contribution* pension plan is often rolled over to (used to purchase) an annuity, that is, set monthly payments that continue for a particular period of time or until the retiree's death, whichever comes first. The company retains any funds not paid out if the retiree passes away prematurely, unless the annuity includes a survivor clause. If so, the survivor (e.g., the retiree's spouse) receives the same payments until his/her own death or the end of the annuity's term. Annuities with a survivor clause generally pay less on a monthly basis than those designed for one person alone; alternatively, the term of the annuity may be shorter. Public universities, as state institutions, follow a different model, the *defined benefit* pension plan. According to this model, the faculty member does not control or manage a lump sum, but receives monthly payments for the rest of his/her life that are based on salary, years of service, and age upon retirement. These pensions, like state university budgets, are subsidized by state governments and supported through state taxes.

<sup>14</sup> As the first of the retirement program's implementation guidelines (below) indicates, the Task Force is recommending a minimum age of 64 for the phased retirement program. It does not recommend the establishment of an early retirement program at this time.

and age at the start of the phase (up to a maximum of 100%). Depending on the length of the phase and the bonus calculation, the faculty member will receive 115-225% in extra income over and above effort (measured in terms of teaching load). This does not include the value of the full benefits provided during the phase.

The phase must be completed in the year that the faculty member turns 70. Applications for a three-year phase must be submitted when the faculty member turns 67, for a two-year phase at age 68, and for a one-year phase (or terminal one-year paid leave) at age 69.

**Table 1. Proposed Phased Retirement Options (Regular)**

**Three-Year Phase (Regular)**

	<b>Yr 1</b>	<b>Yr 2</b>	<b>Yr 3</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Load</b>	75%	50%	<b>50%</b>		
<b>Pay</b>	100% pay	100% pay	100% pay	50% pay + (MxYOS)	<b>190-225% extra</b>
<b>Benefits</b>	full	full	full		<b>125% extra</b>

**Two-Year Phase (Regular)**

	<b>Yr 1</b>	<b>Yr 2</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Load</b>	50%	50%		
<b>Pay</b>	100% pay	100% pay	50% pay + (MxYOS)	<b>165-200% extra</b>
<b>Benefits</b>	full	full		<b>100% extra</b>

**One-Year Phase (Regular)**

	<b>Yr 1</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Load</b>	50%		
<b>Pay</b>	100% pay	50% pay + (MxYOS)	<b>115-150% extra</b>
<b>Benefits</b>	full		<b>50% extra</b>

*M=Multiplier for bonus calculation, which varies with age at start of phase (e.g., up to age 66=2; age 67=1.8; age 68=1.6; age 69=1.4). Multiplier subject to periodic review.  
YOS=Years of service.*

Since some faculty may not be interested in phased retirement, the Task Force has devised a fourth retirement option, namely, a terminal one-year paid leave with no bonus.

The proposed phased retirement program compares quite favorably to models developed by AUB's aspirational peers because it must ensure that the University meets its obligations to retiring faculty of differing nationalities. For example, faculty at some US universities are required to retire before phasing: they are then recalled to take up a reduced load at 50-100% salary for a previously agreed period of time. Since these faculty have already retired, and are no longer full-time employees, they may not be entitled to essential benefits – and certainly not pension contributions. However, post-retirement phasing is unworkable in AUB's context. Non-Lebanese faculty electing to participate in such a plan would be ineligible for work permits. Lebanese faculty (without dual citizenship) would not have access to government retirement benefits to supplement their reduced salaries; they would thus be forced to dip into their Plan B savings earlier than expected or take an immediate cut in income. The program recommended here bypasses these difficulties by following a different

phased retirement model, one in which the faculty member signs a formal phased retirement agreement, completes the phase according to the duration and date specified in the agreement, and receives the bonus at the conclusion of his/her employment at the University.

During the first three years of the transition to tenure, which will require full-time professorial faculty to adjust to a new employment system, the Task Force recommends that the University make these retirement options (three-, two-, and one-year phased retirement and terminal leave) available to all in-post faculty aged 68 and over without requiring completion of the phase or leave by age 70. The Task force further recommends enhancing the phased retirement options along the lines shown in Table 2 for these and other eligible faculty members. As the bold type indicates, two major changes are envisioned: the load during the third year of the three-year phase will be reduced from 50% to 25%; and the faculty member's age at the start of the phase (whether one, two, or three years in duration) will not be a factor when calculating the bonus.<sup>15</sup>

**Table 2. Proposed Phased Retirement Options (Transitional Period)**

**Three-Year Phase (Transition)**

	<b>Yr 1</b>	<b>Yr 2</b>	<b>Yr 3</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Load</b>	75%	50%	<b>25%</b>		
<b>Pay</b>	100% pay	100% pay	100% pay	50% pay + (2xYOS)	<b>230-250% extra</b>
<b>Benefits</b>	full	full	full		<b>150% extra</b>

**Two-Year Phase (Transition)**

	<b>Yr 1</b>	<b>Yr 2</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Load</b>	50%	50%		
<b>Pay</b>	100% pay	100% pay	50% pay + (2xYOS)	<b>180-200% extra</b>
<b>Benefits</b>	full	full		<b>100% extra</b>

**One-Year Phase (Transition)**

	<b>Yr 1</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Load</b>	50%		
<b>Pay</b>	100% pay	50% pay + (2xYOS)	<b>130-150% extra</b>
<b>Benefits</b>	full		<b>50% extra</b>

YOS=Years of service.

No enrichment of the fourth retirement option, terminal leave, is envisioned during the transition to tenure.

This is a very robust retirement program, yet the financial impact on the University is manageable due to the differences in the salaries of senior and junior faculty. As an exercise, an estimate was prepared of the total cost to AUB if all eligible faculty (as of January 2012) simultaneously took advantage of the most costly option in the program – phased retirement over three years. The estimate considered various costs incurred by the program, including faculty salaries, benefits, and bonuses; recruitment, relocation, and seed funding; and the cost

<sup>15</sup> Appendix E summarizes Tables 1 and 2, as well as some essential points.

of paying adjunct faculty to temporarily cover part of the departing faculty member's load. Depending on whether incoming junior faculty assume the newly vacated positions in the third year of the phase or in the year following the phase's conclusion, it should take AUB another three to five years to recover program costs. Of course, this estimate uses aggregated figures for the entire University, so costs may rise or fall should the program prove more popular in some faculties than others.

Although the details of the phase agreement can only be established by the University, after consultation with HR and legal experts, the Task Force recommends the following implementation guidelines:

1. The four proposed retirement options will be open to full-time associate and full professors aged at least 64, with 15 or more years of service of which the last five are continuous. The phase must be completed in the year that the faculty member turns 70.
2. The baseline retirement program will be the three phased retirement options described in Table 1, as well as the fourth terminal leave option. Exceptionally, the variations described in relation to Table 2 will be put in place for the first three years of the transitional period. Once it has passed, AUB will return to the baseline system.
3. Annually, deans will notify the provost of faculty eligible for phased retirement whether they apply or not.
4. The faculty member will initiate the process by providing the faculty/school dean with formal notice of his/her intent to retire. Preferably at least six months' notice will be provided.
5. The faculty member will sign a formal retirement agreement with the University. Discussions on the contents of the agreement will be negotiated by the faculty member, the departmental chair/track convener, and the faculty/school dean, with assistance from HR. Administrative approval by the provost is necessary before the agreement can be finalized.
6. The load will be based on the standard teaching load in the faculty/school and will normally be distributed over two semesters. It may be reduced in the agreement due to research grants, administrative duties, etc.
7. The agreement may also specify the type, level, or name of the course/s to be taught, as well as advising or mentoring duties.
8. Previously owed sabbatical leaves will be taken into consideration in the phased retirement agreement.
9. There will be no merit increases during the phase, but the faculty member will be eligible for supplemental pay for winter or summer sessions that are preapproved by the dean.
10. Health, life, and disability insurance will remain unchanged during the phase. Pension plan contributions calculated according to 100% base salary will continue to be made by AUB and the faculty member. Similarly, children's tuition, housing, and other faculty benefits will not change.

11. Phasing faculty may apply for research grants or for travel or other faculty development grants.
12. Support services, including research assistants (if applicable), will continue to be provided.
13. HR will continue to work on mechanisms to provide faculty members with information on financial planning and retirement.
14. The demise of the faculty member during phased retirement will terminate the phase agreement. The long-term illness or disability of the faculty member will be handled according to the University's existing policies until the normal conclusion of the phase.

## ii. Proposed Post-Retirement Program

Post-retirement programs are developed to address some of the very natural concerns of professorial faculty considering retirement. They most commonly provide faculty retirees with access to benefits (e.g., health insurance) that are normally associated with employment. Such benefits may be extremely difficult or expensive to replace after retirement. Post-retirement programs may also recognize the intense identification of faculty members with their work, the close bonds that they develop with students, and the value that they give to their professional relationships and contacts. They may encourage faculty to remain active members of the university community after retirement. Emeritus appointments, for example, honor the recipient's past achievements and ensure his or her continuing involvement in one or more aspects of university life.

The University currently offers some important benefits to retired faculty members, as well as emeritus status subject to BOT approval. The Task Force recommends, however, that AUB establish a task force or committee to develop a written policy for an improved post-retirement program that builds on these features to address the concerns mentioned above in a more effective manner.<sup>16</sup>

The post-retirement policy would gather and clarify existing information on the health and education benefits provided to faculty retirees, while also expanding the range of benefits so long as this is possible without significant cost to the University. For example, HR might be asked to investigate the continuation of the life and disability insurance normally provided to AUB faculty, with retirees paying the cost of the premiums directly or through the University. Such arrangements would require the consent and cooperation of the benefit provider as well as AUB.

AUB's current policy on emeritus appointments lists six privileges associated with emeritus status. Three of them are indeed privileges, but the others are basic courtesies: issuance of a university identity card and email address, and use of University Libraries. The post-retirement policy should expand these courtesies to include, for example, the use of the Faculty Lounge and the retention of personal computers after retirement, and extend them to all retired professorial faculty without exception.

---

<sup>16</sup> A formal, published post-retirement policy should also protect the University from possible claims that the post-retirement program or some of its elements imply a continuation of employment with some expectation of additional compensation or consideration on the part of AUB.

Some universities, like Yale and Chicago, go much further by permitting retired faculty to maintain existing research grants and contracts after retirement; submit and manage new external research grants through the University; and participate in the grants or contracts of non-retired members of the faculty. These privileges are subject to the approval of the department, dean, and provost. Yale has established policies to permit retiree applications for research grants through the university and to establish appropriate remuneration for the former faculty member.<sup>17</sup> While provisions such as this one are only applicable to faculty with exceptionally productive research agendas, AUB should investigate the possibility of instituting similar privileges for retirees in the context of its post-retirement program.

Finally, the post-retirement program should encourage departments or other units to permit retirees to participate in various types of activities subject to mutual agreement. These activities might include:

1. Advising undergraduate and graduate students, and/or serving on thesis committees.
2. Part-time or one-year teaching.
3. Roles in the advisory boards of centers, faculties/schools, and/or programs.
4. Participation in REP or faculty/school outreach programs.
5. Participation in the University for Seniors program.

---

<sup>17</sup> Yale retirees may submit a program of planned research activities to the (equivalent of) provost in order to obtain the title of research professor for the purpose of grant applications. For research applications sponsored by Yale, in full or in part, approval is granted on a case-by-case basis and is dependent on the “contribution of the proposed research to the University community, its demand on physical facilities, and its direct and indirect effects on other research and training programs of the department and the University.” Yale retirees may only be paid from old or new grants, and may receive only those benefits which are chargeable to the grant and consistent with the University’s policies on providing benefits to research scientists/scholars. Salary is set by the dean or provost and may not exceed the grantor’s cap.



## Appendix A: Charge of the President to the Second Task Force on Tenure

Despite the passage of three years since the faculty and the Board of Trustees of AUB inconclusively debated the challenges of reinstating tenure in the winter and spring of 2008, the issue has never fully receded, but has remained an implicit question lurking in the background. I believe it is now time to reopen the debate formally and to reframe it, in order to reflect certain significant changes that have taken place in the past three years.

The idea of reinstating tenure constituted a major preoccupation of my predecessor, President John Waterbury, under whose appointment a great deal of internal and external assessment took place, setting the stage for discussions which, at the time, proved contentious on a number of points. We are fortunate to begin in a different place, having the benefit of the Charles Vest Report (2006), the Report on the Task Force on Tenure (2007), the “Senate Statement Regarding Tenure” of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate (2008), and the minutes of the Senate at those meetings when tenure was debated in 2008. Moreover, in the intervening time the University has weighed and approved new procedures for the promotion and review of faculty members, implemented in 2010.

My own sense of the record of past deliberations is that a number of important issues were debated simultaneously, which tended to obscure the central question of whether the reinstatement of tenure is a genuine boon to AUB. There are in fact three separate challenges to be addressed, and they are to be answered in sequence, rather than in parallel.

The first is a strategic question that assesses the advantages and disadvantages of tenure itself, the utility of which in the United States has attracted skepticism of late; in fact the overall number of tenured and tenure-track faculty has been trending downward for some time. The statistical trend does not necessarily spell the end of all tenured systems, but it does reflect the fact that universities have been constrained by various factors to take a hard look at life tenure in the academy.

Tenure is usually advocated on the basis of gradual improvement in faculty quality, academic freedom, better developed research agendas, stable intellectual communities and mentoring capabilities, proactive faculty governance, and the recruitment of the very best scholars and students, *inter alia*. Disadvantages include the perception of guaranteed lifelong job security that is not balanced by performance review or accountability, long-term fiscal commitment to a cadre of tenured professors, and the stagnation of research agendas with little impetus for growth in new directions, factors that are now complicated by the elimination of a mandatory retirement age. Thus the first question to be considered is:

1. What is the rationale for reinstating tenure at AUB?

To address fiscal questions, I require that the committee’s work be supplemented by a financial analysis projecting the costs of a proposed tenure system as compared to the current system of contractual engagement, and suggesting how such costs can be managed through a program of phased retirement, with appropriate inducements offered to senior faculty who choose to retire early. To some extent, the committee will have to consider the second question, below, as part of this analysis.

The other two questions can be addressed only if the first is answered convincingly, yet they are equally critical:

2. Assuming the argument for tenure is persuasive and the grounds compelling, how would a contemporary system of tenure be constructed at AUB?

Reinstatement of tenure at AUB does not mean that the university must revert precisely to its previous stance on tenure for all professorial-rank faculty. I charge the committee to review systems of hiring practice at other universities, which, in parallel to a tenure system, can include non-tenurable lines in areas of clinical work, pure research, and language instruction, or lines referred to as “professors of practice,” which do not carry tenure expectation. There are also systems of “rolling tenure,” which guarantee long-term employment with the expectation of serious periodic review; and still other systems that allow lifelong tenure, but bring with it regular “tenure reviews” that call for rigorous assessment for tenured full professors. These other options may offer models that are useful to consider in our present situation, bringing a measure of academic accountability and fiscal flexibility to a true tenure system.

3. How should such a system of tenure be implemented?

Because this question touches directly on the livelihoods of our colleagues and friends, it is perhaps the most sensitive one of all to answer. The problem of implementation has shifted ground since the last time the tenure question was debated, due primarily to the longer-term contracts that have been introduced by the new promotion procedures and the systematic reviews that are a mandatory part of these procedures.

In their earlier report, the first Task Force on Tenure also suggested a revision of the then-current promotion criteria, on which a tenure system could be based, a reasonable extension of their brief. I do not view this issue as part of the charge to the Second Task Force, though it is an important matter that must be addressed: the three questions posed above are substantive enough as they stand.

I ask the Second Task Force to take the remainder of the spring semester in discussions among themselves and with their faculty colleagues, with a view to refining their answers to the three questions and to presenting a recommendation to the Board of Deans and Faculty Senate in the fall of 2011 as to whether, and how, tenure should be reinstated at AUB.

## Appendix B: Tenure at Local and Regional Peer Institutions

Classic tenure is presently on offer at three peer institutions in the Arab world: the Lebanese American University (LAU), AUB's closest competitor in terms of proximity; the American University in Cairo (AUC), the region's oldest American-style university after AUB; and New York University (NYU) Abu Dhabi, the newest entrant, which registered approximately 150 students during its 2010-11 inaugural year.

Prior to September 2011, LAU offered rolling three-year contracts to what it termed 'limited' tenure-track faculty, and single-year appointments for non-tenure system employees. At that time, however, LAU revised its faculty personnel policy<sup>18</sup> and its description of tenure as granted to associate and full professors: "Employment is continuous until retirement, as specified in the provisions of this policy, provided that tenured faculty fulfill their duties satisfactorily, and abide by the rules, regulations and policies that govern the University." The normal retirement age at LAU is 64, after which the faculty member may be given annual one-year contracts until age 70.

AUC's new faculty manual<sup>19</sup> clearly states that: "[a]ll appointments at the rank of assistant professors are tenure-track unless a specified term, not to exceed six years, is announced in the initial advertisement and the offer letter." In fact, most current advertisements for assistant professors specify that the positions are tenure-track. According to the manual, promotion to the rank of associate professor is accompanied by tenure.

NYU Abu Dhabi is not typical of the US branches established in Arab states in recent years. Describing itself as "the first comprehensive liberal arts and science campus in the Middle East to be operated abroad by a major American research university,"<sup>20</sup> it has begun the process of rolling out Bachelor's programs in 19 majors, including Engineering, and is planning to add graduate programs as soon as feasible. A research institute has already begun operations. The university is presently offering tenure-track, tenured, and fixed-term positions to "standing faculty" whose home campus is NYU Abu Dhabi. The tenure process follows guidelines in place at NYU New York.

Tenure is not an option at other national and branch universities established in Arab states in recent years. The American University of Sharjah (AUS) offers three-year renewable contracts to new appointments. The King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) website clearly says that tenure is not available and that professorial faculty are eligible for renewable or rolling two- to five-year contracts. Most branches of US universities are small operations which depend on faculty from home institutions or visiting appointments to fill vacancies for one or two years. Some of them, like the branches of Carnegie Mellon

<sup>18</sup> See: [http://www.lau.edu.lb/governance-policies/policies/personnel\\_policy\\_faculty\\_section.pdf](http://www.lau.edu.lb/governance-policies/policies/personnel_policy_faculty_section.pdf). Another American-style institution in Lebanon, Notre Dame University (Louaize) does not mention tenure in its advertisements; however, according to its website, selected faculty members may be awarded tenure by the university's Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the VP for Academic Affairs.

<sup>19</sup> AUC's manual is dated June 20, 2011, and draws on the policies and procedures of Brandeis, Columbia, Rice, Vanderbilt, and four other US universities. See:

<sup>20</sup> NYU AD expands on this on its home page: "NYU Abu Dhabi is a highly selective liberal arts college, and a world center for advanced research and scholarship — all fully integrated with each other and connected to NYU in New York. Together, NYU New York and NYU Abu Dhabi form the backbone of a unique Global Network University, with faculty and students from New York and Abu Dhabi spending 'semesters away' at one or more of NYU's study abroad sites on five continents." See: <http://nyuad.nyu.edu/>.

and Northwestern universities in Doha, Qatar, explicitly state that newly recruited faculty will be appointed at junior ranks to fill non-tenure-track lines. In at least some instances, they are also joint appointments to both the Carnegie Mellon and Northwestern branches.

### Appendix C: Retention of Full Professors across Faculties

Year - ALL	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>	89	108	118	133	139	147	153	161	168	178
Recruited (began work)	3	5	2	2	2	0	4	0	2	4
Promoted from Associate	14	17	12	14	8	10	10	8	9	13
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Resigned (+/- 65)	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Contract Expired (+/- 65)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nationalities	2 Dual	1 Oth, 1 Dual	1 Dual	1 Oth					3 Leb	3 Dual, 1 Leb
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Termination	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Resigned (60 or under)	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	1	1
Nationalities		2 Dual	1 Oth		1 Leb	2 Oth		3 Oth, 1 Dual, 1 US	1 Leb	1 Dual

Year - FAS	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>	24	32	35	39	39	45	44	46	49	55
Recruited (began work)	1	1	1	1						
Promoted from Associate	4	7	2	4	2	4	2	2	4	7
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>										
Resigned (+/- 65)										
Contract Expired (+/- 65)										
Nationalities										
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>			<b>1</b>			<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>		
Termination			1							
Resigned (60 or under)						2		1		
Nationalities			1 Oth			2 Oth		1 Oth		

Year - FEA	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>	12	16	21	25	25	25	25	25	24	26
Recruited (began work)		1								
Promoted from Associate	2	4	5	4		1	1			1
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>										
Resigned (+/- 65)										
Contract Expired (+/- 65)										
Nationalities										

Year – FEA Cont.	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>									1	1
Termination										
Resigned (60 or under)									1	1
Nationalities									1 Leb	1 Dual

Year - OSB	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3
Recruited (began work)										
Promoted from Associate					1				1	
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>										
Resigned (+/- 65)									nt	
Contract Expired (+/- 65)										
Nationalities										
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>								1		
Termination										
Resigned (60 or under)								1		
Nationalities								1 Dual		

Year - FHS	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>	2	3	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	6
Recruited (began work)										
Promoted from Associate		1		1		1			1	2
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>		1								
Resigned (+/- 65)										
Contract Expired (+/- 65)		1								
Nationalities		1 Oth								
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>								1		
Termination										
Resigned (60 or under)								1		
Nationalities								1 US		

Year - FAFS	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>	10	11	12	15	16	15	14	13	15	15
Recruited (began work)				1						
Promoted from Associate	3	2	1	2	1	1			2	

Year – FAFS Cont.	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>										
Resigned (+/- 65)										
Contract Expired (+/- 65)										
Nationalities										
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>										
Termination										
Resigned (60 or under)								1		
Nationalities								1 Oth		

Year - FM Clin	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>			3	4	5	5	8	12	13	16
Recruited (began work)										1
Promoted from Associate			1		2	1	3	4	1	2
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>			<b>1</b>							
Resigned (+/- 65) - Death			1							
Contract Expired (+/- 65)										
Nationalities			1 Dual							
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>					<b>1</b>					
Termination										
Resigned (60 or under) - Death					1					
Nationalities					1 Leb					

Year - FM Acad	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>	40	41	42	44	47	49	52	55	57	54
Recruited (began work)	2	1	1		2		3		1	3
Promoted from Associate	5	3	3	3	2	2	4	2		1
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>	<b>2</b>			<b>1</b>					<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Resigned (+/- 65)	2			1					3	4
Contract Expired (+/- 65)										
Nationalities	2 Dual			1 Oth					3 Leb	3 Dual, 1 Leb
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>		<b>1</b>								
Termination										
Resigned (60 or under)		1								
Nationalities		1 Dual								

Year - HSON	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>Total Full Professors</b>		4	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
Recruited (began work)		2					1		1	
Promoted from Associate										
<b>Left - Retirement - Total</b>		<b>1</b>								
Resigned (+/- 65)		1								
Contract Expired (+/- 65)										
Nationalities		1 Dual								
<b>Left - Other - Total</b>		<b>1</b>						<b>1</b>		
Termination		1								
Resigned (60 or under)								1		
Nationalities		1 Dual						1 Oth		

Source: AUB Human Resources Department.

Note: Dual nationality means Lebanese and one other.



**Appendix D: Summary of Second Tenure Task Force Questionnaire Results (December 2011)**

Item	AUB	By Faculty						By Rank				
		F AFS	F AS	F EA	F HS	F M	OSB	Asst.	Assoc.	F (All)	F <10	F >10
<b>Total Respondents (N)</b>	311	21	106	53	18	71	23	126	70	115	62	51
Assistant Professor	126	7	45	19	7	23	17					
Associate Professor	70	3	26	17	7	10	3					
Full Professor	115	11	35	17	4	38	3					
<b>Years in Rank (N)</b>	6.2 av											
0 - 2		1	15	8	3	14	5	23	13	10	10	-
10 - 12		3	4	2	-	3	-	-	-	14	-	14
12 - 14		-	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	3	-	3
14 - 16		1	1	2	-	3	-	-	-	7	-	7
16 - 18		-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2
18 - 20		-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	5	-	5
2 - 4		7	39	18	5	18	7	56	24	21	21	-
20 - 22		-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	4	-	4
22 - 24		-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	4	-	4
24 - 26		-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2
26 - 28		-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	3
30 - 32		1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	3
32 - 34		-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
34 -36		-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2
4 - 6		5	20	11	4	8	8	34	15	9	9	-
44-46		-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
6 - 8		1	13	1	3	7	2	8	11	10	10	-
8 - 10		2	2	6	-	6	-	1	4	12	12	-
N/R		-	2	-	2	-	1	3	2	2	-	-
<b>Gender (N)</b>												
Male	224	15	79	43	7	50	18	80	51	93	48	43
Female	87	6	27	10	18	21	5	46	19	22	14	8

Item	AUB	By Faculty						By Rank				
		FAFS	FAS	FEA	FHS	FM	OSB	Asst.	Assoc.	F (All)	F <10	F >10
<b>Greatest Benefit of Reinstating Tenure (%)</b>												
Improvement of Recruitment and Retention	29.9	9.5	35.8	20.8	33.3	29.6	39.1	33.3	24.3	29.6	24.2	33.3
Academic Freedom	21.2	23.8	24.5	22.6	5.6	19.7	17.4	19.8	17.1	25.2	27.4	23.5
Investment in Long-Term Research Agendas	21.5	19	21.7	18.9	38.9	22.5	13	28.6	27.1	10.4	16.1	3.9
Improvement in Governance and in Faculty Commitment to AUB	17.7	23.8	12.3	22.6	16.7	19.7	17.4	13.5	24.3	18.3	21	15.7
Other	4	19	3.8	11.3	5.6	8.5	8.7	3.2	7.1	12.2	9.7	15.7
None	2.3	4.8	1.9	3.8	-	-	4.3	1.6	-	4.3	1.6	7.8
<b>Greatest Drawback of Reinstating Tenure (%)</b>												
Decreased Scholarly Input	20.6	14.3	17.9	18.9	16.7	28.2	26.1	12.7	15.7	32.2	27.4	39.2
Inequitable Teaching and Service Loads	7.7	9.5	6.6	3.8	-	9.9	13	14.3	2.9	3.5	4.8	2
Low Faculty Turnover	12.9	9.5	12.3	18.9	11.1	12.7	8.7	7.9	11.4	19.1	19.4	19.6
Less Disciplinary Innovation	4.2	4.8	2.8	3.8	5.6	7.0	-	6.3	5.7	.9	1.6	-
Other	4	9.5	7.5	9.4	5.6	4.2	13	6.3	8.6	7.8	8.1	7.8
None	47	52.4	52.8	45.3	55.6	38	39.1	51.6	55.7	36.5	38.7	31.4
N/R	-	-	-	-	5.6	-	-	.8	-	-	-	-
<b>Employment System AUB Should Adopt (%)</b>												
Remain with Current System of Term Contracts	2.9	9.5	2.8	3.8	-	1.4	-	.8	1.4	6.1	1.6	11.8
Tenure with Age Cap	37.3	76.2	34.9	37.7	44.4	22.5	34.8	38.9	41.4	33	35.5	31.4
Tenure without Age Cap	21.9	9.5	26.4	39.6	11.1	12.7	17.4	25.4	20	19.1	17.7	17.6
Adopt a Two-Track System with Both Tenure and Term Contracts	37.3	4.8	34	18.9	44.4	63.4	47.8	34.9	34.3	41.7	45.2	39.2
N/R	.6	-	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	2.9	-	-	-
<b>Should an AUB Tenure System Have a Tenure Age Cap with Possible Continued Employment Afterwards Based on Term Contracts? (%)</b>												
No	34	14.3	38.7	39.6	38.9	26.8	34.8	40.5	28.6	30.4	24.2	35.3
Yes	64.6	85.7	60.4	56.6	61.1	73.2	60.9	57.9	68.6	69.6	75.8	64.7
N/R	1.3	-	.9	3.8	-	-	4.3	1.6	2.9	-	-	-

Item	AUB	By Faculty						By Rank				
		FAFS	FAS	FEA	FHS	FM	OSB	Asst.	Assoc.	F (All)	F <10	F >10
<b>At What Age? (%)</b>	68 av.											
<62		-	.9	-	-	-	8.7	2.4	1.4	-	-	-
62		-	1.9	-	-	-	-	1.6	-	-	-	-
64		-	-	7.5	5.6	2.8	-	4	1.4	.9	1.6	-
65		19.0	20.8	17	11.1	18.3	13	15.9	21.4	17.4	24.2	9.8
66		-	.9	-	5.6	-	-	.8	-	.9	1.6	-
67		4.8	3.8	1.9	11.1	1.4	-	4.8	-	.9	1.6	-
68		9.5	-	3.8	-	4.2	8.7	4	4.3	2.6	3.2	2
69		-	-	-	-	2.8	-	.8	-	.9	1.6	-
70		42.9	26.4	15.1	27.8	32.4	26.1	19.8	31.4	35.7	32.3	41.2
72		-	1.9		-	1.4	-	.8	-	1.7	1.6	2
73		-	-	1.9	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	-	-
74		-	-	1.9	-	-	-	.8	-	-	-	-
75		4.8	1.9	5.7	-	8.5	-	1.6	4.3	6.1	6.5	5.9
>75		-	-	-	-	1.4	-	-	-	.9	-	2
N/R		19.0	41.5	45.3	38.9	26.8	43.5	42.9	34.3	32.2	25.8	37.3
<b>At Which Point Should Tenure Be Granted? (%)</b>												
Upon Promotion to Associate Professor	51.5	42.9	59.4	62.3	50	29.6	69.6	69	62.0	25.2	24.2	23.5
Upon Promotion to Full Professor	27.7	42.9	21.7	24.5	11.1	40.8	26.1	11.1	20	50.4	51.6	51
In a Process Separate from Promotion	20.6	14.3	17.9	13.2	38.9	29.6	4.3	19	17.1	24.3	24.2	25.5
N/R	.32	-	1	-	-	-	-	.8	-	-	-	-
<b>Compared to the Promotion Criteria, the Tenure Criteria Should Be: (%)</b>												
As Rigorous	67.8	71.4	70.8	75.5	77.8	60.6	69.6	77.8	70	60.9	69.4	49
More Rigorous	29.3	28.6	29.2	18.9	22.2	39.4	30.4	21.4	28.6	38.3	30.6	49
N/R	1	-	-	5.7	-	-	-	.8	1.4	.9	-	2

Item	AUB	By Faculty						By Rank				
		FAFS	FAS	FEA	FHS	FM	OSB	Asst.	Assoc.	F (All)	F <10	F >10
<b>Possible Drawbacks of Tenure Can Be Adequately Addressed with a Rigorous, Periodic Post-Tenure Review? (%)</b>												
No	25.4	38.1	24.5	34	22.2	22.5	13	19	24.3	33	27.4	39.2
Yes	73.6	61.9	74.5	62.3	77.8	77.5	87	80.2	74.3	66.1	72.6	58.8
N/R	-	-	1	3.8	-	-	-	.8	1.4	.9	-	2
<b>During the Transition, Tenure for Full Professors in Rank Should Be: (%)</b>												
Granted Automatically	45.3	52.4	44.3	62.3	33.3	31	56.5	38.1	45.7	53	56.5	49
Subject to a Review Process	53.7	47.6	52.8	37.7	66.7	69	43.5	61.1	52.9	46.1	41.9	51
N/R	1	-	2.8	-	-	-	-	.8	1.4	.9	1.6	-
<b>During the Transition, Tenure for Associate Professors in Rank Should Be: (%)</b>												
Granted Automatically	21.9	28.6	24.5	28.3	27.8	8.5	26.1	25.4	37.1	8.7	11.3	3.9
Subject to a Review Process	76.9	71.4	71.7	71.7	72.2	91.5	73.9	73.8	62.9	88.7	85.5	94.1
N/R	1.3	-	3.8	-	-	-	-	.8	-	2.6	3.2	2

### Appendix E: Proposed Phased Retirement Plan for AUB Faculty

3-YR PHASE	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Bonus	Total	Notes
<b>Regular Retirement</b>						<b>Regular Retirement Plan is a baseline plan which will take effect in the fourth year of the transition.</b> Load is default for 3-yr phase. Multiplier (M) for bonus calculation varies with age at start of phase (e.g., up to age 66=2; age 67=1.8; age 68=1.6; age 69=1.4). Maximum bonus is 100%.
Load	75%	50%	<b>50%</b>			
Pay	100% pay	100% pay	100% pay	50% pay + <b>(MxYOS)</b>	<b>190-225%</b> extra	
Benefits	full	full	full		<b>125%</b> extra	

Transitional Period						Notes
Load	75%	50%	<b>25%</b>			<b>First Three Years of Transitional Period.</b> Restriction on completing phase/leave prior to turning 70 is temporarily dropped. Load is reduced in Yr 3 compared to regular plan. Multiplier for bonus calculation is 2 in all cases.
Pay	100% pay	100% pay	100% pay	50% pay + <b>(2xYOS)</b>	<b>230-250%</b> extra	
Benefits	full	full	full		<b>150%</b> extra	

2-YR PHASE	Yr 1	Yr 2	Bonus	Total
<b>Regular Retirement</b>				
Load	50%	50%		
Pay	100% pay	100% pay	50% pay + <b>(MxYOS)</b>	<b>165-200%</b> extra
Benefits	full	full		<b>100%</b> extra

Transitional Period				
Load	50%	50%		
Pay	100% pay	100% pay	50% pay + <b>(2xYOS)</b>	<b>180-200%</b> extra
Benefits	full	full		<b>100%</b> extra

1-YR PHASE	Yr 1	Bonus	Total
<b>Regular Retirement</b>			
Load	50%		
Pay	100% pay	50% pay + <b>(MxYOS)</b>	<b>115-150%</b> extra
Benefits	full		<b>50%</b> extra

**Definitions:**

- **Eligible faculty** are full-time University faculty of professorial rank aged 64 and over with at least 15 years' service of which the last 5 are continuous. Phase must be completed in year that faculty turns 70.
- **Pay** is defined as base salary.
- **Bonus** may not exceed 100% of base salary.
- **YOS** are Years of Service.
- **Extra** is pay or benefits over and above load.

<b>1-YR PHASE cont.</b>	<b>Yr 1</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Transitional Period</b>			
Load	50%		
Pay	100% pay	50% pay + <b>(2xYOS)</b>	<b>130-150%</b> extra
Benefits	full		<b>50%</b> extra

<b>1-YR TERMINAL LEAVE with Pay</b>
No bonus, 100% extra pay, 100% extra benefits.