Planning for 2013-14

- Committees
- Candidates for review
- Letters
- Dossiers
- Distribution of Materials
- Meetings
Responsibilities of chair

Spring/summer

- Identify candidates and verify residency status (OLA help: hedien.1)
- Solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate (or appoint P and T chair to do so)
- Make copies of each candidate's dossier and supporting documentation available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty
Early fall semester

• Monitor potential conflicts of interest and remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

• Attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
Mid fall semester

• Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

• Meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
Inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:

• of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair

• of the availability for review of and comment on the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair within 10 calendar days

Provide a written response to any comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier
Forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office’s deadline

For joint appointments, submit a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested

**Spring semester**

Inform candidates of results of higher levels of review when given that information by the dean’s office
Definitions

- P&T committee
- Eligible faculty
- Mandatory review
- Non-mandatory review
- Tenure initiating unit (TIU)
- Appointments, promotion and tenure (APT)
- Procedures oversight designee (POD)
Discussion question: How does your unit go about identifying candidates for a non-mandatory review? How do you address the question of “early” reviews for promotion to full professor?
Principles of the Promotion and Tenure Process at Ohio State

- Specific criteria developed by the 108 TIUs in APT Documents
- Peer review (internal and external faculty colleagues)
- 3 levels of review: unit, college, Office of Academic Affairs
Internal Peer Review (Rules 3335-6-01 (A))

• Provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure. Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance—normally TIU colleagues or colleagues in related units or centers.

• Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the criteria established by the units. Administrators and faculty review bodies at the college or university level may make a recommendation that is contrary to that of the TIU if, in its judgment, the TIU recommendation is not consistent with university, college and TIU standards, criteria, policies, and rules.
APT Documents

• Include both criteria and documentation (not all documentation has to move to the next level of review)

• Posted on the OAA website (http://oaa.osu.edu/governance.html)

• Should be reviewed by eligible faculty as part of consideration of case and included in dossiers of any cases with negative recommendations
External Peer Review

• Need 5 letters

• No more than half by candidate; solicited by chair/P and T chair

• Candidate can review list of names

• Arms’ length (e.g., not advisors; major collaborators; post-doctoral supervisors)

• Credible source/peer institution (higher rank)

• Should focus on research/scholarship unless documentation of other areas is included

• Open-records laws
External Review Letters

• Generally send same material to all reviewers

• Sample letter of invitation included in dossier (multiple if different materials sent to different reviewers)

• Unsolicited letters do not need to be retained or included

*Discussion question: How does your unit go about soliciting external letters?*
Internal Review Letters

• Need to be solicited by TIU head or P&T committee chair
• Collaborators
• Other units on campus in which the candidate holds a joint or courtesy appointment
• Regional campus letters if applicable
• Peer reviews of teaching
• Annual review letters (date of hire or past 5 years)
• 4th Year Review letter
Peer Review

• Conflict of interest
• Collaborators within department
Core Dossier

• Importance of narrative sections
  • Research and teaching statements
  • Description of collaborative effort
  • Quality indicators

• Time frame

• Information about accomplishments prior to position
TIU Level Review

• Preparation and presentation of case
• Distribution of materials
• Confidentiality
Voting of Eligible Faculty

• Must attend meeting in order to vote
• Attendance can be via teleconference or other means
• Vote can be immediately after meeting or for some time period afterwards
• Vote can be electronic
• Regional campus faculty can vote
• Abstentions do not count as a vote
Voting of Eligible Faculty

• Quorum and percentage vote needed for a positive recommendation are spelled out in the APT Document. OAA recommends a quorum of two-thirds of eligible faculty.

• Quorum does not count eligible faculty who are on leave or have a conflict of interest.

• Percentage needed for a positive recommendation varies by unit from simple majority to 2/3 to 75%.

• Can add faculty outside of unit if needed to meet minimum composition.
TIU Review

• TIU head may attend the meeting but not vote
• P&T chair writes a letter summarizing the review and reporting the vote
• TIU head makes independent assessment
Internal Recommendation Letters

• Summary of TIU eligible faculty assessment and vote
  - Contextualize vote
  - Fulfillment of criteria
  - Peer evaluation of documented record

• TIU head’s independent assessment
  - Minimal repetition of record
  - Interpretation and assessment including relation to mission of unit
TIU Recommendation

• Candidate has right to review and comment on the letters within 10 days

Discussion question: What practices does your unit have regarding how to make sure that the candidate has this right to review?
Withdrawing from Review

• Only the candidate can stop the review once it has begun.

• Withdrawing from a mandatory review must be in writing and accompany a letter of resignation to the TIU head.

• Last date of employment is no later than May 31 of the year following the mandatory review.

• Letter must acknowledge that the decision to terminate is irrevocable and that tenure will not be granted.
Procedural Errors and New Information

• Significant procedural errors (those that reasonably could have affected the outcome of deliberations) should be corrected before the review continues. The error should be corrected at the level where the error occurred and be fully reconsidered from that point onward.

• Occasionally it may be appropriate to amend the record when significant new information becomes available. An amended record must be reviewed by all parties to the review process.
Hiring Senior Faculty

• When a department is considering making an offer at senior rank (associate professor or full professor), the eligible faculty must vote on the appropriateness of the rank being considered. OAA does not require a full dossier for consideration.

  • Copy of draft letter of offer
  • Candidate’s CV
  • 5 external letters
  • Reviews and recommendations by
    • Eligible faculty
    • TIU head
    • College dean
Off-cycle Review as Part of Retention Effort

• Off-cycle reviews that are part of a retention effort require complete dossiers, including the core dossier. Consideration of an off-cycle review must be accompanied by evidence of competing offer for tenure/promotion.