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Definitions

- P&T Committee
- Eligible Faculty
- Mandatory Review (including 4th and Penultimate Year)
- Non-mandatory Review
- Tenure-initiating Unit
- Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)
APT Documents

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

• Posted on the OAA website (http://oaa.osu.edu/governance.html); this is the document of record for the review

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

• Faculty member to select document
Responsibilities of P&T Chair

- **Early fall semester if not sooner**
  - Appoint Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)
  - Review candidates’ dossiers for completeness and accuracy
  - Meet with candidates for clarification as necessary
  - Help adjudicate conflicts of interest as necessary
Responsibilities of P&T Chair

- **Mid fall semester**
  - Write letter summarizing eligible faculty’s analysis of each candidate, including faculty vote and summary of perspectives expressed during the meeting
  - Provide a written response (for inclusion in dossier) on behalf of eligible faculty to any comments that warrant response
  - Provide written evaluation and recommendation to department chair in case of jointly appointed faculty whose TIU is elsewhere (if called for in APT Document)
Responsibilities of TIU POD

- Committee of Eligible Faculty selects; cannot be the Chair
- Reasonable efforts to assure that the review body follows the written procedures governing its reviews and that its proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner
- The POD should clarify that the correct set of criteria are being used in the review process
- Criteria should be read prior to each review so comparisons are made to criteria, not between individuals
POD role continued…

- POD should monitor the review process in regard to equitable treatment for women and minority candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review.
POD role

- If the POD has concerns about a review, these concerns should first be brought to the attention of the person or review body generating the concerns.
  - Candidate who prepared the dossier
  - Faculty who may not be following procedure
  - Committees not following procedure

- If concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (TIU head or dean) who must look into the matter and reply in writing to the POD
Responsibilities of P&T Chair

- **Spring semester**
  - Review APT Document
  - Consider requests from faculty members seeking non-mandatory review
  - Suggest names for external evaluators to department chair or solicit letters on behalf of chair
  - Provide consultation with chair regarding requests to lengthen the probationary period for tenure-track faculty; these must be submitted before April 1st of the calendar year of a mandatory review
Principles of the Promotion and Tenure Process at Ohio State

• Specific criteria developed by the TIUs in APT Documents
• Peer review (internal and external faculty colleagues)
• 3 levels of review: unit, college, Office of Academic Affairs
Internal Peer Review (Rule 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 unit. 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.
External Peer Review

- Need 5 letters
- No more than half by the candidate; solicited by chair or P&T chair
- 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
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 (including centers)
• 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—Eligible Faculty

- Conflict of interest
- Collaborators within department
Core Dossier

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

• Items should only be listed once

• Teaching Evaluation including SEI summarized
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 held during the meeting or for some time 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 APT Document.

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

• Percentage needed for a positive vote varies by unit from simple majority to 66 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
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 year.

• 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 the 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.