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• This presentation and other P&T related documents are available on the OAA website

• We’ll answer questions throughout.

• If needed, we will update the P&T FAQ document following this session
1 Definitions
Principles

1. Specific criteria developed by each TIU and documented in APT documents
2. Peer evaluation (internal and external)
3. Three levels of review—TIU, College, OAA
Definitions

P&T Committee
Eligible Faculty
Mandatory Review
Non-mandatory Review
Tenure-Initiating Unit (TIU)
Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)
2 TIU Head Responsibilities
University Faculty Rule 3335-3-35(C)(3)

- Prepare—after consultation with faculty—a statement setting forth the criteria and procedures according to which recommendations are made
- Made available to all faculty
- Reaffirmed/updated at the beginning of each four-year term
APT Documents

• Include both criteria and documentation—sample criteria and documentation on the OAA website
• Posted on the OAA website; this is the document of record for the review *unless faculty member requests* to use the one that was in effect at appointment
• Must be reviewed by eligible faculty as part of consideration of case and included in dossiers of any cases with negative recommendations
University Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(B)(5)

The chair shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and recommendation for the dean for inclusion in the dossier. As soon as the faculty report and chair's letter have been completed, the candidate should be notified in writing of the completion of the tenure initiating unit review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the tenure initiating unit chair with written comments on the tenure initiating unit review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The promotion and tenure committee (eligible faculty) and/or chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.
3 Chair of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities
Spring Semester

• Review APT Document
• Consider requests for non-mandatory review
• Suggest external evaluator names to TIU head or solicit letters on their behalf
• Consult with TIU head 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 (see University Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(D)(2))
Spring or Early Autumn Semester

• Have Committee appoint Procedures Oversight Designee(s) (POD)
• Meet with candidates for clarification as necessary (can also be the POD)
• Help adjudicate conflicts of interest as necessary
3 Eligible Faculty Chair Responsibilities

Mid-Autumn Semester

• Write letter summarizing eligible faculty’s evaluation 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
4 Procedures Oversight

Designee (POD)

Responsibilities
4 POD Responsibilities

- Committee/Chair of Eligible Faculty selects; cannot be the Eligible Faculty Chair or TIU Head
- Candidate checklist signed prior to review—page 1 Form 105
- 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
- Confirm that the correct set of criteria are being used
- Read criteria prior to each review so comparisons are made to criteria, not between individuals
POD should monitor the review process for equitable treatment of 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.
If the POD has concerns about a review, bring first to the attention of the person or 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, bring to the attention of the relevant administrator (TIU head or dean) who must investigate the matter and reply in writing to the POD
POD Signs

Page 3—Form 105 Internal Evaluation
Page 4—Form 105 Numerical Voting
5 Process
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
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 and discovery theme)
  - Regional campus letters if applicable
  - Peer reviews of teaching
  - Annual review letters (date of hire or past 5 years) plus comments
  - 4th Year Review letter plus comments
Faculty Rule 3335-6-01(A)—Internal Peer Review

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.
Peer Review—Eligible Faculty

Conflict of interest

Collaborators within unit
Peer Review—External Evaluators

• 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
• Should focus on research/scholarship unless documentation of other areas is included/needed based upon job assignments
• Open-records laws
Not Five Letters

The lack of five external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding, but it will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, P&T chair, and the chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and will not constitute a procedural error.
Process for Promotion and/or Tenure

T IU P&T Review → Chair Review → 10 Day Response Period → TIU and Chair Response

College Committee Process followed? Recommendation on proposed action to Dean → Dean → 10 Day Response Period → College and Dean Response

University Committee College without TIU Mixed, Negative, Concern → Provost Level Review All Dossiers → Board of Trustees Final - June
TIU Level Review

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

Must attend meeting (in person or virtually) to vote

Vote should be held during the meeting

Vote can be electronic

Regional campus faculty can vote

Abstentions do not count as a vote

Consideration of response from candidate
Voting of the Eligible Faculty

• Quorum and percentage vote needed for a positive recommendation are 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 (3 at rank of need) – Chair and Dean select
TIU Review

• TIU head may attend the meeting, but may not vote
• Chair of Eligible Faculty writes a letter summarizing the review and reporting the vote. Letter to include both positive and negative views, even if minority view
• 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
- Assist with placing in context of position – 75% teaching or 75% administration
- Interpretation and assessment including relation to mission of unit
Withdrawning from a 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.
# Fourth Year Review

Non-renewal at 4<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> year—Form 101 by June 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regional Dean</th>
<th>TIU Head</th>
<th>Columbus Dean</th>
<th>OAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College is TIU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College with TIUs</td>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campus</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Notes
Why University Advisory Committee and Provost may disagree with TIU

• Criteria not used as basis for decision or not documented well
• Criteria description in letters does not match governance document
• Criteria and documentation of governance document do not match
• Annual reviews are not descriptive of any concerns
• Fourth year review not descriptive of any concerns
• Non-mandatory reviews—required documents needed
• Write letters differently depending on level—TIU Chair and Chair of Eligible Faculty
• Exclusion year(s)—do not discuss in letters
• Not all materials move forward
• Narratives need to be used better!
• Requests for change of composition of committee
Annual Reviews

• Faculty must be offered the opportunity for a face-to-face annual review meeting

• Importance of annual reviews—while positive year to year annual reviews may not suggest that a person meets total criteria for promotion—no statements regarding overall trajectory can cause concerns with a negative review
Questions?