Tenure and Promotion Process

Department Chair’s Perspective
When Does the Process Begin?

Essentially, the tenure and promotion process should begin when a candidate interviews for a tenure track faculty position.

In our department, the Chair spends a fair amount of time explaining the workload distribution, which is typically 45%T, 45%R, and 10%S for tenure track faculty members and the expectations and criteria for tenure and how the process is carried out over the entire probationary period. Candidates are also given a copy of the department’s policies manual.

I think this strategy is advantageous for our candidates if they are deciding between multiple job offers since the issue of tenure and promotion is often perceived as a very stressful time period in one’s career. The clearer that the expectations are presented to the candidates, the less fear of the unknown they may have.
What are Clear Expectations?

**Minimum research requirements:**

Normally, publication of the equivalent of ten peer reviewed articles (and recognized as significant contributions by the external reviewers assessing the candidate), or seven articles and a scholarly book published by a recognized publisher that is discipline appropriate.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to be the first, senior, or sole author on the majority of the publications.

In assessing the publication record, appropriate emphasis will be given to the scope and quality of the individual publications and the field of specialty of the candidate. In rare cases, the scope and quality of individual publications may justify an exception to the minimum number.

The mentoring of graduate students, soliciting external funding, graduate committee involvement, development and continuity of an independent line of research are also considered.
Once Hired

Within the first few weeks of a faculty member’s first semester in the department, we begin an ‘In-Processing’ procedure that requires the faculty member to meet with their assigned mentor (senior faculty member), the Chair, Undergraduate and Graduate Liaisons, IT Representative, Undergraduate Advisors, Administrative Assistant, Office Staff, and the Research Oversight Committee Chair.

During the meeting with the Chair, the process of annual faculty evaluations, the third year review process, and tenure and promotion policies are re-visited in more detail.

We also use a template ‘Pre-Tenure Planning Tool’ to help new faculty members, along with the Chair, plan a strategy over their entire probationary period to help ensure steady progress and to create goals or benchmarks that they hope to achieve on their way to T&P.

We encourage new hires to attend the new faculty workshop hosted by the Center for Teaching Excellence since they spend 1 meeting on T&P and to attend the T&P workshop offered in the spring.
# Pre-Tenure Planning Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Annual evaluation</td>
<td>Annual evaluation</td>
<td>Annual evaluation</td>
<td>Annual evaluation</td>
<td>Annual evaluation</td>
<td>Prepare tenure packet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-career review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept T&amp;P Voting Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provost and Regent's Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External Reviewer letters accumulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional talks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards &amp; Honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees dept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees college &amp; univ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Template created by University of Oklahoma Center for Research Development and Enrichment
http://www.uic.edu/eng/ems/WISEST/initiatives2/sessions/session16/Planning%20for%20tenure%20timeline.pdf

With thanks to The University of Illinois at Chicago Women in Science and Engineering System Transformation:
Annual Faculty Evaluations

• **What materials are required:**
  - General: CV; mini CV; expanded mini CV;
  - Research: 1st page of publications, in press articles or verification of a paper in review; abstracts from national conferences; theses or dissertations completed; membership on graduate committees
  - Teaching: classes taught; class sizes; syllabi; course rosters; self evaluations; STE; peer evaluations; examples of student papers or projects (optional)
  - Service: letters of appointment

• **Time Line:**
  02/02   all evaluation materials due in Chair’s office for review by Com ‘A’
  02/03 - 02/06  Com ‘A’ review of faculty materials
  02/09   distribution of annual evaluation forms to individual faculty for review
  02/10 - 02/16  Com ‘A’ available to all faculty for review of annual evaluations
  02/20   unit mini vita, faculty evaluation forms, faculty mini vitae and vitae, and Chair evaluations submitted to the Dean’s office for review
Letters from Annual Faculty Reviews and Progress Towards Tenure

• The letter must be accurate, honest, and complete for the candidate.
• It should address if expectations for T/R/S are being met or not and what needs to be done to get back to meeting expectations.
• The Progress Towards Tenure letter represents the cumulative performance during the probationary period at OU in each area (T/R/S).
• It should reflect how much time is remaining on probation and the candidates workload distribution.
• It should refer the candidate to the Faculty Handbook for the general guidelines for T&P and to the departmental policies regarding T&P (if a split appointment, then it should reflect the policies from each dept.
• It should include 3 separate sections for T/R/S and all the factors that go into each section based on departmental guidelines.
• It should have a summary statement if progress towards tenure and promotion are satisfactory, needs improvement, or is unsatisfactory and what steps need to be taken for improvements.
3rd Year Formal Review

- Spring semester of the third year (as part of the annual review process).
- Formal comprehensive review of T/R/S with letters from external reviewers.

- **Third Year Review:** In the Spring semester of the third complete year of service, a faculty member should receive a formal review of teaching, research, and service activities to date. Included in the review will be a comprehensive review of all annual evaluation materials and an external review of research progress by external peers selected by the candidate, Com ‘A’, and Chair (slightly different approach compared to selection of reviewers for T&P).

- The third year review should include evaluation of teaching, research/creative activity, and service contributions. The feedback from the third year review is intended to provide specific guidelines for attainment of tenure or a recommendation of termination.
Overview of the Departmental Process for T&P to Associate Professor

• Dec: Discuss the T&P process; remind candidate and Com ‘A’ about external reviewers.
• Feb: Chair and candidate – discuss preparation of tenure dossier and materials for reviewers.
• March: Candidate and Com ‘A’ each submit 10-12 potential external reviewers: 1) similar research interests; 2) at comparable institutions with similar departments; and 3) no previous relationships (if split appointments, Chairs and Com ‘A’ from both departments would work together).
• April: Com ‘A’ selects 5-6 names from each list, then forwards them to the College along with 1) a draft of the e-mail that will be sent to the reviewers; 2) a description of the department; and 3) the departments T&P policy.
• Once reviewers approved, they are contacted. If they agree, a formal letter is sent along with a description of the department, the departments policy for T&P, and the materials provided by the candidate (statements of teaching philosophy and activities, research/creative activities, and service, CV, and several representative publications).
• Aug: External reviewers submit their evaluations and CV’s.
• Sept: T&P materials made available online for tenured faculty to review (at least 2 weeks to review).
• Oct: Eligible voting faculty meet to discuss the dossier (candidate available for clarifications). Voting options are to grant/deny/abstain by secret ballot. *(perhaps might be good to include junior faculty in the discussion)*
• Com ‘A’ meets separately to discuss the dossier and cast secret ballots. Com ‘A’ and the Chair count the ballots.
• Oct: Chair drafts a separate recommendation to the Dean.
• Oct: Com ‘A’ drafts a separate recommendation to the Dean.
• Oct: Chair notifies the candidate in writing of the votes of the faculty, Com ‘A’, and Chair.
• Oct: All materials and departmental recommendations uploaded to the secure T&P website.
How to Put the Dossier Together

• If the candidate has done a good job of organizing materials for each separate annual evaluation (this process begins on day one of the new position) then it should be easy to combine each year’s materials to put the dossier together.

• Critical that the candidate is organized and keeps everything that they do in T/R/S in a separate file. This ensures complete materials for the annual evaluations, the 3rd review dossier, and the T&P dossier.

• Easiest for the Chair, Com ‘A’, and the candidate to do the work in ‘word’ then save as ‘pdf’.

• If Promotion is for a RRT faculty member, the letter to the reviewers would be very different, highlighting the WL distribution and focusing on teaching. Potential reviewers could include Chairs, non TT faculty, or tenured faculty that are teaching specialists. The review would focus on teaching but would also include any R/S that they have done. In this case the review materials would include: teaching statement; courses taught; syllabi; size of classes; STE; teaching awards; peer evaluations; letters of support from students.
What Goes in the Dossier

Part 1
• Chair

1.1 Criteria for evaluating faculty (from department Policy Manual)
1.2 If any revisions to the criteria – explain
1.3 Original letter of appointment (any modifications to dates, etc.)
1.4 Annual progress towards tenure letters
1.5 Post tenure reviews (for promotion to full only)
1.6 Summary reports of annual faculty evaluations

• Candidate

1.7 CV
1.8 Teaching data (philosophy; classes; sizes; STE; Peer evals; letters of support from past or current students and examples of student work (optional)
1.9 Research/Creative activity data (philosophy; pubs; internal and external funding
1.10 Service data (philosophy; list of activities – prof, univ, college, dept, comm)
1.11 Appendix (optional)
Part 2

Chair

2.1 Selection narrative for external evaluators
2.2 Description of external evaluators
2.3 CV from external evaluators
2.4 Letters sent to the reviewers
2.5 Materials sent to the reviewers
2.6 Confidential letters received from the external reviewers

Part 3

Chair

3.1 Unit Procedures
3.2 Recommendations of faculty concerning tenure and/or promotion
   (recommendation for tenure; list of eligible voting faculty; recommendation
   for promotion; list of eligible voting faculty)
3.3 Recommendations of Com ‘A’
3.4 Recommendations of the Chair/Director
The Discussion/Voting and issues of Confidentiality

- Discussion (after at least 2 weeks that the dossier is available) – Only tenured faculty have access to all the materials (including external letters) that are on-line, however, it might be wise to include junior faculty during the open discussion so they can see the process and various issues that are discussed. Candidate is not present but is available for clarifications.

- Voting options are grant/deny/abstain for tenure and for promotion, separately. Secret paper ballots are cast and Com ‘A’ and the Chair count the ballots.

- Com ‘A’ meets separately and also votes to grant/deny/abstain for tenure and for promotion, separately. Secret paper ballots are cast Com ‘A’ and the Chair count the ballots. Com ‘A’ also submits a written explanation of their decision.

- The Chair also votes to grant/deny/abstain for tenure and promotion separately and submits a written explanation of their decision.

- The external letters, the discussion and the votes are confidential by the university to the extent that they are permitted to do so by law.
What is Given to the Candidate after the Departmental Voting Procedures?

• The numerical result of the formal secret ballot polling shall be provided to the candidate at the candidate’s request.

• At the time recommendations are made at any stage of the review process, notification of such recommendations must be provided to the chair and the individual candidate. It shall be the responsibility of the chair to inform the faculty of the unit about recommendations made at the various stages of the review process.

• The dean will attach a recommendation to the tenure materials and forward all materials to the Campus Tenure Committee with supporting reasons and will notify the candidate and the chair of the unit of the recommendation.

• The numerical result of the Campus Tenure Committee recommendation shall be provided to the candidate at the candidate’s request.
Promotion to Full Professor

- The candidate must have demonstrated satisfactory performance in teaching, research/creative writing, and service and must have established a research record of national prominence, as determined by both internal and external peer review. The research conducted after promotion to Associate Professor and leading to promotion to Full Professor should include additional scholarly activity (i.e., peer reviewed publications) that is consistent in quantity and quality with national standards at comparable institutions and should be clearly beyond expectation to the rank of Associate Professor, but the entire body of research accomplished by a candidate during his/her career will be evaluated.

- Generally, the time period before review for advancement to Full Professor will require at least an additional five to six years of meritorious service from the date of promotion to tenure.