Unit Head’s Role in the Tenure and Review Process

Office of the Provost
November 7 2018, 8:00 – 9:50 AM
EMU Cedar-Spruce
Objectives

Participants will be able to...

1. Describe the steps of the tenure timeline and process.

2. Avoid common missteps along the way.
Welcome & Introductions

Yvonne Braun – Associate Vice Provost

Scott Pratt – Executive Vice Provost

Sierra Dawson – Associate Vice Provost

( Ellen Herman – Vice Provost)
Please introduce yourself

- Name
- Unit
- Role
- New in your role?
Pair-up

Share with your neighbor one problem that you have heard about that has occurred during the tenure process.

Be prepared to share – popcorn style (briefly/quickly) – what problems you discussed.
Overview of discussion

- Process
- External Reviewers
- The Tenure File
- Communicating with the Faculty Member(s)

Under Review
Process
What are the different levels of review of the tenure file?

**Unit**
(personnel committee; faculty vote; head’s letter)

**School/College**
(personnel committee; dean’s letter; dean’s meeting with candidate)

**Institution**
(faculty personnel committee - FPC)

**Provost**
Who makes the decision about tenure?

The Provost

All other levels of the process are advisory to the Provost.
What guides assessment at each stage of the process?

The unit’s promotion and tenure policy.

This document travels with the file at all levels – and FPC depends on it.

Write your reports and letters with this in mind.
What if someone has a joint appointment?

Find out if there was an MOU at time of hire.

If no MOU - head should clearly address the conditions of appointment in letter:

- Specific duties & responsibilities
- Balance of work between units
If there has been policy change during review period, can faculty choose which policy to be reviewed against?

Yes – they may select between unit policy at time of hire, and current approved unit policy.
How is the period of review determined?

Need to very clearly communicate the review period in the file, and to reviewers.

Tenure Clock Considerations

Probationary Period

The University of Oregon has established a six-year pre-tenure (probationary) period, with one major ("midterm") review required prior to the actual review for tenure. Successful midterm review results in a contract that establishes the date by which a final tenure decision is required. For faculty hired without credit for prior service, the midterm review generally occurs during the third year of employment, and the final tenure decision is required by the conclusion of the sixth year of employment.

Questions?

Read more about third-year/midterm review
Section 24. Credit for Prior Service. When credit for prior service is agreed upon, the terms of hire will state the number of years of credit granted, the earliest date for tenure consideration, and the required date for tenure consideration. Scholarship, research, creative activity, and teaching completed by the bargaining unit faculty member during the period of prior service will receive full consideration during the promotion and tenure process if the bargaining unit member elects the earliest date for tenure review. Should a bargaining unit member who received credit for prior service at the time of hire choose to delay the review for the full six years of full-time appointment at the University of Oregon, teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity completed prior to arrival at the university will be of secondary consideration during the promotion and tenure process. Should the bargaining unit faculty member choose to use some, but not all of the credit for prior service, the focus of the review of teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity will adjust appropriately so that, for example, four years of full-time appointment at the University would mean that at most two years of prior service will receive full consideration.
Section 28. Stopping of the “Tenure Review Clock.” The “tenure review clock” may be stopped in the following circumstances, at the bargaining unit faculty member’s discretion. The bargaining unit faculty member must decide whether to opt to stop the tenure review clock at the start of the leave or absence, or the tenure review clock will not be stopped during the leave or absence. The bargaining unit faculty member, however, may later opt to restore the period when the clock was stopped and may apply for tenure review at the time the bargaining unit faculty member would have become eligible without the stopping of the clock.

The tenure review clock may be stopped: (1) for one year upon the birth or adoption of a child; (2) for up to two years for approved leaves of absence without pay lasting two or more terms; or (3) in other extraordinary circumstances as approved by the Provost or designee.
External Reviewers
Describe best practice for producing the external reviewers list:

Discussion at your table for 1 minute.

How can you ensure that the majority are independently selected by committee?
Who can communicate with external reviewers?

Heads – only.

Do you have to use the template for the reviewer email correspondence?

Yes. Use of the template is required.
External Letters of Evaluation

The unit head is the individual responsible for identifying and recruiting external reviewers to write letters of evaluation during the spring and summer terms of the year preceding the year that the review will be conducted. A minimum of five external letters are required for each case, making it advisable to arrange for at least six or seven.

The unit must compile a list of possible external reviewers. The candidate may also provide a list, which should be compiled without knowledge of the unit’s list. If the candidate suggests a reviewer who also appears on the unit’s list, that reviewer may be considered an independent unit selection rather than one proposed by the candidate.

There is no obligation to include reviewers suggested by the candidate, but it is advisable to do so unless the candidate has provided only names of individuals who appear to be inappropriate.

Resources

- Sample inquiry regarding availability to serve as external reviewer
- Sample letter upon agreement to provide the requested evaluation
- Sample paragraph waiving access to the external letters
- Sample paragraph for retaining access to the external letters
- Sample paragraph for retaining partial access to the external letters
- Sample paragraph for candidates who have taken leave(s) of absence
- Sample paragraph for candidates who are using credit for prior service
- Sample thank you letter upon receipt of letter of evaluation
July 1, 2014

Professor ____________
Department of Accounting
University of Texas at Austin
1 University Station B6000
Austin, TX 78712

Dear Professor ____________:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate ____________, Assistant Professor of Accounting, who is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at the University of Oregon. As part of our promotion process, we seek outside evaluations from highly regarded faculty in the candidate’s field to help us assess the faculty member’s scholarly contributions to the field. When you submit your evaluation – by September 16, 2014, as previously agreed – please also provide a copy of your current curriculum vita or biographical sketch, which we will provide to the University’s personnel committees.

Enclosed you will find Professor ____________’s current CV, personal statement, and representative examples of scholarship, as well as the Department’s statement of expectations for tenure and promotion. It will be very helpful to us if your written evaluation addresses the following questions.

- What is the nature of your relationship, if any, to Professor ____________?

- What are the most significant scholarly results produced by Professor ____________, and what impact have those results had on the discipline?
  - Please comment on the appropriateness of the venues/outlets used by the candidate to disseminate scholarly products.
  - Please consider contextualizing your remarks in terms of common practices within the discipline or sub-field of the candidate with respect to collaboration, co-authorship, grant funding, or other characteristics.

- How does Professor ____________’s record of scholarship compare – both qualitatively and quantitatively – with other scholars in the field at comparable stages in their academic careers?

- How do you assess Professor ____________’s potential for producing high-quality scholarship going forward?

- Would Professor ____________’s record of scholarship support a positive tenure recommendation at your institution?

- Optionally, you may comment on the impact of any professional (disciplinary) service rendered by Professor ____________. We do not ask you to evaluate the significance of Professor ____________’s teaching or local service activities, unless you have had the opportunity to personally observe those activities.
Name the types of relationships that would disqualify a reviewer:

Note: “Maintain a clear majority of reviewers 1) with no more than a professional knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, and 2) that were not suggested by the candidate”.

Do not include:
Dissertation supervisor
Co-author in last 5 years
Collaborator in last 5 years
Close friends
The Tenure File
Confidential sharing of documents is imperative.

What tool allows you to share documents confidentially?

OneDrive.
What are the waiver options?

Candidate's letter of waiver or non-waiver

- Sample Full Waiver Letter [Word]
- Sample Non-waiver Letter [Word]
- Sample Partial Waiver Letter [Word]

How should the options be conveyed to junior faculty?
Section 27. Waiver of Access to Materials. Bargaining unit members have the right whether to waive in advance in writing their access to see any or all of the evaluative materials (see Article 8, Personnel Files). The choice by the bargaining unit faculty member to waive or not waive access to evaluative materials shall not be considered during the evaluation process. Such waivers, however, shall not preclude the use of redacted versions of these documents in a denial review process. The redacted versions are intended to protect the identity of the reviewer.
What should be included in the equity and inclusion statement, and how does your unit handle this portion of the file?

Take 1 minute at your table to discuss.

Suggestion:
Heads can highlight equity and inclusion efforts into the research, teaching and service portions of their letter.
Equity and Inclusion in Personal Statements for Reviews of Bargaining Unit Faculty

PREFACE: The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) reached between United Academics and the University includes provisions encouraging the inclusion of a discussion of the contributions to institutional equity and inclusion in the personal statement of a candidate for tenure and promotion (for tenure-track faculty) and in the personal statement of non-tenure track faculty who are being reviewed for promotion.

Articles 19 and 20 of the CBA require both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty to develop a 3-6 page personal statement documenting relevant research (or creative activity), teaching and service contributions as part of this review process. According to the CBA, the "statement should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion." (Article 19, Sec 11, p27 and Article 20, Sec 8, p 32).

The guidelines in the pdf linked to below, which are taken from our own work as well as from existing documents in the University of California System, offer a general framework for faculty members in describing "contributions to institutional equity and inclusion" in their personal statements.

In the future, we plan to offer additional guidance about how to measure the quality of contributions within the context of various academic processes.

Examples of Equity and Inclusion in Personal Statements for Reviews of Bargaining Unit Faculty
What is the purpose of the head’s letter?

Describe the review process and details of appointment

Report on the committee discussion

Report on the faculty vote

Provide context (e.g.: fractures in the discipline)

Provide independent evaluation
How much does the head’s letter need to restate what is included in the external letters and committee report?

Do what is necessary

Be brief

Don’t cut & paste from other documents
What documentation is required regarding the faculty vote?

Paper signed ballots or printed email collected by staff member

Collated in Voting Summary template (found in digital dossier)
# Voting Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Summary</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or School Committee</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Membership:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Committee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Comments may be entered in the following area:)

---
What needs to be included regarding documentation of external reviewers?

- List of everyone asked
- Even those who turned you down, and why.
- CV & bio for each reviewer
Contents for Evaluation Letters Section

(Please provide these materials in the order indicated.)

Communications with External Reviewers (one example of each)
- Initial Inquiry
- Official Request to Review
- Other

List of Materials Sent to Reviewers (must include candidate’s personal statement and CV, P&T criteria document, and scholarship portfolio)

Biographical Sketches of Reviewers (include name, title, and institution; brief comments establishing standing in field; explicit comments on any relationship with the candidate (or note “no known relationship”)

External Review Letters

Internal Review Letters

Declinations to Review
What should be included related to teaching loads?

Typical unit teaching load for reference

Candidate’s teaching load

Include these in teaching section of committee report & head’s letter
Communicating with the Faculty Member(s) Under Review
Spend 1 minute at your table discussing possible pitfalls when talking to a faculty member about his/her tenure file, or his/her tenure process.

Be careful about making promises and misleading statements (even if intended to be comforting).
If the faculty requests union representation at a meeting related to their performance, what should you do?

Say yes.
Once the unit and head have completed their evaluation and submitted the tenure file to the school/college, should they share the general result of departmental votes and recommendations with the candidate?

Yes! This should be a consistent best practice across all units.
Additional Questions?