



OFFICE OF THE
Senior Vice President & Provost

To: Deans, Chairs and Directors – Norman Campus

From: Kyle Harper
Senior Vice President and Provost 

Date: April 17, 2015

Subject: Call for Tenure and Promotion Recommendations: 2015-2016

Attached are the procedures and timetables for tenure and promotion recommendations for 2015-2016. As in previous years, these procedures have been combined and placed on the same timetable. This facilitates the processing and review of the dossier for those Assistant Professors who are being simultaneously considered for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor.

Tenure and promotion recommendations are among the most important decisions made in the University. As the Faculty Handbook states, “The choices that the University makes in granting tenure are crucial to its endeavors toward academic excellence. A decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of high professional competence and performance measured against national standards.” Likewise, promotion decisions also must reflect such standards.

This document is being mailed to the 2015-2016 candidates for tenure and 2015-2016 candidates for promotion as well as e-mailed to deans, directors, and chairs. The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for the candidate and those who will be making these critical decisions. This year’s candidates will use the online submission system for the 2015-2016 year.

Please note that early familiarity (by relevant decision-makers, including the candidate) with policies, procedures, and timetables about tenure and promotion recommendation is desirable. Careful reading of the yearly “Call for Tenure and Promotion Recommendations,” with attention to continuity and change, helps promote such familiarity. Even before the year in which any particular candidate is to be considered, a general familiarity with basic policies, procedures, and timetables is to be encouraged. Please note also that it is an ongoing policy from previous years that the Provost’s Office recommends that units begin planning for external letters of evaluation during the Spring semester for the coming academic year’s tenure cycle. *Note especially this change from previous years: external reviewers should be provided with the candidate’s distribution of effort and the unit’s standard teaching load for that distribution.*

I encourage you to read this document carefully as well as the sections in the Faculty Handbook, available at <http://www.ou.edu/provost/handbook>, relating to tenure (section [3.7](#)) and to advancement in rank (section [3.13.3](#)).

Attachments

cc: Dr. Simin Pulat, Vice Provost for Faculty Development
Dr. Randy Hewes, Chair, Faculty Senate (2014-2015)
Dr. Tassie Hirschfeld, Chair Elect, Faculty Senate (2015-2016)
Dr. Joanna Rapf, Chair, Campus Tenure Committee (2014-2015)
Dr. Dawn Jourdan, Chair Elect, Campus Tenure Committee (2015-2016)
Mr. Robert Kelly Jr, Manager, Technology Services

TENURE/PROMOTION DOSSIER - WHO MAY BE CONSIDERED

TENURE: A list of those who must be considered for tenure this coming academic year has been sent to the budget deans and to directors of other units housing tenure track faculty (Oklahoma Museum of Natural History). If this list does not match the departmental/college list, please contact my office immediately. Any request for "early consideration" for tenure (for tenure track faculty showing extraordinary high merit performance) should have the approval of the Senior Vice President and Provost prior to including the name on the list of candidates. Early consideration is rare; and the candidate must have built an extraordinary record of both teaching and research/creative activity.

PROMOTION: Consideration of a faculty member may be initiated (1) by Committee A or the Chair/Director, (2) at the request of the individual faculty member, or (3) at the request of the Dean or the Senior Vice President and Provost.

CRITERIA

TENURE: The criteria for tenure recommendations must be both those listed in the University of Oklahoma Regents' Policy on Tenure and the Provost-approved criteria for the department, school or unit involved that was current when the candidate started their probationary period. If the academic unit has a more recently approved criterion that was in effect after they were hired at OU, the candidate may elect to use the more recent criteria. The candidate must document, in writing, their desire to use the more recent criteria. All such criteria must have been approved by the appropriate Dean and the Senior Vice President and Provost prior to being implemented.

PROMOTION: The criteria for promotion recommendations must be the approved criteria for the department or school involved. In order to be considered the approved criteria, the appropriate dean and the Senior Vice President and Provost must have approved these criteria.

ROUTING

TENURE: The department chair/director is responsible for providing the online materials (as described in Contents and Evaluation of Each Tenure/Promotion Dossier of this letter) and making the dossier available for review online by the voting members of the academic unit at least TWO WEEKS prior to the vote. Following the vote the academic unit's recommendation all appropriate documentation shall be uploaded and the Dean's Office notified.

The Dean shall upload his/her recommendation regarding tenure and notify the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Campus Tenure Committee. The Dean will notify the candidate and the chair of the unit of the recommendation by a formal letter.

The Campus Tenure Committee shall submit its recommendations to the Senior Vice President and Provost with supporting reasons and will notify the candidate, the chair of the unit, and the college dean of its recommendations. The Provost will upload the Campus Tenure Committee recommendations to the system.

PROMOTION: The same procedure is used for Promotion except that the dean does not notify the Campus Tenure Committee.

TENURE/PROMOTION:

The Senior Vice President and Provost, who may seek the advice of others (including the advice of the Campus Tenure Committee on promotion cases), will submit recommendations to the President and the University of Oklahoma Board of Regents.

The normal routing of the tenure and promotion dossier for review and recommendations is:

- A. Faculty (tenured for tenure decisions and at least full professors for promotion)
- B. Departmental Committee A (if applicable)
- C. Chair/Director
- D. College Committee A (if applicable)
- E. Dean's Advisory Committee (if applicable)
- F. Dean (both tenure and promotion)
- G. Campus Tenure Committee (tenure only)
- H. Senior Vice President and Provost
- I. President
- J. OU Regents

TIME LINE

Late Spring

Tenure Only

Senior Vice President and Provost sends list to Deans of those who are to be considered for tenure in the upcoming academic year.

Promotion

Chair/Director identifies faculty to be considered for promotion.

Tenure and Promotion

Senior Vice President and Provost calls for recommendations and sends instructions.

Tenure and Promotion

Chair/Director

- Checks online system to make sure the correct candidates and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty are posted.
- Assembles supporting material and uploads offer letter, evaluations, etc.
- Requests candidate to submit material.
- Advises candidate that a sample dossier is available online.
- Advises candidate to consult with the chair/director or with senior colleagues concerning materials to include and informs candidate that a departmental committee can be or is formed to oversee parts of the evaluation process.
- Makes clear that the primary responsibility for the contents of the dossier resides with the candidate.
- Initiates external letters of evaluation.
- Identifies names of faculty who are eligible to vote on tenure and/or promotion and submits list to Provost for security set-up.

By August 14

Tenure

Chair/Director notifies candidates of upcoming consideration at least five weeks before the candidates' colleagues determine their recommendation.

Summer

Tenure and Promotion

Dean - If it is applicable College policy, Dean monitors unit regarding letters of evaluation.

Tenure and Promotion

Candidate (with help of Chair/Director as appropriate) assembles supporting material.

By October 1

Tenure and Promotion

Chair/Director ensures supporting materials, including letters of evaluation from external evaluators, are uploaded online and available to eligible voting faculty at least **TWO WEEKS (14 DAYS)** prior to their vote.

By October 16

Tenure and Promotion

Eligible voting faculty discuss candidate's qualifications and vote.

Candidate should be available to enter the faculty meeting to answer questions or to clarify circumstances relevant to the qualifications, if invited to do so.

Chair/Director records the confidential ballot vote of eligible voting faculty. Note that how individual faculty voted must be kept confidential; the outcome of the faculty vote (positive, tie, or negative) should be communicated to the candidate by the chair/director. If the candidate requests to receive the exact numerical vote count of the faculty (in a written request to the chair/director), the chair/director will communicate that vote count to the candidate.

Beginning October 23

Tenure

Committee A prepares its independent recommendation (with reasons) separate from the faculty vote count.

Chair/Director prepares an independent recommendation (with reasons) separate from the recommendation of the Committee A and the faculty vote count.

Promotion

Each Committee A member and Chair/Director records an independent opinion, by name, without obligation to represent a majority departmental opinion. Committee A and Chair/Director prepare separate recommendations.

By Nov. 2

Tenure and Promotion

Chair/Director notifies candidates in writing within a few days of the vote of the faculty and the positive or negative recommendations of Committee A and the Chair/Director.

Chair/Director uploads the final recommendations of faculty, Committee A, and Chair/Director and notifies the Dean.

By Nov. 30

Tenure and Promotion

Dean all of the colleges (except Arts and Sciences) upload the recommendations and notifies the Provost. The Dean notifies (in writing) each candidate and each candidate's Chair/Director of their positive or negative recommendation for candidates being simultaneously considered for Tenure and Promotion or for Tenure only.

By Jan. 15

Tenure and Promotion

College of Arts and Sciences deadline for materials (see above).

By Feb. 29

Promotion

Deans of all colleges upload recommendations on promotion and notifies the Provost they have finalized their process, and notifies (in writing) each candidate and each candidate's Chair/Director of the Dean's recommendation for candidates being considered only for promotion.

Tenure

Campus Tenure Committee forwards their recommendation in regards to process and substance to Provost and notifies (in writing) each candidate and candidate's Dean and Chair/ Director of Committee's recommendation.

Beginning March 11

Tenure

Senior Vice President and Provost notifies Campus Tenure Committee of any cases for which the Provost plans to recommend to the President contrary to that of the Committee and discusses those cases with the Committee.

Before May Regents Meeting

Tenure and Promotion

Senior Vice President and Provost recommends to the President and notifies each candidate and candidate's dean and Chair/Director of meeting date and Provost's recommendation. (Chair/Director should initiate a Personnel Action Form with the title change and appropriate salary increase.)

May Regents Meeting

Tenure and Promotion

President recommends to the OU Regents and notifies the Provost of President's recommendation if a recommendation for tenure or promotion will not be made. Provost will upload final recommendations.

By May 30

Tenure

President notifies each candidate of Regents' action except when appeals make this impossible.

Following May Regents Meeting

Tenure and Promotion

Senior Vice President and Provost notifies each candidate and candidate's Dean and Chair/Director of Regents' action except when appeals make this impossible.

CONTENTS AND EVALUATION OF EACH TENURE/PROMOTION DOSSIER

To ensure that the best possible case is made for each candidate and that the evaluation of all candidates is conducted on an equitable basis across the University, each tenure/promotion dossier should contain the materials specified below. Based on the data and information listed below, the academic unit is asked to evaluate the candidate's performance in teaching, research or creative activities, and service; to document that evaluation; and to indicate how the candidate's expertise is expected to contribute to the short- and long-range educational goals of the academic unit, college, and University.

The forms attached to this memorandum should be completed for each candidate and should appear in the order indicated on the "Dossier Outline." Brevity is encouraged. A 2-3 page summary of research is, in most cases, preferable to including copies of actual research publications in the dossier. Nevertheless, the candidate has the right to include anything in the dossier that he/she wishes. If included, copies of research publications should be in the appendices.

PART 1 CANDIDATE DATA

The following information is required for all candidates. The academic unit should assist the candidate by providing the data from departmental files and uploading the files to the system.

1.1 Criteria for Evaluating Faculty

Appropriate Provost-approved criteria for college, department, school, or unit to evaluate candidate for tenure and/or promotion

1.2 Request by Candidate to Use Revised Criteria

If the candidate elects to use more recent criteria approved after they were hired at OU, include candidate's statement or request

1.3. Original Letter of Appointment

Candidates' original letter of appointment and documentation of changes from the conditions in the original appointment letter; such as a change to the tenure review date, or tenure and promotion decisions (if applicable)

1.4 Annual Progress-Toward-Tenure Letters

Tenure candidates' annual progress-toward-tenure letter for each probationary year

1.5 Post Tenure Review

Promotion candidates that have post-tenure reviews should include the following documents from the most recent post tenure review: self evaluation, PTR check sheet, Committee A written evaluation, and most recent sabbatical request and report

1.6 Summary Reports of Annual Faculty Evaluation for years in rank

1.7 Curriculum Vitae - Complete and up-to-date vitae including a summary of college and

university degrees earned, all professional employment, and all professional honors and awards.

1.8 Teaching Data

- a. Statement of Teaching - Candidates are asked to include philosophy, activities, and a synopsis of both student and peer evaluations of teaching and academic advising, being sure to summarize strong and weak areas at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (including the supervision of master's degree and doctoral thesis and dissertations). They should also mention efforts to improve teaching such as workshops, any of their publications that relate to teaching and advising, and special efforts (designing new courses, lab development, etc.).
- b. Courses Taught and Enrollments - For each undergraduate and graduate course taught each semester and each summer session at OU, please list the course number, title of the course, and approximate enrollment. Include syllabi for courses during probationary period or most recent five years for promotion only dossiers. Please provide analogous information about each teaching assignment under the auspices of Continuing Education and Public Service and indicate whether or not extra compensation was received.
- c. Student Course Evaluations – Include the most recent five years of student evaluation reports and student comments and provide individual, unit and college average scores. Summaries of student-teaching evaluation scores, by themselves, will be insufficient. Selected student evaluations and excerpts from student evaluations usually are not an effective means of evaluation; they are ignored by the CTC unless accompanied by the complete set of student evaluations. An analytical interpretation of student evaluations' import and significance by the Chair or another appropriate entity is more important than the summary of raw data.
- d. Peer Course Evaluations
- e. Letters from Past and Current Students (optional)
- f. Individual Work with Students – Describe individual work with students (ex., UROP), graduate student advising (chairing or membership on committees, completed and in-progress of thesis/dissertation projects). For each master's degree or doctoral student at OU for whom the candidate was the major adviser, please list the name of the student, the title of the student's thesis or dissertation, the date (or expected date) of completion, etc.

1.9 Research/Creative Activity Data

- a. Statement of Research/Creative Activities – Candidates are asked to include a synopsis of their research/creative activity, accomplishments, future directions, etc. The candidate is encouraged to present a critical assessment of the content, significance, quality, and quantity of their published research, scholarly, or creative activity, including any evidence of the extent to which this work has earned the candidate regional or national recognition, and special efforts (participation in or development of research centers, new programs, etc.).
- b. Publications/Performances – May include books, monographs, archival journal papers, conference papers, recitals, exhibitions, dramatic performances, etc. Please provide complete citations (including pagination, names of co-authors, etc.) for all publications. Manuscripts in press or submitted for publication should be listed separately and abstracts should be distinguished from complete articles. Complete and bibliographically correct citations should be provided for all publications (including the author list as published, pagination, year published, etc.). Include document describing the professional reputation of the publication outlets, e.g., flagship journal, first-tier publication. Please clearly note any citation

that is not peer review work as such. (There is no need to forward actual publications or copies of them -- a well-organized list will suffice.)

- c. External and Internal Funding – For all external or internal funding the candidate has received at OU, please specify title, sponsor, dollar value, and time period. Specify the role of the candidate (Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, Research Team Members, etc.) and the number of months supported on the project. Identify the Principal Investigator.

1.10 Service Data

- a. Statement of Service - Indicate membership (with dates) on task forces, councils, committees, Faculty Senate, etc., at the academic unit, college, or university level. Also indicate the nature and extent of advising of student organizations. The candidate is encouraged to present a critical assessment of the nature, significance, quality, and quantity of the work in this area, including any evidence of demonstrated leadership roles.
- b. List of Service - Complete list with dates and descriptions of Unit, College, and University service. List activities and professional offices held in professional organizations, and list public service to the larger community that is based on expertise related to the faculty member's discipline or profession. Chairs/Directors may also wish to obtain confidential letters from appropriate persons outside the academic unit who are well-acquainted with the candidate's service work, particularly if these persons are able to point to the extent to which the candidate contributed to the fulfilling of the charge given to the council, committee, group, or agency.

1.11 Appendices (optional)

PART 2

PROCEDURES AND EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS – Chair/Director Data

2.1 Selection Narrative for External Evaluators

The Chair/Director should provide a list and brief narrative of the process used to select the external evaluators who provided letters of evaluation for the research, scholarly, or creative activities of the candidate. The narrative should address:

- the number of external evaluators that the chair/director (and designed faculty or staff member) initially asked to provide a review and whether they were suggested by the candidate or the unit;
- the number of evaluators who agreed to provide a review and whether they were suggested by the candidate or the unit;
- and the number of evaluators who actually did submit a review and whether they were suggested by the candidate or the unit.

Academic units are advised to solicit external letters of evaluation early enough that they produce thorough appraisals of the tenure candidates. The Provost's Office recommends that units begin soliciting these during the Spring semester for the coming academic year's tenure cycle. Evaluators should receive an appropriately representative body of work to review, and candidates should have input into what pieces of work are sent to evaluators.

Some colleges require more than the Provost minimum of 3 confidential letters of evaluation for inclusion in both tenure and promotion dossiers *from off-campus scholars or distinguished professionals* in the field who have access to the records or creative

work of the candidate. The purpose of external peer evaluations is to provide an independent, unbiased evaluation of the candidate's scholarly attainment. Someone other than the candidate (usually the Chair and/or Committee A and/or other relevant departmental committee) does the authoritative selection of evaluators and corresponds with evaluators.

The Chair/Committee A, or the candidate, may suggest, submit for consideration, or propose potential evaluators. Units should allow, indeed encourage, the candidate to suggest some names. Some appropriate balance should be sought in selection between names suggested by the candidate and suggested by others. However, at least three of the external evaluators chosen by the unit should have no close academic or personal connections with the candidate: Ph.D. advisers and committee members, coauthors, and close personal friends should not be asked to evaluate the candidate. In rare cases, such as when a candidate has a very narrow and specialized field of expertise, one or two evaluators with a close professional connection may be included. It is the responsibility of the unit to explain and justify such exceptions to the general requirement.

- 2.2 Descriptions of External Evaluators – Using the attached form, submit a brief description of evaluators providing letters - who they are, where they are, what their status in the profession is, whether they were suggested by the Chair/Committee A or by the candidate, why they were selected as reviewers, and whether they have any academic or personal connection with the candidate.

- 2.3 Curriculum Vitae of External Evaluators.

- 2.4. Letters Sent to External Evaluators - Include copies of letters sent to all of the external evaluators. At the request of the Campus Tenure Committee and the Office of Legal Counsel, the following information **MUST** be included in requests for external letters of evaluation. (Note new text **highlighted** below):

“As part of this review process, we are soliciting assessments of Professor _____’s research contributions from academic colleagues and distinguished professionals outside of the University of Oklahoma. These letters of evaluation are treated as confidential by the University to the extent we are permitted to do so by law. These assessments will become part of Professor _____’s tenure dossier to be reviewed in accordance with our procedures for the tenure decision which generally includes review by the departmental tenure faculty, a select group of college faculty appointed by the dean, the Campus Tenure Committee, and relevant administrators at the University of Oklahoma. We ask for your letter of evaluation and a copy of your own curriculum vita to include with the tenure dossier. In your letter, it is important that you elucidate the extent of your professional or personal relationship with Professor _____; the intent is to identify potential cases of partiality or conflicts of interest that might otherwise not be known by us. We ask that evaluators not provide comments as to whether a candidate should or should not be awarded tenure at the University of Oklahoma but rather comments on how the candidate's research record compares with those who have recently been awarded tenure at your institution. **For your information, the candidate's distribution of effort was set at ___%-___%-___% for teaching, research, and service respectively. For this unit, that represents a course load of ___ courses per year.**”

- 2.5 List of Materials Sent to External Evaluators – Provide a list of materials sent to evaluators.
- 2.6 Letters Received from External Evaluators - Copies of all confidential letters of

evaluation solicited and received must be included in the dossier.

PART 3 UNIT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Unit Procedures - A description of the procedures the unit used for the tenure/promotion process should follow the "Recommendation of Faculty Concerning Tenure/ Promotion." A sample of such a procedure statement follows:

SAMPLE Details of Faculty Vote on Tenure and Promotion

The tenure dossier of Professor XX was compiled and made available for inspection to the (number) tenured faculty in the Department of Art & Automation on October 14, 20___. (Note here if any tenured faculty were ineligible to vote due to the nepotism policy or for other reasons). The tenured faculty met to discuss Professor XX's qualifications on October 28, 20___*, with 13 of the 15 tenured faculty members in the department present (absent were Professor YY and Associate Professor ZZ). At the conclusion of this meeting ballots were distributed with instructions that they be completed and returned by no later than 5:00 p.m. on October 28, 20___. Completed ballots were deposited in a ballot box and the voting faculty member's name was checked off on a list of the department's tenured faculty. Professor YY submitted an absentee ballot; we were not able to obtain a vote from Professor ZZ, who is on sabbatical. The Chair and Committee A met on October __, 20__ to tally the tenure and promotion votes regarding Professor XX. At this same meeting, Committee A conducted its vote by a show of hands, and the Chair/Director announced his or her recommendation. On October __, 20__ the Chair/Director advised the candidate and faculty of the outcome of faculty vote, the Committee A recommendation, and the Chair/Director recommendation by email.

*Note the two-week (14 calendar days) period for voting faculty to inspect the dossier is specified in the *Faculty Handbook*. Exceptions to this procedure should be noted, and approval for such exceptions should be obtained from the unit's eligible voting faculty, college dean, and University Senior Vice President and Provost, as appropriate.

3.2 Faculty Recommendations

- a. The "Recommendation of Faculty Concerning Tenure" forms provide a useful summary of information about 1) the academic unit and 2) the faculty eligible to vote on tenure.
- b. Chair/Directors should append a copy of the unit's faculty tenure voting policy with a separate list of faculty eligible to vote on tenure.
- c. The "Recommendation of Faculty Concerning Promotion" forms provide a useful summary of information about 1) the academic unit and 2) the faculty eligible to vote on promotion.
- d. Chair/Directors should append a copy of the unit's faculty promotion voting policy with a separate list of faculty eligible to vote on promotion.

While the unit is asked to complete this form, the Dean is expected to verify the completeness and accuracy of the data.

The definitions of a vote coded to *grant* or *deny* are self-evident.

A vote coded as *abstain* means that an eligible faculty member reviewed the dossier, participated in the eligible faculty discussion and elected to cast a vote of abstain; i.e., they do not want to make either a positive or negative recommendation.

A vote coded *unavailable* means that an eligible faculty member did not review the dossier or did not participate in the eligible faculty discussion and voting process. This happens most typically when a faculty member is on sabbatical and out of the country.

A vote coded *ineligible* means that an otherwise eligible faculty member is recusing themselves from casting a vote. This most typically occurs when the candidate is a spouse of the eligible faculty member.

The faculty vote, in order to be considered positive, should have a majority of the votes coded grant out of the total number of votes coded grant, deny, and abstain.

For faculty seeking Tenure/Promotion who are appointed in two or more academic units, the full numerical results of the votes by the academic units shall be reported and fully considered. However, in characterizing the overall vote at the unit level as positive or negative, the Provost and Campus Tenure Committee will weigh the overall positive or negative result of each unit. Thus, for a candidate whose FTE is evenly split between two units and who receives a positive vote in one unit and a negative vote in the other, the vote will be characterized as split regardless of the absolute numbers of faculty voting positively or negatively across both units.

3.3 Recommendation of Committee A

For tenure candidates, this section is the "Recommendation of Committee A" (including dissenting reports, if any) with critical assessments of the quality, quantity, and significance in Teaching and Advising, Research and Creative Activity, and Service. Provide an analysis of how the candidate meets or does not meet the unit tenure guidelines, and discussions in the light of tenure cases in the recent past.

For promotion candidates, this section is the "Recommendation of Committee A" (with the individual vote of each member recorded) as required by Regents' policy, which provides that each member record an independent opinion, by name, without obligation to represent majority departmental opinion. Individual members may submit separate reports, that is, each member must record his/her own vote by name, and also has the option of submitting a separate report articulating the reasons for their decision.

3.4 Recommendation of the Chair/Director - (with supporting reasons)

It is essential that all recommendations specify how the candidate fulfills the unit's and University's criteria for tenure and/or promotion in the areas of Teaching and Advising, Research and Creative Activity, and Service. If the candidate to be considered has been hired with special stipulations or exceptions with regard to the unit's criteria for tenure

and/or promotion, such conditions should be explicitly stated.

PART 4

ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The “Recommendation of the College Dean” should follow the same format as the Recommendation of Committee A and the Chair/Director
- 4.2 Recommendation of Campus Tenure Committee
- 4.3 Recommendation of Senior Vice President and Provost
- 4.4 Recommendation of President and OU Regents