

1
2 **Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**
3 **Promotion and Tenure Committee**
4 **May 11, 2009**
5 **Passed**
6

7 **Whereas**

8 Cases heard by the Faculty Senate P&T Committee in Fall 2008 (and a few others we are
9 aware of) suggest that the P&T process sometimes does not function as well as it could.
10

11 **Whereas**

12 The problems are issues of process including following procedures, applying appropriate
13 criteria, or providing clear guidance to candidates. Department/School P & T guidelines
14 are sometimes vague, incomplete, or inconsistent with College guidelines.
15

16 **Whereas**

17 It is desirable for Department/School P & T guidelines to clearly establish procedures for
18 departmental committees and administrators, as well as for candidates. Transparent and
19 efficient guidelines are strongly in the best interests of the university as a whole.
20

21 **Be it resolved that**

22 The following language should be added to the faculty handbook in Section II
23 (“Contracts”), Subsection E (“Procedures for Tenure and Advancement ...”) as “Item 9”:
24

25 9. Departmental/School P&T Committees should insure that
26

27 a. A section of the Departmental/School P&T guidelines explicitly states
28 that a negative decision at any level may be appealed on the basis of a
29 perceived:
30

31 i. Violation of academic freedom
32

33 ii. Failure of consideration of relevant facts or circumstances
34

35 iii. Failure to follow designated procedures (“due process”),
36 including use of procedures that are inconsistent with Department,
37 School, College, or University P&T policies.
38

39 Departmental/School guidelines should state that appeal of a P&T
40 decision is possible, and steps to initiate an appeal are laid out in
41 Section II.F of the Faculty Handbook.

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87

- b. Department/School P&T guidelines should be reviewed at least every five years. Such a review should be announced to all tenure track faculty at least one month ahead of time, should entail discussion among the entire tenure track faculty, and invite suggestions from all. All changes require a majority vote of Group I faculty for approval. With regard to criteria for tenure and promotion to the associate rank, faculty should be “grandfathered” in, and should have the choice of following either the revised guidelines or guidelines in place at the time of their last advancement. With regard to criteria for promotion to the professor rank, a grace period of three years after the revision should be offered to faculty before implementing changes in the department/school criteria.
- c. All probationary faculty should be formally evaluated on their cumulative performance and progress toward tenure and promotion midway through their probationary period in addition to annual progress-towards-tenure reviews.
- d. The relative weightings of teaching, research/creative activity, and service that will be applied in reaching the tenure decision should be explicitly communicated in writing to the candidate and evaluating committees at the time of the hire.
- e. Criteria that will be used to assess the candidate within each general performance category (teaching, research/creative, or service) should be clearly described in the departmental/school P&T guidelines. Criteria may be qualitative or quantitative. If quantitative measures are used, normative values should be specified to the fullest extent possible, and the relationship between quality and quantity should be *defined*. No general category of performance (teaching, research/creative, or service) should be assessed by a single criterion. Annual progress-towards-tenure reviews should specifically address progress with respect to these criteria.
- f. A successful candidate’s record is judged as a complete package, although levels of performance may vary between individual criteria.
- g. If departments include obtaining grants or other funding in their criteria, funding levels will be judged adequate to the extent that they can support a productive, high-quality research or creative program of the candidate.
- h. In the case of appointment with credit toward tenure (i.e. if a faculty member has held a similar appointment previous to their appointment at Ohio University), professional accomplishments from this previous appointment should be credited to the candidate.

88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104

i. Departments and candidates should negotiate *a priori* to determine the extent to which a candidate’s participation in interdisciplinary programs (e.g. Environmental Studies, African Studies, Development Studies, etc.) or other programs will be credited in the tenure process. The candidate and the P&T Committee will be informed of his/her negotiated commitment in writing. In the P&T decision, credit should be given for interdisciplinary scholarship, teaching and service, as negotiated. How much credit has been given should be clearly indicated in annual evaluations and in the P&T committee’s letter of recommendation for a candidate.

Be it further resolved that

The last paragraph of Appendix A, Point F be removed as it duplicates above language.