

AY21-19-G

The policy and timeline concerning the Eminent Scholar procedures are both unclear and unreasonable.

B.2.a. External reviewers - the solicitation of five external review letters in such a short time span (two to four weeks) is onerous and unreasonable. During the tenure review process, we only have to secure four letters over the span of four months. The policy specifies that the letters should be confidential -- but should say that the letters should not be shared with the candidate and should be held in confidence by the department and university committee members.

B.2.b. The first sentence is unclear. I think it is supposed to mean that the chair should convene a department committee by Oct 1. Between Oct 1 and November 15, the committee will be tasked with contributing to a list of possible external reviewers, writing a review letter and participating in a secret ballot. All procedures should be completed by November 15.

B.2. - there are two B.2. sections.

C.1. There are no guidelines about the candidate soliciting letters from the same external reviewers. Can both be included? How would the candidate know who to NOT solicit letter from?

C.2. proper organization - the policy states that materials should be organized into proper categories and then those categories are not fully specified. Therefore, there is no proper organization.

Schedule

10.1 - this sentence implies that the department committee formation and submission of a full package happen on the same date. This is impossible given that the department committee must weigh in on external reviewers and those letters still have to be solicited. This should be clarified and I would suggest that full materials be made available to the committee on Nov 1 so that they have two weeks to review materials. This only leaves four weeks to create a list of external reviewers, vet them against the criteria and conflict of interest as well as actually solicit the letters. See my note about unreasonable timeline.

There are no consequences or procedures specified if five letters are not successfully solicited or if the department committee fails to write a review letter by Nov 15.

There are no stipulations around the secret ballot --i.e. should abstentions be an option (Yes, No, Abstain).

There is no appeal process for the candidate.

There is not specification of whether the process proceeds or stops given an incomplete package (either candidate does not supply sufficient materials or we cannot get five letters) or if there is a negative vote or letter at any level.

There is no specification of whether this happens in Workflow.