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Principles of the Promotion and Tenure Process at Ohio State

- Specific criteria developed by the TIUs in APT Documents
- Peer review (internal and external faculty colleagues)
- 3 levels of review: unit, college, Office of Academic Affairs
Internal Peer Review (Rules 3335-6-01 (A))

Provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure. Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual’s qualifications and performance—normally TIU colleagues or colleagues in related units or centers.

Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the criteria established by the units. Administrators and faculty review bodies at the college or university level may make a recommendation that is contrary to that of the TIU if, in its judgment, the TIU recommendation is not consistent with university, college and TIU standards, criteria, policies, and rules.
Chair Duties: Rule 3335-3-35 (C)(3)

To prepare, after consultation with the faculty and in accordance with the pattern of departmental administration, a statement setting forth the criteria and procedures according to which recommendations are made concerning appointments and/or dismissals, salary adjustments, promotions in rank, and matters affecting the tenure of the faculty. This statement shall be made available to all present and prospective members of the department or school, and a copy shall be deposited in the office of the dean of the college and in the office of the executive vice president and provost. At the beginning of each four-year term of the chair of a department or the director of a school, the members of the department or school, the office of the dean of the college, and the office of the executive vice president and provost shall receive either a revision or reaffirmation of the original statement.
Chair Duties: Rule 3335-3-35 (C)(9)

To recommend to the dean of the college, after consultation with the faculty in accordance with paragraph (C)(3) of this rule, appointments, promotions, dismissals, and matters affecting the tenure of members of the department or school faculty.
Chair Duties: Rule 3335-6-04 (B)(5)

The chair shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and recommendation for the dean for inclusion in the dossier. As soon as the faculty report and chair's letter have been completed, the candidate should be notified in writing of the completion of the tenure initiating unit review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the tenure initiating unit chair with written comments on the tenure initiating unit review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The promotion and tenure committee and/or chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.
APT Documents

• Include both criteria and documentation \((\text{not all materials move to the next level of review})\)

• Document of record for the review – Faculty Member Choice

• Document should be reviewed by eligible faculty as part of consideration of case and included in dossiers of any cases with negative recommendations or using an document other than the one posted as the current document.
External Peer Review

- Need 5 letters for promotion reviews of tenure-track and research faculty; clinical and associated faculty follow APT Document
- No more than half by the candidate; solicited by chair or P&T chair
- Candidate can review list of names
- Arms’ length (e.g., not advisors; major collaborators; post-doctoral supervisors)
- Credible source/peer institution (higher rank)
External Peer Review

• Should focus on research/scholarship unless documentation of other areas is included

• Open-records laws
  ▪ Usually solicited only for promotion reviews
External Review Letters

- Generally send same material to all reviewers

- Sample letter of invitation included in dossier (multiple if different materials sent to different reviewers)

- Unsolicited letters must not be included or retained
Internal Review Letters

- Need to be solicited by TIU head or P&T committee chair
  - Collaborators
  - Other units on campus in which the candidate holds a joint or courtesy appointment (including centers)
  - Regional campus letters if applicable
Internal Review

• Colleagues or administrators who can speak to service beyond department if requested by candidate or called for in APT Document

• Peer reviews of teaching

• Annual review letters (date of hire or past 5 years)

• 4th Year Review letter
Peer Review—Eligible Faculty

- Conflict of interest
- Collaborators within department
Core Dossier

- Importance of narrative sections
  - Research and teaching statements
  - Description of collaborative effort
  - Quality indicators
- Items should only be listed once
- Information about accomplishments prior to position
- SEI Summary
TIU Level Review

• Preparation and presentation of case
• Distribution of materials
• Confidentiality
  • Only those who discuss may vote; no exceptions.
TIU Review

• TIU head may attend the meeting but not vote.

• P&T chair writes a letter summarizing the review and reporting the vote.

• TIU head makes independent assessment.
  • Minimal repetition of record
  • Interpretation and assessment including relation to mission of unit – Overarching review providing context to material
Internal Recommendation Letters

• Summary of TIU eligible faculty assessment and vote
  • Contextualize vote
  • Fulfillment of criteria
  • Peer evaluation of documented record

• TIU head’s independent assessment
  • Minimal repetition of record
  • Interpretation and assessment including relation to mission of unit
TIU Recommendation

- Candidate has right to review and comment on the letters within 10 days
  - Practices to conduct
Withdrawing from Review

- Only the candidate can stop the review once it has begun.
- Withdrawing from a mandatory review must be in writing and accompany a letter of resignation to the TIU head.
- Last date of employment is no later than May 31 of the year following the mandatory review year.
- Letter must acknowledge that the decision to terminate is irrevocable and that tenure will not be granted.
Procedural Errors and New Information

• Significant procedural errors (those that reasonably could have affected the outcome of the deliberations) should be corrected before the review continues. The error should be corrected at the level where the error occurred and be fully reconsidered from that point onward.

• Occasionally it may be appropriate to amend the record when significant new information becomes available. An amended record must be reviewed by all parties to the review process.
Hiring Senior Faculty

- When a department is considering making an offer at senior rank (associate professor or full professor), the eligible faculty must vote on the appropriateness of the rank being considered. OAA does not require a full dossier for consideration.
  - Copy of draft letter of offer
  - Candidate’s CV
  - 5 external letters
  - Reviews and recommendations by
    - Eligible faculty
    - TIU head
    - College dean
Off-cycle Review as Part of Retention Effort

- Off-cycle reviews that are part of a retention effort require complete dossiers, including the core dossier. Consideration of an off-cycle review must be accompanied by evidence of competing offer for tenure/promotion.