3.12.1.1 Non-mandatory review  
Revised: 04/01/07  
Edited: 08/01/07

When a faculty member withdraws from a non-mandatory review, the withdrawal is noted on the college report. The dossier should be kept in the candidate's TIU, but not in his/her primary personnel file, until such time as the candidate either is promoted or is denied tenure.

A candidate who decides to terminate a non-mandatory review should put the request in writing and address it to the administrator at the level at which the case presently resides (regional campus, TIU, college, OAA).

The administrator at that level will notify all other relevant administrators.

3.12.1.2 Mandatory review  
Revised: 04/01/07  
Edited: 01/01/11

Probationary faculty who withdraw from or decline to participate in a mandatory review for tenure or promotion and tenure are subject to the relevant standards of notice per Faculty Rule 3335-6-08. Their decision to terminate the review must be accompanied by a letter of resignation to the TIU head (or regional campus dean) stating:

- Last day of employment (no later than June 30 of the year following the mandatory review year). Normally this is the end of the seventh year but may be earlier if the faculty member had a shorter probationary period.
- Acknowledgement that the decision to terminate the review is irrevocable and that tenure will not be granted.

This action requires that the Report of Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointment of Regular Tenure track, Regular Clinical Track, and Regular Research Track Faculty be submitted to OAA, along with a copy of the faculty member's letter, by June 1 of the year in which the decision to terminate the review occurs.

OAA must keep accurate records of such actions since it, like a negative decision, usually precludes rehiring the individual (see Faculty Appointments Policy, http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf).

3.12.2 Negative decisions  
Revised: 04/01/07  
Edited: 01/01/11

If an untenured candidate is denied tenure, s/he must be notified promptly of this decision and informed in writing that June 30 of the year following the mandatory review year is the last day of employment. The nonrenewal letter must be accompanied by a copy of the material on appeals (see Faculty Appointments Policy, http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf).

The termination date is June 30 regardless of hire date. June 30 will be the final working day for these persons, with a final pay-out effective on that day for both 9-month and 12-month faculty.

A negative decision usually precludes rehiring the individual, particularly in a new RTT faculty appointment (see Faculty Appointments Policy, http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf).

4.0 Dossier  
Revised: 05/01/10  
Edited: 01/01/11
The Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank-Tenure-Reappointment ("Cover Sheet") gives administrators' recommendations with their signatures along with basic information on the faculty member's appointment and the review. It is the first page of the dossier and should be immediately visible when the folder is opened. Do not place anything on top of the "Cover Sheet."

The Dossier Checklist, found on the forms page of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html), is placed second, immediately behind the "Cover Sheet."

A single checklist is used to ensure that every dossier meets all requirements before moving to the next level of review. In four stages the candidate, the TIU-level POD, the college-level POD, and a designated staff member in the college office will use the same checklist to examine the dossier and to ascertain its accuracy and completeness. The college will serve as the final guarantor of the integrity of every dossier before it is forwarded to OAA for the completion of the review process.

In colleges without units (colleges that serve as the TIU for their faculty), the POD will fulfill the role of the TIU-level designee.

The dossier should not contain duplicative material. When in doubt, err in favor of including material only once.

Primarily responsibility of the candidate:
- Part I. Introduction—education and professional positions
- Part II. Core Dossier

Primarily responsibility of the TIU and college:
- Record of Review ("Cover Sheet")
- Dossier Checklist
- Part III. Evaluation
- Part IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction

4.1 Outline
Revised: 06/01/09
Edited: 06/01/09

Record of Review
Dossier Checklist
I. Introduction
II. Core Dossier
III. Evaluation
   A. Internal Letters of Evaluation
   B. External Letters of Evaluation
IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction
   A. Cumulative Fixed-Response Survey Data
   B. Fixed-Response Student Evaluation Data
   C. Summary of Open-Ended Student Evaluations
4.1.1 Introduction
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 06/01/09

List degrees and professional positions held, with dates for each. This list replaces the traditional CV appended in the past.

4.1.2 Core dossier
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 06/01/09

4.1.2.1 Instructions for the candidate
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 01/01/11

Number pages consecutively within the Core Dossier. The first page will be the first item in the Core Dossier Outline.

In Parts I and III place the required materials in sequence following the outline, but do not paginate them.

Include every item in the Core Dossier Outline in the dossier. If a particular item is not applicable, or there is nothing to report, write “none” for the item. Do not omit the item.

Candidates should not look at dossiers from the past (including their own) for examples of how to present material, since guidelines change and past formats may no longer be acceptable. If a candidate is unsure about the content needed for a particular item, s/he should consult his/her TIU head or chair of the committee of the eligible faculty for assistance.

Present accomplishments as succinctly as possible and in outline form to the extent possible. Some explanation is valuable but lengthy narrative and explanation may obscure important accomplishments rather than highlight them. In general these should be approximately 750 words or less except where noted. Accomplishments may only be listed once in the dossier. Candidates should consult their chair of the committee of the eligible faculty with any questions about where specific accomplishments should be included.

Avoid self-evaluation except when it is requested. Others can most appropriately offer assessment of the quality and importance of the candidate’s accomplishments.

Section IV. A. should contain only summary tables of SEI (Student Evaluation of Instruction) data or the evaluation data approved by the candidate’s college. Individual course fixed-response student evaluation reports should be placed in Section IV. B.

4.1.2.1.1 Instructions for the candidate—OSU:pro
Revised: 05/01/10
Edited: 05/01/10

RTT faculty members undergoing Fourth-Year Review and mandatory promotion and tenure review are required to use OSU:pro to generate their core dossier. (See https://pro.osu.edu to enter the system.

4.1.2.2 Time frame
Revised: 06/01/09
Edited: 01/01/11

Use date of hire or date of last promotion, whichever is most recent. Use a date earlier in your career only if it is germane to the evaluation. The candidate should consult with his/her chair of the committee of the eligible faculty to make this determination.
4.1.2.3 Organization
Revised: 06/01/09
Edited: 06/01/09

Organize all material in the Core Dossier in reverse chronological order.

4.1.2.4 Core dossier outline
Revised: 01/19/11
Edited: 01/19/11

Teaching

1) Undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses taught

List each course taught and clinical instruction (see Courses/Clinical Instruction in Forms Section), including the following information:

- courses taught by quarter (AU, WI, SP, SU) and year
- course number, title, and number of credit hours
- official final course enrollment
- percentage of course taught by candidate based on proportion of total student contact hours in course
  - brief explanation (approximately 250 words) of candidate’s role, if candidate was not solely responsible for course, including GTA supervision, course management, and team teaching
- indicate whether formal course evaluations were completed by students and/or faculty peers by placing a check mark in the appropriate column

If the candidate has not obtained student evaluations in every regular classroom course, explain why this was not done. Such evaluation is required by Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 (C) (14).

Do not include in this list extension, continuing education, or other non-credit courses.

2) Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations and undergraduate research

a) Graduate students: list completed and current and include:

i) doctoral students (dissertation advisor): For advisees who have graduated, list name of student, year of graduation, and title of dissertation. Also provide the current position of the former student, if known.

ii) master’s students plan A (thesis advisor): For advisees who have graduated, list name of student, year of graduation, and title of thesis. Also provide the current position of the former student, if known.

iii) master’s students plan B (advisor)

iv) doctoral students (dissertation committee member): Do not include service as a Graduate School representative.

v) doctoral students (candidacy examination committee chair)

vi) doctoral students (candidacy examination committee member): Do not include service as a Graduate School representative.

vii) master’s students (thesis committee member)

viii) master’s students (examination committee member)

b) Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of graduate students for whom the candidate has been the advisor of record, for example, publications during or emanating from graduate program, awards for graduate work, prestigious post-docs or first post-graduate positions.
NOTE: OSU:pro users should note these in the entry records of each individual advisee.

c) Senior honor theses: give name of student, title of thesis, quarter of graduation, and noteworthy outcomes of this mentorship such as publications, presentations, honors or student awards.

d) Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of undergraduate students, in particular related to research, for whom the candidate has been the advisor of record (publications, posters, honors or student awards).

NOTE: OSU:pro users should note these in the entry records of each individual advisee.

3) Involvement with postdoctoral scholars and researchers

List completed and current postdoctoral scholars and/or researchers under the candidate’s supervision.

4) Extension and continuing education instruction

Summarize briefly the major instructional activities (workshops, non-credit courses) which the candidate has conducted. Identify the candidate’s role in the instruction and the number of participants.

5) Curriculum development

Give specific examples of the candidate’s involvement in curriculum development (role in the design and implementation of new or revised courses); development of new teaching methods or materials (undergraduate, graduate, or professional); creation of new programs. This section may also include examples of teaching methods or materials adopted beyond Ohio State.

6) Brief description of the candidate’s approach to and goals in teaching, major accomplishments, plans for the future in teaching.

7) Evaluation of teaching

Brief description of how the candidate has used the evaluation information to improve the quality of instruction.

8) Awards and formal recognition for teaching

List awards the candidate has received for excellence in teaching. Nominations for such awards should not be listed. These awards may include citations from academic or professional units (department/school, college, university, professional associations) which have formal procedures and stated criteria for awards for outstanding teaching performance.

9) Other academic advising

Brief description of academic advising of students not included in section 2 under teaching or section 7 under service. Examples might include advising of undergraduate majors or of graduate students who are in course work.

Research

1) List of books, articles, and other published papers.

Only papers and other scholarly works that have been formally accepted without qualification for publication or presentation, or have actually been published or presented, should be listed in Items a-g below. Publication refers to both print and digital formats.

Works under review must be listed separately in Item k.
Works being drafted and not yet submitted should be discussed in the narrative section in number 3 below.

Use the standard citation style for the candidate’s discipline with authors listed exactly as they are listed on the publication. Candidates must list themselves even if they are the only author.

**NOTE:** OSU:pro gives users a choice of bibliography or author/date format. The candidate does not have the option to specify a discipline-specific format when using OSU:pro.

In cases of multiple authorship for Items 1a - 1e, a narrative description (approximately 50 words) of the candidate’s intellectual contribution is required. Examples of appropriate formats for this information include:

- I designed the experiment (which was carried out by the graduate student co-authors), and wrote the article.
- I identified the patients for the study, administered the drug regimen, reported results to the consortium and reviewed the draft manuscript.
- I completed and wrote the literature review for the paper, shared equally with the co-author in the analysis and interpretation of the data, and reviewed the complete draft manuscript.

Statements such as the following are not acceptable: "All authors contributed equally"; "50% effort." Do not refer to past dossiers for models of how to write the required description, since they occasionally include unacceptable statements such as these.

Candidates may provide the approximate percentage of their contribution in relation to the total intellectual effort involved in the work if the unit or college requires this information. This information is not required by OAA and under no circumstances is it an acceptable substitute for the required narrative description.

For Items 1f - 1j: the above information is not needed unless the unit requires it.

Include as separate categories:

a) Books (other than edited volumes) and monographs

b) Edited books

c) Chapters in edited books

d) Bulletins and technical reports

e) Peer-reviewed journal articles

f) Editor-reviewed journal articles

g) Reviews (indicate whether peer reviewed)

h) Abstracts and short entries (indicate whether peer reviewed)

i) Papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer reviewed)

j) Unpublished scholarly presentations (indicate whether peer reviewed)

k) Potential publications under review (indicate authorship, date of submission, and to what journal or publisher the work has been submitted)

2) List of creative works pertinent to the candidate’s professional focus (If the candidate has no creative works to list, write “None” for number 2. Do not list each individual letter.)

a) Artwork
b) Choreography

c) Collections

d) Compositions

e) Curated exhibits

f) Exhibited artwork

g) Inventions and patents, including disclosures, options, and commercial licenses

h) Moving image

i) Multimedia/databases/websites

j) Radio and television

k) Recitals and performances

l) Recordings

m) Other creative works

3) Brief description of the focus of the candidate’s research, scholarly or creative work, major accomplishments,
and plans for the future, including works in progress.

4) Description of quality indicators of the candidate’s research, scholarly or creative work such as citations,
publication outlet quality indicators such as acceptance rates, ranking or impact factors of journal or publisher.
Individual units should determine what kinds of information could be described here, if any.

5) Research funding

In cases of multiple authorship for Items 5a - 5b, a narrative description (of the type described above for Item 1,
approximately 50 words) of the candidate’s intellectual contribution is required. List the author or authors in
the order in which they appear on the grant proposal.

The candidate may provide the approximate percentage of his/her contribution in relation to the total intellectual
effort involved in the grant proposal if the unit or college requires this information. This information is not
required by OAA and under no circumstances is it an acceptable substitute for the required narrative
description.

a) Funded research, including contracts and clinical trials, on which the candidate is or has been the principal
investigator

  • period of funding
  • source and amount of funding
  • whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant

b) Funded research, including contracts and clinical trials, on which the candidate is or has been a co-investigator

  • period of funding
  • source and amount of funding
• whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant

c) Proposals for research funding that are pending or were submitted but not funded

• date of submission
• title of project
• authors in the order listed on the proposal
• agency to which proposal was submitted
• priority score received by proposal, if applicable

d) Funded training grants on which the candidate is or has been the equivalent of the principal investigator

• source and amount of funding
• whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant

e) Proposals for training grants that are pending or were submitted but not funded

• date of submission
• title of project
• authors in the order listed on the proposal
• agency to which proposal was submitted
• priority score received by proposal, if applicable

f) Any other funding received for the candidate’s academic work

Provide the type of information requested above as appropriate.

6) List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly or creative work. Nominations for such awards should not be listed.

Service

1) List of editorships or service as an editorial reviewer or board member for journals, university presses, or other learned publications.

2) List of offices held and other service to professional societies. List organization in which office was held or service performed. Describe nature of organization (open or elected membership, honorary).

3) List of consultation activity (industry, education, government). Give time period in which consultation was provided and other information as appropriate.

4) Clinical services. State specific clinical assignments.

5) Other professional/public community service directly related to your professional expertise, (Community service not germane to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to P&T reviews.) if not listed elsewhere.

6) Administrative service. Give dates and description of responsibility.

   a) Unit committees
   b) College or university committees
   c) Initiatives undertaken to enhance diversity in your unit, college or the university
d) Administrative positions held, e.g. graduate studies chair

e) Service as a graduate faculty representative on a dissertation in another unit or university

7) Advisor to student groups and organizations

List name of group or organization and specific responsibilities as advisor.

8) Office of Student Life committees

a) List Office of Student Life committees on which you have served.

b) Summarize participation in Student Life programs such as fireside discussions, lectures to student groups outside your unit, addresses or participation at student orientation.

**NOTE:** In OSU:pro make sure to select the button denoting that this item is “in service to Student Life” in order for it to print in the correct section of the dossier.

9) List of prizes and awards for service to your profession, the university, or your unit. Nominations for such awards should not be listed.

10) Brief elaboration that provides additional information about service activities listed above.

**4.1.3 Letters of evaluation**
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 01/01/11

Only letters solicited by the chair, chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, or other authorized persons may be considered in the review process and/or included in the dossier. See Letter 201 in the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook for a sample letter to external evaluators.

All items in this section should be placed in the order listed to ensure that necessary items are included and may be easily located during the review process.

Every item in Part III.A. should be preceded by a plain-colored page noting the item that follows.

**4.1.3.1 Internal letters of evaluation**
Revised: 05/01/10
Edited: 01/01/11

Either the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty or the TIU head must explain the unit expectations against which the candidate is being assessed. Likewise, either the chair of the regional campus faculty deliberative body or the regional campus dean must explain the regional campus expectations against which the candidate is being assessed.

1.1) Regional campus faculty deliberative body's detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.

1.2) Regional campus dean's detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.

2.1) TIU faculty deliberative body's detailed assessment, to include:

- thorough assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, regarding both strengths and weaknesses
- report of the discussion by the faculty deliberative body
• numerical vote of the full faculty deliberative body

2.2) TIU head’s (or dean in colleges without units) independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. This assessment should take into account the faculty deliberative body's recommendation. If the TIU head's assessment and/or recommendation differs from that of the faculty, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

2.3) Head of any unit in which the candidate holds a joint (split FTE) or courtesy academic appointment’s independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses.

2.4) TIU-level comments process, including any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

3.1) College P&T committee’s (in colleges with units) independent assessment including the committee's numerical vote and recommendation to the dean. If the college committee's assessment is contrary to the TIU-level assessment, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

3.2) College dean’s (in colleges with units) independent assessment and recommendation to the provost. If the dean's assessment and/or recommendation differs from any of the prior assessments or recommendations, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

3.3) College-level comments process, including any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

3.4) College P&T committee recommendations to the dean. If the college committee’s recommendation is contrary to the TIU-level assessment or the annual review letters, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

3.5) College dean’s comments on the previous year’s assessment and recommendations to the provost. If the dean's comments differ from the previous assessment or recommendations, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

4.1) Annual review letters.

OAA has required written annual evaluations of all regular faculty since 1993. If annual review letters are lacking for any of the years specified below, a written explanation is required.

For untenured candidates, include all annual review letters since year of hire.

For tenured candidates, include all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or year of hire with tenure, not to exceed the most recent five years.

4.2) Written comments on the annual reviews by untenured and tenured candidates shall be included if the candidate requests.

5) Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports). Peer review is required. The material in this section must match requirements set forth in the TIU's APT document.

4.1.3.2 Additions
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 06/01/09

Units and colleges may add to the above list any evaluations that are required in their APT documents. For example, in some TIUs that have sections or divisions, a letter from the section or division head is required by the unit.

4.1.3.3 External letters of evaluation
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 01/01/11

1) Summary sheet listing (Summary Form for External Evaluators, Form 114 found at http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html):

• name and institution of all persons from whom letters were solicited
• name of person who suggested each evaluator
• the relationship of the evaluator to the candidate (expert in the field, collaborator)

2) Persons who were asked to write, but did not, must be listed on a second summary sheet (Summary Form for Non-Responding External Evaluators, Form 115 found at http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html). Cover pages, however, should not be included for these persons.

3) A single representative example of the letters sent to the evaluators if these letters were identical. If different letters, or different sets of material for review, were sent, an example of each must be included along with an explanation of why evaluators were treated differently.

If the letter does not list the materials sent to the evaluators, provide this information separately.

4) External letters preceded by a cover page (see External Evaluator Cover Page, Form 106 found at http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html) for each letter received containing the following information:

• name, title (rank if in the academy), and institutional affiliation
• Concise summary of the person's qualifications as an evaluator of the candidate. Sufficient information must be provided to establish the credibility of the evaluator; simply to note that the evaluator is a professor at university X or does research in the candidate's area is insufficient. Do not, however, include the full CV of each evaluator when forwarding the dossiers to the OAA.
• name of person who recommended the evaluator (candidate, chair, or other [specified])
• Evaluator's relationship to the candidate (expert in the field, collaborator). This information must be accurate.

4.1.4 Student Evaluation of Instruction
Revised: 06/01/09
Edited: 06/01/09

Only in individualized teaching situations for relatively small groups, such as grand rounds or clinical teaching, may individual evaluations (one per student) be included in this section. These responses too might be summarized on a single form for each clinical teaching group, since numbers are small, but OAA has never insisted on this.

4.1.4.1 Cumulative fixed-response survey data
Revised: 05/01/10
Edited: 05/01/10

Fixed-Response Survey: For all courses in which the candidate used a type of fixed-response survey (the SEI or comparable unit form) to obtain student evaluations, provide a summary table. Complete documentation as set forth below is required.

Results for every quarter the course was taught are presented horizontally across the page in the summary table. The table should not simply list item numbers, but should clearly describe the item to which students were responding, i.e., the table should be self-explanatory to anyone who reviews it.

To obtain a Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Report that meets OAA guidelines:

• Go to http://www.buckeyelink.osu.edu/facultystaff.html for a menu of the Registrar's online services.
• Click on the “Faculty Center” link and log in using your OSU username and password. This will take you to the most recent quarter you taught.
• Click on the “Change Term” button. Select the term for which you wish a report and click “Continue”.
• Click on the “SEI Info” button that appears next to your course.
• Click on the “Generate New SEI Cumulative Report” to create your cumulative SEI summary report.
NOTE: Candidates using OSU:pro do not need to go to the Registrar’s website. Follow the instructions on the OSU:pro report page to include the Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction Report.

4.1.4.2 Fixed-response student evaluation data
Revised: 05/01/08
Edited: 06/01/09

Copies of individual course fixed-response student evaluation reports should be placed here. Item A of section IV of the dossier proper should include only the summary tables of these reports.

a) If the unit uses SEI instruments, include all individual course reports.

b) If the unit uses another type of fixed-response survey instrument, include here one page per course/quarter taught, listing:
   - actual statements to which students responded
   - full rating scale of possible responses
   - for each statement, number of students that selected each response choice

4.1.4.3 Summary of open-ended student evaluations
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 05/01/10

Open-ended (discursive) evaluation: For all courses in which the candidate used open-ended evaluation instruments (including open-ended questions on fixed-response evaluations if collected by the unit for this purpose) to collect student input, someone other than the candidate must summarize the comments on a course-by-course basis for inclusion in this section of the dossier. Candidates for promotion should provide evaluations for the most recent five years. The TIU head will assign this task to a faculty member or qualified staff member. State in the dossier the name and role (such as faculty member or staff member) of the person who wrote the summaries. OAA recommends that the candidate review these summaries prior to inclusion in the dossier.

State on each course summary the number of students in the course and the number of these who completed evaluations.

5.0 Procedures for regular clinical and regular research track faculty
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 08/01/07

Positive decisions by the dean to reappoint RCT and RRT faculty to a new contract period will be approved by OAA without review and forwarded to the BOT for final action. For each positive decision, submit to OAA one original signed "Cover Sheet" (Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment).

Do not submit reappointment letter, CV, or dossier.

A decision by the dean not to reappoint is final.

For further information on review and reappointment of RCT and RRT faculty, see Chapter 6.

5.1 Regular clinical track
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 08/01/07

RCT faculty who have not collected and maintained the documentation necessary to support a fully informed evaluation should be informed that promotion will be considered only when sufficient documentation has been accumulated.