

Volume 3 Promotion and Tenure Review

1.0 Timetable

Revised: 06/22/12

Edited: 06/22/12

All colleges are encouraged to deliver dossiers to OAA as soon as college-level review, including the comments process, is complete, regardless of due date.

The dates below are the latest time at which dossiers can be delivered for each group of colleges. When the deadline cannot be met for individual cases, please let Bobbie Houser (houser.73@osu.edu) know the status of the case and its anticipated delivery date.

Second Friday in January

Dentistry

Law

Nursing

Optometry

Pharmacy

Public Affairs

Public Health

Social Work

University Libraries

These seven colleges without units, University Libraries, and Public Affairs must submit all Fourth-Year Reviews and any annual reviews with a non-renewal recommendation by the dean by the second Friday in January in addition to their promotion & tenure (P&T) cases.

Fourth Friday in January

Arts and Sciences

Second Friday in February

Business

Education and Human Ecology

Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

Engineering

Fourth Friday in February

Medicine

Veterinary Medicine

If the deadline falls on a university holiday, the dossiers are due the following work day.

2.0 Submission to Academic Affairs

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

2.1 Positive dossiers for screening

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

For every case coming forward with all positive recommendations (or positive at all levels except the college P&T committee), the college should submit one (1) dossier for screening before making and delivering any further copies.

The 10-day comments process at the college level must be complete before college offices submit the dossier.

Please submit as early as possible and as soon as each case is completed. Doing so will significantly assist OAA in moving the review process along.

OAA prefers to screen the original dossier but if a college must submit a copy for screening, it may provide the original dossier later. At the conclusion of every promotion and tenure cycle, the original dossiers are archived.

Positive cases that pass screening do not go to the university-level committee; therefore, no additional copies are needed. If OAA determines that a screened case must go to the committee, OAA will inform the college office and request the necessary number of copies.

2.2 Cases with negative recommendation

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 03/01/12

Every case coming forward with a negative recommendation at the TIU faculty, TIU head, and/or dean level must go to the university-level committee. In these cases, OAA needs the original plus one additional hard copy of the file, along with one electronic copy of the file in PDF format, submitted on a disc or through electronic means. OAA will therefore need multiple copies: 10 + original. Please contact Bobbie Houser (houser.73@osu.edu) with any questions.

OAA will consult the P&T section (Section VII) of the TIU's approved APT Document that is posted on OAA's website at <http://oaa.osu.edu/governance.html>. Effective with the 2014 – 15 promotion and tenure review cycle, the document on this website is the APT Document of record for all cases. Individual units should retain previous versions of APT Documents for a period of 10 years.

2.3 Placement of materials

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

2.3.1 Cover sheet

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 01/01/11

Original: The original signed Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment ("cover sheet"), found on the forms page of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html>), is placed first in the original dossier. Do not place anything on top of this page. The cover sheet should be immediately visible when the dossier is opened.

Copy: A copy of the signed cover sheet is placed first in each dossier copy, when copies are required.

2.3.2 Dossier checklist

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Original: The original signed checklist is placed directly behind the Record of Review.

Copy: A copy of the checklist is placed directly behind the Record of Review in each dossier copy, when copies are required.

2.3.3 P&T section of the TIU's APT Document

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

This only applies to cases with a negative recommendation at the TIU faculty, TIU head, and/or dean level.

Original: A copy of the P&T Section (Section VII) of the TIU's APT Document is placed directly behind the Dossier Checklist.

Copy: A copy of the P&T Section of the TIU's APT Document is placed directly behind the Dossier Checklist.

2.3.4 Presentation

Revised: 08/02/12

Edited: 08/02/12

Use colored sheets of paper (not tab dividers) between the main sections of the dossier. Place each dossier, original and copies, in an individually labeled manila folder (not file jackets). Mark the original dossier to distinguish it from the copies.

On the horizontal tab edge of the manila folder, so that the information is visible when the folder is filed, type:

COLLEGE - LAST name, FIRST name - TIU - REVIEW YEAR

ASC - Mozart, Wolfgang A. - School of Music – 2012-13

Do not staple.

Do not use paper clips.

Do not bind.

Do not use 3-ring notebooks.

Print Form 109 (Record of Review) in color.

2.3.5 Report on Candidates Considered

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 01/01/11

Complete one Report on Candidates Considered for Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment, found on the forms page of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html>), for each TIU.

List all candidates within the unit on the report for that unit—one report per TIU, not one report per candidate.

Indicate for each candidate the voting recommendation (Y or N, not X) at each level of review including the regional campus review when appropriate.

This form is solely for OAA's use in managing the P&T process. You may place your college's set of the forms in a separate envelope or folder when delivering dossiers. The Report on Candidates Considered is not copied or placed inside dossiers.

In the event that dossiers are delivered in stages, the voting results on the report for each TIU should be updated with each successive delivery. However, the initial report should list the names of all faculty members under review in that unit even if some of the reviews are delayed and all voting recommendations are not yet known.

If a faculty member withdraws from a review at any stage, this report should so indicate.

2.3.6 Copies for university level committee

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Create one set of original dossiers in alphabetical order by candidate's last name.

Create 10 sets of copies, each set in alphabetical order by candidate's last name.

3.0 General considerations

Revised: 05/01/08

Edited: 08/01/07

3.1 Review schedule for mid-year hires of probationary tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty

Revised: 06/18/12

Edited: 06/18/12

All faculty hired within the same calendar year are in the same cohort for promotion and tenure reviews. For example, anyone hired in 2012 is in the 2012-13 cohort and will come up for mandatory review in 2017-18.

3.2 Public Records Act

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/10

The Ohio Public Records Act (see Volume 1, Chapter 8, Section 5.0) requires that public records be made available upon request. Documents generated for P&T reviews are public records. Candidates and others may request access to these documents and units must provide them. Evaluators may be informed that candidates have asked to view evaluation letters.

3.3 Residency status

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 01/01/11

The university will only award tenure to U.S. citizens or permanent residents (see Faculty Appointments Policy, <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>).

3.4 Academic rights and freedoms

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

In June 2005 a statement on academic freedom and intellectual diversity on American campuses was released by the American Council on Education (ACE), the major coordinating body for the nation's higher education institutions, of which The Ohio State University is a member. The ACE statement includes the following principles:

- Academic freedom and intellectual pluralism are core principles of America's higher education system.
- Government's recognition and respect for independence of colleges and universities are essential for academic excellence.
- Colleges and universities should welcome diverse beliefs and the free exchange of ideas.
- Grades and other academic decisions should be based solely on considerations that are intellectually relevant to the subject matter.
- Neither students nor faculty should be disadvantaged or evaluated on the basis of their political opinions.
- Any member of the campus community who believes s/he has been treated unfairly on academic matters must have access to a clear institutional process to address grievances.

Ohio's Inter-University Council (IUC), a statewide consortium of public universities, endorsed these principles in October 2005. It then passed a resolution recommending that all four-year public universities in Ohio communicate these principles to their campus communities.

See <http://oaa.osu.edu/rightsandresponsibilities.html> for more information.

3.5 University level review committee

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

The Provost's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee is appointed during the summer. The committee consists of nine faculty members from different colleges or Arts and Sciences divisions. Faculty members serve a three-year term with a third of the committee cycling off in a typical year. The vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources serves as the non-voting convenor of the committee.

3.5.1 Members

Revised: 09/11/13

Edited: 02/15/13

2011 – 2014

John Barnard, Pediatrics

Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Political Science

Anne B. McCoy, Chemistry

2012 – 2015

Betty Lise Anderson, Electrical and Computer Engineering

John A.E. Hubbell, Veterinary Clinical Sciences

Thomas P. Kasulis, Comparative Studies

2013 – 2016

Wendy L. Frankel, Pathology

Casey W. Hoy, Entomology

Natasha Slesnick, Human Sciences

3.5.2 Procedures

Revised: 05/01/10

Edited: 05/01/10

The Provost's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee reviews cases when

- there is concern regarding the appropriateness of lower level recommendations
- there are unclear or inconsistent recommendations from the previous levels of review
- all previous recommendations are negative

The committee deliberates on each case and votes by secret ballot upon a recommendation to the provost. The voting options are:

- Strongly recommend approval of proposed action
- Weakly recommend approval of proposed action
- Undecided
- Weakly recommend disapproval of proposed action
- Strongly recommend disapproval of proposed action

The vice provost serving as non-voting convenor of the committee prepares a written report of the committee's assessment and vote for inclusion in the dossier.

3.6 Procedures for tenure-track faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Most review procedures are covered by the APT Documents of the TIU and college.

3.6.1 Verifying residency status

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 05/01/08

In the case of a mandatory review, a faculty member who is neither a U.S. citizen nor a permanent resident may be granted "Visiting Professor" status. Visiting Professors in this category have a maximum of three years to obtain permanent resident status or their employment will be terminated.

3.6.2 Procedures Oversight Designee

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 01/01/11

TIU: The committee of the eligible faculty selects a member of the committee as Procedures Oversight Designee (POD). The POD should not be the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty.

College: The members of the college P&T committee select one of its members as POD. The POD should not be the chair of the P&T committee.

Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of review bodies must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias for all faculty members. Review bodies, not the POD, are ultimately responsible for the integrity of the review process.

A summary of duties for the POD is available at <http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>.

3.6.3 Integrity of review procedures

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 08/01/07

The POD should make reasonable efforts to assure that the review body at that level follows the written procedures governing its reviews and that its proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner. The written procedures are to be taken from the current approved TIU APT Document. As noted in section 2.3.3 above, as of the 2014 – 15 review cycle, the current approved document of record will be the one posted on the OAA website at <http://oaa.osu.edu/governance>. The POD should monitor the review process in regard to equitable treatment for women and minority candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review.

If the POD has concerns about a review, these concerns should first be brought to the attention of the person or review body generating the concerns. For example, if a dossier is not prepared correctly, the POD should ask the candidate who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not being followed by either faculty or staff, then those individuals should be promptly informed of the problem.

If concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (TIU head or dean, depending on the level of review). The administrator must look into the matter and respond in writing to the POD regarding either the actions taken or the reasons that action was judged to be unwarranted.

3.6.4 Voting procedures

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 01/01/11

Only "yes" and "no" are votes. Consistent with Robert's Rules of Order, OAA does not consider abstentions to be votes and they may not be counted in determining whether the unit's recommendation on a case will be positive or negative. Only committee of the eligible faculty members present at the meeting or participating in the meeting by discussing the case by teleconference may vote.

The POD should verify the number of members present need to constitute a quorum and the percentage of votes needed to recommend a positive decision as defined in the APT Document. OAA recommends that departments require a quorum of two-thirds for action on P&T cases (see Volume 1, Chapter 1, Section 3.1).

OAA also recommends considering both the percent of the vote and the actual count of positive and negative votes when assessing the disposition of a vote at all levels of review.

The P&T chair writes a letter to the TIU head reporting the vote and summarizing the discussion of the eligible faculty. This letter should be evaluative as well as descriptive and contextualize the vote, including any “minority opinions” as relevant.

3.6.5 Documentation

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The university requires complete documentation of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service (unless one of these is not an expectation of the position) to conduct an informed review.

TIUs should not start formal consideration of a case until the dossier and associated documentation (such as external evaluations) meet all requirements. Errors in documentation found at a later stage of review often require correcting them and restarting the review.

3.6.5.1 Non-mandatory reviews

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Do not seek external evaluations before determining the availability of all documentation required by the dossier outline along with any supplemental requirements established by the TIU and college. Examples of situations in which a promotion review must be postponed until an academic year when complete documentation is available:

- The candidate has failed to obtain or retain student evaluations for all courses taught in the past five years or since hire, if less than five years ago.
- The TIU has not conducted peer evaluation of teaching as required by the unit's APT Document.

3.6.5.2 Mandatory reviews

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 08/01/07

Although substantive missing documentation is grounds for a negative decision, mandatory reviews must proceed even when documentation is missing and unobtainable. In general, the dossier will be reviewed at all levels with only the documentation available at the start of the TIU's review process. For more on external evaluations see Section 3.7.

3.6.6 Verification of citations

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

One of the responsibilities of the POD at the TIU level is to affirm that the accuracy of all citations listed in the dossier has been verified. This verification is one of the items on the Dossier Checklist. If this responsibility is carried out by another person, that person must be clearly identified on the checklist.

3.7 External evaluations

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 09/26/11

The TIU head, chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, or equivalent individual as stated in the TIU's APT Document, is responsible for requesting the external letters of evaluation.

External evaluation letters must be submitted on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator's signature. PDFs submitted electronically are acceptable as long as they are on letterhead and signed.

Under no circumstances should candidates contact prospective or actual external evaluators regarding their case at any stage of the review process, nor should they discuss their case with any evaluator or provide additional materials to any evaluator even if the evaluator initiates the contact. Such contact compromises the integrity of the review process. Soliciting external evaluators and providing materials to them is solely the responsibility of the TIU head, chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, or equivalent individual as stated in the TIU's APT Document.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (B) (3) requires that no more than one-half of the external evaluation letters in the dossier may be from persons suggested by the candidate. OAA requires a minimum of five external evaluation letters.

In order to meet this requirement, more letters should be solicited from persons not suggested by the candidate than from persons suggested by the candidate. So as not to exhaust the pool of potential evaluators, it is also best that the number of evaluators suggested by the candidate be limited to three or four.

It is the unit's obligation to obtain the required number of evaluations and to begin the process of obtaining these letters well in advance of the review. In the event that a unit is unable to obtain the required five external evaluations, the unit must document its efforts, noting the individuals who were contacted, how they were contacted, and the dates and number of times they were contacted. The unit should notify the college and OAA as soon as it becomes apparent that it will not be able to obtain the required letters in time for the meeting of the eligible faculty. The lack of five external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding, but will halt a nonmandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, P&T chair, and the chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and will not constitute a procedural error.

All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier unless OAA approves their removal from the review process.

To best assure meaningful and credible external evaluations while meeting the above requirement, the following suggestions are offered. Units may follow other procedures, but these have proved to work very well.

- The TIU head and/or P&T committee should generate a lengthy list of prospective evaluators who are not employed at The Ohio State University. These should be distinguished faculty (or occasionally non-academics who have similar research credentials and experience) who are in a position to comment in an informed way both on the quality of the candidate's scholarly work and on its significance to the broader field in which it resides. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the scholarly work. They should generally be full professor at rank or must be at the rank above the candidate being considered unless an exception has been granted by the college (or OAA in the cases of colleges that are TIUs). They may not be former advisors, collaborators, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that could reduce objectivity. It is essential that the individual or body generating the list of prospective evaluators ascertain the relationship of those individuals with the candidate before seeking a letter of evaluation and not seek letters from persons who cannot provide an arm's-length evaluation.
- Letters from collaborators may be appropriate as a means of determining a candidate's contributions to jointly conducted work, but collaborators must not be asked to write an external evaluation. They cannot be arm's-length since they would be, in part, evaluating their own work. Collaborators can generally be identified by examining the candidate's list of publications and grants, but the best way to avoid asking a collaborator to be an external evaluator is to ask the candidate to review the full list of potential external evaluators, to identify all who have been collaborators, and to describe the nature and timing of the collaboration. A different request letter from the one sent to regular external evaluators must be sent to research collaborators.
- The candidate should be shown the list to identify any conflicts of interest or other issues that would interfere with the objectivity of the reviews, and be invited to augment it with several names of persons who meet the criteria for objective, credible, arm's-length evaluators. Unless the persons so identified do

not meet such criteria and the candidate cannot offer acceptable alternatives, the TIU should make every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from a person suggested by the candidate. OAA does not require that the dossier contain letters from persons suggested by the candidate.

- The TIU head (or dean) may choose to seek approval of the tentative list of prospective evaluators for each candidate from the dean (or OAA) to minimize the risk that the selection of evaluators will subsequently be judged inappropriate. If such approval is sought, the dean (or OAA) must be provided complete and accurate information about the prospective evaluator's credentials and relationship with the candidate.
- Approximately three months before completed evaluations are due, the person designated by the TIU to solicit external evaluations should send out letters of invitation to the prospective evaluators. The letter of invitation should state expectations, due date for receipt of the completed evaluation, and the realities of the Public Records Act (see Volume 1, Chapter 8, Section 5.0). See Letter 201 in the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook for a sample letter to external evaluators.
- Evaluators who accept the invitation should then be sent the appropriate materials. All evaluators should be sent the same materials unless there is a substantive reason for differentiating among evaluators. In a case in which evaluators are sent different materials, the TIU head or chair of the P&T committee must provide an explanation to be included in the dossier. When evaluators are sent different materials (different research papers), TIUs must take care to assure that sufficient letters are obtained regarding the different sets of papers to provide a meaningful body of evaluative information about each set.
- The likelihood of obtaining a useful letter is greatly increased when the evaluator is not only given plenty of time in which to review the materials, but when the nature of the requested letter is carefully explained. Evaluators should generally be asked only to provide a critical analysis of the candidate's scholarly work (at least partly on the basis of provided materials). Evaluators should specifically be asked not to comment on other matters such as whether the candidate should be promoted and tenured at Ohio State or would be promoted and tenured at their own institution.

3.8 Comments process and informing candidate of review outcomes

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

3.8.1 Tenure initiating unit level

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

After the letter from the TIU deliberative body to the TIU head and the letter from the TIU head to the dean are completed, the TIU head must immediately inform the candidate in writing of the following:

- nature of the recommendations by the TIU deliberative body and by the TIU head
- availability of the TIU deliberative body's letter to the TIU head and the TIU head's letter to the dean if the candidate wishes to review them
- opportunity for the candidate, for up to 10 calendar days from receipt of the written notice, to provide written comments on the above letters for inclusion in the dossier when the case is forwarded to the college. If the last day of a designated time period falls on a weekend or a day on which the university is closed, the time period shall expire at the close of business on the next succeeding business day.
- opportunity for the TIU deliberative body and the TIU head to provide written comments on the candidate's comments, also for inclusion in the dossier when the case is forwarded to the college
- outline of the remaining steps in the review process (review at the college and university levels of the recommendations originating in the TIU, and ultimately approval by the president and the BOT of positive recommendations by the provost)

It is desirable for the TIU deliberative body and/or TIU head to respond in writing to comments by the candidate alleging procedural problems that might reasonably have affected the review's outcome.

3.8.2 College level

Revised: 05/01/10

Edited: 05/01/10

After the college P&T committee completes the letter to the dean and the dean completes the letter to the provost, the dean informs the candidate and the TIU head of the completion of the college level review and of the availability of these reports. The comments process is repeated exactly as described above.

3.8.3 Use of the comments process

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 08/01/07

Candidates are advised to use this process to amend, correct, or otherwise comment on factual information or procedural matters. **Comments are not appeals but rather an opportunity to further clarify or correct the record.** Candidates should understand that the exercise of professional judgment on the part of reviewers is central to the review process.

3.8.4 University level and Board of Trustees approval

Revised: 05/01/10

Edited: 05/01/10

After the provost has made his/her decision, s/he will inform the dean who will inform the TIU head. The TIU head will inform the candidate of the provost's decision. This process of notification is repeated when the BOT takes action on promotion and tenure recommendations.

When a promotion and tenure decision is negative, the TIU head must also advise the candidate of his/her right to appeal and also of his/her final date of employment under the seven year rule (if applicable).

3.9 Reconsideration of case during review process

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

It may occasionally be appropriate, while a review is in process, for one or more parties to the review to reconsider the case. Such a re-review may be prompted either by procedural problems or by significant new information. Consultation with OAA is strongly recommended before an administrator or faculty review body initiates a reconsideration of a case.

3.9.1 Procedural error

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Significant procedural errors (those that reasonably could have affected the outcome of deliberations) should be corrected before the review continues. If a review body or unit administrator becomes convinced that such an error has occurred, that body or administrator should take necessary steps to correct the error at the level of review at which it occurred. The case should be fully reconsidered from that point on.

If internal letters of evaluation and comments letters have already been generated at that level of review and beyond, they should be saved but not included in the dossier. The new written evaluations should note that reconsideration took place because of a procedural error and state the nature of the error. The comments process must be repeated for the new internal letters of evaluation at the TIU or college level.

3.9.2 Significant new information

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 08/01/07

Generally, reviews proceed on the basis of a candidate's record at the beginning of the review process. Occasionally it may be appropriate to amend the record when significant new information about items already contained in the dossier becomes available. Examples include acceptances of or publication of works listed as in progress; funding of grants listed as submitted; or contracts or patents that have received a license or other commercial activity. An amended record must be reviewed by all parties to the review process.

If information regarding significant new information about items already contained in the dossier becomes available before a case leaves the TIU, but after the TIU eligible faculty has voted, the question of the appropriateness of reconsideration may be posed immediately. If the information becomes available after a case has left the TIU, a higher level review body may return the case to the TIU.

New information is not accepted after the dossier has been submitted to OAA. Once the dossier has been submitted to OAA, the only information that may be added is information that corrects errors in items already included in the dossier.

3.9.3 Recommended procedures

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

In either case, following review of the new information (which need not take place in a meeting), the TIU deliberative body may take a preliminary vote to determine whether to re-vote the case. This preliminary vote may take the form of a ballot asking each member of the deliberative body to indicate whether the new information might change his/her vote. If one person indicates that his/her vote might change, the TIU deliberative body shall meet to discuss the case with the new information and re-vote. The originally generated reports will then be amended to reflect the content of the reconsideration and the new vote. In this situation:

- Previously generated reports remain in the dossier.
- The comments process is repeated.
- The case then proceeds to the next level in the review process either for initial consideration or reconsideration. If that body has previously considered the case, it may also follow the two-step process described above to determine whether to re-vote the case.

3.10 Conflicts of interest and other recusals

Revised: 05/01/10

Edited: 05/01/10

3.10.1 Committee of eligible faculty and P&T committee

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 01/01/11

A faculty member is not permitted to participate in the review of a particular candidate when s/he has a conflict of interest. Such a conflict exists when there is a familial or comparable relationship with the candidate or a close professional relationship such that the faculty member stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review of a candidate. A similar concern exists when a faculty member was the candidate's dissertation advisor. It may be difficult for a faculty member to review a candidate objectively when the faculty member is co-author on a significant portion of the candidate's published work or when the faculty member is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional services.

When there is a question about potential conflicts, open discussion, and professional judgment are required in determining whether it is appropriate for the faculty member to recuse himself or herself from a particular review. Some units establish formal mechanisms for excluding persons from a review on the basis of a conflict of interest.

Members of college and university P&T committees are not permitted to participate in reviews of cases from their own TIUs or in cases in which they have any involvement at a previous level of review.

3.10.2 TIU heads and deans

Revised: 05/01/10

Edited: 07/01/13

In the event that a TIU head has a conflict of interest, is at lower rank than the candidate, is not tenured, or is otherwise unable to write the TIU head letter, the dean will select another TIU head from within the college to review the case and write the TIU head letter. In the event that the TIU head is the dean of a college without units, the provost will select another dean that is also a TIU head to review the case and write the TIU head letter.

In the event that a dean of a college with departments has a conflict of interest or is otherwise unable to perform the review, the provost will select the dean of another college with departments to review the case and write the college letter.

3.11 Reviews in restructured tenure initiating units

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 08/01/07

In restructured TIUs, for the first two years after establishment of the restructured unit (in the case of faculty to be reviewed for promotion and tenure) or for the first year (in the case of faculty to be reviewed for promotion only), **or longer if so stipulated in the restructuring agreement.** candidates are to be given the choice of being reviewed under the P&T guidelines and by the faculty of their previous unit or under the P&T guidelines and by the faculty of their new unit.

The candidate must make the choice and then acknowledge in writing that, once the review commences under the chosen means, the choice is irrevocable. Regardless of the candidate's choice, the current TIU head provides the administrative review of the case.

3.12 Withdrawals and negative decisions

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

3.12.1 Withdrawals

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

A candidate may withdraw from a review at any time.

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: 12/18/13

Edited: 02/15/13

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 May 31 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 Tenure-track, Clinical, and Research 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, must be assessed before rehiring the individual in another track or unit (see Faculty Appointments Policy, <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>).

3.12.2 Negative decisions

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

If an untenured candidate is denied tenure, s/he must be notified promptly of this decision and informed in writing that May 31 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 May 31 regardless of hire date. May 31 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 tenure-track 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: 02/15/13

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.

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—Research in View

Revised: 04/01/12

Edited: 04/01/12

Tenure-track faculty members undergoing Fourth-Year Review and mandatory promotion and tenure review are required to use Research in View to generate their core dossier. (See <https://osu.researchinview.thomsonreuters.com/> 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 P&T chair to make this determination.

4.1.2.3 Organization

Revised: 02/15/12

Edited: 02/15/12

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

4.1.2.4 Core dossier outline

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 02/15/12

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), semester (AU, SP), session or term (May and summer) 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) doctoral students (dissertation committee member): Do not include service as a Graduate School representative.
- iii) doctoral students (candidacy examination committee chair)
- iv) doctoral students (candidacy examination committee member): Do not include service as a Graduate School representative.
- v) 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.
- vi) master's students plan B (advisor)
- 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: Research in View users should note these in the Narrative Section in the form titled Noteworthy Accomplishments—Graduate Students.

- c) Senior honor theses: give name of student, title of thesis, quarter or semester 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: Research in View users should note these in the Narrative Section in the form titled Noteworthy Accomplishments—Undergraduate Students.

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: The candidate does not have the option to specify a discipline-specific format when using Research in View.

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, and the Second-Year Transformational Experience Program (STEP).

NOTE: Research in View 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: 12/18/13

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: 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: 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: 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 and minimum vote required for a positive recommendation (included in 1st paragraph of letter)
- 2.2) TIU head (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: independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses.
- 2.4) TIU-level comments process: include any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.
- 3.1) College P&T committee (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 (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: include any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.
- 4.1) Annual review letters:
- OAA has required written annual evaluations of all tenure-track, clinical, and research 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: include any comments submitted as part of an annual review if the candidate requests.
- 5) Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching: include any letters or reports generated as part of peer evaluation. The material in this section must match requirements set forth in the TIU's APT Document.

4.1.3.2 Additions

Revised: 12/18/13

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. TIUs may also solicit and obtain internal letters regarding scholarship from a list provided by the candidate of colleagues in other units at Ohio State, including other TIUs and academic centers. Such letters may be particularly helpful in the case of candidates who are engaged in significant inter- or trans-disciplinary scholarship. Candidates with significant service and/or outreach activities outside the unit may also request that the TIU solicit letters from colleagues familiar with the candidate's contributions to these activities.

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: 02/15/12

Edited: 02/15/13

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/semester 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/semester 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.

4.1.4.2 Fixed-response student evaluation data

Revised: 02/15/12

Edited: 02/15/12

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/semester 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: 08/22/11

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 to full professor 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 clinical and research faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Positive decisions by the dean to reappoint clinical and research 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 clinical and research faculty, see Chapter 6.

5.1 Clinical faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Clinical 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.

5.1.1 Levels of review

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The only promotion cases forwarded to the OAA for review on the university-level are those for which the dean recommends positively. The dean's decision is final for cases in which promotion is denied.

5.1.2 Documentation of teaching and service

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Complete documentation of teaching and service is required.

5.1.3 Documentation of research: external evaluation

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 02/15/13

External evaluations are optional for clinical faculty unless scholarship is an expectation of the position. If research is an expectation of the position but an insufficient body of work exists to justify the efforts of external evaluators to review it, the person should not be up for review.

External evaluations, when deemed necessary, must meet the criteria set forth in Section 3.7 of this volume. At least five arm's-length external evaluations of the individual's research record are normally required.

The presence of a few research papers in the dossier of a faculty member whose assignment consists solely of clinical teaching and service does not create a need for external evaluation of research. In such cases evaluators can provide little useful information. However, in some cases, depending on the TIU's requirements for promotion, external evaluation of clinical work and professional service may be appropriate.

5.2 Research faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Research 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.

5.2.1 Levels of review

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The only promotion cases forwarded to OAA for review on the university-level are those for which the dean recommends positively. The dean's decision is final for cases in which promotion is denied.

5.2.2 Documentation of teaching and service

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Normally research faculty members conduct research, but do not teach; documentation of teaching is therefore not generally expected. Documentation of service is required only if the faculty member has significant service responsibilities.

5.2.3 Documentation of research: external evaluation

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

External evaluations are required for research faculty promotion reviews since research is an expectation of the position.

External evaluations must meet the criteria set forth in Section 3.7 of this volume. At least five arm's-length external evaluations of the individual's research record are normally required.

6.0 Procedures for associated faculty

Revised: 12/18/13

Edited: 08/01/07

Associated 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 (and assisted with understanding what information is required).

6.1 Levels of review

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

A negative recommendation at any level means that the final decision is negative and the case does not go forward.

If the TIU head makes a negative recommendation, the decision is negative.

If the TIU head makes a positive recommendation and the dean makes a negative recommendation, the decision is negative.

The only promotion cases forwarded to OAA for review on the university-level are those for which the dean recommends positively. The dean's decision is final for cases in which promotion is denied.

6.2 Documentation of teaching and service

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

6.2.1 Clinical practice faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Documentation should match that required by the academic unit for clinical faculty.

6.2.2 Associated with tenure-track titles below 50% FTE and adjunct faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Documentation should match that required by the academic unit for tenure-track faculty.

6.3 Documentation of research: external evaluation

Revised: 07/24/12

Edited: 07/24/12

External evaluations are optional for associated faculty. In cases where a department or college APT Document does not specify that they be solicited, the department chair should determine whether to solicit them in consultation with the P and T chair and with the approval of the college dean. OAA recommends that external evaluations be solicited in cases where the associated faculty member's responsibilities include a significant expectation of published research or scholarship or when the eligible faculty is not able to provide a thorough peer review of the case without the expertise of faculty outside of the university. In some cases external evaluation of clinical work and professional service may be appropriate.

7.0 Approved exceptions

Revised: 3/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

OAA approved exceptions to the P&T rules, as set forth in Faculty Rules Chapter 3335-6.

7.1 College of Medicine

Revised: 3/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

The College of Medicine makes the following exceptions for tenure-track probationary faculty with substantial clinical service responsibilities:

- The maximum probationary period for assistant professors is 11 years rather than six years with mandatory review for promotion and tenure in the 11th year.
- The maximum probationary period for associate professors hired without tenure is six years rather than four with mandatory review for tenure in the final year of the probationary period approved for a particular faculty member in the letter of offer.
- Promotion to the rank of associate professor without the simultaneous award of tenure may take place subject to the existence of OAA approved criteria for this action at both the unit and college level. Faculty who are promoted without the award of tenure must be considered for tenure no later than the mandatory review date or six years following promotion, whichever comes first.

7.2 University Libraries

Revised: 3/25/04

Edited: 07/08/11

University Libraries may allow a P&T committee that is not a committee of all eligible faculty members to make recommendations to the director regarding P&T cases. In 2011, the faculty of the University Libraries voted to follow the standard OSU procedures.

7.3 University Extension in College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

Revised: 3/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

University Extension may allow a P&T committee that is not a committee of all eligible faculty members to make recommendations to the chair regarding P&T cases.