

Office of Academic Affairs

Policies and Procedures Handbook

INTRODUCTION	9
REVISIONS AND EDITS.....	9
RULES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY	9
EXAMPLES	9
MATERIAL UPDATED EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 2013	10
COMMON ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT.....	11
VOLUME 1 OPERATIONAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	13
CHAPTER 1 GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS	13
1.0 PATTERN OF ADMINISTRATION	13
1.0.1 DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS	13
1.0.2 COLLEGES.....	14
1.1 SUGGESTED OUTLINE.....	15
1.2 DEPARTMENT MISSION.....	15
1.3 ACADEMIC RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	16
1.4 FACULTY	16
1.5 ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT SERVICES AND STAFF.....	16
1.6 OVERVIEW OF DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION AND DECISION-MAKING.....	16
1.6.1 CHAIR.....	16
1.6.2 COMMITTEES	17
1.7 FACULTY MEETINGS	17
1.8 DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	17
1.8.1 SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS	18
1.9 COURSE OFFERINGS AND TEACHING SCHEDULES	18
1.10 ALLOCATION OF DEPARTMENTAL RESOURCES	18
1.11 LEAVES AND ABSENCES	18
1.12 SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION AND PAID EXTERNAL CONSULTING ACTIVITY	18
1.13 FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	19
1.14 GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES	19
2.0 APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION & TENURE DOCUMENT	19
2.0.1 REQUIREMENTS	19
2.0.2 COLLEGE APT DOCUMENTS.....	21
2.1 REQUIRED OUTLINE	21
2.2 PREAMBLE.....	22

2.3 DEPARTMENT MISSION.....	23
2.4 DEFINITIONS	23
2.4.1 COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY	23
2.4.2 PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE	24
2.4.3 QUORUM.....	24
2.4.4 RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY	24
2.5 APPOINTMENTS.....	25
2.5.1 CRITERIA	25
2.5.1.1 TENURE TRACK FACULTY	25
2.5.1.2 TENURE TRACK FACULTY AT A REGIONAL CAMPUS	25
2.5.1.3 REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY	26
2.5.1.4 REGULAR RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY.....	26
2.5.1.5 AUXILIARY FACULTY.....	26
2.5.1.6 COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR FACULTY	27
2.5.2 PROCEDURES	27
2.5.2.1 REGULAR TENURE TRACK FACULTY.....	27
2.5.2.2 REGULAR TENURE TRACK FACULTY AT A REGIONAL CAMPUS.....	27
2.5.2.3 REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY	28
2.5.2.4 REGULAR RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY.....	28
2.5.2.5 AUXILIARY FACULTY.....	28
2.5.2.6 COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR FACULTY	28
2.6 ANNUAL REVIEWS PROCEDURES	28
2.6.1 PROBATIONARY REGULAR TENURE TRACK FACULTY.....	29
2.6.1.1 PROBATIONARY REGULAR TENURE TRACK FACULTY AT A REGIONAL CAMPUS	29
2.6.1.2 FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW	29
2.6.1.3 EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD	29
2.6.2 REGULAR TENURED FACULTY	29
2.6.3 REGULAR TENURED FACULTY AT A REGIONAL CAMPUS.....	29
2.6.4 REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY	29
2.6.5 REGULAR RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY	30
2.6.6 AUXILIARY FACULTY.....	30
2.7 MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS.....	30
2.7.1 CRITERIA	30
2.7.2 PROCEDURES	30
2.7.3 DOCUMENTATION.....	30
2.8 PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	30
2.8.1 CRITERIA	30

2.8.1.1 CITIZENSHIP, COLLEGIALLY, AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICAL BEHAVIOR	31
2.8.1.2 PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE.....	31
2.8.1.3 PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITHOUT TENURE	31
2.8.1.4 PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	31
2.8.1.5 REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY	32
2.8.1.6 REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY	32
2.8.1.7 REGULAR RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY.....	32
2.8.2 PROCEDURES	32
2.8.2.1 REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY	33
2.8.2.2 NON-MANDATORY REVIEWS	33
2.8.2.4 EXTERNAL EVALUATION.....	33
2.8.2.5 MECHANICS	33
2.8.3 DOCUMENTATION.....	33
2.8.3.1 TEACHING.....	34
2.8.3.1.1 PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	34
2.8.3.1.2 STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING	34
2.8.3.2 RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP.....	35
2.8.3.3 SERVICE.....	35
2.9 APPEALS	35
3.0 SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEW	36
3.1 UPDATING OBSOLETE MATERIAL IN TIU GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS.....	36
CHAPTER 2 UNIT ADMINISTRATION.....	37
1.0 TENURE INITIATING UNIT	37
1.1 CHAIRS AND DIRECTORS (TIU HEADS).....	38
1.1.1 DEFINITIONS	38
1.2 ASSISTANT, ASSOCIATE, AND VICE CHAIRS AND DIRECTORS	39
1.3 DEPARTMENT STAFF	39
1.3.1 TEACHING COMPONENT IN UNCLASSIFIED ADMINISTRATIVE & PROFESSIONAL (A&P) STAFF POSITIONS.....	39
1.4 DEPARTMENT FACULTY	39
1.4.1 UNITS WITH AN APPROVED CLINICAL TRACK	40
1.4.2 UNITS WITH AN APPROVED RESEARCH TRACK.....	41
1.4.3 DUAL CAREER HIRING COST-SHARING FUND	41
1.4.4 EMERGENCY LOAN FUND FOR NEW FACULTY.....	42
1.4.5 DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	42
1.4.5.1 TEACHING.....	44
1.4.5.2 RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP.....	44
1.4.5.3 SERVICE.....	45

1.4.6 EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION	45
1.4.6.1 PEER EVALUATION	45
1.4.6.1.1 REQUIRED	45
1.4.6.1.2 RECOMMENDED	46
1.4.6.1.3 CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.....	46
1.4.6.1.4 COURSE MATERIALS	46
1.4.6.1.5 GUIDELINES FOR REVISING CURRENT PRACTICES	46
1.4.6.2 STUDENT EVALUATION	47
1.4.6.2.1 REQUIRED	48
1.4.6.2.2 RECOMMENDED	48
1.4.6.3 ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION	49
1.4.6.4 SELF EVALUATION	49
1.4.6.5 INTEGRATION AND INTERPRETATION	49
1.4.7 EXCLUSION FROM THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD	49
1.4.7.1 BIRTH OF A CHILD OR ADOPTION OF A CHILD UNDER AGE SIX	49
1.4.7.2 ADVERSE EVENTS	50
1.4.8 EXTENSION OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR PART-TIME FACULTY	50
1.5 COURSE SCHEDULING	51
1.6 NEW COURSES AND ABOLISHMENT OF COURSES	51
1.7 INSTRUCTION	51
1.8 GRADUATE ASSOCIATES.....	52
2.0 COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION	52
2.1 DEANS	52
2.2 ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS	53
2.2.1 ASSOCIATE DEANS	53
2.2.2 ASSISTANT DEANS	53
2.3 FACULTY TEACHING WORKLOAD	53
3.0 REGIONAL CAMPUSES	54
4.0 UNIVERSITY SENATE	54
5.0 RULES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY.....	54
5.1 BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE.....	55
5.2 CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT.....	55
6.0 FACULTY IN MEMORIAM RESOLUTIONS.....	55
7.0 MANAGING SITUATIONS THAT ARE HIGHLY CHARGED WITH EMOTION OR POTENTIALLY VIOLENT	55
CHAPTER 3 APPEALS	56
1.0 PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROBATIONARY RENEWAL APPEALS	56
1.1 ALLEGATION OF IMPROPER EVALUATION.....	57

1.2 ALLEGATION OF DISCRIMINATION	57
1.3 SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS	57
2.0 FACULTY SALARY EQUITY APPEALS PROCESS	57
2.1 ELIGIBILITY	58
2.2 PARTIES TO THE APPEAL PROCESS.....	58
2.2.1 ACADEMIC UNIT HEAD	58
2.2.2 DEAN/DEAN-DIRECTOR	58
2.2.3 COLLEGE FACULTY SALARY APPEALS COMMITTEE	59
2.2.4 REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY SALARY APPEALS COMMITTEE.....	59
2.3 TIME FRAME FOR APPEAL.....	59
2.4 COLLEGE AND REGIONAL CAMPUS SALARY APPEALS POLICIES	59
2.5 DEPARTMENT SALARY APPEALS PROCESS.....	59
2.6 APPELLANT RESPONSIBILITIES	60
2.7 ACADEMIC HEAD RESPONSIBILITIES.....	60
2.8 COLLEGE OR REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY SALARY APPEALS COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES	61
2.9 DEAN OR DEAN/DIRECTOR RESPONSIBILITIES	61
2.10 SALARY EQUITY ADJUSTMENTS PROPOSED UNDER THESE PROCEDURES	61
2.11 DECISIONS THAT CANNOT BE APPEALED	61
2.12 DECISIONS THAT CAN BE APPEALED.....	62
3.0 COMPLAINTS AGAINST REGULAR TENURE TRACK, REGULAR CLINICAL, REGULAR RESEARCH, OR AUXILIARY FACULTY MEMBERS	62
CHAPTER 4 LEGAL MATTERS	62
1.0 ETHICS LAW, OHIO	62
2.0 FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT (FERPA).....	62
3.0 IMMUNITY, INDEMNIFICATION AND REPRESENTATION	62
4.0 PERSONAL USE OF PUBLIC PROPERTY	63
5.0 PUBLIC RECORDS	63
CHAPTER 5 SOURCES OF IMPORTANT INFORMATION	64
1.0 BOARD OF TRUSTEES	64
1.1 RULES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY.....	64
1.1.1 ORGANIZATION AND CONTENTS.....	64
1.1.2 SECTIONS OF PARTICULAR INTEREST TO FACULTY	65
2.0 ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT, COMMITTEE ON AND CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT	65
3.0 ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING, UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR THE.....	65
4.0 BUSINESS AND FINANCE, OFFICE OF	66
5.0 CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER, OFFICE OF.....	66
6.0 DISABILITY SERVICES, OFFICE OF.....	66

7.0 DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION, OFFICE OF	66
7.1 AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COORDINATOR, OFFICE OF	66
7.2 COMMITMENT TO SUCCESS PROGRAM.....	66
8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY, OFFICE OF	67
9.0 HUMAN RESOURCES, OFFICE OF	67
10.0 INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING, OFFICE OF	67
11.0 REGISTRAR, OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY.....	67
12.0 RESEARCH, OFFICE OF	67
12.1 RESPONSIBLE RESEARCH PRACTICES, OFFICE OF	68
12.2 SPONSORED PROGRAMS, OFFICE OF.....	68
12.3 TECHNOLOGY COMMERCIALIZATION OFFICE	68
13.0 UNIVERSITY POLICIES WEBSITE	68
CHAPTER 6 OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION.....	68
1.0 REGIONAL CAMPUS BOARDS	68
1.1 COMPOSITION AND ADMINISTRATION.....	68
1.2 NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS	69
1.3 RESPONSIBILITIES	70
1.4 MEETINGS.....	70
1.5 CONFLICT OF INTEREST	71
1.6 OFFICERS	71
1.7 COMMITTEES	71
2.0 FACULTY FELLOW PROGRAM	72
2.1 PURPOSE.....	72
2.2 COMPENSATION	72
2.3 APPOINTMENT PROCESS	72
2.4 CAROLE A. ANDERSON FELLOW.....	72
VOLUME 3 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	73
1.0 TIMETABLE.....	73
2.0 SUBMISSION TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	73
2.1 POSITIVE DOSSIERS FOR SCREENING	73
2.2 CASES WITH NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION.....	74
2.3 PLACEMENT OF MATERIALS	74
2.3.1 COVER SHEET	74
2.3.2 DOSSIER CHECKLIST	74
2.3.3 P&T SECTION OF THE TIU’S APT DOCUMENT	74
2.3.4 PRESENTATION	75
2.3.5 REPORT ON CANDIDATES CONSIDERED	75

2.3.6 COPIES FOR UNIVERSITY LEVEL COMMITTEE.....	75
3.0 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	76
3.1 REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR MID-YEAR HIRES OF PROBATIONARY REGULAR FACULTY	76
3.2 PUBLIC RECORDS ACT	76
3.3 RESIDENCY STATUS	76
3.4 ACADEMIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS	76
3.5 UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW COMMITTEE	76
3.5.1 MEMBERS	77
3.5.2 PROCEDURES	77
3.6 PROCEDURES FOR REGULAR TENURE TRACK FACULTY	77
3.6.1 VERIFYING RESIDENCY STATUS	77
3.6.2 PROCEDURES OVERSIGHT DESIGNEE	78
3.6.3 INTEGRITY OF REVIEW PROCEDURES	78
3.6.4 VOTING PROCEDURES	78
3.6.5 DOCUMENTATION	79
3.6.5.1 NON-MANDATORY REVIEWS	79
3.6.5.2 MANDATORY REVIEWS	79
3.6.6 VERIFICATION OF CITATIONS	79
3.7 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS.....	79
3.8 COMMENTS PROCESS AND INFORMING CANDIDATE OF REVIEW OUTCOMES	81
3.8.1 TENURE INITIATING UNIT LEVEL	81
3.8.2 COLLEGE LEVEL.....	81
3.8.3 USE OF THE COMMENTS PROCESS.....	81
3.8.4 UNIVERSITY LEVEL AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES APPROVAL	81
3.9 RECONSIDERATION OF CASE DURING REVIEW PROCESS	82
3.9.1 PROCEDURAL ERROR	82
3.9.2 SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION	82
3.9.3 RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES.....	82
3.10 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND OTHER RECUSALS.....	83
3.10.1 COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY AND P&T COMMITTEE.....	83
3.10.2 TIU HEADS AND DEANS	83
3.11 REVIEWS IN RESTRUCTURED TENURE INITIATING UNITS	83
3.12 WITHDRAWALS AND NEGATIVE DECISIONS.....	84
3.12.1 WITHDRAWALS.....	84
3.12.1.1 NON-MANDATORY REVIEW	84
3.12.1.2 MANDATORY REVIEW	84
3.12.2 NEGATIVE DECISIONS	84

4.0 DOSSIER.....	85
4.1 OUTLINE.....	85
4.1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	86
4.1.2 CORE DOSSIER.....	86
4.1.2.1 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CANDIDATE.....	86
4.1.2.1.1 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CANDIDATE—RESEARCH IN VIEW.....	86
4.1.2.2 TIME FRAME.....	87
4.1.2.3 ORGANIZATION.....	87
4.1.2.4 CORE DOSSIER OUTLINE.....	87
4.1.3 LETTERS OF EVALUATION.....	92
4.1.3.1 INTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION.....	92
4.1.3.2 ADDITIONS.....	94
4.1.3.3 EXTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION.....	94
4.1.4 STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION.....	94
4.1.4.1 CUMULATIVE FIXED-RESPONSE SURVEY DATA.....	94
4.1.4.2 FIXED-RESPONSE STUDENT EVALUATION DATA.....	95
4.1.4.3 SUMMARY OF OPEN-ENDED STUDENT EVALUATIONS.....	95
5.0 PROCEDURES FOR REGULAR CLINICAL AND REGULAR RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY.....	95
5.1 REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK.....	96
5.1.1 LEVELS OF REVIEW.....	96
5.1.2 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE.....	96
5.1.3 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION.....	96
5.2 REGULAR RESEARCH TRACK.....	96
5.2.1 LEVELS OF REVIEW.....	96
5.2.2 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE.....	97
5.2.3 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION.....	97
6.0 PROCEDURES FOR AUXILIARY FACULTY.....	97
6.1 LEVELS OF REVIEW.....	97
6.2 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE.....	97
6.2.1 AUXILIARY CLINICAL FACULTY.....	97
6.2.2 AUXILIARY WITH REGULAR TITLES BELOW 50% AND ADJUNCT FACULTY.....	97
6.3 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION.....	97
7.0 APPROVED EXCEPTIONS.....	98
7.1 COLLEGE OF MEDICINE.....	98
7.2 UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES.....	98
7.3 UNIVERSITY EXTENSION IN COLLEGE OF FOOD, AGRICULTURAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES.....	98

Introduction

Revised: 05/01/08

Edited: 05/01/08

This handbook contains the faculty and academic unit procedures promulgated by the Office of Academic Affairs. It is an accompaniment to the OAA policies posted at <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>. It is updated annually or in response to a change to the Rules of the University Faculty and Bylaws of the Board of Trustees.

Revisions and edits

Each section includes the dates the last time the section was revised and edited. Edits do not represent substantive changes to that section. If, for example, a section was revised on 09/01/99, it is still current, since no revision has been needed since then.

Rules of the University Faculty

When referring the reader to specific language in the Rules of the University Faculty, this handbook will provide the web reference for the index housed on the Ohio State Board of Trustees website (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and the chapter and section numbers that will allow the reader to find the specific reference.

Examples

Examples, provided in parentheses, are exemplary only. They do not represent an exhaustive list.

Material updated effective February 2013

The handbook has been reformatted so that university-wide policies comply with the university's policy template. Doing so eliminated most of the material in Volume 2. The leftover material has been moved to Volume 1. Material on promotion and tenure remains in Volume 3.

Updated material in this version of the handbook is highlighted in yellow.

Substantive revisions occurred on the following pages.

Volume 1

14

19

25 – 26

37

46

48

54

60

64

68 – 72

Revisions to Volume 3 were either minor or only affected procedures. None of the changes affect the production of the core dossier.

Volume 3

76 – 77

84 – 85

88

Common abbreviations used in this document

APT	Appointments, promotion, and tenure	ODS	Office of Disability Services
B&F	Business and Finance, Office of	OHR	Office of Human Resources
BOT	Board of Trustees	OIA	Office of International Affairs
CAFR	Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility	ORRP	Office of Responsible Research Practices
CEF	Committee of the Eligible Faculty	OSP	Office of Sponsored Programs
CIO	Chief Information Officer	OTLC	Office of Technology Licensing and Commercialization
COAM	Committee on Academic Misconduct	P&T	Promotion and tenure
DOL	Department of Labor	POA	Pattern of Administration
EHS	Environmental Health and Safety, Office of	POD	Procedures Oversight Designee
FERPA	Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act	RCT	Regular clinical track
FPL	Faculty Professional Leave	RIV	Research in View
FTE	Full time equivalent	RRT	Regular research track
GL	General Ledger	RTT	Regular tenure track
IRP	Institutional Research and Planning, Office of	SA	Special Assignment
IUC	Inter-University Council	SEI	Student Evaluation of Instruction
LOA	Leave of Absence	TCO	Technology Commercialization, Office of
OAA	Office of Academic Affairs	TIU	Tenure initiating unit
ODI	Office of Diversity and Inclusion	UCAT	University Center for the Advancement of Teaching

Volume 1 Operational Policies and Procedures

Chapter 1 Governance Documents

1.0 Pattern of administration

Revised: 05/01/08

Edited: 02/15/13

1.0.1 Departments and Schools

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 02/15/13

Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 requires chairs of departments and directors of schools (hereafter, chairs) to develop the pattern of administration (POA) document in consultation with the faculty. It does not require formal faculty acceptance of the document, although most units provide for such a process. It is obviously very desirable for the chair and faculty to reach consensus on the document; however, the chair may have to implement **changes** without consensus.

The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) expects newly appointed or reappointed chairs to complete the consultation process outlined in the current POA and to have in place a new or reaffirmed POA that has been approved by the dean and by OAA no later than the end of the academic year in which they are appointed or reappointed. The current POA remains in effect until a new or revised one is approved by OAA. The vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources encourages chairs to submit drafts of POAs for consultation and advice. Formal submissions, however, should be submitted to OAA by college deans following review and approval.

The POA should strike a balance between assuring active and meaningful involvement of the faculty in the governance of the unit and recognizing that the chair has ultimate responsibility for the unit's administration.

A unit may develop advisory bodies to consider and make recommendations on any issue requiring a decision, from course assignments to salary recommendations, but the chair must retain responsibility for the final decision or recommendation to a higher level of administration. The chair has ultimate responsibility for allocating the unit's resources in a way that makes the most fiscal and programmatic sense and cannot delegate that responsibility.

Do not include in the POA content that overlaps material required in the department's Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document. Redundant content in the POA and the APT document serves no real purpose and often results in inconsistencies.

Refer to and be consistent with the Rules of the University Faculty. It is inadvisable to quote rules extensively, however, since such passages will not reflect later revisions. In place of quoted material, provide the address of the web site of the Board of Trustees (BOT), Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and the rule number. If quoting from the rules is deemed essential, please clearly demarcate the quotation (indent or italicize).

Date the first page of the POA, include a table of contents, and paginate the document. In order to promote consistency across the university, follow the university's editorial style guide found at www.osu.edu/resources/styleguide.php. OAA encourages units to make their POA available on their websites and maintains a digital collection of governance documents on its own website.

OAA offers a suggested (not required) outline for a POA in response to chairs' requests for assistance of this kind prior to beginning work on their own pattern. The outline covers topics appropriate for most units but may not fit the needs of all, given the diversity of unit missions, structures, and cultures.

In addition, there is a prototype POA found in the section on prototype documents. To the extent possible, the prototype provides actual content and language that could be adopted in its present form, or modified to better suit

the particular needs of a unit. The suggested content and language are based on university rules and policies as well as on common practices that work well for many units. Chairs are strongly encouraged to follow the prototype POA.

Sections of italicized text in the prototype document are notes and comments; they should not appear in a department's POA. Highlight deviations from and additions to this prototype document when submitting the draft document to OAA for approval. Also highlight changes to the current POA.

Please note that material required in the APT document (see Section 2.0 of this chapter) is not included in the POA outline. For ease of use maintain these as separate documents.

Formal department policies and guidelines not included in the POA must also be submitted as appendices for college and OAA review when the POA is submitted for review and approval. Refer to the university's guidelines on policies (www.hr.osu.edu/policies/about.php) when considering implementing a policy not already covered in the OAA Handbook.

1.0.2 Colleges

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

Faculty Rule 3335-3-29 requires college deans to develop the pattern of administration (POA) document in consultation with the faculty. The rule requires newly appointed or reappointed deans to complete the consultation process outlined in the current POA and to put in place a new or reaffirmed POA.

OAA requires that deans submit a new or reaffirmed POA no later than the end of the academic year in which they are appointed or reappointed. The current POA remains in effect until a new or revised one is approved by OAA.

Colleges must include at a minimum an introductory statement, and sections on the college mission; types of faculty appointments and their respective governance rights; organization of college services and staff; overview of college administration; description of college faculty governance structure; policies governing faculty responsibilities and teaching assignments; policies governing allocation of college resources; grievance procedures; and a statement recognizing in principle the presumption favoring faculty rule on those matters in which faculty have primary responsibility, including: curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status (appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty), and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

Colleges must have two committees that are not required at the department level. One is a college investigations committee, per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, and the other is a salary appeals committee (see Chapter 3). Because business for these committees is rare, these functions may be assigned to another standing committee or the POA may establish procedures for appointing them should the need arise.

Examples of committees found in colleges across the university include committees on budget, curriculum, diversity, faculty development, graduate education, honors and scholars, library, personnel, research, technology, and undergraduate education. Most colleges have an executive committee. Many colleges have faculty advisory committees, staff advisory committees, and graduate student and undergraduate student advisory committees.

The BOT requires that every college and department have formal criteria and procedures for reviewing the merits of proposals for faculty professional leave submitted from faculty within their units.

Colleges that wish to establish college centers must include a template for proposals to establish centers and procedures for their periodic review (no less than every five years). See Faculty Rule 3335-3-36 and the OAA Academic Organization and Curriculum Manual for guidelines on establishing a college center. New centers will not be approved until this section of the POA has been approved by OAA.

Colleges that wish to establish college distinguished professors must include criteria for review and procedures for awarding such distinctions. See the Faculty Appointments Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>.)

Colleges are encouraged to provide guidelines on parental modification of duties to assist department chairs in making flexible arrangements for regular faculty seeking accommodation for childbirth/adoption.

Formal college policies not included in the POA must also be submitted as appendices for OAA review when the POA is submitted for review and approval. Refer to the university's guidelines on policies (www.hr.osu.edu/policies/about.php) when considering implementing a policy not already covered in the OAA Handbook.

1.1 Suggested outline

Revised: 06/22/12

Edited: 06/22/12

This outline uses “department” as the example.

Pattern of Administration for the Department of XXX

- I. Introduction
- II. Department Mission
- III. Academic Rights and Responsibilities
- IV. Faculty
 - A. Distinguished Professor (colleges only)
- V. Organization of Department Services and Staff
- VI. Overview of Departmental Administration and Decision-Making
- VII. Department Administration
 - A. Chair
 - B. Committees
 - C. Centers (colleges only)
- VIII. Faculty Meetings
- IX. Distribution of Faculty Duties and Responsibilities
 - A. Regular Tenure Track Faculty
 - i. Special Assignments
 - B. Regular Clinical Track Faculty
 - C. Regular Research Track Faculty
 - D. Auxiliary Faculty
 - E. Parental Modification of Duties
- X. Course Offerings and Teaching Schedules
- XI. Allocation of Department Resources
- XII. Leaves and Absences
 - A. Discretionary Absence
 - B. Absence for Medical Reason
 - C. Unpaid Leave of Absence
 - D. Faculty Professional Leave
- XIII. Supplemental Compensation and Paid External Consulting Activity
- XIV. Financial Conflicts of Interest
- XV. Grievance Procedures
 - A. Salary Grievance
 - B. Faculty Misconduct
 - C. Faculty Promotion and Tenure Appeals
 - D. Sexual Harassment
 - E. Student Complaints
 - F. Code of Student Conduct
 - G. Professional Student Honor Code

1.2 Department mission

Revised: 05/01/08

Edited: 05/01/08

Include the department's academic mission. This statement must also appear in the department's APT document. This is the only example of duplicated material in the two documents; the language must be identical in both.

1.3 Academic rights and responsibilities

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 07/08/11

Include the link to the university's reaffirmation of academic rights and responsibilities, <http://oaa.osu.edu/rightsandresponsibilities.html>.

1.4 Faculty

Revised: 08/04/09

Edited: 01/01/11

Describe who is considered a faculty member in the department for voting purposes and for purposes of consultation (if the two are different). Only regular faculty may have voting rights, but departments differ in how they handle joint appointments (both salaried and non-salaried). Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU (see Faculty Appointments Policy, <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>). This section could also describe who is considered a member of the graduate faculty if this information is not contained in a separate graduate handbook.

Departments with a regular clinical track (RCT) should define clinical faculty and should address what titles they will be given, what governance rights will be extended to clinical faculty, and what appointment cap is in effect. RCT faculty may not participate in or vote on tenure track P&T decisions.

Departments with a regular research track (RRT) should define research faculty and should address what titles they will be given and what appointment cap is in effect. RRT faculty may not participate in or vote on tenure track or clinical track P&T decisions.

1.5 Organization of department services and staff

Revised: 08/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

OAA recommends a description of department offices and staff and their functions in larger ones with many support personnel. This section may not be necessary in small units.

1.6 Overview of departmental administration and decision-making

Revised: 08/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

Include a statement on how department policy and program decisions are made.

1.6.1 Chair

Revised: 05/01/08

Edited: 06/22/12

Quote Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 (C) on responsibilities of the chair. State clearly those matters for which the chair has final authority. This is the only section where direct quotation of material available online is encouraged.

If the department has other administrative positions such vice, associate, or assistant chairs, describe these positions in this section.

1.6.2 Committees

Revised: 01/01/11

Edited: 02/15/13

Departments should seek a committee structure that assures that the time faculty members spend in committee work is time well spent. There is no model that fits all, or even most, units. Considerations include the number of faculty in the unit (the fewer the faculty the greater the importance of a highly efficient committee structure), the complexity of the unit's programs, and the unit culture.

Faculty time is a limited commodity and should not be consumed with administrative tasks that could be accomplished reasonably in other ways. The number of committees, their size, and their intensity of effort should be consistent with the size of the department (fewer faculty, fewer and smaller committees) and handled with good judgment regarding faculty input on the various types of business to be conducted.

Describe the unit's standing committee structure including the responsibilities of each committee, who the members are and how they are selected. State under what circumstances ad hoc committees will be formed and how they will be formed.

Units are strongly advised to have a committee that can review grievances.

An increasing number of larger departments have an executive committee or faculty advisory committee, the purpose of which is to provide an efficient source of advice and consultation to the chair on a broad array of matters. Effective use of such a committee can reduce the need for single function standing committees. Members may serve by virtue of position (associate chair or graduate studies chair), by appointment, by election, or a combination of these.

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (B)(1), departments are required to have a committee of the eligible faculty, which votes on personnel matters. Most departments have a standing committee that focuses on undergraduate curriculum and related matters, a standing committee that focuses on graduate curriculum and related matters, and a standing committee that provides administrative service for P&T reviews. All other standing committees are specific to department needs. The chair typically appoints members to standing committees—in part to assure a fair distribution of service effort among faculty and in part to assure appropriate membership in terms of expertise, diversity, and other considerations.

Examples of other department committees used across the university include committees on awards, curriculum, diversity, graduate admissions and recruitment, graduate studies, honors, salary, space, subfields, technology, and undergraduate studies.

Many functions occur irregularly and may be carried out by ad hoc committees. These include faculty searches and periodic curriculum review. The chair typically appoints members to ad hoc committees.

The chair is an *ex officio* member of every committee, non-voting on the committee of eligible faculty.

1.7 Faculty meetings

Revised: 08/04/09

Edited: 06/22/12

Cover how faculty meetings are scheduled, how faculty members are informed of meetings and how meeting agendas are established. Include what constitutes a quorum and what vote is required to approve those matters on which a vote is taken (Sections 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 in this chapter contains guidance on quorum, voting, and abstentions). Note that Faculty Rule 3335-5-18 requires that faculty meet at least once each semester of the academic year.

1.8 Distribution of faculty duties and responsibilities

Revised: 06/22/12

Edited: 06/22/12

OAA requires that every college, school, department, and regional campus have guidelines on the distribution of faculty duties and responsibilities. For colleges with departments, the college guidelines should establish minimum expectations for all of its units. See Chapter 2, Section 1.4.2 for additional information on unit policies on the distribution of faculty duties and responsibilities.

This section should include guidelines for regular tenure track, regular clinical track, regular research track, and auxiliary faculty.

Include department expectations regarding faculty office hours.

1.8.1 Special assignments

Revised: 01/01/11

Edited: 06/22/12

Describe any department guidelines that supplement college guidelines and university policy with regard to Special Assignments (SAs). See <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/specialassignment.pdf>.

1.9 Course offerings and teaching schedules

Revised: 08/26/04

Edited: 08/01/10

Describe how the unit's course offering schedule (see Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 1.5) and faculty teaching schedule is developed (see Chapter 2, Section 1.4.2 of this volume). The POA also should refer the reader to the OAA Handbook at <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>.

1.10 Allocation of departmental resources

Revised: 08/26/04

Edited: 06/22/12

Describe any department guidelines with respect to travel funds, space assignments, and other resources other than merit salary increases, which are discussed in the APT Document.

1.11 Leaves and absences

Revised: 05/01/08

Edited: 06/22/12

Describe any department guidelines that supplement college guidelines and university policies with regard to how leaves are considered and approved, and how absences from duty are handled:

- Faculty Professional Leave (FPL), <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyprofessionalleave.pdf>
- Unpaid Leave of Absence (LOA), <http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy645.pdf>
- Entrepreneurial Leave of Absence, <http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy645.pdf>

If the department has no supplemental guidelines, this section must at least list each topic and direct the reader to the appropriate university policy or Faculty Rule.

The BOT requires that every college and department have formal criteria for reviewing the merits of proposals, including procedures for peer review, for faculty professional leave submitted from faculty within their units.

1.12 Supplemental compensation and paid external consulting activity

Revised: 08/26/04

Edited: 02/15/13

Describe any department guidelines that supplement college guidelines and university policies with respect to the circumstances under which supplemental compensation for university work will be considered and external professional service activities will be approved.

University policies represent upper limits on what is possible and individual departments are encouraged to consider whether **lower limits** are appropriate to their circumstances.

If the department has no supplemental guidelines, this section must at least list each topic and direct the reader to the Faculty Compensation Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultycompensation.pdf>) and the Faculty Paid External Consulting Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/paidexternalconsulting.pdf>).

1.13 Financial conflicts of interest

Revised: 08/26/04

Edited: 06/22/12

Describe any department guidelines that supplement college guidelines and university policies with respect to reporting and managing potential financial conflicts of interest.

If the unit has no supplemental guidelines, this section must at least list each topic and direct the reader to the Faculty Financial Conflict of Interest Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/financialconflictinterest.pdf>).

1.14 Grievance procedures

Revised: 01/01/11

Edited: 07/08/11

Describe the department's mechanism for reviewing faculty, staff, and student grievances. This includes salary grievance procedures. If the department does not have such mechanisms, it should establish them. This section should include references, including web addresses to:

- OHR Policy 1.10, Nondiscrimination policy (www.hr.osu.edu/policy/index.aspx)
- OHR Policy 1.15, Sexual harassment policy (www.hr.osu.edu/policy/index.aspx)
- anonymous reporting line (https://secure.ethicspoint.com/domain/en/report_custom.asp?clientid=7689)
- hearing procedures for complaints against faculty, Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>)
- Code of Student Conduct (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>)
- Professional student honor code (if applicable)

Tenure appeals procedures should be covered in the department's APT document.

2.0 Appointments, Promotion & Tenure Document

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

2.0.1 Requirements

Revised: 07/08/11

Edited: 07/08/11

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 require that every TIU have an APT document describing the criteria and procedures for making recommendations regarding the appointment, advancement, and reward of faculty.

OAA expects newly appointed or reappointed TIU heads to complete the consultation process outlined in the current POA and to have in place a new or reaffirmed APT document that has been approved by OAA no later than the end

of the academic year in which they were appointed or reappointed. The current APT document remains in effect until a new or reaffirmed one is approved by OAA.

This document is crucial to establishing and upholding the quality of the unit's academic endeavors. Development or revision of the document provides an opportunity for the TIU to consider:

- its mission in the context of college and university missions
- the quality of its programs and its standing among comparable units in peer institutions
- how the mission and program quality affect faculty appointments, advancement, and reward

The document should communicate department goals in a way that is clear both within and beyond the department and should state explicitly the qualities sought by the department in new faculty and the expectations held for appointed faculty.

The unit APT document must:

- be reviewed and either reaffirmed or revised during the first year of a TIU head's appointment or reappointment
- be approved by the dean and OAA. The vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources encourages chairs to submit drafts of APT documents for consultation and advice. Formal submissions, however, should be submitted to OAA by college deans following review and approval.
- follow the required outline exactly

Because a common format is needed to facilitate reference to APT documents by P&T reviewing bodies, follow the required outline exactly as presented. Units do not have the option of modifying this outline.

Refer to and be consistent with the Rules of the University Faculty. It is inadvisable to quote rules extensively, however, since such passages will not reflect later revisions. In place of quoted material, provide the address of the web site of the BOT, Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and the rule number. If quoting from the rules is deemed essential, please clearly demarcate the quotation (indent or italicize).

Include current references to all university titles, rules, policies, offices and entities. All such references must be checked during the required governance document review in the first year of a TIU head's appointment or reappointment. See Section 3.0 of this chapter on updating obsolete material in TIU governance documents for a summary of commonly found obsolete references that must be corrected before the document is submitted for review.

Date the first page, include a table of contents, and paginate the APT document. In order to promote consistency across the university, follow the university's editorial style guide at www.osu.edu/resources/styleguide.php. OAA encourages units to make their APT documents available on their websites and maintains a digital collection of governance documents on its own website (<http://oaa.osu.edu/governance.html>). Note that the officially approved version of the document is the one posted on the OAA website. TIU heads should be diligent in seeking college and OAA approval when making changes to their APT document.

A prototype APT document can be found in the section on prototype documents. To the extent possible, the prototype provides actual content and language that could be adopted in its present form, or modified to better suit the particular needs of a unit. The suggested content and language are based on university rules and policies as well as on common practices that work well for many units. While OAA encourages TIU heads to follow the prototype APT document whenever possible, OAA acknowledges that wholesale adoption of the prototype is inconsistent with each unit's need for a thoughtfully crafted and clear document that is specific to its discipline and supports its unique mission.

Sections of italicized text in the prototype document are notes and comments; they should not appear in a department's APT document. Highlight deviations from and additions to this prototype document when submitting the draft document to OAA for approval. Also highlight changes to the current APT document.

2.0.2 College APT documents

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 requires each college to have an APT document.

OAA expects newly appointed or reappointed deans to complete the consultation process outlined in the current POA and to have in place a new or reaffirmed APT document that has been approved by OAA no later than the end of the academic year in which they were appointed or reappointed. The current APT document remains in effect until a new or reaffirmed one is approved by OAA.

College APT documents should describe, in qualitative terms, the college's criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure within the context of the college's mission. The document should also describe the college's procedures for conducting college level reviews for P&T.

2.1 Required outline

Revised: 01/01/11

Edited: 01/01/11

This outline uses "department" as the example. Only include sections on faculty at a regional campus if your unit has regional campus faculty members. Only include sections on RCT and RRT faculty if your unit has an approved track.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for the Department of XXX

- I. Preamble
- II. Department Mission
- III. Definitions
 - A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty
 1. Regular tenure track faculty
 2. Regular clinical track faculty
 3. Regular research track faculty
 4. Conflict of interest
 5. Minimum composition
 - B. Promotion and Tenure Committee
 - C. Quorum
 - D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty
 1. Appointment
 2. Reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal
- IV. Appointments
 - A. Criteria
 1. Regular tenure track faculty
 2. Regular tenure track faculty at regional campus
 3. Regular clinical track faculty
 4. Regular research track faculty
 5. Auxiliary faculty
 6. Courtesy appointments for regular faculty
 - B. Procedures

1. Regular tenure track faculty
 2. Regular tenure track faculty at a regional campus
 3. Regular clinical track faculty
 4. Regular research track faculty
 5. Auxiliary faculty
 6. Courtesy appointments for regular faculty
- V. Annual Review Procedures
- A. Probationary tenure track faculty
 1. Faculty at a regional campus
 2. Fourth-Year Review
 3. Exclusion of time from probationary period
 - B. Tenured faculty
 - C. Tenured faculty at a regional campus
 - D. Regular clinical faculty
 - E. Regular research track faculty
- VI. Merit salary increases and other rewards
- A. Criteria
 - B. Procedures
 - C. Documentation
- VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion reviews
- A. Criteria
 1. Promotion to associate professor with tenure
 2. Promotion to associate professor without tenure (Medicine only)
 3. Promotion to professor
 4. Faculty at a regional campus
 5. Promotion of regular clinical track faculty
 6. Promotion of regular research track faculty
 - B. Procedures
 1. Regular tenure track faculty
 2. Regular tenure track faculty at a regional campus
 3. Regular clinical track faculty
 4. Regular research track faculty
 5. Auxiliary faculty
 6. Courtesy appointments
 - C. Documentation
 1. Teaching
 2. Scholarship
 3. Service
- VIII. Appeals
- IX. Seventh-Year Review
- X. Appendices

2.2 Preamble

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

Explain the document's purpose and its relationship to other documents that contain P&T policies and procedures.

2.3 Department mission

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

The unit's academic mission statement should:

- identify the audiences of the unit's teaching, research, and service
- explain how these audiences affect the nature of its teaching, research and service
- establish the relative importance of the various kinds of faculty effort in the context of the mission

As part of its mission the unit should set the goal of increasing the quality of its endeavors. In addition, the unit should assure that its policy on faculty duties and responsibilities (see Chapter 2, Section 1.4.1 of this volume) included in its POA is consistent with its mission and its criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure and for merit salary increases and other rewards.

2.4 Definitions

Revised: 08/20/10

Edited: 08/20/10

2.4.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty

Revised: 08/20/10

Edited: 02/15/13

Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (B)(1) states that “with the exception noted below, eligible faculty are tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate excluding the tenure initiating unit chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president. For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors excluding the tenure initiating unit chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.”

OAA interprets the definition of eligible faculty found in faculty rule (3335-6-04 (B)(1)) to mean faculty members who are tenured in the department in which tenure is being considered. A tenured faculty member who holds a joint appointment is only a member of the eligible faculty in the department where his/her tenure resides. OAA encourages units with large numbers of joint appointments to consider an alternate method for seeking input on P&T decisions from regular faculty who are appointed into but not tenured in the unit.

Regular clinical track faculty may not participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of regular tenure track faculty (see Faculty Rule 3335-7-04(A)).

Regular research track faculty may not participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of regular tenure track faculty or regular clinical track faculty (See Faculty Rule 3335-7-37).

For faculty recommendations on initial appointment, the committee of the eligible faculty includes assistant professors. A second vote is taken when an appointment at senior rank of the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

Members of the eligible faculty with a conflict of interest must recuse themselves from the review process. At a minimum, faculty with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate must not participate in a review of that candidate. In addition, a close professional relationship may give rise to a conflict of interest, such as when a faculty member is co-author on a significant portion of the candidate's publications, has served as the candidate's dissertation advisor, or is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional activities.

OAA **requires** that there be a minimum of three faculty members involved in any P&T vote. In the event the TIU does not have three eligible faculty members who can undertake the review, the TIU head, after consulting the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college. In smaller units, the TIU head may appoint faculty from another TIU within the college on an ad-hoc basis to provide the minimum required in, for example, a promotion vote to full professor. In such instances, the individual from outside the department should not serve as chair of or POD for the committee of the eligible faculty. A quorum must be based on the number of eligible faculty on-duty in a given semester.

To permit faculty who did not attend the discussion of a particular case to vote on that case is inconsistent with the requirement that such a discussion be held. The presumption is that the meeting to discuss a case is important to deciding the matter. Faculty members who are not present cannot vote *in absentia* unless they participate by conference call or video link.

2.4.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee

Revised: 08/20/10

Edited: 01/01/11

Units may choose to have a Promotion and Tenure Committee (a subset of the committee of the eligible faculty) that assists the committee of the eligible faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues of the unit.

The TIU head appoints a chair to this committee who may also chair the committee of the eligible faculty.

A P&T committee does not vote on or otherwise make recommendations on cases.

2.4.3 Quorum

Revised: 08/20/10

Edited: 01/01/11

Often there is confusion surrounding quorum, voting, and abstentions. This section has definitions and examples to clarify various ways to approach decision making through a vote.

Quorum is the required number of members present at a meeting for official action to occur. This includes taking a vote. Quorum can vary depending on the size and nature of the body. Most bodies require a majority present to conduct business. Others require a super-majority, typically two-thirds, while others require less than a majority such as 20% or 25%. OAA recommends that TIUs require a quorum of two-thirds in order for a vote to be valid.

OAA strongly urges units to give thorough consideration to the size and needs of the unit when determining both the quorum needed to hold a meeting of the committee of the eligible faculty and the majority needed for a positive recommendation.

2.4.4 Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

Revised: 08/20/10

Edited: 02/15/13

This section states the required vote in order for there to be a positive recommendation from the committee of the eligible faculty.

A vote is defined as a "yes" or "no" vote—abstentions are not votes, according to Robert's Rules of Order.

An abstention indicates that an individual does not wish to go on the record with a position. As such abstentions are not counted. When calling for a voice vote, the chair should not call for abstentions since this would force the individual to go on record. In paper balloting, a blank ballot, a ballot with "abstain" written on it, and a ballot that is not returned are all the same. Only votes that are cast (aye/nay, yes/no, for/against) are counted.

In accordance with Robert's Rules OAA endorses a couple options for establishing the majority required for approving a P&T action.

Majority: Approval requires at least more than half of the votes cast to vote in the affirmative.

Two-thirds majority: Approval requires at least two-thirds of the votes cast to vote in the affirmative.

Here are examples based on a membership of 100, only a quorum in attendance, and five abstentions. The table indicates the fewest number of votes needed for approving a motion.

Quorum	25%	Majority	2/3
# to attain quorum	25	51	67
Majority	11	24	32
2/3 Vote	14	31	42

Units may have different voting requirement for new hires and for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal, unless a college APT Document has specified college-wide requirements. This distinction must be clearly spelled out in this section of the APT document.

OAA 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.

2.5 Appointments

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

2.5.1 Criteria

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

See the Policy on Faculty Appointments (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>) for the definition and uses of faculty titles.

2.5.1.1 Tenure track faculty

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

This section should establish criteria for appointment at the rank of instructor and assistant professor. Tenure track appointments generally should be at the assistant professor level or higher. Appointments as instructor should be reserved for faculty who are in the process of completing required credentialing but otherwise fit the criteria for assistant professor. Any specific information regarding instructors should be included. Promotion occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. Criteria for appointment at higher ranks should be consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks established in this APT document.

The unit is encouraged to commit itself to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the unit. Refer to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 regarding criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure, and to Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 regarding probationary service and duration of appointments for regular tenure track (RTT) faculty.

2.5.1.2 Tenure track faculty at a regional campus

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

Criteria for appointment at each rank should reflect the greater relative importance of teaching on the regional campus compared to research.

2.5.1.3 Regular clinical track faculty

Revised: 07/08/11

Edited: 07/08/11

This section and all subsequent sections pertaining to RCT faculty are relevant only to academic units authorized to make such appointments (see Faculty Rule 3335-7).

This section should establish criteria for appointment at the rank of instructor and assistant professor. Criteria for appointment at the rank of instructor on the RCT should follow the same principles guiding the same rank on the RTT. Criteria for appointment at higher ranks should be consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks established in this APT document.

The suggested appointment criteria included in the prototype document are somewhat generic since the nature of RCT appointments varies according to the mission of the unit. The unit should strive for an equivalent or greater level of detail in adapting the suggested content to its particular needs. For each rank, the document should spell out the required practice criteria, such as:

- required licensure/certification
- teaching experience related to the teaching areas to be assigned
- meeting the promotion criteria to each rank

2.5.1.4 Regular research track faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

This section and all subsequent sections pertaining to RRT faculty are relevant only to academic units authorized to make such appointments (see Faculty Rule 3335-7).

This section should establish criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Criteria for appointment at higher ranks should be consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks established in this APT document.

2.5.1.5 Auxiliary faculty

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

This section should establish criteria for appointment and reappointment of compensated and uncompensated auxiliary faculty, with criteria for appointment at each rank comparable to the criteria for the RTT or RCT ranks. These criteria will also serve as a basis for evaluating the promotions of auxiliary faculty member. Auxiliary appointments may be made for a period of up to three years and require a formal renewal at the end of the contract period if they are to be continued. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed for only three consecutive years.

Definitions and policies for auxiliary faculty can be found in Faculty Rule 3335-5-19.

Promotion procedures for auxiliary faculty can be found in Volume 3, on guidelines, procedures and dossier outline.

The types of auxiliary appointments are as follows (also see <http://oaa.osu.edu/documents/FacultyRankTitleCode.pdf> for a chart on types of faculty appointments):

- clinical titles (compensated or uncompensated)—providers of clinical teaching and patient care in the health sciences
 - clinical instructor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, clinical professor
- regular titles 1-49% (compensated)
 - instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor

- regular titles 0% (uncompensated)
 - instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor
- visiting titles (compensated or uncompensated)—temporary faculty and persons on leave from other academic institutions
 - visiting instructor, visiting assistant professor, visiting associate professor, visiting professor
- adjunct titles (compensated and uncompensated)
 - adjunct instructor, adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, adjunct professor
- lecturer and senior lecturer (compensated)

Uncompensated auxiliary appointments are appropriate only for individuals who provide substantial service to the academic mission of the appointing unit. Units should establish guidelines for the circumstances in which such auxiliary faculty may identify themselves as Ohio State faculty. Abuses of auxiliary faculty titles can occur.

2.5.1.6 Courtesy appointments for regular faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

This section should establish criteria for making and continuing courtesy appointments.

Courtesy appointments are warranted only if they are accompanied by substantial involvement in the academic work of the department. Criteria should include the expectations for such involvement. Unlike auxiliary appointments, courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal, but continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing involvement.

2.5.2 Procedures

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

2.5.2.1 Regular tenure track faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

OAA requires a national search to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. Requests for exceptions to this policy must be submitted to OAA. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with university policies as set forth in the OHR Guide to Effective Searches (<http://hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>).

Appointments at senior rank require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

Appointments at junior rank with prior service credit require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

The required documentation for appointments at senior rank and junior appointments with prior service credit can be found in the Policy on Faculty Appointments (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyrecruitment.pdf>).

2.5.2.2 Regular tenure track faculty at a regional campus

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 05/01/08

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a faculty search, but it should consult with, and reach agreement on, the description with the chair of the department that will serve as the TIU for the appointee. The search committee for the position should include representation from both the regional campus and the prospective TIU.

Candidates should be interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean/director, the TIU head, and either the search committee or broader representation of both faculties. A hiring decision requires agreement on the part of the TIU head and regional campus dean/director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement, and the letter of offer must be signed both by the TIU head and the regional campus dean.

2.5.2.3 Regular clinical track faculty

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 06/15/10

If the unit is authorized to have RCT faculty, this section should establish the procedures for appointment of such faculty.

OAA requires a national search to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. Requests for exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college.

Appointments at senior rank require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

2.5.2.4 Regular research track faculty

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 06/15/10

If the unit has voted to have RRT faculty, this section should establish the procedures for appointment of such faculty.

OAA requires a national search to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. Requests for exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college.

Appointments at senior rank require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

2.5.2.5 Auxiliary faculty

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 06/15/10

Describe how the decision is made to initiate or not to renew an auxiliary appointment.

Initial appointments at senior rank require prior approval by the college dean and OAA.

2.5.2.6 Courtesy appointments for regular faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

State how the decision is made to initiate and terminate a courtesy appointment for a faculty member from another TIU.

2.6 Annual reviews procedures

Revised: 08/04/09

Edited: 08/04/09

Explain the procedures for the annual review of each category of faculty found in the department. Every faculty member must have an annual performance review that includes a scheduled opportunity to hold a face-to-face meeting with the chair or the chair's designee.

The means for carrying out the review will vary according to the APT document and the traditions of the various fields within the unit.

2.6.1 Probationary regular tenure track faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

Refer to Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 on probationary service and duration of appointments for RTT faculty. The procedures for faculty participation in the annual review of probationary tenure track faculty should be described in this section, including provision for handling differing assessments by the unit faculty and the chair. Such differences should be resolved so that conflicting advice is not offered to a probationary faculty member.

A nonrenewal recommendation during the first-, second-, third- or fifth-year review must result from application of Fourth-Year Review procedures.

See the Policy on Faculty Annual Review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>) for OAA guidelines on the annual review process of probationary tenure track faculty.

2.6.1.1 Probationary regular tenure track faculty at a regional campus

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

See the Policy on Faculty Annual Review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>) for OAA guidelines on the annual review process of probationary tenure track faculty.

2.6.1.2 Fourth-Year Review

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

See the Policy on Faculty Annual Review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>) for OAA guidelines on the Fourth-Year Review process of probationary tenure track faculty.

2.6.1.3 Exclusion of time from the probationary period

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

See Chapter 2, Section 1.4.8 for OAA guidelines on the exclusion of time from the probationary period of probationary tenure track faculty.

2.6.2 Regular tenured faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

See the Policy on Faculty Annual Review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>) for OAA guidelines on the review of tenured faculty.

2.6.3 Regular tenured faculty at a regional campus

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

See the Policy on Faculty Annual Review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>) for OAA guidelines on the review of tenured faculty at a regional campus.

2.6.4 Regular clinical track faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

See the Policy on Faculty Annual Review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>) for OAA guidelines on the review of RCT faculty.

2.6.5 Regular research track faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

See the Policy on Faculty Annual Review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>) for OAA guidelines on the review of RRT faculty.

2.6.6 Auxiliary faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

See Volume 3, Section 6.0 for OAA guidelines on the review of auxiliary faculty.

2.7 Merit salary increases and other rewards

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

2.7.1 Criteria

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

Clearly state the criteria for salary increases and any other performance-based rewards (see the Policy on Faculty Compensation (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultycompensation.pdf>)).

2.7.2 Procedures

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

State the procedures for determining salary recommendations and recommendations for other rewards.

2.7.3 Documentation

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

It is essential that the unit require adequate documentation of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. This section should list the documents that faculty must submit for annual reviews and consideration for salary increases, but should not provide detail about how the unit evaluates various aspects of performance. Such content belongs under “Documentation” in the following section, unless the content differs from the way in which performance is evaluated in promotion & tenure and promotion reviews.

2.8 Promotion and tenure and promotion reviews

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

2.8.1 Criteria

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 05/01/08

Criteria are general statements about the quality of performance in teaching, research and service expected for promotion and tenure or promotion. Teaching, research and service are not in themselves criteria, nor are teaching evaluations or publications. A list of evidence to be examined belongs under “Documentation” below.

Although criteria will vary both according to unit mission and the specific responsibilities of each faculty member, every candidate should be held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

Above all, candidates should be held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching should be required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities. Units may also, if they wish, define excellence in teaching, research, and service to include professional ethical conduct consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics (www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm).

2.8.1.1 Citizenship, collegiality, and professional ethical behavior

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 05/01/08

Citizenship, collegiality, or professional ethical behavior may not be established as a fourth criterion in P&T reviews independent of teaching, research, and service. On request of the Senate Rules Committee, in May 2000, OAA communicated that the Faculty Rules provide solely for review of teaching, research and service in P&T reviews. Review bodies may consider collegiality and professional ethical behavior in the context of evaluating the three main areas of activity, but may not use that issue as an independent category.

2.8.1.2 Promotion to associate professor with tenure

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

See Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (B) and (D). Note that according to this rule tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor. The unit should establish and exercise very high standards for the awarding of tenure since a positive tenure decision has a powerful impact on the quality and future of the unit.

2.8.1.3 Promotion to associate professor without tenure

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 07/08/11

The College of Medicine has an approved exception for regular tenure track faculty with substantial clinical service responsibilities. 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.

The College of Medicine and TIUs must have clearly articulated criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to associate professor without tenure established in their APT documents.

Faculty members 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.

2.8.1.4 Promotion to professor

Revised: 08/04/09

Edited: 02/15/13

See Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) and (D). Promotion standards should also reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence **equally** in all evaluation dimensions and (b) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively.

2.8.1.5 Regional campus faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 02/15/13

Units with regional campus faculty must state the criteria for their promotion to associate professor with tenure and for their promotion to professor. Criteria for regional campus faculty should be developed in consultation with the unit's regional campus faculty and the deans of the regional campuses. These criteria must reflect the following considerations:

- The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities.
- Regional campus faculty are expected to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity, but the character and quantity of that activity may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty because of the weight of other responsibilities and because of lack of access to comparable resources, for example regional campus faculty do not have graduate teaching associates to assist them in their teaching or generally have access to research facilities comparable to those of Columbus-based faculty.
- Teaching and service responsibilities of regional campus faculty are often more substantial than those of Columbus-based faculty.

2.8.1.6 Regular clinical track faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/04/09

Because RCT faculty may be hired at the rank of instructor, this section should describe the criteria for promotion to assistant professor, associate professor, and professor of clinical [department name]. These criteria should reflect the fact that RCT faculty members are primarily engaged in patient care or professional practices and clinical instruction. Any expectations for scholarly work should be substantively different from those for RTT faculty.

The suggested promotion criteria in the prototype APT document are somewhat generic since the nature of RCT appointments varies according to the mission of the unit. The unit should strive for an equivalent or greater level of detail in adapting the suggested content to its particular needs. For each rank, the document should spell out the required practice criteria, such as:

- required licensure/certification
- teaching experience related to the teaching areas to be assigned
- meeting the promotion criteria to each rank

2.8.1.7 Regular research track faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

Because the entry rank at which RRT faculty may be hired is assistant professor, this section should describe the criteria for promotion to research associate professor and research professor. These criteria should reflect the fact that RRT faculty members are primarily engaged in research.

2.8.2 Procedures

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

The unit's procedures for promotion & tenure and promotion reviews must be consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04. This rule provides general information but does not delineate all aspects of the review process. Listed below are unit-specific issues that should be addressed in this section to supplement Faculty Rule 3335-6-04.

Whatever the unit's procedures, they should assure a thorough and critical review. A unit that conceptualizes a review as advocacy of the candidate, as building rather than evaluating a case, is not acting in its own best interests. Advocacy of a weak candidate not only sends an unfavorable message about the unit to higher level review bodies but, if successful, may in the long term be detrimental to the unit.

2.8.2.1 Regional campus faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

The TIU's procedures for deciding when to review tenured faculty members for promotion are to be applied to tenured regional campus faculty.

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service. The regional campus dean forwards the report and recommendation of the regional campus review to the TIU head, from which point the review follows the same course as all P&T reviews.

2.8.2.2 Non-mandatory reviews

Revised: 07/08/11

Edited: 07/08/11

This section covers how the unit will determine which faculty members to review for promotion in rank or for non-mandatory promotion and tenure. Screening reviews are encouraged since premature reviews are costly in many ways and should be avoided. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (A) (3) states that a unit may establish screening procedures with the limitation that a tenured faculty member who wants to be reviewed cannot be denied consideration for promotion for more than one year.

2.8.2.4 External evaluation

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 05/01/08

Describe how a slate of potential evaluators is determined, who is responsible for contacting them, and the timetable for requesting external evaluations. Include what aspects of performance these persons are asked to evaluate and what materials are provided to them. See Volume 3 for advice on these matters.

If the candidate is asked to provide names of external evaluators, the number of names suggested by the candidate should be restricted to three or four to avoid limiting the number of credible evaluators available to be suggested by others.

2.8.2.5 Mechanics

Revised: 08/04/09

Edited: 01/01/11

Describe the roles of the candidate, the P&T committee (if the unit has a P&T committee), the committee of the eligible faculty, and the TIU head.

Include in this section which administrator or body (the TIU head, the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, the P&T committee, the committee of the eligible faculty) will be authorized to remove from the review a faculty member with a conflict of interest, when the faculty member refuses to withdraw voluntarily.

Include the approximate timing for each stage of the review and who is responsible for verifying the accuracy of citations and other aspects of candidates' dossiers.

2.8.3 Documentation

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

Describe in detail the specific documentation that will be examined in assessing performance. This documentation will vary according to the field of study and the unit's mission. The OAA core dossier outline (See Volume 3) serves as a basic standard for documentation, but the unit is not limited to assessing the stated items.

The unit may weigh forms of documentation differentially as appropriate to its mission and to the responsibilities of the candidate. While some possible forms of documentation are described below under the headings of teaching, scholarship, and service, these headings are not intended to define teaching, scholarship, and service. **For general definitions see 3335-6-02.** In some fields of study or in some instances, an item listed in one area may be considered a reflection of performance in another area.

2.8.3.1 Teaching

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/04/09

OAA requires evaluation of instruction in all courses and by all faculty members. The faculty is responsible for the evaluation of instruction, to be carried out on a regular basis and in a systematic manner to be determined by each TIU, subject to the approval of the dean of the college. Moreover, the evaluation of university teaching should be a comprehensive, integrated process that includes collection of data from students, peers, administrators, and the faculty members themselves. These data are interpreted with the understanding that both university instruction and its evaluation entail professional judgments according to expectations of the TIU.

2.8.3.1.1 Peer evaluation of teaching

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/04/09

Peer review of teaching aims to apply appropriate disciplinary (peer) standards to the teaching performance of faculty members. TIUs should provide opportunities for and mechanisms that support both formative and summative evaluation of teaching. The TIU must set forth detailed guidelines for peer evaluation of teaching to be used in faculty performance reviews that is appropriate for the unit's instructional situation(s).

Peer evaluation should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey, major required course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with current disciplinary knowledge. Assessment of these aspects can be made by peers within the unit or external reviewers as determined by procedures established by the TIU.

TIUs may select from among many modalities of peer review. See the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching's (UCAT) website (www.ucat.osu.edu/) for links to on-line resources at Ohio State and at other institutions, as well as published sources that offer principles and methods for the formative and summative evaluation of teaching. TIUs must not only establish rules governing evaluation of instruction but also abide by those rules, applying them evenly and without prejudice. For further discussion see Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 1.4.

2.8.3.1.2 Student evaluation of teaching

Revised: 08/04/09

Edited: 02/15/13

Student evaluation is focused on students' perceptions of instruction, taking into account those factors shown by research to affect such response, including class size and whether the course was required or an elective in the student's program. The TIU must set forth a detailed plan for obtaining student evaluation information to be used in faculty performance reviews. Faculty must use a standard, objective, TIU-approved tool for student evaluation. As noted above, the TIU's selection of an assessment tool is subject to the approval of the dean of the college. This assessment tool may be generated by the unit, or the Ohio State SEI may be used. For required components and further discussion see Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 1.4.

Solicited letters from former students, and particularly from former graduate students, are not credible forms of evaluation of teaching. Given the fact that such letters are known to be public documents, it is not likely that a former student would risk retribution by saying anything critical about a faculty member.

Other methods of documenting and evaluating teaching include:

- the candidate's self-assessment and statement of plans and goals
- a summary of the candidate's portfolio on teaching, including documentation of formative evaluation
- assessment of the success of the candidate's current and former graduate students and post-docs
- the extent to which pedagogical materials developed by the candidate have been adopted by other faculty
- the extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State, in professional societies, or at other institutions
- teaching awards or other recognitions

2.8.3.2 Research and Scholarship

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 02/15/13

When the product of scholarship is primarily disseminated in the form of publications, documentation could include the measures of the quality of the publication outlets, internal evaluation of the candidate's work, and frequency with which the candidate's work is cited by others, if appropriate. External funding for research may be a form of documentation of scholarship (aside from its importance in facilitating the conduct of research) when the review processes that lead to its receipt are measures of the quality of a faculty member's past and planned research.

When the product of scholarship is disseminated in other forms such as performances, works of art, inventions, or digital media, the unit should describe the specific ways in which the quality of these works will be assessed.

External evaluations of scholarship are, of course, required. Units should nonetheless make every effort to assess the quality of a candidate's work from multiple approaches rather than rely solely on the external letters of evaluation. Total reliance on external evaluations is inappropriate, possibly leading to decisions that are inconsistent with departmental standards and expectations.

2.8.3.3 Service

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 02/15/13

Activities generally considered to be service include:

- administrative work for the department, college, or university
- service to the profession such as leadership roles and editorial and reviewing activities
- application of professional expertise in outreach to the community (community outreach not germane to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to P&T reviews.)

Determine quality as well as quantity indicators of service roles. The quality of unit service will generally be known. Beyond the unit and external to the university, quality indicators of service would include election or appointment to leadership roles, other evidence that the candidate's services are sought rather than volunteered, and awards.

Depending on the nature of a candidate's service, it may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those who are in a position to evaluate specific contributions.

2.9 Appeals

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative P&T decisions and provides further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation.

3.0 Seventh-Year Review

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh-Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year review.

3.1 Updating obsolete material in TIU governance documents

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/12

All university titles, rules, policies, offices and entities must be checked for currency during the required governance document review in the first year of a TIU head's appointment or reappointment.

Many POAs and APT documents that are submitted for approval contain obsolete material. Common examples of such material are summarized below so that units may make the needed corrections before forwarding their documents for review.

Now that all university rules and policies are available on the web, it is inadvisable for the governance documents to quote these extensively as such passages will not reflect later revisions to the material at the web site. In place of quoted material, the address of the web site should be provided.

For matters relating to Employee and Labor Relations, please contact OHR, Organization and Human Resource Consulting, (614) 292-2800. For specific contact information see www.hr.osu.edu/ohrc/.

The current handbook: the web-based OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook - <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>.

Do not cite material directly or indirectly from obsolete handbooks. The Faculty Handbook (last issued 1984) and Handbook for Deans, Directors and Chairs (last issued 1996) no longer exist. Most references can be replaced by references to the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook or to the Rules of the University Faculty.

Rule number changes approved at the BOT 7/9/04 meeting:

- Faculty Rule 3335-47 is now 3335-6
- Faculty Rule 3335-48 is now 3335-7

Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 (C) (3) sets forth responsibilities of chairs. The amended rule includes the TIU head's responsibility to inform faculty members in their annual review letters of their right to review their personnel file. Most POAs that quote this rule lack this provision.

Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (A) (1) sets forth procedures for appeal of a negative P&T decision. The amended rule eliminates the requirement that a faculty member attempt to resolve an appeal informally at the local level before taking the appeal to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. Any content in the appeals section of an APT document that cites the abolished requirement and/or describes a local appeals process intended to meet that requirement must be deleted immediately so that faculty members are not advised incorrectly about how to proceed with appeals in the coming year.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (C) (2) sets forth procedures for nonrenewal of a probationary faculty appointment. The amended rule requires that nonrenewal of a probationary appointment result from application of Fourth-Year Review procedures. Many APT documents approved prior to this amendment are inconsistent with the new requirement, creating the risk of improper procedure if nonrenewal is considered during the first, second, third, or fifth year of a probationary appointment.

Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 no longer requires 10 years of continuous service for a faculty member to be eligible for emeritus status. Units whose governance documents cite this requirement should delete it.

Faculty Rule 3338-6-03 (H) on the exclusion of time from probationary periods has been changed. A year is guaranteed to be excluded for the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six once the department and college notify OAA (<http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html>). The maximum number of years that may be excluded from a probationary period increased from two to three.

Many governance documents incorrectly refer to the provost's full title. The correct title is Executive Vice President and Provost.

The College of Medicine and Public Health is now two separate colleges, the College of Medicine and the College of Public Health.

The Colleges of Education and Human Ecology are now one single college, the College of Education and Human Ecology.

The Ohio State University Research Foundation (OSURF) is now the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP).

Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (B) has been revised to comply with federal law and to align with Human Resources Policy 1.10. Rather than quote the language in this rule or policy, OAA recommends that departments refer to the Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity and Non-Discrimination/Harassment Policy and provide the web address, <http://hr.osu.edu/policy/>.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (B) (1) has been revised. Faculty members promoted from instructor to assistant professor no longer automatically receive prior service credit. Prior service credit must be requested by the faculty member and approved by the committee of the eligible faculty, the chair, the dean, and OAA.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (A) (3) has been revised. It states that a unit may establish screening procedures for tenured faculty seeking promotion with the limitation that a tenured faculty member who wants to be reviewed cannot be denied consideration for promotion for more than one year.

Faculty Rules 3335-6-03 (D) (1) and (2) have been revised. The deadlines mentioned in both sections have been changed to April 1.

Faculty Rule 3335-7-03 has been revised. The appointment cap on clinical faculty in the health sciences is now 40% of the total regular faculty within the college. The appointment cap on clinical faculty in colleges outside of the health sciences is now 20% of the total regular tenure track faculty within the college. In all TIUs not in the health sciences, the number of clinical track faculty members must be fewer than the number of regular tenure track faculty members in each unit.

Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (D) has been revised. Auxiliary appointments may be made for a period of up to three years. With the exception of visiting appointments, they may be reappointed.

Faculty Rule 3335-3-29 has been revised to require that colleges have a Pattern of Administration with specified content.

Chapter 2 Unit Administration

1.0 Tenure initiating unit

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 06/15/10

The concept of the TIU is described in Faculty Rule 3335-6-06. Characteristics of departments and schools are described in Faculty Rule 3335-3-34. Each RTT faculty member, including those with multiple appointments, has a tenure home in a single unit (department, school, division, or in the case of colleges without departments, college).

Multiple faculty appointments totaling 50% or more of service to the university shall be considered to be the same as a single appointment of 50% or more for the purpose of determining eligibility for tenure of a RTT faculty member. Faculty members with multiple appointments may only vote on P&T matters in the TIU designated as their tenure home.

1.1 Chairs and directors (TIU heads)

Revised: 08/15/12

Edited: 02/15/13

The term of service and responsibilities of TIU heads (department chairs and school directors) is described in Faculty Rule 3335-3-35.

TIU heads are appointed by the college dean, subject to the formal approval of the provost, president, and the BOT.

The dean determines whether the appointee is to be drawn from the faculty within the unit, usually following an internal search; is to be selected following a national search; or is to be selected in some other way. The dean also appoints search committees for TIU heads.

Deans determine the terms of appointment in light of the needs of the TIU, circumstances of the person to be appointed, and any other relevant considerations including OAA compensation policies (see Faculty Compensation Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultycompensation.pdf>)).

TIU heads are normally appointed for a four-year term. Mid-year appointments terminate at the end of the third full academic year of appointment. A shorter appointment period may occasionally be specified in special circumstances.

TIU heads must be members of the faculty of the unit they administer. TIU heads are subject to annual review and may be removed before the end of the appointment period.

For additional information on the review of principal administrative officials, see University Bylaws 3335-1-03 (S).

Letters of offer appointing or reappointing TIU heads, including interim and acting, require prior approval by OAA following approval by the college dean. All such appointments are forwarded to the BOT for final approval (except those for a period of less than 90 days). Copies of final letters of appointment, including indication of acceptance by the TIU head, must be sent to OAA to be forwarded to the BOT for final approval.

Deans must include documentation **of the search and/or reappointment process** with letters of offer or reappointment when submitting them to OAA for prior approval.

Appointment of an outside appointee to a senior rank requires approval by **the eligible faculty**, the college dean and OAA. See Faculty Appointments Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>) for a description of the required documentation for all appointments to a senior rank and the section on sample documents for the suggested language for a letter of offer including appointment to a senior rank.

Interim or acting TIU heads must be faculty members or emeritus faculty members from a TIU within the college.

Reappointments are effective on July 1 for 12-month appointees (end date June 30), and on September 1 for 9-month appointees (end date May 31). The July or **September** reappointment dates are used even if the first appointment as TIU head was on a mid-year date.

1.1.1 Definitions

Revised: 11/09/04

Edited: 08/01/07

Interim: formal replacement until a new person is hired; position is vacant.

Acting: stand-in for a person still in the position but on leave; position is filled.

1.2 Assistant, associate, and vice chairs and directors

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

TIU heads may appoint such assistant, associate, and vice chairs and directors as are needed to carry out the business of the department or school.

The TIU head determines the terms of appointment, subject to approval of the dean of the college.

1.3 Department staff

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

The TIU head is responsible for appointing, supervising, and evaluating the staff of the unit. This responsibility may be delegated in larger departments, but the TIU head is ultimately accountable for the matters covered in this section.

TIU heads can obtain information on staff hiring procedures from college fiscal officers **or human resources directors** and from Employment Services (292-2800). This information will not be covered here. The OHR home page may be found at: www.hr.osu.edu/.

1.3.1 Teaching component in unclassified administrative & professional (A&P) staff positions

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 08/01/07

If the assigned job duties of an unclassified A&P staff position include teaching, the maximum percentage of time that may be devoted to teaching is 33%.

If teaching is not part of the assigned job duties of an unclassified A&P staff position, teaching may be done for supplemental compensation, subject to the 20% cap that applies equally to faculty and staff.

1.4 Department faculty

Revised: 04/01/99

Edited: 08/01/07

1.4.1 Units with an approved clinical track

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

This is a list of colleges (bold), departments, and schools with approved clinical tracks. Unless an exception is approved by the University Senate and the Board of Trustees, clinical track faculty may comprise no more than 40% of the total regular faculty in each of the colleges of the Health Sciences and no more than 20% of the regular faculty in other colleges. In all TIUs not in the health sciences, the number of clinical track faculty members must be fewer than the number of regular tenure track faculty members in each unit. The College of Medicine has an approved exception and has no appointment cap in clinical departments; all other departments have a 40% cap of the regular faculty. Units that impose a stricter limit are noted in parentheses.

Arts and Sciences

Communication (10)

Psychology*

Speech and Hearing Science

Business

Dentistry

Engineering

Architecture

Biomedical Engineering (49)

Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering

Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering**

Computer Science and Engineering

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Integrated Systems Engineering

Materials Science Engineering

Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (10)

Law

Medicine

Anesthesiology

Biomedical Informatics

Emergency Medicine

Family Medicine

Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

Internal Medicine

Neurological Surgery

Neurology

Obstetrics and Gynecology

Ophthalmology

Orthopaedics

Otolaryngology

Pathology

Pediatrics

Pharmacology (40%)*

Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Psychiatry

Radiation Oncology

Radiology

Surgery

Nursing

Optometry

Pharmacy

Public Health

Veterinary Medicine

Veterinary Biosciences

Veterinary Clinical Sciences

Veterinary Preventative Medicine

*Pending OAA approval of governance documents.

** Clinical and research track faculty are capped at 25% of the total regular faculty.

1.4.2 Units with an approved research track

Revised: 06/18/12

Edited: 06/18/12

This is a list of colleges (bold), departments, and schools with approved research tracks. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the tenure track faculty in a unit, research track faculty must comprise no more than 20% of the number of tenure track faculty in the unit. In all cases, however, the number of research track faculty positions in a unit must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure track faculty in the unit. Units that authorize a different cap are noted in parentheses.

Arts and Sciences (20)

Earth Sciences

Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology

Psychology (10)

Sociology (10)*

Speech and Hearing Science

Dentistry

Engineering

Biomedical Engineering

Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering

Civil, Environmental, and Geodetic Engineering**

Computer Science and Engineering

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Integrated Systems Engineering

Materials Science and Engineering

Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (10)

Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences

Animal Sciences

Entomology

Environment and Natural Resources*

Food, Agricultural, and Biological Engineering

Food Science and Technology

Medicine

Biomedical Informatics

Family Medicine

Internal Medicine

Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry

Molecular Virology, Immunology, and Medical Genetics

Neurological Surgery

Neuroscience

Obstetrics and Gynecology

Pediatrics

Pharmacology (40)

Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Physiology and Cell Biology

Psychiatry

Radiation Oncology*

Radiology

Surgery

Urology

Nursing

Optometry (30)

Pharmacy

Public Health

Veterinary Medicine

Veterinary Biosciences

*Pending OAA approval of governance documents.

** Clinical and research track faculty are capped at 25% of the total regular faculty.

1.4.3 Dual career hiring **cost-sharing fund**

Revised: 06/22/12

Edited: 02/15/13

The university recognizes that many faculty members are part of a dual-career couple and that in some cases both members of the couple will be interested in attaining a faculty position. In these instances, OAA expects deans and department chairs to cooperate willingly, constructively and in good faith with the hiring unit for the target candidate to accommodate the other half of the academic couple. In some cases, OAA is able to assist units making such hires through its Dual Career Hiring **Fund**. OAA provides cash to cover one third of the initial base salary of the partner following the targeted hire for the first three years of the appointment. The other two thirds of the salary and all of the benefits are split between the units of the targeted hire and the partner hire respectively. The program is intended for assisting with hires in which both parties will be in regular faculty positions and are in two different colleges. Dual career requests for other arrangements or for additional cost-sharing will be evaluated on a case by case basis.

The university does not expect any department/college to hire candidates that do not meet the same quality standards as candidates hired in the receiving department.

The process will be conducted with all deliberate speed to reach a final agreement in time to allow a successful recruitment of the target candidate.

1.4.4 Emergency loan fund for new faculty

Revised: 10/18/11

Edited: 10/18/11

The Ohio State University Emergency Loan Fund for New Faculty is available upon request to assist newly appointed regular faculty during their first semester on campus in meeting expenses associated with their transition to Ohio State. Although these resources are limited, the university attempts to make emergency loans readily available to ease the financial burden of relocating until first paychecks are received and local credit can be established. Each new faculty member is eligible to borrow up to \$1,500. The program is administered through the Office of the University Bursar. This revolving fund is available on a first come, first serve basis. New loans are awarded as previous recipients repay their loans. The loan is interest free.

Because this is a revolving fund, individuals are required to repay the loan through the Office of the University Bursar via credit card, direct withdrawal from their bank account or check. There will be a payment of \$300 each month beginning in January and continuing until May for a total of 5 months. Faculty receiving loans will be required to complete a promissory note with the Office of the University Bursar and a data sheet with personal information as well as two personal references. Faculty requesting a loan must complete an application and obtain the appropriate signatures in their college and forward to OAA. Normal processing of the application should result in the check being mailed to the faculty member's home address within 5-7 business days upon receipt of the completed application in OAA.

1.4.5 Duties and responsibilities

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 02/15/13

OAA requires departments, in cooperation with their colleges, to establish guidelines that describe the allocation of effort in the department as a whole (as opposed to that of individual faculty members). Such guidelines must be established within the parameters set by Faculty Rule 3335-5-07.

Using the guidelines developed by the Regents' Advisory Committee as a basis for the university policy as well as college and departmental guidelines, the following range of teaching responsibilities applies to all colleges and departments whose missions include undergraduate students.

- Departments with active baccalaureate programs and no—or limited—activity in graduate programs should have a norm for teaching activities of at least 70% of the total departmental workload with the remainder devoted to other scholarly activities of research/creative activity and service.
- Departments with active baccalaureate and master's degree programs should have a norm for teaching activities that is at least 60% of the total departmental workload with the remainder devoted to research/creative activity, service and other professional activities consistent with the department's mission.
- Departments with active baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral programs should have a norm of at least 50% of the total departmental workload devoted to teaching. The remaining workload time should be devoted to sponsored and department funded research/creative activity, service, and other professional responsibilities consistent with the department's mission.

College and departmental guidelines should define the range and general expectations regarding teaching, scholarship and research, as well as service responsibilities in terms of the academic mission of the college and department.

Guidelines should provide for a differentiation of faculty roles and recognize the fact that different colleges within the university and different departments within each college have different missions, resulting in differing expectations for various colleges and departments.

Different colleges in the university have different missions, and there are differing expectations for the various departments within colleges. These expectations should be acknowledged by college guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities. They should recognize that departments within a college may have different, but equally valuable, missions and that faculty within departments may make different, but equally valuable, contributions to those missions.

The purpose of the guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities for a department is to identify the relative emphasis to be placed on teaching, research, and service. Where appropriate, the departmental guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities should place special emphasis on identifying the relative importance given to undergraduate instruction and to meeting the academic needs of undergraduate students.

The guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities should include—but are not limited to—time in a formal classroom setting. In nearly all departments, the faculty commitment to teaching extends beyond the classroom to include a variety of learning activities, such as supervision of individual tutorial projects, formal advising and mentoring, and informal supervision and advising on research projects and assignments, and clinical rotations.

Departmental guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities should consider departmental expectations that result from the types, strengths and viability of the degree programs it offers, its research and other scholarly activities, the external funding it receives, and the service it provides. Workload policies should include statements of:

- overall workload expectations to ensure a balance of faculty time and effort spent in teaching, research, and service
 - The department chair is responsible for achieving this balance for the department through the assignment of duties to individual faculty.
- types and amounts of instruction needed to accomplish the teaching mission of the unit
 - Normally this will include an analysis of the likely numbers and types of courses/sections necessary to satisfy the demand for undergraduate general education, undergraduate major and graduate and/or professional programs.
- expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity by the faculty

The mission of the department will determine the relative balance of effort in teaching, research/creative activity, and service. OAA anticipates that there will be significant differences in the missions of many departments and, as a result, there will be differences among departments in the relative amounts of effort faculty spend in their teaching, research/creative activity, and service responsibilities. Within departments significant differences in the assignment of responsibilities to individual faculty members may exist, reflecting individual faculty strengths, interests, and abilities to contribute to the overall mission of the department. These responsibilities should be articulated on an annual basis as part of the faculty review process.

In establishing suggested ranges in departmental teaching, the department chair should focus on total teaching effort rather than on some of the more traditional measures of teaching workload such as number of courses, number of credit hours, or weighted student credit hours. The emphasis on effort is a more realistic approach to recognizing the complexity and diversity evident in delivering instruction. The effort required to teach a course is related to a variety of factors (the number of students enrolled, the availability of instructional support staff, the nature of the material being taught, the number and type of assignments to be graded, the method of instructional delivery). A focus on the percentage of workload effort devoted to teaching should be general enough to include a variety of delivery systems, yet specific enough to ensure greater accountability by departments in meeting student instructional needs.

Part-time faculty members include those persons appointed to carry out instructional responsibilities dictated by enrollment demand or by the special needs of an academic unit. Because their primary responsibility is teaching, part-time faculty are not usually expected to engage in other university duties. The actual assignment of instructional responsibilities for a part-time faculty member will be determined by contractual agreement with the university.

All programs may not fit administratively into one of the above categories of departments. In such a case, the appropriate proportion of time to be devoted by the academic unit to teaching should be determined by the dean, subject to approval of the provost. There may be departments that differ significantly from the above classification such as those that have graduate programs but no, or few, undergraduate ones, as may be the case in the health sciences and some of the professional colleges. Appropriate teaching responsibilities for such departments should be determined by the department chair in consultation with the college dean, subject to the approval of the provost.

1.4.5.1 Teaching

Revised: 04/01/99

Edited: 02/15/13

For academic units in which formal course offerings are the primary mode of instruction, the policy on faculty duties and responsibilities must include an indication of the average, minimum, and maximum course load per year (in terms of either courses or credit hours).

In situations in which formal course offerings are not the primary mode of instruction (cooperative extension, clinical areas in the health sciences, and the libraries), a unit's policy may specify the average, minimum, and maximum percentage of time faculty are expected to devote to instructional activities or may describe expectations in some other appropriate way.

Optional content could include expectations with respect to numbers of undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional students advised, development of instructional materials, and/or other instructional activities of importance to a particular unit. In specifying formal course loads, units may also choose to distinguish type and level of course and course size.

Every department, college without departments, and regional campus must have a written policy for the equitable assignment and distribution of faculty duties and responsibilities. Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 requires that such a policy be a part of the academic unit's POA.

This policy does not constitute a contractual obligation. Fluctuations in demands and resources in the department (college, regional campus) and the individual circumstances of faculty members may warrant temporary deviations from the policy.

A unit's policy should address how variations in scholarly activity and formal classroom instruction will be balanced to assure a reasonably equitable distribution of responsibilities among faculty. Academic units that offer little or no formal classroom instruction should indicate how variations in scholarly activity and instructional activity, however measured, will be balanced. Additional detail is optional.

The chair is responsible for assuring that every faculty member has duties and responsibilities commensurate with his or her appointment and that departmental workload is distributed equitably among faculty. While faculty members are expected to exercise "self-determination" in conducting their research or other scholarly activity, the chair assigns teaching and in most cases departmental service.

In making these assignments the chair must balance the needs of the department with the preferences of the faculty member within the context of the department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities described below.

While on duty faculty members are expected to be accountable for interaction with students, service assignments, and other responsibilities even if they have no formal course assignment that semester/term. In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-5-08, on-duty faculty members who need to be away from campus to conduct research or other university business may do so with permission of their chair, dean, and OAA through an approved leave of absence form. Absences of more than ten consecutive business days require approval by OAA.

1.4.5.2 Research and Scholarship

Revised: 04/01/99

Edited: 08/04/09

A unit's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities must include a statement describing the average level of scholarly productivity expected within a time frame appropriate to the discipline.

In departments in which seeking and obtaining external funding is customary, the policy should state the expectations for seeking and obtaining such funding.

The degree of specificity in all such statements will vary widely across disciplines. Since scholarly activity is self-generated rather than assigned, however, the language in this section should be sufficiently explicit to communicate expectations clearly and to provide a basis for adjusting duties and responsibilities in instruction and service in response to variations in the level of scholarly productivity.

1.4.5.3 Service

Revised: 04/01/99

Edited: 02/15/13

A unit's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities must include a statement regarding expectations for faculty participation in department, college, university, and, for regional campus faculty, regional campus governance, and for participation in professional organizations, and professional consultation.

Many faculty members voluntarily take on a variety of professional activities that fall outside the department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities. These activities often benefit the department or university and, to the extent possible, should be taken into account in considering a faculty member's total **distribution of duties**.

However, fairness to other faculty and the department's need to meet its programmatic obligations may become issues when a faculty member seeks relief from departmental obligations in order to devote considerable time to personal professional interests that may not contribute to departmental goals. The chair may decline to approve such requests when approval is not judged to be in the best interests of the department.

1.4.6 Evaluation of instruction

Revised: 04/16/02

Edited: 08/04/09

Without systematic forms of teaching assessment, there is little basis on which to evaluate either the quality of instruction or the performance of individual faculty members. TIUs should establish measurable criteria for evaluation of teaching. Criteria that are research-based and specific to the unit's teaching mission are most useful in faculty evaluation of teaching. The TIU's procedures and policies for peer evaluation and for student evaluation must be included in its APT document. The plan may be included in the documentation Section following P&T review procedures or may be attached to the APT document as an appendix.

See http://oaa.osu.edu/eval_teaching/index.html for links to on-line resources at Ohio State and at other institutions, as well as published sources, that offer principles and methods for the formative and summative evaluation of teaching. The material provided is intended to be helpful both to individual faculty planning to evaluate their teaching and to academic units developing statements on policy and procedures.

1.4.6.1 Peer evaluation

Revised: 04/16/02

Edited: 08/01/07

Successful peer review entails a commitment of time and resources as units educate faculty on best practices and develop and implement specific policies and procedures. Although OAA does not require any particular form of peer evaluation, units are required to develop a detailed plan that is appropriate for their instructional situations, taking into account what assessments will be done, for what purpose, by whom, and when.

1.4.6.1.1 Required

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

Periodic peer evaluation is required for all regular faculty and recommended for any faculty with multiple-year appointments. In case of full professors, such evaluation can take the form of peer review without a formal written evaluation. In addition, peer evaluation for promotion should include at least two different evaluations, with the exact number to be determined by the TIU in line with college policies.

Peer evaluation is the responsibility of the faculty of the TIU, not the individual faculty member being reviewed. The faculty must determine the methods of peer review that work best for the particular unit and apply them consistently.

1.4.6.1.2 Recommended

Revised: 04/16/02

Edited: 08/01/07

Peer evaluation should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot validly assess, such as appropriateness of curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with highest standards of disciplinary knowledge. Peer evaluation should have clear goals, be informed by student opinion, and be grounded in a unit culture that values good teaching. Classroom observations should not serve as the sole method for peer assessment of teaching effectiveness.

1.4.6.1.3 Classroom instruction

Revised: 04/16/02

Edited: 08/01/07

The focus of peer evaluation of classroom teaching should be on how the faculty member engages the students in learning in a manner appropriate to the situation. Peer evaluation of classroom teaching should include an assessment of the substance of the class including the appropriateness of topics, given the goals of the course (survey, major required course), and the methods used to communicate them.

1.4.6.1.4 Course materials

Revised: 08/04/09

Edited: 08/04/09

Examine syllabi, assignments, projects, and examinations to determine the extent to which:

- course objectives are appropriate
- course materials and assignments are up-to-date and consistent with course objectives
- syllabi are informative
- feedback on assignments is appropriately detailed and contributes to learning
- graded examinations and projects demonstrate the engagement of the faculty member and the students
- assessment of course materials may be made by peers within the unit or external reviewers as determined by procedures established by the TIU
- Peer review done for the purpose of informing reviews for promotion and tenure or promotion should be done often enough, and across a sufficient range of instructional situations, to provide a meaningful body of evidence and early enough to allow for the use of feedback for improvement. Such reviews should in general be done by senior faculty for probationary faculty and by full professors for associate professors.

1.4.6.1.5 Guidelines for revising current practices

Revised: 03/15/02

Edited: 08/01/07

The following brief guidelines, taken in part from Nancy Van Note Chism's *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook*, 2nd ed. (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2007), will greatly benefit units that wish to initiate substantive and effective change in current practices of peer review of teaching at the most local levels (units or schools).

Local Discussion of Evaluating Peer Review of Teaching

This first step in reviewing current practices and seeking effective change is most crucial. Faculty must come together to address several philosophical and pedagogical issues before revising existing practice or implementing new practices. The kinds of issues addressed during local discussions (which will take place over several meetings and/or during retreats to address teaching) might include the following:

- Define good teaching within the unit, its qualities and goals (a "what" of peer review). For what purpose is teaching reviewed (the "why")?
- Define "peer" (a "who" of peer review). Who is eligible to conduct reviews of teaching?
- Define who will be reviewed (a second "who"). According to OAA guidelines, all faculty teaching must be reviewed periodically.
- Enumerate the range of practices defined as teaching (a "what" and "where" of peer review). These practices might include classroom teaching, scholarship on teaching, advising, web-based instruction, distance learning, dissertation and thesis advising, independent study, curriculum development.
- Articulate the areas of focus for review of classroom teaching (articulation of course goals, mastery of course content, effective use of instructional methods and materials, appropriate evaluation of student work).
- Establish the process by which peer review of teaching will take place (the "how" of peer review). What tools and methods will be used? What kinds of documentation will be required of faculty, peer reviewers, unit heads?
- Define a schedule by which all faculty members will be reviewed (the "when").
- Articulate the relationship between and provide opportunities for both formative and summative evaluation of teaching.
- Articulate the relationship among types of evaluation of teaching (student, peer, administrative, self).

Implementing the System

Once a unit has discussed and reached consensus on issues like those listed above, it can then begin to implement the new processes. To do so effectively, the unit must:

- prepare faculty to participate effectively in the new review processes
- monitor, review, and evaluate the new processes
- commit to further change and adjust the system if data suggests that is necessary

"Closing the Loop"

In addition to preparing faculty, monitoring and evaluating and perhaps adjusting a new system of peer review of teaching, units must also "close the loop," they must use the data gathered in peer review to improve the quality of teaching within the unit. Teachers (and peers) use what they learn from both formative and summative evaluation to become better teachers. Units must also seek to use the data collected to make informed and equitable judgments about teaching while undertaking summative evaluation of teaching. Peer review of teaching, as well, must be situated in terms of the other data available (self-evaluation, student evaluation, administrative review). Similarly, all data should be interpreted in terms of both the unit's and candidate's goals, philosophies of teaching, and mission.

1.4.6.2 Student evaluation

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 (A) (14) requires units to assure that students are given the opportunity to evaluate every course every time it is taught. The university recognizes the value of soliciting commentary from students on their experiences in the classroom. Student assessment of teaching, however, may be colored by the student's

performance in the course, personal response to a particular instructor, and other aspects of the course or situation that do not necessarily reflect on the quality of instruction; nevertheless, student opinions about instructors and classes are very important. TIU faculty must develop and implement policies for collecting student input, including qualitative as well as quantitative data as appropriate as well as procedures for interpreting data collected from students. However, TIUs should not rely solely on student responses to courses and instruction such as the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) in their assessment of the quality of a faculty member's teaching.

1.4.6.2.1 Required

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 06/15/10

Every TIU's APT document must specify a single required method of soliciting student opinion in each distinct type of course (large lecture course, small seminar). Faculty members may supplement this with other methods if they wish.

Student opinion must be solicited in every course on those issues that students are best able to assess:

- instructor's preparedness for class
- clarity of communication
- ability to generate interest in the material
- accessibility
- ability to establish a conducive learning environment
- timeliness of and quality of responses to student work

When the results of soliciting student opinion are to be a component of performance review, the process cannot be under the control of the faculty member. TIUs must have a mechanism for assuring that faculty members do not collect student opinion surveys themselves.

If instruments that are not machine-gradable are used in the P&T process, someone other than the faculty member must summarize the results for inclusion in the dossier. Units may determine whether comments received on the electronic SEI should be collected and summarized for the purposes of P&T review. Such comments are not retained by the Registrar's Office and will be available directly to instructors unless otherwise requested by the TIU.

1.4.6.2.2 Recommended

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 06/15/10

Queries should include a highly structured component. Data should correlate to specific issues on which student opinion is desired. If the TIU wishes to draw comparisons among instructors, then performance in comparable types of courses should provide the basis for comparison.

Open-ended or even semi-structured essays by themselves do not serve these purposes well. Comments may be useful in allowing respondents to expand on highly structured queries but when few such comments are available, they offer minimal basis for generalization. Student comments that aid specifically in the interpretation of the statistical data are useful.

Efforts should be made to maximize response rates. Students generally respond well to being told that they value the feedback. Decreased response rates resulting from the transition to on-line SEIs should not be cited as negative indicators.

Numerical assessments that determine solely whether a faculty member does or does not meet or exceed the college or university mean in the cumulative average on the SEI are not useful. Trivial differences in mean values do not constitute a viable basis for comparing one instructor with another. The focus should be on patterns of responses and on general comparisons rather than on small differences in mean values.

Exit interviews of graduating majors, though not generating large amounts of data about specific instructors, are often helpful in revealing how students view their overall experience in the unit's courses.

1.4.6.3 Administrator evaluation

Revised: 04/16/02

Edited: 08/01/07

TIU heads play a particularly important role in the definition, development, and implementation of appropriate practices of peer review of teaching. Administrator evaluation of classroom teaching should focus on:

- evaluating drop rates, failure rates, and other data associated with the course
- judging whether a pattern of negative data is a direct consequence of the quality of instruction or is possibly related to other factors
- providing important corroborating evidence related to the quality of teaching by faculty in a particular unit
- identifying particular teaching contributions of the faculty member to the teaching mission and mandates of the unit
- evaluating the effectiveness of extra-classroom teaching of faculty

1.4.6.4 Self evaluation

Revised: 04/16/02

Edited: 08/01/07

Reflective practice and self-assessment by faculty members are necessary components of the systematic evaluation of instruction. Individual faculty members should be given every opportunity to:

- explain the goals and intentions of their courses and assignment designs
- describe the philosophy of teaching and learning that informs their practice
- interpret the relationship between student ratings and classroom events
- reflect on evaluation information to improve their teaching

Although self-assessment cannot be the only source of data for making credible personnel decisions, the personal narrative that provides an explanation of a faculty member's teaching goals is a valuable source for P&T decisions.

1.4.6.5 Integration and interpretation

Revised: 04/16/02

Edited: 08/01/07

Units must integrate and interpret data from all sources within the context of the discipline and the unit. Each unit should develop a system to integrate and interpret data derived from all of the relevant sources using the TIU's criteria for judging teaching effectiveness and excellence. Units must develop procedures for interpreting evaluation of teaching in a fair and responsible way.

Systems of evaluation must make both summative judgments about the quality of teaching and provide timely and formative feedback with the opportunity for faculty to use this feedback to improve their instruction of Ohio State students.

1.4.7 Exclusion from the probationary period

Revised: 03/02/07

Edited: 08/01/07

1.4.7.1 Birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six

Revised: 01/07/09

Edited: 06/15/10

Faculty members will notify their TIU using the Notification of Birth or Adoption of Child Form (Form 111), found at <http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html>. Units will notify OAA within one year of the birth of a child or the adoption of a child under age six of a probationary faculty member. After the notification form is received, one year will be excluded from the probationary period unless a nonrenewal notice has been issued, up to a maximum of three years.

1.4.7.2 Adverse events

Revised: 03/02/07

Edited: 02/15/13

Annually every unit should remind its probationary faculty (other than those who have received nonrenewal notices) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (2).

Under this rule the maximum time that may be excluded from the probationary period is three years of service, except in extraordinary circumstances.

Applications to exclude time under this rule must be submitted on the Request for Exclusion of Service Time from the Tenure Probationary Period form.

Requests to exclude time under Section (D) (2) require, in addition to the form, the following items:

- unit promotion & tenure committee review
- documentation of the adverse event leading to the request including, if not self-evident, why the adverse event was beyond the faculty member's control and how it interfered with productivity
- documentation of the faculty member's productivity to date (usually a CV)

The adverse events providing the basis for the request must be clearly beyond those experienced by most probationary faculty. For example, most faculty who conduct laboratory-based research must purchase equipment, obtain various kinds of approvals (drug licenses or animal research protocols), and obtain funding before they can begin their research. To the extent that such delays are normal, they do not constitute a basis for an exclusion of time from the probationary period.

The unit may postpone consideration of a request to exclude time due to an adverse event that occurs early in the probationary period, when such postponement is reasonable given the circumstances, in order to see whether or not productivity will return to the expected level after that event.

As stated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, an exclusion of time from the probationary period in no way limits the right of the university to terminate a probationary appointment prior to the time of the mandatory review for promotion and tenure, should circumstances warrant such action.

An exclusion of time results in a revised mandatory review year for promotion and tenure. Faculty members who have had time excluded from the probationary period may undergo P&T review prior to the revised mandatory review year, should the unit faculty judge such a review to be appropriate.

Such action is at the discretion of the unit faculty, not the probationary faculty member.

Should a negative decision result from a P&T review that occurs prior to the revised mandatory review year, this decision will not result in nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. The faculty member still has the option of undergoing P&T review in the revised mandatory review year.

1.4.8 Extension of probationary period for part-time faculty

Revised: 03/25/05

Edited: 01/01/11

Probationary tenure track faculty whose appointment is less than full-time (but 50% FTE or greater) may request an extension of the probationary period in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (F). The extension shall be for an

integral number of years based on the principle that the usual probationary period represents full-time service. The maximum permissible extension of a probationary period under this paragraph is one year for a probationary instructor, three years for a probationary assistant professor (including time spent at the rank of instructor) and one year for a probationary associate professor or professor.

OAA policy does not approve extensions in advance. During the second year of a faculty member's reduced appointment, OAA will approve an extension of one year, for example, in recognition of two years of service at 50% FTE. At the appropriate time the TIU head forwards a letter requesting approval of the extension to the dean and then OAA.

The TIU head's letter to the dean should state all relevant information (the amount of the reduction, when it will take affect, and whether it is permanent or temporary). For probationary tenure track faculty, the letter should include a projected revision of the review schedule and projected year in which the adjusted "Fourth-Year" review would fall, if the Fourth-Year Review has not already occurred.

For additional information on reduction of FTE, see the Faculty Appointments Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>).

1.5 Course scheduling

Revised: 07/23/04

Edited: 02/15/12

While unit heads must give consideration to the teaching specialties and preferences of faculty, the primary consideration in scheduling classes must be to provide for the needs of students, both the unit's own students and those from other units who need specific courses to meet their degree requirements. Unit heads should make every effort to assure the regular availability of required courses and the sensible timing of high-demand offerings so that all students have a fair chance of fitting such courses into their schedules.

It is the unit head's responsibility to assure that the schedule of course offerings each semester makes the most effective use of the unit's instructional resources. Faculty Rule 3335-8-16 establishes a standard that an elective course below the 300 level should have an enrollment of at least 12 and an elective course at the 300 level or above should have an enrollment of at least eight for the course to be taught. A unit may wish to establish higher minimums.

Units should review annually the patterns of enrollment in their course offerings, especially their elective offerings. Unit heads should identify offerings that may represent a less than optimal use of instructional resources. Units should discontinue or, at least not offer again until there is reason to expect adequate enrollment, courses with enrollments that are frequently below minimum. Unit heads should assign other courses to faculty who teach such courses, or whose courses are cancelled because of low enrollment. Faculty may not cancel courses on their own. The unit head is responsible for determining whether a scheduled course is to be cancelled.

1.6 New courses and abolishment of courses

Revised: 08/05/05

Edited: 08/01/07

At the start of each new academic year OAA issues an updated manual containing information on the creation of new courses and the abolishment of courses: Academic Organization and Curriculum Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>).

1.7 Instruction

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/10

The Rules of the University Faculty contains policy on instruction that applies to all faculty members at the university.

Precedence of scheduled hours:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-11

Class rosters:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-13

Course examinations:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-19

Schedules for final examinations:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-20

Marks:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-21

Report of marks:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-22

Alteration of marks:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-23

Retention or disposal of materials submitted to meet course requirements:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-23.1

Credit hours:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-24

Admission to courses as an auditor:

- Faculty Rule 3335-8-29

Absences:

- Faculty Rule 3335-9-21

Group absences:

- Faculty Rule 3335-9-22

1.8 Graduate Associates

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/04/09

The Graduate School Handbook, updated annually and available at www.gradsch.ohio-state.edu, contains the university policies on graduate associate appointments.

2.0 College administration

Revised: 09/01/99

Edited: 08/01/07

2.1 Deans

Revised: 09/01/99

Edited: 02/15/13

The term of service and responsibilities of deans are described in Faculty Rule 3335-3-29. The BOT appoints deans for five-year terms subject to an annual performance review. Deans undergo a more thorough review **after the fourth** year of service if they wish to be considered for reappointment.

The dean title implies both academic responsibilities (responsibilities related to curriculum and faculty) and decision-making authority. The title should be used only for positions involving academic responsibilities and the incumbent should have appropriate credentials.

2.2 Associate and assistant deans

Revised: 08/01/01

Edited: 08/01/07

Deans may appoint such associate and assistant deans as are needed to carry out the business of the college. The dean determines the terms of appointment.

Letters of offer to associate and assistant deans require prior approval by OAA. OAA suggests that these appointments be for a length of one year and that they may be renewable. Associate and assistant deans are subject to annual review and may be removed before the end of the appointment period.

The following descriptors and criteria for assistant and associate dean titles were adopted by OAA in 1992 following consultation with the Council of Deans and University Senate Steering Committee.

2.2.1 Associate deans

Revised: 08/01/01

Edited: 08/01/07

Associate deans' duties may include considerable decision-making authority in academic areas such as research, curriculum development and implementation, academic support services for students, academic support services for faculty, and space and facilities.

Associate deans may also have responsibility for faculty appointments, grievances, discipline, and other personnel matters specific to faculty. Associate deans must be RTT or RCT faculty members.

2.2.2 Assistant deans

Revised: 05/01/08

Edited: 05/01/08

Assistant deans' duties may include both support activities and some decision-making authority in academic areas such as curriculum development and implementation, academic support services for students, and academic support services for faculty.

Ideally assistant deans should hold the terminal degree in a discipline in the college in which they serve or a related discipline, but do not need to be faculty members. However, if an assistant dean has authority in the area of faculty appointments, grievances, and related matters, that individual must have faculty status.

2.3 Faculty teaching workload

Revised: 04/01/99

Edited: 02/15/13

In setting college workload policy, flexibility is important in order to recognize that there may be ranges in teaching, research, and service expectations among departments, as well as among the faculty within departments.

The dean of each college, in consultation with the provost and the college's department chairs, is responsible for **approving** the appropriate division of workload expectations for each department (or equivalent unit in the college) according to the department's level of activity in the degree programs it offers. In determining the relative emphasis that a given department would place upon undergraduate programs, research, and graduate **and professional**

programs, the dean should consider the research productivity of the faculty, including externally funded research, and the average number of graduate and/or professional degrees granted annually.

At all times, consideration should be given to the fact that students at Ohio State learn in a research intensive environment where research and teaching are seen as two inseparable facets of the learning experience for both faculty and students.

3.0 Regional campuses

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 08/04/09

The four regional campuses—Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark—offer Associate of Arts degrees as well as undergraduate and graduate programs in selected areas.

Courses on these campuses must be approved by the relevant units on the main campus. All courses taught on the regional campuses are Ohio State courses, not regional campus courses.

Regional campus faculty members are assigned to the campus that hired them for the duration of their employment with the university unless a campus transfer is made under the terms of Faculty Rule 3335-6-07.

The TIU of regional campus faculty is the discipline-based unit on the Columbus campus. This arrangement necessitates considerable cooperation between the regional campus and the Columbus campus TIU in order to assure that appointments, annual reviews, and P&T reviews are carried out in a manner fair to the faculty and consistent with the needs and standards of both the TIU and the regional campus.

4.0 University Senate

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

For the powers of the University Senate, see Faculty Rule 3335-5-41.

The web site of the University Senate is at www.senate.osu.edu.

The University Senate consists of 70 faculty members representing the colleges, the University Libraries, the regional campuses, the military sciences, and the John Glenn School of Public Policy; ten graduate students, five professional students, and 26 undergraduate students; and 26 administrators including the university president, the executive vice president and provost, the senior vice president for business and finance, vice president for student life, the vice president for research, the deans of the colleges, the executive dean of the college of arts and sciences, the executive dean of the regional campuses, the dean of the graduate school, the dean of undergraduate education, the director of libraries, and the college of arts and sciences divisional deans of arts and humanities, natural and mathematical sciences, and social and behavioral sciences. Most of the business of the University Senate is conducted through its two organizing and 18 standing committees.

5.0 Rules of the University Faculty

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

Chapters of the Rules of the University Faculty with special relevance to faculty and academic administrators are:

3335-3	Administration
3335-5	Faculty, Governance and Committees
3335-6	Tenure track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, & Promotion & Tenure
3335-7	Regular Clinical & Regular Research Track Appointment, Reappointment & Nonreappointment, & Promotion

The remaining Chapters of the Rules of the University Faculty are:

3335-8	Instruction, Courses and Curricula
3335-9	Attendance and Graduation
3335-11	Student Life/University Discipline
3335-13	University Property/Restrictions/Patent Rights
3335-15	Miscellaneous Provisions

5.1 Bylaws of the University Senate

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

3335-17	Election Bylaws of University Senate
3335-19	Bylaws of University Senate

5.2 Code of Student Conduct

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

3335-23	<u>Code of Student Conduct</u>
---------	--------------------------------

The Rules of the University Faculty can be found on the BOT website: www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php.

6.0 Faculty in memoriam resolutions

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

The BOT Office makes reasonable efforts to stay informed of deaths of faculty and faculty-emeritus. When a death is noted (in local newspaper obituaries) the BOT Office contacts the dean of the faculty member's college and requests that a memoriam be written and sent to the BOT Office. That resolution is then taken to the next BOT next meeting for approval. After the BOT meeting, a certified copy of the memoriam and a letter from the president is sent to the family of the deceased.

7.0 Managing situations that are highly charged with emotion or potentially violent

Revised: 06/15/10

Edited: 02/15/13

We must always be aware of and respond carefully to incidents or circumstances that increase risks to the university community. For almost a decade The Ohio State University has had services in place to intervene in such circumstances before they escalate to the level of physical violence. Here are some general guidelines for directors and peers, including information about when and how to access these university resources.

Workplace violence does not occur in a vacuum but is preceded by patterns of problematic behaviors and interactions. Speak out to others if actions, words, or behaviors cause uncomfortable situations in the workplace.

If initial polite attempts to bring a stop to behaviors such as verbal outbursts or intimidation are not effective or are met with an escalation of anger, seek appropriate assistance from your departmental Senior HR professionals, the Office of Human Resource Consulting, or the University Faculty and Staff Assistance Program (contact information for these two offices appears below). These professionals will help guide you through the appropriate process.

When reasonable attempts do not work, it may be necessary to convene a meeting of a university Crisis Assessment Team (CAT Team; contact information appears below), consisting of representatives from the Office of Human Resources, University Police, Employee Health, University **Employee** Assistance Program, Environmental Health and Safety, and other units when appropriate, such as the Office of Legal Affairs and/or the Office of Academic Affairs. The crisis assessment team will meet with leaders from the affected area, conduct a risk assessment, and make specific recommendations to be implemented.

In case of actual physical violence or threats, call 911.

The most important point is to not tolerate or excuse inappropriate behavior but to reach out for consultation and guidance. Directors and peers should remember the following:

- A goal of the Ohio State University is to provide a workplace in which violence of any kind is neither tolerated nor excused.
- Extremely violent acts do not occur in a vacuum but are often the culmination of a pattern of escalating negative interactions.
- Zero tolerance for violence and intimidation, whether verbal or physical, must become part of the culture of the organization through education, performance expectations, and predictable administrative response to offenses.

The Ohio State University provides multiple resources to assist leaders and others in responding appropriately and with support to inappropriate workplace behavior.

- Workplace and family and relationship violence policy (HR policy 7.05)
- Senior Human Resource Professionals in academic and work settings
- The Office of Organization and Human Resource Consulting, OHRC (614-292-2800)
- The University Employee Assistance Program, EAP (614-292-4472)
- Crisis Assessment Team (CAT team), Robert Meier, Director of Behavioral Health, OSU Health Plan, Robert.Meier@osumc.edu (614-292-3283)
- OSU Wexner Medical Center Security (614-293-8500); emergency (911)
- Guide to Assist Disruptive or Distressed Individuals (<http://ap.osu.edu/emergency/>)
- Columbus campus: OSU Police Department (614-292-2121); emergency (911)
- Lima campus: Campus Security Office (419-995-8499); emergency (911)
- Mansfield campus: Campus Security Office (419-755-4346 or -4218); emergency (911)
- Marion campus: Public Safety Office (740-725-6300); emergency (911)
- Newark campus: Public Safety Department (740-366-9301); emergency (911)

Chapter 3 Appeals

1.0 Promotion and tenure and probationary renewal appeals

Revised: 07/08/11

Edited: 07/08/11

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or probationary renewal decision.

Unsolicited commentary by colleagues, students, or others on behalf of a candidate will not be considered at any time during the P&T or probationary renewal review process and will not influence the course of an appeal.

TIU heads, deans, and the provost will normally not discuss a P&T or probationary renewal decision with individuals not party to the decision-making process.

Members of faculty review bodies and administrators are required to exercise professional judgment in considering the evidence material to making a fair determination in a promotion or tenure case. Differences in or disagreements with professional judgments do not provide a valid basis for appealing a negative P&T or probationary renewal decision.

Favorable annual reviews are not a basis for appealing a negative P&T or probationary renewal decision. A favorable annual review during the probationary period serves as the basis for a positive annual reappointment decision but does not imply a commitment to grant tenure. The review for tenure for faculty on the RTT and the penultimate year review for faculty on the RCT or RRT entails a much weightier decision than the annual review and entails assessment of both cumulative performance and promise for the future. Performance that is adequate for

annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of tenure (see Faculty Rule 3335-6-05) or securing a reappointment.

1.1 Allegation of improper evaluation

Revised: 07/08/11

Edited: 07/08/11

The primary basis for an appeal of a negative P&T or probationary renewal decision is improper evaluation. Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly may appeal a negative decision. Improper evaluation includes violations of written procedures that could reasonably have affected the outcome of a review and failure to consider evidence material to a fair determination.

A formal appeal cannot begin until the provost has rendered a decision, or the dean in the case of faculty on the RCT and RRT. However, a candidate may occasionally raise issues about the review process during the review, through the comments process provided for in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04. When appropriate, these issues should be addressed at the time they are raised. The chair may wish to consult with the dean and/or OAA regarding the best ways to address a particular issue.

An appeal alleging improper evaluation is reviewed in accord with procedures described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

Within 30 days of the date of the letter from either the TIU head or dean informing the faculty member of the provost's negative decision, or the dean's negative decision in the case of faculty on the RCT or RRT, the faculty member is required to send a written complaint describing the alleged improper evaluation to the chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibilities (CAFR), copied to the provost, or the dean in the case of faculty on the RCT and RRT, and should follow up with a phone conversation with the chair of CAFR regarding the complaint and next steps.

The faculty member should promptly inform the chair of CAFR and OAA if s/he decides not to pursue the appeal.

1.2 Allegation of discrimination

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

An appeal may also be based on the allegation of discrimination. Such an appeal would focus on discrimination based on protected status (see OHR Policy 1.10). A complaint alleging discrimination should be presented in writing to the Director of Consulting Services in OHR, with a copy to the provost, within 30 days of the date of the letter from either the TIU head or dean informing the faculty member of the provost's negative decision.

1.3 Seventh-Year Reviews

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

In rare instances, a TIU may petition the dean to conduct a Seventh-Year Review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure (see Faculty Rule 3335-6-05(B)).

2.0 Faculty salary equity appeals process

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/04/09

Given the importance of salary to individuals, the fact that funds for salaries are limited, and the fact that in allocating those funds, decision makers must make choices that benefit some more than others, some degree of salary dissatisfaction is unavoidable. Eliminating that dissatisfaction is impossible. However, varying salary levels among individuals should be consistent with differences in the factors that appropriately affect salary.

This appeals process is intended to address only salary appeals that are based on the appellant's belief that his/her salary is lower than comparable faculty within his/her academic unit and that the salary disparity cannot be explained by factors that appropriately affect salary levels.

Subject to OAA approval, department, school, college, and regional campus patterns of administration may contain additional policies pertinent to this process.

2.1 Eligibility

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

Faculty who meet all of the following criteria may use this process if:

- they are regular faculty members
- they do not receive part of their OSU compensation from a health care practice plan
- their salary is 5% or more below the average salary of all other faculty of the same rank in their academic unit or in a recognized discipline or subdiscipline with a distinct salary market within their academic unit (TIU for Columbus faculty; regional campus for regional campus faculty). There must be at least two such faculty, in addition to the appellant, for these procedures to apply. Further, these faculty members must allege that the salary disparity cannot be accounted for by:
 - differences in years of service and years in rank
 - productivity in teaching, research, and service
 - centrality of the person's work to the academic unit
 - past/present administrative duties
 - market factors
 - other factors set forth as legitimate bases for salary determination in the faculty member's academic unit APT document or POA or otherwise consistently communicated and applied in hiring and merit salary increase decisions
 - three full academic years have passed since a final decision was rendered on a faculty member's previous appeal under this process. For example, if a faculty member uses this process during the academic year 2008-09 and a final decision is rendered in that time period, s/he may not use the process again until the 2012-13 academic year.

This process is not intended to address all bases of dissatisfaction with salary. Faculty with salary concerns who are not eligible for review under this process may seek information about and resolution to their concerns through discussion with the head of their academic unit.

2.2 Parties to the appeal process

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

2.2.1 Academic unit head

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

For purposes of this process, the academic unit head is the head of the TIU, be that a department, school, or college except in the case of regional campus faculty. The academic unit head for regional campus faculty is the regional campus dean-director.

2.2.2 Dean/dean-director

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

The dean of a college, the director of University Libraries, or the dean-director of a regional campus.

2.2.3 College faculty salary appeals committee

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

There will be a faculty salary appeals committee at the college level (whether or not the college is a TIU). The committee may exist solely for the purpose of reviewing salary appeals under this process or may be an existing committee (the P&T committee or college investigation committee).

Because a two-level review process (department and college) is not possible for the nine colleges (including the University Libraries and the John Glenn School of Public Policy) that serve as TIUs, and the academic unit head and dean are the same person in these units, a slight modification of the college faculty salary appeals committee is possible. In these units, the faculty member may select, if s/he wishes, an additional faculty member to serve on the college committee. This faculty member must be a full-time tenured faculty member from within the college of the appellant and may not be a member of the comparison group.

2.2.4 Regional campus faculty salary appeals committee

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

There will be a faculty salary appeals committee for the regional campuses which shall consist of one faculty member from each regional campus appointed by the dean of that campus. Terms of members shall be four years and initially will be staggered (one year for Lima, two for Mansfield, three for Marion, and four for Newark) to assure continuity of membership. The chair of the committee shall rotate among the campuses in the order of Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark. Reappointment to the committee is possible.

2.3 Time frame for appeal

Revised: 03/01/12

Edited: 03/01/12

Appeals under these procedures must be initiated no later than September 30 in order to facilitate completion of the review before salary recommendations are made for the next academic year. Every reasonable effort must be made by the parties to the review process to complete consideration of a salary appeal by mid-April of the academic year.

In the event it is not possible to conclude review of an appeal in this time frame, the administrator who makes salary recommendations for the appellant will carry out that role as usual. It will usually be necessary to update appeal materials following the annual raise process since both academic records and salaries included in the original appeal materials will no longer be current.

2.4 College and regional campus salary appeals policies

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

A college (whether it has units or not) or regional campus POA may establish college-wide or regional campus policies for the documentation of salary appeals under this process if the college or regional campus wishes to have such policies. College and regional campus salary appeals policies must be approved by OAA before they are implemented. Colleges and regional campuses may amend these policies as needed subject to approval of OAA.

2.5 Department salary appeals process

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

Except where college-wide standards for documentation of appeals are established, individual department POAs may establish written policies for the documentation of salary appeals under these procedures if departments wish to

have such policies. These policies must be approved by the college office and OAA before they can be implemented. Units may amend these policies as needed subject to the required approvals.

2.6 Appellant responsibilities

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

The faculty member using this process bears full responsibility for documenting the appeal.

Documentation must be consistent with any department and college or regional campus written requirements as well as with the eligibility requirements set forth in Section 2.1 of this chapter. Unless department, college, or regional campus POAs specify otherwise, this documentation must consist of a detailed analysis of the appellant's academic record and salary relative to faculty in the comparison group taking into account years of service, years in rank, and other factors that affect salary as noted in Section 2.1 of this chapter. CVs of comparators and salary information are public records and can be requested from the academic unit office.

Unless unit, college, or regional campus POAs specify otherwise, the comparison group must include all other faculty of the same rank in the academic unit (excluding the academic unit head). When an academic unit contains distinct and recognized disciplines or subdisciplines which have different salary markets, the comparison group will be limited to all other faculty of the same rank in appellant's discipline or subdiscipline within the academic unit (excluding the academic unit head).

As noted in Section 2.1 of this chapter, at least two comparators that meet these requirements must exist for this process to be applicable.

The faculty member may, but is not required to, initially present his/her documentation to the chair of the college or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee for informal advice as to whether the appeal, as set forth, appears to meet the eligibility and documentation requirements set forth in this document and in any written academic unit and college salary appeals documents.

The faculty member may then determine whether to proceed with a salary appeal. The salary appeals committee chair shall not express an opinion as to whether the appeal has merit since that judgment cannot be made based only on the appellant's perspective.

The faculty member may appeal to the college or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee if the academic unit head dismisses the appeal or proposes a resolution that is judged to be unsatisfactory by the faculty member.

2.7 Academic head responsibilities

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

On receipt of documentation alleging salary inequity from a faculty member, the academic unit head shall review the documentation. The academic unit head may request additional information from the faculty member and/or meet with the faculty member as appropriate.

The academic unit head may dismiss the appeal or propose a salary adjustment (see Section 2.10 of this chapter for required approvals for salary adjustments). Salary adjustments should not be communicated to affected faculty until the required approvals have been obtained.

The academic unit head will respond in writing to the appeal. The response may provide additional analysis, as deemed necessary, and must provide a rationale for the conclusions. **The academic unit head will ensure delivery of the final written notice of the disposition of the appeal by also sending an electronic copy to the appellant.**

If the academic unit is a TIU within a college, forward to the college office a copy of all written material generated by the appeal for record keeping purposes.

2.8 College or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee responsibilities

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

On receipt of an appeal from a faculty member who is dissatisfied with the academic unit head's disposition of that appeal the college or regional campus faculty salary review committee will review the documentation submitted by the faculty member and the written conclusions of the academic unit head in light of the unit's salary criteria.

While the committee may, on occasion, request additional information from either the academic unit head or appellant, and/or meet with parties to the complaint, its review should be based primarily on the appellant's documentation and the academic unit head's response to that documentation. The committee does not develop new documentation. An inadequately documented appeal should be dismissed.

The college or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee may make a recommendation to the dean or dean-director regarding:

- whether a salary adjustment for the appellant is or is not warranted
- an explanation of its conclusions
- if an adjustment is warranted, its approximate amount

The committee's recommendation to the dean or dean-director is advisory.

2.9 Dean or dean/director responsibilities

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

On receipt of a recommendation from the college or regional campus faculty committee the dean or dean/director will accept, amend, or reject the faculty committee's recommendation. If the dean/dean-director determines that a salary adjustment shall be made, the dean/dean-director shall determine the amount and the timing of that increase (see Section 2.10 of this chapter).

The dean or dean/director will communicate the final decision to the appellant and to the appellant's academic unit head if that person is different from the dean/dean-director. The dean/dean-director will also communicate to the faculty salary appeals committee the final action taken on a complaint and, if the action differs from the faculty committee's recommendation, the reason for that action.

The dean or dean/director will maintain in the college or regional campus office a record of all appeals, including those dismissed by the academic unit head and not appealed to the college or regional campus faculty committee. Each record should include all written materials developed for and generated by the appeal.

2.10 Salary equity adjustments proposed under these procedures

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

Salary equity adjustments proposed as a result of using these procedures should be funded from annual raise monies available during the annual raise cycle to the extent possible. A proposal to provide an equity salary increase from other academic unit funds, regardless of the proposed timing of the increase, requires the approval of the dean (in colleges with units) and OAA.

2.11 Decisions that cannot be appealed

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

A decision is final under these procedures and cannot be appealed when the academic unit head's written conclusions regarding the matter are not appealed to the college or regional campus faculty salary appeals

committee within 30 days of the date of the academic unit head's letter to the appellant reporting conclusions; when the dean/dean-director accepts a recommendation of the college or regional campus faculty salary committee to dismiss an appeal; or when the dean/dean-director accepts a recommendation of the college or regional campus faculty salary committee to provide a salary adjustment and offers an adjustment that is at least 75% of the amount recommended by the committee.

2.12 Decisions that can be appealed

Revised: 03/25/04

Edited: 08/01/07

If the dean or dean-director dismisses an appeal that was not dismissed by the faculty committee, or proposes a salary adjustment that is less than 75% of the amount recommended by the faculty committee, the appellant may appeal to the provost. The provost or designee will review the matter and render a final decision.

3.0 Complaints against regular tenure track, regular clinical, regular research, or auxiliary faculty members

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 establishes the procedures for formal complaints against RTT, RCT, RRT, and auxiliary faculty members. This rule also applies to administrators who hold faculty appointments.

Chapter 4 Legal Matters

1.0 Ethics Law, Ohio

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The State of Ohio requires all university personnel, including faculty members, to adhere to the Ohio Ethics Law. Additional information can be found on the Office of Legal Affairs (OLA) website, www.legal.osu.edu/olaindex.php and on the Ohio Ethics Commission website, www.ethics.ohio.gov/OhioEthicsLaw.html.

2.0 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974, as amended, sets forth requirements designed to protect the privacy of student educational records. The law governs access to records maintained by educational institutions and the release of information from those records. The Ohio State Policy Concerning Privacy and Release of Student Educational Records can be found on the Registrar's website, www.ureg.ohio-state.edu/ourweb/more/Content/ferpa_pg1.html.

3.0 Immunity, indemnification and representation

Revised: 09/01/99

Edited: 08/01/07

Ohio law provides university employees with immunity from liability in law suits filed in state courts. Individuals seeking to recover damages for the wrongful acts of a university employee must file a state court law suit in the Ohio Court of Claims. The defendant in such a case is the university and employees cannot be named individually.

University employees may in some circumstances be named as individual defendants in law suits filed in federal courts. However, the university may provide legal representation and pay the amount of any judgment in these cases.

University employees must satisfy two conditions in order to obtain the benefit of the immunity in state courts and the indemnification in federal court cases:

- The actions of the employee giving rise to the law suit must be within the scope of the employee's duties.
- The employee cannot be found to have acted with malice, in bad faith, or with reckless disregard as to the consequences of his or her actions.

Further information concerning the legal liabilities of faculty members, including unit heads, may be obtained from OLA (www.legal.osu.edu/olaindex.php).

4.0 Personal use of public property

Revised: 09/01/99

Edited: 01/01/11

Unauthorized use of university property for personal purposes is prohibited and could result in criminal charges. In certain limited circumstances, faculty members may use university property in connection with activities authorized under the Faculty Paid External Consulting Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/paidexternalconsulting.pdf>). However, faculty members must obtain prior approval from their TIU head and must reimburse the university for the fair market value of such use.

5.0 Public records

Revised: 07/26/04

Edited: 08/01/07

The Ohio Public Records Act defines a "record" as any document, device, or item, regardless of physical form or characteristic, created or received by, or coming under the jurisdiction of, any public office of the state or its political subdivisions, which serves to document the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the office.

Such records shall be promptly prepared and made available for inspection to any persons at all reasonable times during regular business hours. Upon request, a person responsible for public records shall make copies available at cost, within a reasonable period of time.

An academic unit should have a single person responsible for dealing with public records requests and in most cases that person should be the unit head. The TIU head or other person responsible for handling such requests may wish to consult with OLA (www.legal.osu.edu/olaindex.php) before responding to a request.

The Act does not require that records be created in response to a request. If there is no record that corresponds to a request, then there is no record to be provided.

The Act allows public entities to charge reasonable costs for making copies. If a unit receives a request for copies of records that appears to justify cost recovery, it should seek the advice of the OLA.

The Ohio Revised Code requires public institutions and agencies to abide by the rules for the disposition of public records as established by the State Records Administrator. However, the law exempts public institutions of higher education from the State Records Administrator and authorizes them to establish their own programs of records retention and disposition.

At The Ohio State University, authority for matters of records retention and disposition is vested in the University Archives (www.library.osu.edu/sites/archives/). University Archives maintains a schedule governing the retention and disposition of records common to university units. University Archives also develops schedules for units in cases when they have records not listed on the General Schedule. These schedules are specific to units and are in conformity with *Records Retention for Public Colleges and Universities in Ohio: A Manual* (Columbus, Ohio: Inter-university Council of Ohio, 1992 and updates).

Chapter 5 Sources of Important Information

1.0 Board of Trustees

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

The Ohio State University is governed by a board of 17 trustees who are responsible for oversight of academic programs, budgets and general administration, and employment of faculty and staff.

The Governor of the State of Ohio appoints 15 members to 9-year terms and two non-voting student members to two-year terms. In addition the Board of Trustees may appoint alumni or “friends of the university, who are not Ohio residents, to three-year terms as charter trustees.

Additional information can be found at the Board of Trustees (BOT) website, www.trustees.osu.edu/.

1.1 Rules of the University Faculty

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

According to the Bylaws of the University (3335-3-04), the legislative authority to establish educational and academic policies of the university is vested in the university faculty, subject to the approval of the BOT. In this connection, the university faculty shall have the authority, subject to the approval of the BOT, to adopt rules to effectuate the educational and academic policies of the university. It shall also act upon all matters of routine faculty business in pursuance of already established university policies and shall recommend to the BOT candidates for honorary degrees.

1.1.1 Organization and contents

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Rules of the University Faculty can be found at www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php. These rules are divided into 11 Chapters.

- 3335-3 Administration
 - Organization of the university
 - Deans of colleges
 - Dean/directors of regional campuses
 - Chairs of departments
 - Directors of schools
- 3335-5 Faculty, governance, and committees
 - College, departmental/school, regional campus faculties
 - Faculty of the arts and sciences
 - Graduate faculty
 - Council on Research and Graduate Studies
 - University Senate
- 3335-6 Tenure track faculty appointments, reappointments, promotion & tenure
- 3335-7 Regular clinical track and regular research track faculty appointment, reappointment & nonreappointment, & promotion
- 3335-8 Instruction

- Courses & curricula
 - university required courses
 - Examinations & marks
 - university year
- 3335-9 Attendance and graduation
- Admission, registration & payment of fees
 - Absences
 - Warning & dismissal
 - Graduation
- 3335-11 Student Life
- University discipline
 - Activities
 - The Ohio Union
- 3335-13 University property
- Restrictions
 - Patent rights
- 3335-15 Miscellaneous provisions
- Recommendations regarding amendment of rules
 - Regulations & bylaws

1.1.2 Sections of particular interest to faculty

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Sections of particular interest to faculty include the following:

- 3335-5-01 Academic freedom & responsibility
- 3335-5-19 Regular faculty tracks, auxiliary and emeritus faculty
- 3335-5-37 –
- 3335-5-48 University Senate

2.0 Academic Misconduct, Committee on and Code of Student Conduct

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) is charged with maintaining the academic integrity of The Ohio State University by establishing procedures for and investigating all reported cases of alleged academic misconduct by students. In those instances where a student is found to have violated the Code of Student Conduct, the committee determines a suitable disciplinary action. The Code of Student Conduct can be found on the BOT website, www.trustees.osu.edu/. More information on COAM, including resources that can be used in the classroom, can be found at the COAM website, www.oaa.osu.edu/coam/home.html.

3.0 Advancement of Teaching, University Center for the

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/04/09

The University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT) provides information, consultation, and event coordination to support teaching. Additional information on UCAT, including the policy on GA preparation and ongoing support can be found on the UCAT website, www.ucat.osu.edu.

4.0 Business and Finance, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Office of Business and Finance (B&F) attends to the business and finance operations of Ohio State including infrastructure and facilities maintenance services. Additional information, including policies on travel, procurement cards, and reporting and investigating financial fraud can be found on the B&F policies website, www.busfin.ohio-state.edu/expenditures/Index.htm.

5.0 Chief Information Officer, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) provide services to help Ohio State faculty, students and staff use technologies in learning, teaching, research, and administrative settings. More information, including policies on the deployment and use of wireless data networks, disclosure or exposure of personal information, payment for employee home and off-campus internet access, responsible use university computing and network resources, retention of electronic records, and the web can be found at CIO's website, www.cio.osu.edu.

6.0 Disability Services, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Office of Disability Services (ODS) provides services, auxiliary aids, and accommodations for students at The Ohio State University with documented disabilities. ODS also assists faculty members in their responsibilities to ensure all students have access to classroom instruction. The ODS website, www.ods.ohio-state.edu/faculty.asp, includes a faculty handbook on teaching students with disabilities as well as a syllabus statement regarding disability.

7.0 Diversity and Inclusion, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 01/01/11

The Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) provides leadership in supporting the success of minority students, faculty, and staff. ODI advocates for minority individuals at Ohio State and emphasizes the recruitment, retention, and timely graduation of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. Additional information can be found at the ODI website, www.oma.osu.edu.

7.1 Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinator, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The university's focal point for disability related initiatives is the Office of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator. More information, including policies and procedures on accommodation and accessibility, can be found at the Ohio State's ADA website, www.ada.osu.edu.

7.2 Commitment to Success Program

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Commitment to Success Program supports the university's Diversity Action Plan by researching the impact and enhancement diversity has on both educational and work settings at Ohio State. More information on the Commitment to Success Program can be found on the website of ODI, <http://odi.osu.edu/administrative-offices/commitment-to-success-program/>.

8.0 Environmental Health and Safety, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Office of Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) assists the university community in providing and maintaining a safe, healthful work environment including biosafety, environmental affairs, occupational health and safety education, radiation safety, research safety and emergency planning and business continuity. Additional information on these topics can be found at the EHS website, www.ehs.ohio-state.edu.

9.0 Human Resources, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

OHR provides human resource services to faculty and staff at Ohio State. These services include supporting recruitment and hiring, compensation and benefits programs, employee education and training, enhancing the climate and quality of work life, and creating and valuing a diverse work force. More information on the services OHR provides including university-wide policies on affirmative action, equal employment opportunity, and non-discrimination/harassment; sexual harassment; personnel records; nepotism; conflicts of interest and work outside the university; university faculty and staff assistance program; whistleblower; benefits and services; wage and salary; employment; staff development; hours of work and leaves; health and safety; discipline and grievances; reduction in workforce; and student employment can be found on the OHR website, www.hr.osu.edu. While some of these policies apply only to staff, most of them apply equally to all university employees including faculty.

10.0 Institutional Research and Planning, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) develops and analyzes university strategic indicators and performance measures. Additional information on IRP can be found at the IRP website, www.oaa.osu.edu/irp/home.php.

11.0 Registrar, Office of the University

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Office of the University Registrar provides support for enrollment, course and final exam scheduling, course registration, and other student data-related information. Additional information, including enrollment related policies and Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) can be found on the Registrar's faculty/staff website, www.ureg.ohio-state.edu/Indexes/faculty-staff.html.

The university's final examination policy can be found in Faculty Rules 3338-8-19 and 3335-5-20.

12.0 Research, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 02/15/13

The Office of Research provides support for the research mission of the university. Additional information including the policies on the authorization to seek off-campus funding, conflict of interest, facilities and administrative costs (indirect costs), gifts versus grants and contracts, human subjects and biosafety, misconduct in research, patents and copyrights, qualifications for service as a principal investigator, and research scientist appointments can be found at the Office of Research resources website, www.research.osu.edu/resources/index.cfm.

The Office of Research also oversees the Office of Responsible Research Practices (ORRP), the Office of Sponsored Research (OSP) and the **Technology Commercialization Office (TCO)**.

12.1 Responsible Research Practices, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

ORRP provides administrative support to the university research community by assisting faculty, staff, and students seeking committee approvals to conduct human subject and animal research; provide educational programming in support of the responsible conduct of research; and supports the operations of the university's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and Institutional Review Boards. More information on these topics can be found on the ORRP website, <http://orrp.osu.edu>.

12.2 Sponsored Programs, Office of

Revised: 08/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) promotes the development, implementation, and coordination of sponsored research at Ohio State and provides oversight of sponsored projects and the personnel associated with them by offering specialized integrated project development, administrative and financial services for research, and other activities supported by external sponsors. Additional information on OSP, including the policies governing externally sponsored research at Ohio State can be found at the OSP website, <http://rf.osu.edu>.

12.3 Technology Commercialization Office

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

TCO fosters an entrepreneurial culture at Ohio State by assisting in maximizing the value of Ohio State developments and by accelerating the transition of new developments into products, services, and new or expanded jobs. Additional information, including policies and legislation governing technology licensing and commercialization can be found at the **TCO** website, www.tlc.osu.edu.

13.0 University Policies Website

Revised: 08/01/10

Edited: 08/01/10

The university maintains a designated website for information on university-wide policies. This website can be found at <http://www.osu.edu/policies>.

Chapter 6 Office of Academic Affairs Administration**1.0 Regional Campus Boards**

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

1.1 Composition and Administration

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

A regional campus board has been established for each of the university's regional campuses located in Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark. Composition and administration of the regional campus boards shall be as follows:

- (1) Each of these boards shall be composed of ten members appointed by the executive vice president and provost ("the provost") in consultation with the dean/director of each regional campus.

(2) Nine members of each board shall be private citizens. One member of each board shall be a student who is currently enrolled and in good standing on his or her campus. The student member shall have no voting power on the board.

(3) Citizen members shall be appointed for terms of three years. Terms will be staggered so that three terms end each year. In case a vacancy develops, the provost may appoint a citizen member to fill the remaining part of the unexpired term. No citizen member shall serve more than three terms, consecutive or otherwise. (In determining eligibility for reappointment, an initial appointment of two years, or more, shall be construed as a term.)

(4) The student member shall serve a term of one year, and is eligible for reappointment as long as he or she remains a student in good standing on his or her campus.

(5) Terms of the appointed members shall begin on July first.

(6) Board members shall serve without compensation but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. Board members shall be provided immunities or indemnification against any claims or liabilities which may arise from the performance of their duties to the full extent permitted by law.

(7) The dean/director of each campus, in collaboration with the provost, shall establish campus priorities. The chair of each board shall advise the dean/director in establishing board agendas that promote these priorities. Reasonable staff services and other assistance as may be required by a board will be provided by the dean/director. The dean/director may attend all meetings of the board.

(8) The provost or the provost's designee, in cooperation with the deans/directors, shall serve as the liaison between the regional campus boards and the various colleges and departments of the university, and may attend all meetings of these boards.

(9) The chairs of the Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark campus faculty assemblies shall serve as resource persons to their campus's board and, in order to serve that function, may attend all public meetings of the board.

1.2 Nominations and Appointments

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

Nominations for and appointments to regional campus boards shall proceed as follows, with the goal of continually ensuring a strong, independent group of dedicated members of diverse backgrounds who represent a range of professions and experiences.

(1) All members of the regional campus boards are appointed by the provost, in consultation with the dean/director of each campus.

(2) The deans/directors will consult with their boards in determining nominees.

(3) The following criteria shall guide the nominations of community members:

(a) They are well acquainted with their respective campus and its region; with the other regional campuses; and with the Ohio state university as a whole;

(b) They have a record of community service;

(c) Consideration should be given to nominating individuals with diverse professional expertise and perspectives; and

(d) Employees of the university and their immediate family members, employees of the co-located technical college and their immediate family members, and members of the board of the co-located technical college are ineligible to serve as citizen members.

(4) Student members should be in good standing on their respective campuses, with an active interest in improving the campus and the Ohio state university in general, and must be willing to inform themselves about the needs, interests, and concerns of other students. However, in their capacity as board members, the student members' role is as that of any other board member – to balance the needs and issues of all constituencies in their deliberations – not to represent a single constituency.

(5) Deans/directors will communicate their nominations to the provost no later than the Tuesday following Memorial Day of each year.

(6) Vacancies shall be filled by the provost in the same manner and subject to the same qualifications as appointments for full terms.

(7) Members of the regional campus boards serve at the pleasure of the provost.

1.3 Responsibilities

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

The regional campus boards shall serve in an advisory capacity to the dean/director of their respective campuses. Each board shall:

(1) Assist in maintaining key relationships with external constituencies by:

(a) Developing support for its campus;

(b) Being knowledgeable about the Ohio state university, in general, and, in particular, about the campus served by the board;

(c) When appropriate, serving as a knowledgeable and effective advocate for its campus and for the Ohio state university with the state legislature and state and local agencies;

(d) Ensuring effective coordination with the board of the co-located technical college in all areas of common interest; and

(e) Ensuring effective coordination with the Columbus campus through service by appointed board members on appropriate Columbus-based councils and committees.

(2) Offer advice and guidance, as appropriate, about its campus's strategic plan, campus plan, student life plan, safety and security plans, etc. The regional campus boards shall have no jurisdiction with respect to faculty. The hiring, evaluation, promotion, tenure status, duties and responsibilities, and compensation of faculty shall be conducted in accordance with established university rules.

(3) The deans/directors of the regional campuses may at their discretion seek the advice of their respective boards on such matters as annual budgets, capital projects, tuition and fees proposals, etc.

1.4 Meetings

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

Regular meetings of the regional campus boards shall be held on such schedule as may be established by these boards in consultation with the dean/director, at times which shall be set and publicly announced.

(1) Special meetings may be called at the direction of a board chair, in consultation with the dean/director, or may, in consultation with the dean/director, be called by a chair at the request of three members of his or her board. In such cases, notice to all members of that board shall be given not less than five days prior to the meeting and publicly announced.

(2) Non-binding recommendations to the dean/director may be passed by a majority of the voting members present.

1.5 Conflict of Interest

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

No regional campus board member shall participate in deliberations on a university contract, action or transaction when the board member has a financial or personal or fiduciary interest in any person or entity affected by such contract, action or transaction. The board member having the prohibited interest shall make full disclosure thereof and shall abstain from any deliberations on any such matter. Board members shall provide the provost on or about August first of each year with a full disclosure of any financial or fiduciary interest the board member, a member of the board member's family, or any business associate of the board member may have in any service provider who may be qualified to do business with the university

1.6 Officers

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

Officers of regional campus boards shall be as follows:

(1) The executive committees of the regional campus boards shall consist of a chair, vice chair, and a recording secretary of each board. These officers shall be elected annually by their respective board on a schedule to be determined by that board. No officer may serve more than two consecutive, one-year terms in the same office.

(2) The chair shall preside at all meetings of his or her board, shall appoint members of any committees created by the board, shall serve as an *ex officio* member of all standing and special committees, and shall approve the agenda for all board meetings.

(3) The vice chair shall perform the duties and exercise the powers of the chair during the absence of the chair or in the event of the chair's inability to act.

(4) The recording secretary shall be responsible for ensuring that minutes of board meetings are produced and maintained; for ensuring that board members are kept informed about board activities and campus issues; for ensuring that correspondence of the board is properly conducted; and for posting board minutes to a designated location on his or her campus's website in a timely fashion.

1.7 Committees

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

Committees of regional campus boards may form and operate as follows:

(1) In consultation with their respective deans/directors, the regional campus boards shall establish such committees, both standing and *ad hoc*, as needed to inform their advice and recommendations to the deans/directors.

(2) The charge and composition of the regional campus board committees shall be determined by the board chairs in consultation with their respective dean/director.

(3) The work of the regional campus board committees shall be facilitated by such offices on the Columbus campus as student life, strategic enrollment planning, minority affairs, business and finance, and other units as may be appropriate to a committee's charge. The provost or the provost's designee will assure the regular and ongoing contact of the regional campus board committees and these offices and units on the Columbus campus.

(4) The regional campus board committees shall also work with individuals and entities, as appropriate, at the technical school co-located on their campus to ensure the continuing collaboration and mutual benefit of both institutions.

2.0 Faculty Fellow Program

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

2.1 Purpose

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

This program enables OAA to obtain the services of a senior faculty member for an in-depth, time-limited administrative project, releasing him/her from 50% or more of his/her regular duties. The program is also designed to provide a leadership development opportunity for senior faculty.

2.2 Compensation

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

A faculty fellow appointment does not entail additional compensation. OAA will transfer funds to the fellow's home unit to cover the fellow's compensation in proportion to the percent FTE that OAA is obtaining for the fellow's time.

Compensation can include summer funding for faculty who are on 9-month appointments, not to exceed 2/9ths of the base salary.

2.3 Appointment Process

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

The provost must approve any proposal for a project to be undertaken by a fellow. Once the proposal is approved, OAA will call for nominations, including self-nominations, through an electronic message sent to faculty, chairs and deans. All applications must include a recommendation from the unit head. The provost will appoint a screening committee to review applications and make a recommendation about an appointment.

2.4 Carole A. Anderson Fellow

Revised: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

In selecting the Carole A. Anderson Fellow (Named in honor of Carole A. Anderson, professor emerita of Nursing, retired July 31, 2011.), the screening committee may consider participation in a leadership development program or significant university service as a factor in making a recommendation. There will generally be only one Anderson fellow appointed at any given time.

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: 04/01/07

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. OAA will therefore need multiple copies: 10 + original. Please contact Bobbie Houser (houser.73@osu.edu) with any questions.

The P&T section (Section VII) of the TIU's appointments, promotion and tenure (APT) document must be included in each copy for use by the committee members as they study the case. If more than one case from a single unit will go to the committee, only one copy of the material need be supplied. Put the copy in the dossier of the candidate from that unit whose name comes first in the alphabet.

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 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 regular 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: 02/15/13

Edited: 02/15/13

2010 – 2013

Suzanne Bartle-Haring, Human Sciences

Mark A. Bennett, Horticulture and Crop Science

Lois A. Rosow, Music

Lane J. Wallace, Pharmacy

2011 – 2014

John Barnard, Pediatrics

Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Political Science

Anne B. McCoy, Chemistry

2012 – 2015

Betty Lise Anderson, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Thomas P. Kasulis, Comparative Studies

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 regular 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: 08/04/09

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.

3.6.3 Integrity of review procedures

Revised: 04/01/07

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 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: 05/01/10

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.

Some units define a positive outcome in a manner leading to ambiguous or controversial results when a vote is mixed or when a substantial proportion of faculty do not vote either "yes" or "no." 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.

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: 04/01/07

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.

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: 09/26/11

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.

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 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 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: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Candidates are advised to use this process to amend, correct, or otherwise comment on factual information or procedural matters. 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: 04/01/07

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 becomes available. An amended record must be reviewed by all parties to the review process.

If information regarding significant new accomplishments becomes available before a case leaves the TIU, but after the TIU deliberative body 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.

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 may exist 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 may exist 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: 05/01/10

In the event that a TIU head has a conflict of interest, is at lower rank than the candidate, is not on the RTT, 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, is at a lower rank than the candidate, is not on the RTT, 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: 04/01/07

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), 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: 02/15/13

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 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 **May** 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 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: 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

RTT 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 chair of the committee of the eligible faculty 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: 02/15/12

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.

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: 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.
- 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: 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 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.

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 RCT 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 Regular research track

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

RRT 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 RRT 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 RRT 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 auxiliary faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

Auxiliary 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.

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.

6.2 Documentation of teaching and service

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

6.2.1 Auxiliary clinical faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

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

6.2.2 Auxiliary with regular titles below 50% and adjunct faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

Edited: 08/01/07

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

6.3 Documentation of research: external evaluation

Revised: 07/24/12

Edited: 07/24/12

External evaluations are optional for auxiliary 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 auxiliary faculty member's responsibilities include a significant expectation of published research or scholarship or when the eligible faculty are 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 RTT 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.