

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND REVIEWS PROCEDURES

Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University at Mansfield

Updated 9/13/2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Preamble.....	2
2. Campus Mission.....	2
3. Appointments	3
3.1 Criteria	3
3.1.1 Tenure-Track Faculty	3
3.1.2 Auxiliary Faculty	3
3.2 Procedures	4
3.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty	4
3.2.2 Auxiliary Faculty	5
4. Annual Reviews	6
4.1 Procedures	6
4.2 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	6
4.2.1 Fourth-Year Review	6
4.2.2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	7
4.3 Tenured Faculty	7
4.4 Auxiliary Faculty	7
5. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	7
5.1 Criteria.....	7
5.2 Procedures	8
5.3 Documentation	9
6. Reviews for Promotion and Tenure	9
6.1 Criteria	10
6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	10
6.1.2 Promotion to Professor.....	11
6.2 Procedures	11
6.2.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	11
6.2.2 Responsibilities of the Candidate	16
6.2.3 Responsibilities of the Dean and Associate Dean	17
6.2.4 Responsibilities of P&T Committee Members	18
6.2.5 Promotion to Professor	20
6.2.6 Overview of Responsibilities for Promotion to Professor	21
6.3 Documentation	22
Appendix A: AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics	24

Appendix B: Schedule of Faculty Review Process	26
Appendix C: Checklist for OSU Mansfield Procedures Oversight Designee	27

1. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) [Policy and Procedures Handbook](#); the governance documents of tenure-initiating units (TIUs); and other policies and procedures of the university to which the Mansfield campus and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Mansfield campus will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every five years on the appointment or reappointment of the campus Dean and Director (henceforth “the Dean” or “the campus Dean”).

The Dean of the Mansfield campus and the Office of Academic Affairs must approve this document before it may be implemented. It sets forth the campus’s mission and, in the context of that mission and the mission of the university, the campus’s criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and faculty promotion, tenure, and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the campus Dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the campus and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and candidates for faculty positions in relation to the campus’s mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in University Rule [3335-6-01](#). In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in University Rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to this campus and relevant TIUs; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

2. Campus Mission

Through its Mansfield Campus, The Ohio State University extends Ohio State University courses, curricula, and resources geographically, to meet the educational needs of the people of North Central and Northeast Ohio. In achieving its mission, The Ohio State University at Mansfield is guided by several operating principles and core values including the following:

Ohio State Quality: All courses and curricula offered on the Mansfield campus fully maintain the same content and standards as those offered in Columbus. All regular faculty hold the highest degree awarded by their profession, and almost all non-tenure track faculty hold a master’s degree or higher. Regular faculty are members of their OSU

departments and meet departmental criteria for promotion and tenure. Regular faculty are expected to remain current in their professions by engaging in active scholarship.

Student-Friendly: Regular, full-time faculty deliver more than half of the instruction. Excellent teaching is expected of all faculty. Class size is kept relatively small, averaging 20-25 students per class. Faculty members help students to learn both inside and outside of class. Highly professional staff members support student learning in many diverse ways, such as maintaining facilities, advising students, tutoring, and providing administrative services.

Broad and Open Access: The Mansfield campus maintains Ohio State's Land Grant tradition of making higher education accessible to traditional and non-traditional students. Admission is open to all. The campus values diversity and strives to engage all of the surrounding community. Scholarships and other financial aid help many students surmount financial obstacles, and the campus's academic support services help students who may have been away from education for a number of years or who need help with learning skills.

Community Involvement: The campus is involved in the life of the community. The campus is formally involved with the region in economic development, in the arts and cultures, and in support for schools. Many faculty and staff contribute time, money, and expertise to the good of the community. In turn, community leaders help the campus assess community needs, and the community has contributed generously to campus campaigns. A community Board helps advise the campus.

Diversity: At Ohio State, we celebrate and learn from our diversity, and we value individual differences. Academic freedom is defended within an environment of civility, tolerance, and mutual respect.

3. Appointments

3.1 Criteria

3.1.1 Regular Tenure-Track Faculty

Each TIU at Ohio State defines a set of criteria, including research and scholarly activity, for hiring tenure-track faculty at Ohio State's regional campuses (TIU governance documents are available [here](#)). In addition, University Rule [3335-6-04](#) D.1 notes that "the relative weight of teaching and service is ordinarily greater on regional campuses."

3.1.2 Auxiliary Faculty

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. Appointment as a lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a master's degree (or equivalent experience) in a field appropriate for the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of or potential for high quality instructional ability is required. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure. Appointment as a senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate or terminal degree in a field appropriate for the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high quality instruction; or a master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience at OSU-Mansfield with documented high-quality

performance. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure. Lecturers' and senior lecturers' responsibilities pertain strictly to formal course instruction. The Associate Dean will follow criteria established by TIUs in determining whether a candidate is qualified for a lecturer appointment. Auxiliary appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All auxiliary appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Renewals will be based on a performance review as well as the continued need for the position.

Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held at that institution. The rank at which other (non-regular faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

Reemployment of retired faculty. For eligibility requirements and guidelines on the rehiring of faculty who have retired from The Ohio State University, see the Office of Human Resources (OHR) Policy on Reemployment of Faculty and Staff ([Policy 4.25](#)). It is acceptable for units to negotiate some post-retirement work with non-retired faculty in order to facilitate retirement. Yet long-term agreements are inappropriate, and even short-term agreements should be made subject to availability of funds, programmatic needs, and performance. Reemployment of retired faculty is not an entitlement and cannot be guaranteed. Note that faculty may be rehired into the same position at greater than 75% FTE only if the salary is not greater than 75% of the base salary at the time of retirement. Note also that the personnel action of entering a retired faculty member into the OHR system as an emeritus appointment should not be confused with the reemployment of a retired faculty member (see the OAA [Faculty Appointments](#) policies).

3.2 Procedures

3.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus Dean, TIU head, and TIU representatives. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the TIU head and regional campus Dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin; the letter of offer must be signed by the TIU head and the regional campus Dean.

Decisions to create new positions and fill vacant positions are the responsibility of the Dean. The Curriculum Committee, a standing committee of the Mansfield campus Faculty Assembly, is charged with advising the Dean on such decisions. The Mansfield campus has primary responsibilities for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the Dean or designee consults with the TIU head to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one Columbus representative from the TIU.

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be requested from the Office of Academic

Affairs in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of [A Guide to Effective Searches](#).

Should the Dean feel that the applicant pool or the final group of candidates is insufficiently diverse, he or she may propose that the search either be extended or cancelled until a later date. Should the search be extended, additional efforts will be made to increase the diversity of the candidate pool by advertising the position in additional venues or using other acceptable means necessary to achieve a diverse pool.

The Dean, in consultation with the head of the TIU, will appoint an ad hoc search committee to identify candidates for the position. The committee will include at least one Columbus campus member of the TIU unless the TIU head declines to recommend such an appointment. The committee will solicit applications, strive to cultivate a diverse applicant pool, and invite applicants to visit both the Mansfield campus and the Columbus campus. The TIU is responsible for determining what the candidate will do during the visit to the Columbus campus. At the Mansfield campus, the candidate will deliver a research presentation, submit to questions from the search committee, and receive personal interviews with the Dean, the Associate Dean, and appropriate faculty members. The research presentation is meant not only to showcase the candidate's scholarly work but also to give the audience a sense of the candidate's teaching style; as such, these presentations are open to all members of the campus community, including students. The interview process at the Mansfield campus may include a group meeting with students and may also include presentations delivered by way of video-conferencing technology to other campuses.

To the head of the TIU and the Dean, the search committee will deliver a recommendation indicating which candidates are acceptable, in order from most acceptable to least acceptable. The TIU head will follow the TIUs procedures for selecting a candidate for an offer. According to University Rules, hiring can go forward only when the Dean and the TIU head reach agreement. Upon such agreement, the Dean can begin negotiations with a candidate.

The Dean consults with the TIU head in determining negotiation parameters. Letters of offer must present the signature of the Dean and the TIU head, and in some cases, the dean of the college. The offer letter will generally specify that the candidate has two weeks to respond.

Any exceptions to this process require OAA approval.

3.2.2 Auxiliary Faculty

Lecturers. The Associate Dean, in consultation with the Dean, the TIU head, program coordinators and other relevant faculty members, appoints lecturers to teach specific courses.

Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. The appointment and reappointment of all visiting faculty members is decided by the Dean in consultation with the Associate Dean, TIU head, and relevant faculty members.

Retired faculty. Rehiring a retired faculty member requires approval of the campus Dean, the TIU head, and OAA prior to extending an offer (see the [Request to Rehire Retired Faculty Member Form](#)).

4. Annual Reviews

The Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean, conducts an annual review of all regular and visiting faculty members. TIU's must also conduct annual reviews for regular regional campus faculty members, and the faculty member bears the responsibility of finding out what documentations the TIU requires. The campus annual review focuses primarily on teaching and service; the TIU bears primary responsibility for assessing research productivity.

4.1 Procedures

The campus follows the Office of Academic Affairs policies for annual reviews (available [here](#)). The annual review covers a faculty member's performance over the previous calendar year in relation to expected performance in teaching, service, and research (the research performance assessment may reflect the prior three years' research productivity), as set forth in the campus's policy on "Duties and Responsibilities of Faculty" (in the campus [Faculty & Staff Handbook](#)); it also covers any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual as well as progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every regular faculty member is described under "Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards" (section 5) below. In conducting each annual review, the Dean reviews the faculty member's core dossier; the Dean also reviews the faculty member's service involvement using the faculty-approved method of self-assessment for service (see the campus [Faculty & Staff Handbook](#)). Faculty members must update their core dossier by January 31 of the year following the year to be reviewed. For full professors, completing the core dossier is not required; full professors may instead submit a CV that clearly highlights their contributions and achievements during the previous calendar year. By January 31, all faculty members must also submit a self-assessment report of service involvement during the year to be reviewed. The Dean retrieves additional data on teaching performance (e.g. peer evaluations, eSEI reports, summaries of students' discursive evaluations, etc.) from the faculty member's personnel file or from other university offices.

All faculty members have the right (per University Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

4.2 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

The Dean meets with each probationary faculty member to discuss the faculty member's performance and then prepares a letter summarizing the performance evaluation. The Dean sends the original letter to the faculty member and a copy of the letter to the TIU head. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the Dean and the TIU, the TIU head discusses the matter with the Dean in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

4.2.1 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, a faculty member undergoes a fourth-year review that serves as the annual review for that year; this review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review with the exception that the external review letters are not required. The chair of the campus's Promotion and Tenure committee (P&T Committee) conducts a review of the faculty member according to section 6 of this document (below). The chair sends the committee's evaluation letter to the Dean, who, after completing an independent review of the faculty member's record and reviewing the letter from the chair of the P&T Committee, sends both her or his own letter and the committee's letter to the faculty member's TIU head. The letter from the Dean includes a recommendation regarding whether or not to renew the faculty member's appointment for an additional probationary year. The review then moves to the TIU and then to the faculty member's college. The college dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

4.2.2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

University Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period, including for such reasons as birth of a child, adoption, and adverse events. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

4.3 Tenured Faculty

The review process for tenured faculty members is identical to that for tenure-track probationary faculty. The Dean prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The Dean sends the evaluation to the faculty member and sends a copy to the faculty member's TIU head. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the Dean and the TIU, the TIU head and the Dean discuss the matter in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. The Dean has the authority to make the final decision in case of a difference of opinion regarding a specific performance rating.

4.4 Auxiliary Faculty

Review of all auxiliary faculty, except visiting faculty, is the responsibility of the Associate Dean. Review of visiting faculty members is the responsibility of the campus Dean.

5. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

5.1 Criteria

Merit salary increases are based as much on qualitative as quantitative contributions in each of the three areas of faculty activity: teaching, research, and service.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

The campus Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean and with the appropriate TIU head, annually assesses faculty performance in teaching, research, and service in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions (see section 6.1, below). The time frame for assessing teaching and service is the previous calendar year. The time frame for assessing research may be longer, dependent on the TIU; wherever possible, however, the Dean and Associate Dean will request a rating that reflects the previous three years for research in order to attend to longer-term patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

In accordance with OAA policy and with University Rule [3335-6-04 D.1](#), the campus's standard weighting for salary adjustments emphasizes teaching. The standard weights are 50% for teaching, 40% for research, and 10% for service. During his or her annual performance review, a faculty member may ask the campus Dean to adjust his or her salary weighting for the year following the year under review. The Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean and the individual faculty member, may choose to modify the respective weighting of teaching, research, and service performance in situations where a faculty member's assigned responsibilities deviate in a significant way from the typical profile. Faculty members contribute to the mission of the campus and university in different ways, and their contributions to each of the three major areas will likely vary over time.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

5.2 Procedures

The Dean determines annual salary increases and other performance rewards. The Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean, rates each faculty member's annual performance in teaching and service; the Dean consults with the appropriate TIU head to rate each faculty member's performance in research. Taken together, these three ratings are used to formulate salary increases for meritorious annual performance. In making salary increase recommendations, the Dean also considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The following scale is used to assess each of the three areas of performance:

- 0 Well below expectations of a regional faculty member
- 1 Somewhat below expectations of a regional faculty member
- 2 Meets expectations of a regional faculty member
- 3 Somewhat above expectations of a regional faculty member
- 4 Well above expectations of a regional faculty member

Faculty members may meet with the Dean to discuss with their individual salary determination process, including but not limited to their salary, salary increase, and/or their ratings. In addition, faculty should consult the faculty salary equity appeals process: see Volume 1, Chapter 3, section 2 of the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

5.3 Documentation

The Dean will inform faculty in a timely manner of impending deadlines and required materials. Most faculty members submit a core dossier; faculty members not submitting a core dossier must submit an updated CV. All faculty members must submit a self-assessment of service activities using the faculty-approved method of self-assessment for service. In order to understand a faculty member's eSEIs, student discursive evaluations, and peer evaluations in context, the Dean should also review a faculty member's grade distributions and drop rates.

Faculty members must also check with their TIU to determine what documents to submit to the TIU for their annual review.

6. Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion

Promotion and Tenure (P&T) decisions are the most important decisions a university makes because they ultimately determine the strength of the university's faculty and, thus, the quality of the university. Detailed P&T procedures exist to ensure that P&T decisions are informed and fair.

P&T decisions should uphold and strengthen the institution. Likes and dislikes must be set aside; even humanitarian concerns must be secondary. P&T criteria must reflect, and decisions must be based upon, the best long-term interests of the institution.

P&T decisions involve faculty peer review and administrative review at many levels. For OSU Mansfield candidates, the process begins with peer review and a recommendation by a committee of tenured campus faculty members, followed by a recommendation by the Dean. These campus recommendations become part of subsequent reviews conducted by faculty and administration in the candidate's department or school (i.e., the TIU), college, and OAA.

Before tenure, a regular faculty member is considered to be on probationary status. Annually, a decision is made as to whether to renew the appointment of a probationary faculty member. A non-renewal decision (unless based upon fiscal or programmatic considerations) must be based on the results of an annual performance review conducted by the Dean using fourth-year review procedures (see section 4, above). Non-renewal of a probationary faculty member is not to be confused with dismissal for cause. A high level of performance must be documented for renewal, but even excellent performance does not guarantee renewal and tenure, for the needs of the institution may change.

Each step of this process follows detailed procedures set forth in the P&T documents of the respective academic units. Yet the procedures cannot replace judgment. Both are necessary to ensure that the ultimate decision is both free of bias and in the best interests of the university.

The following procedures are followed in conducting the Mansfield campus purview of P&T reviews of faculty, which duties are performed by a Dean-appointed, Executive Committee-approved P&T Committee, as well as by the Dean.

This document must be understood in its context as only one part of the university P&T process. In particular, candidates must inform themselves of the P&T criteria set forth by their TIUs and must organize their dossiers in the format prescribed by OAA (see the OAA [dossier outline](#)). Candidates should also study the procedures that will be followed by their TIUs, their colleges, and OAA. These are detailed in P&T documents promulgated by the respective units. In addition, the P&T review performed by the Mansfield campus P&T Committee is limited to evaluation of a candidate's teaching and service contributions. The campus review should not attempt to comment on the quality or quantity of scholarship; evaluation of scholarship is the responsibility of the TIU.

Definitions

“Promotion” can be from assistant to associate professor or from associate to full professor.

“Tenure” typically occurs in the course of promotion from assistant to associate professor.

“Renewal of appointments of probationary faculty” is assessed annually by the Dean (see section 4.2, above) but is also done twice with faculty involvement: first in the fourth-year review (see section 4.2.1, above) and second in the tenure review.

6.1 Criteria

6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

For a favorable P&T recommendation, the Mansfield Campus requires candidates to demonstrate excellence in teaching, to have excellent records of service appropriate to their rank and discipline, and to have adhered to professional standards of ethical behavior. The summary of a candidate's case, along with the P&T Committee's recommendation, will take the form of a letter addressed to the Mansfield campus Dean. Candidates must also satisfy the research expectations their TIUs have established for regional campus faculty (primary responsibility for evaluating research productivity rests with the TIU). In rare instances, a decision not to reappoint a probationary faculty member may be based upon fiscal considerations or upon changes in the programmatic needs of the campus.

Teaching

Consistent with its mission, the Mansfield Campus requires excellent teaching for promotion and tenure. Teaching quality is assessed in multiple ways (see “Evaluation of Teaching” in the campus [Faculty & Staff Handbook](#)). The assessment of teaching includes more than judging performance before a classroom audience. In addition, course organization, communication of course goals to students, motivation, testing, and help outside of the classroom all contribute to teaching success. Student advising, curriculum development, and faculty involvement in student research may also be included as teaching contributions.

Service

All faculty members are expected to contribute to faculty governance and to render excellent service to, and beyond, the campus. The campus [Faculty & Staff Handbook](#) describes faculty service expectations (see “Service” under “Duties and Responsibilities of Faculty”). The P&T

Committee may also consider the quality, in addition to quantity, of service performed. While the P&T Committee may examine service to the discipline and profession as well as the campus, it may also flag particular contributions for the TIU to evaluate in cases where the TIU may be the more appropriate judge of service quality and impact.

Research

Research expectations are set by the TIU. Each TIU has a statement of research expectations in its policies governing promotion and tenure. TIUs recognize that regional campuses differ from the Columbus campus in mission, teaching workload, and research facilities, and they take these differences into account when considering P&T cases.

Professional Ethics

All faculty members are expected to observe commonly accepted standards of professional ethics. The attached AAUP statement (Appendix A) on professional ethics, originally passed in 1966 and revised in 1987, serves as a good summary of professional ethical responsibilities of faculty members. Significant departure from these ethical standards inevitably compromises the institution's ability to fulfill its missions. In any case where the faculty P&T Committee determines a candidate has not met the ethical standards of the profession, that determination in itself may be grounds for non-renewal, even if the effects are not visible in the candidate's teaching, research, and service; such a case will nevertheless be considered in the context of evaluating teaching and service.

Needs of the Campus

Under unusual circumstances it is possible that fiscal problems or changing needs of the campus might render a probationary faculty member's position superfluous. These circumstances would constitute legitimate grounds for non-renewal, even if the faculty member's performance has been satisfactory. Non-renewal of a probationary appointment for fiscal or programmatic reasons does not entail a performance review but does require prior approval from the Executive Vice President and Provost.

6.1.2 Promotion to Professor

As with promotion to associate professor with tenure, the Mansfield Campus requires candidates for promotion to professor to demonstrate excellence in teaching, to have excellent records of service appropriate to their rank and discipline, and to have adhered to professional standards of ethical behavior. Candidates must also satisfy the research expectations their TIUs have established for regional campus faculty (primary responsibility for evaluating research productivity rests with the TIU).

6.2 Procedures

This section consists of overviews of the procedures involved in P&T deliberations. In general these are provided to furnish participants, including candidates, committee members, and the campus Dean, with guidelines intended to promote fairness, timeliness, and professionalism in P&T decisions. While certain procedures in this section are presented as responsibilities, a more detailed cataloging of responsibilities is presented in sections 6.2.2, 6.2.3, and 6.2.4 (below).

6.2.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Appointment of Committee

Each January, the campus Dean will determine which faculty members are due for a faculty review in the next academic year. A faculty review is routinely scheduled during the fourth and sixth years of service of probationary assistant professors. Subsequent to the above determination, the Dean will consult with the newly elected Executive Committee during a January meeting and appoint a campus P&T Committee consisting of five or more tenured associate or full professors.

Structure of Committee

If three or more faculty reviews are scheduled, the committee will be organized into subcommittees, one for each candidate. Subcommittees generally consist of three members: the subcommittee chair, a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD), and a third member. The Dean, in consultation with the tenured members of the Executive Committee, will appoint a chair and a POD for each subcommittee and a chair for the full P&T Committee. This document has been written assuming a typical year in which two or more faculty reviews are scheduled; for years in which this not the case, then “subcommittee chair” and “full committee chair” should be taken as identical positions, and the full committee will consist of a total of five individuals: the chair, the POD, and three additional members. In years when only one formal review is scheduled, no subcommittees will be formed and the full P&T Committee will assume all responsibilities herein assigned to subcommittees.

Committee-Member Responsibilities

Faculty members who are asked to serve on the campus P&T Committee should consider such service as a professional obligation. However, a faculty member should not participate in the review of a particular candidate when he or she has a conflict of interest—for example, close family or other comparable relationships, or when the outcome of a review could result in professional or economic gain or loss for the committee member (see “Conflict of Interest” in Volume 3 of the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#)). Faculty members who agree to serve on the P&T Committee are expected to serve for the duration of the committee’s existence (generally no longer than 1 year), serving even after their subcommittee duties have been completed. If members are unable to attend P&T meetings during a portion of the committee’s existence (e.g., if they are traveling during a sabbatical), then they are encouraged to seek a leave of absence from the committee during those periods rather than to resign from the committee. Committee members on leave of absence or who have been designated by the P&T chair as possessing a conflict of interest on a given case would not be counted as “active” committee members toward calculation of quorum.

Initial Organizational Committee Meeting

The Dean will convene an organizational meeting of the P&T Committee early enough in spring semester to allow sufficient time for the rest of the review process. At this meeting, campus procedures will be reviewed, current procedural documents will be made available, and questions will be answered. In addition, the Dean will bring the spring semester teaching schedules of candidates whose dossiers are due in Columbus during or prior to autumn semester; the supplied schedules will serve both to facilitate and to emphasize the need for subcommittee members to schedule timely evaluations of candidates’ teaching.

Campus-TIU Interface

The head of the candidate's TIU will be contacted to ascertain when the campus recommendation must be received by the TIU. The Dean will be responsible for making this contact with the candidate's TIU, though in cases where both the candidate and the subcommittee chair are members of the same TIU, the Dean may delegate responsibility for contacting the TIU head to the subcommittee chair. The subcommittee chair will devise a schedule that will meet TIU scheduling needs (see Appendix B). The subcommittee chair is responsible for assuring that this schedule is communicated to the candidate, to subcommittee members, and to the P&T Committee chair. The P&T Committee should assume that their letter must be submitted to the campus Dean no later than two weeks prior to the case's due date to the Columbus TIU.

Subcommittee Member Responsibilities

Each member of a candidate's subcommittee will visit one or more of the candidate's classes within two years of the P&T Committee meeting in which a candidate's case is considered; during these visits, subcommittee members should follow standard peer evaluation of teaching conventions, including making arrangements with the candidate prior to attending specific classes. If the candidate submits narrative student teaching evaluations, then the subcommittee will prepare a written report presenting a balanced summary of these evaluations. This written report will be included as part of the candidate's dossier. The narrative evaluations themselves will be made available to any P&T Committee member upon request.

Candidate Responsibilities

Each candidate is responsible for knowing campus and TIU P&T criteria and for preparing a dossier using the current OAA [outline](#). Candidates are encouraged to attend campus and/or College workshops on the tenure process. The candidate should also feel free to contact the subcommittee chair at any time for advice or information. The candidate will supply the subcommittee with completed versions of her or his dossier, which includes teaching evaluations and all annual review letters since the date of hire; the subcommittee members will carefully read the supplied dossier. The subcommittee will then meet with the candidate to review the dossier and may make suggestions for revisions; however, responsibility for the dossier rests with the candidate. The subcommittee, at the subcommittee chair's discretion, may also meet with the candidate either prior to or following the mandatory meeting with the subcommittee at which the dossier is reviewed. Any candidate or subcommittee member (including the chair) may request a meeting with the Dean and Associate Dean, if needed, to resolve procedural questions, to discuss aspects of the candidate's performance, or to follow up on items in the file or dossier.

Letters

After the subcommittee has examined and discussed the case, the subcommittee chair will write a letter addressed to the Dean; this letter will give a thorough and objective evaluation of the case. It will evaluate the candidate's teaching and service contributions but not the candidate's research expectations or research accomplishments. In addition to providing a balanced and objective summary of the candidate's case, the letter may include the following: a positive recommendation for continuation, promotion, or tenure; a negative recommendation; or no stated recommendation. The letter will be distributed to all subcommittee members for comment. If necessary, the subcommittee will meet to discuss constructive suggestions for improving the

letter. The subcommittee chair will then forward the letter to the P&T Committee chair who may also supply comments and who will determine whether the letter is ready to be forwarded to the full P&T Committee. The letter should be made available to the full P&T Committee only once it has been approved by the P&T Committee chair. Since the letter will serve as the primary means of conveying the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's case to the full committee, it should be highly polished.

Document Distribution to Committee

The subcommittee letter should be distributed to each member of the full P&T Committee at least one week prior to the full committee meeting, either electronically or as hard copy, depending on the subcommittee chair's preference. The dossier (excluding external evaluative letters regarding research) and supporting materials should be provided online on a secure website to which the full P&T Committee has access; in addition, one hard copy should be provided to the Dean's office secretary. If the dossier and supporting materials are not provided online to the full P&T Committee, then two hard copies should be provided to the faculty services secretary so committee members can have access to them; in that case, additional hard copies of the dossier should be made available to committee members who wish to receive such a copy, and the P&T Committee chair should query committee members to determine who would or would not prefer to receive a personal hard copy of each candidate's dossier. All distributed dossier copies and reports should be collected and destroyed, preferably by the P&T Committee chair, following completion of a decision. Yet documents generated for P&T reviews are public records, which means that one hard copy of these documents must be filed with the Dean's office secretary in case of a request for access to these documents.

Full Committee Meetings, Preliminary Considerations

The P&T Committee chair will convene one or more meetings of the full committee, as needed, for discussion and voting. One week prior to the first meeting (i.e., at least five business days), the P&T Committee chair will distribute the letter and dossier for inspection. Comments on the letter, or on the dossier as a whole, may be supplied by P&T Committee members to the subcommittee chair (at the P&T Committee member's discretion) prior to the meeting of the full P&T Committee to consider the candidate's case. Prior to the formal P&T Committee meeting, all discussion of the letter among committee members should be avoided, including electronic discussion.

It is the expectation of the full committee that each subcommittee member will have fully read and vetted the candidate's dossier prior to the submission of the dossier to the full committee, drafting of the letter, and the letter's distribution to the full committee. Indeed, it is the expectation of the full committee that the subcommittee will provide the bulk of the effort with regard to preparation of the letter and dossier and that the subcommittee will guide subsequent deliberations.

The full committee's responsibilities are to read the letter and dossier prior to meeting on the candidate's case, and then to participate, in person if at all possible, in subsequent deliberations on that case especially during that meeting. Members of the full committee can also provide guidance to the candidate with regard to dossier editorial suggestions, though these should be communicated to the candidate through the subcommittee chair. Committee members also are

expected to inform the P&T Committee chair, in a timely manner, if they are unable to make either a scheduled or proposed P&T meeting.

The responsibilities of the full committee chair are to schedule meetings, approve letters before their distribution to the full committee, ascertain that only P&T Committee members are present at meetings, determine whether a quorum—defined as 2/3 of the actively serving members of the full P&T Committee—has been reached during meetings, and otherwise productively chair meetings. Especially with larger committees, it is not always possible to schedule meetings when all committee members are able to attend; if possible, however, the chair of the full committee should schedule meetings when all members of the candidate’s subcommittee can attend.

Full Committee Meetings, Attendance

At least two-thirds of the P&T Committee members (i.e., active members, including the P&T chair) must be present in person or via teleconference at deliberation meetings on a candidate’s case. Efforts will be made during the scheduling of these meetings to ensure that all subcommittee members involved with a given case will be present at the meeting during the deliberation. Roll will be taken by the full committee chair to ensure that only faculty appointed to the current P&T Committee are present. Faculty who are not members of the current P&T Committee should be asked to leave the meeting. Deliberation meetings will be chaired by the full committee chair (or appropriate replacement if necessary).

Full Committee Meetings, Deliberations

Deliberations of a candidate’s case center on the “teaching” and “service” sections of the dossier and will also consider the subcommittee’s letter in detail. The subcommittee chair for a given case will lead discussions; the subcommittee chair will also relate any additional information or comments which have been received prior to the meeting from other committee members. Deliberations may lead to recommended changes in the wording of the subcommittee’s letter or even revision of the dossier itself. Several candidates may be considered at the same meeting.

Full Committee Meetings, Voting

Voting on a case may occur only after a motion has been made, seconded, and passed (with approval of two-thirds of those present) to end discussion. Voting shall be conducted via secret ballot, and the votes will respond with “yes,” “no,” or “abstain” to the following proposition: “I support reappointment” (for fourth-year review cases) or “I support promotion and tenure” (for sixth-year review cases). The votes will be counted immediately by both the full committee chair and subcommittee chair (or alternative if no subcommittees are constituted), and the results will be announced to those present. 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.

A recommendation for continuation of a case will require a simple majority supporting continuation. By way of example, if the full P&T Committee comprises 15 members, then at least 10 must be present to achieve a quorum; when the vote takes place, if 2 of these 10 members abstain, then at least 5 of the 8 members who cast “yes” or “no” votes must vote “yes” for recommendation of continuation to occur. Committee members who abstain are counted for

purposes of determining whether a quorum has been achieved at the meeting but are not counted for purposes of determining whether a simple majority has been achieved in the vote.

The remainder of the meeting may involve discussion of additional changes in the committee's letter in order to reflect the judgment of the full committee. The full committee's final letter may or may not conclude with a specific recommendation for the positive or negative disposition of the review. If a recommendation is made, then the letter should explain the recommendation. The letter will also specify the number of votes supporting and not supporting this candidate's case as well as the number of abstentions.

It is important to remind committee members, including both full committee and subcommittee chairs, that discussion of the case with non-committee members (with the exception of the Dean and Associate Dean) should not take place either prior to or subsequent to committee deliberations. This includes electronic or private discussions, which could become inadvertently public (e.g., those taking place in public locations), as well as discussion with the candidate. Indeed, it is not acceptable for committee members to inform candidates of the committee discussions or conclusions except by explicit approval of the campus Dean.

Post-Meeting Procedures

After the P&T Committee has voted and the meeting is completed, the subcommittee chair will amend the letter to reflect the full committee's input on the candidate's accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses, and final evaluation. The P&T Committee chair will review this letter to ensure that it reflects committee judgment. Additional committee members may also review this letter at their request, the full committee chair's request or discretion, and/or the subcommittee chair's request or discretion. Both the subcommittee chair and the P&T Committee chair will sign the completed letter. The P&T Committee chair will then deliver the signed letter, along with the procedures oversight checklist, to the campus Dean.

Role of the Campus Dean

The Dean will examine the candidate's file and dossier. Informed by this examination, by the letter, and by the P&T Committee vote, the Dean will prepare a separate letter of evaluation. The Dean will send this letter to the TIU head along with the P&T Committee's letter; these become permanent parts of the case. If the Dean's recommendation differs from the majority vote of the P&T Committee, the Dean will request a meeting with the P&T Committee to present reasons. Yet the final recommendations of the Dean and the P&T Committee need not be the same.

When the Dean is informed of the P&T Committee's vote, the Dean will promptly inform the candidate of the number of "yes" votes, "no" votes, and abstentions. Later, when the campus review is fully complete, the Dean will promptly inform the candidate of the outcome and will offer the candidate the opportunity to view the campus recommendation. The Dean will notify all members of the P&T Committee of the ultimate disposition of the case at the University level.

6.2.2 Responsibilities of the Candidate

General: As elaborated in section 6.2.1 (above), the candidate is responsible for knowing the applicable P&T criteria, for meeting these criteria, for gathering evidence of performance, for presenting evidence in the prescribed form of a dossier (including teaching evaluations and all

annual review letters since the date of hire), and for supplying documents to her or his subcommittee chair on a timely basis. The candidate should also become familiar with the P&T procedures of his or her TIU, which may differ from those of the Mansfield campus (e.g., the TIU typically requires research materials to be included with the dossier).

Specifically, the candidate:

1. Consults with his or her TIU to learn the P&T procedures of the TIU;
2. Arranges for student evaluations of every course taught (not just the summary table but photocopies of the one-page electronic Student Evaluation of Instruction [eSEI] sheet received for each course, since these provide additional information not available in the summary table) and supplies these evaluations, both narratives and eSEIs, on schedule to the subcommittee chair;
3. Prepares a dossier and any supporting materials deemed necessary in accordance with OAA's currently prescribed [format](#) and submits either three paper copies or an electronic version, on schedule and complete, to the subcommittee chair;
4. Meets with the subcommittee to review the dossier.

6.2.3 Responsibilities of the Campus Dean and Associate Dean

General: As elaborated in section 6.2.1 (above), the Dean is responsible for evaluating each candidate fairly and writing a recommendation informed by the P&T Committee's conclusions and in consultation with the Associate Dean. The Dean, in cooperation with the Associate Dean, shares responsibility with the P&T Committee for ensuring that campus review procedures are properly followed and that deliberations are free of prejudice.

Specifically, the Dean, in consultation with the Associate Dean:

1. Ascertains, in consultation with TIU heads and OAA, which faculty members are candidates for formal review;
2. Appoints the campus P&T Committee and its subcommittees early in January with the advice of the Executive Committee;
3. Schedules and attends the initial organizational meeting with the newly formed P&T Committee;
4. Monitors campus review procedures, investigates any evidence of bias, and corrects procedural lapses;
5. Responds in writing to the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) in the event that the POD brings to the Dean's attention her or his concerns about any aspect of the review process;
6. Upon receipt of the P&T Committee letter, reviews the entire case and writes a recommendation to the TIU;
7. Notifies each candidate of the campus P&T Committee vote and then of the outcome of the Dean's review and offers the candidate the opportunity to see the P&T Committee's letter and the Dean's letter;
8. Notifies the P&T Committee members of the ultimate disposition of each case.

Specifically, the Associate Dean:

1. Ensures that all probationary faculty have their teaching reviewed, at least annually, by the campus Peer Evaluation of Teaching Committee;

2. Informs the candidate of the membership of that candidate's P&T subcommittee.

6.2.4 Responsibilities of P&T Committee Members

Responsibilities of the Subcommittee Chair

General: As elaborated in section 6.2.1 (above), the subcommittee chair is responsible for providing, in a timely manner, a letter giving a thorough and objective evaluation of a candidate's case to the full P&T Committee.

Specifically, the subcommittee chair:

1. Ascertains the time schedule of the TIU (either through the Dean's office or by consulting directly with the TIU head);
2. In consultation with the P&T Committee chair, devises a time schedule for the campus review and communicates this schedule to the candidate and the P&T Committee chair;
3. Arranges for a committee report containing a balanced and detailed summary of narrative student course evaluations;
4. Convenes subcommittee meetings with and without the candidate;
5. Arranges a meeting with the Dean and Associate Dean, if either the Dean or the subcommittee consider such a meeting to be needed;
6. Responds to requests by the candidate for information and advice, as appropriate;
7. Distributes the dossier with a balanced and detailed summary of student written comments to the full P&T Committee chair at least ten days prior to the full committee meeting, making sure that supporting materials are also available;
8. Writes a thorough and objective evaluation of the case in the form of a letter, in consultation with the subcommittee and P&T Committee chair, and transmits that letter to P&T Committee chair at least ten days prior to the full committee meeting;
9. After the case has been discussed and voted on by the P&T Committee, modifies the P&T Committee letter so that it contains a fair summary of the P&T Committee's judgment, along with the vote;
10. Signs the peer review letter (as does the P&T Committee chair).

Responsibilities of the Subcommittee Members

General: As elaborated in section 6.2.1 (above), each subcommittee is responsible for reviewing in detail the case of one candidate and preparing a thorough and objective evaluation of that case for presentation to the P&T Committee.

Specifically, each subcommittee member:

1. Provides the subcommittee chair with schedules of availability as requested;
2. Examines the candidate's dossier and other available material in detail;
3. Participates in producing a written summary of the narrative student evaluations of teaching;
4. Visits one or more of the candidate's classes (over a period no greater than two years prior to voting on the candidate's case);
5. Participates in drafting a letter that objectively evaluates the candidate's performance in teaching and service;
6. Takes part in full P&T Committee deliberations (see below).

Responsibilities of the Procedures Oversight Designee (formerly Affirmative Action Designee)

General: The Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) is responsible for ensuring that the review follows proper procedures and is free of bias. There is one POD per subcommittee and the POD is a member of that subcommittee.

Specifically, the Procedures Oversight Designee:

1. Checks the dossier to ensure it is correctly presented and asks the candidate to make changes as needed;
2. Monitors the entire campus process for a given candidate, watching for any evidence of bias or failure to observe campus procedures;
3. Reports immediately any sign of bias or procedural lapses to the P&T Committee chair and the Dean, or to the Vice Provost for Academic Policy and Human Resources in case of bias by the Dean;
4. Fills out a checklist, certifying points 2 and 3 (see Appendix C);
5. Submits the checklist to the P&T Committee chair at the time the P&T Committee votes on the candidate.

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

Responsibilities of the P&T Committee Chair

General: As elaborated in section 6.2.1 (above), the P&T Committee chair is responsible for monitoring all subcommittee schedules, ensuring that campus procedures are adhered to, and assembling the P&T Committee to vote on each candidate.

Specifically, the P&T Committee chair:

1. Confers with each subcommittee chair to produce realistic time schedules;
2. Monitors subcommittees' adherence to schedules;
3. Acts with the Dean to ensure a fair review in case there is evidence of bias or of procedural lapses;
4. Convenes and chairs meetings of the P&T Committee for the purpose of discussing each case, voting on each candidate, and giving direction regarding the review letter;
5. Distributes the dossier with a balanced and detailed summary of student written comments to the full committee one week (i.e., at least five working days) prior to meeting, making sure that supporting materials are also available;
6. Distributes the subcommittee chair's draft of the review letter to the P&T Committee members one week (i.e., at least five working days) prior to meeting;
7. Collects reports, dossiers, and other materials from committee members after the meeting for shredding;
8. Signs each review letter (as does the subcommittee chair);
9. Transmits each review letter and procedure oversight checklist to the Dean;
10. In case a candidate files an objection to the campus recommendation, confers with the Dean concerning whether to make a campus response to the objection.

Responsibilities of All P&T Committee Members

General: As elaborated in section 6.2.1 (above), the P&T Committee is responsible for reviewing each case fairly; discussing the achievements, strengths, and weaknesses of each candidate; and voting on each candidate. P&T Committee members have full access to the personnel files of all candidates.

Specifically, each member of the P&T Committee should:

1. Provide the P&T Committee chair with schedules of availability as requested;
2. Examine each dossier and supplemental materials and evaluate each candidate fairly;
3. Attend all P&T meetings (see section 6.2.1, above, for attendance policies);
4. Participate in the discussion of each case;
5. Vote on the proposed action;
6. Make sure that extra copies of P&T documents used by the full P&T Committee after the review are destroyed, either by electronic deletion or hardcopy shredding (hardcopies should be given to the P&T Committee chair for shredding);
7. Report to the P&T Committee chair and to the Dean, or to the Vice Provost for Academic Policy and Human Resources in case of bias by the Dean, any sign of bias or procedural lapse.

6.2.5 Promotion to Professor

The procedure for promotion to professor is generally the same as the procedure for the tenure review but is non-mandatory and thus is typically initiated by the candidate or the candidate's TIU in consultation with the candidate. When informed that a TIU wishes to consider an OSU Mansfield faculty member for promotion to professor, the campus Dean will organize an ad hoc promotion committee consisting of three professors from the Mansfield campus. The Dean may ask professors from other OSU regional campuses to serve on the committee if an insufficient number of professors from the Mansfield campus are available.

The committee will review the last five years of the teaching and service portions of the candidate's dossier and will prepare a letter of evaluation based on their review. The committee will present the letter at a meeting of all full professors on campus. This group will discuss the case and vote on a recommendation.

As early in the process as possible, the campus Dean will notify the promotion committee and the candidate about when the committee's letter and recommendation must be received by the Dean, as well as when the Dean's letter and recommendation must be received by the TIU. The committee should complete its letter to the Dean at least two weeks before the Dean's letter to the TIU is due.

Informed by the letter and recommendation, the Dean will review the dossier and write a recommendation letter to the TIU head. This review will be scheduled in accordance with the scheduling needs of the candidate's TIU.

Throughout the process, the candidate or the committee chair may request a meeting with the Dean to resolve procedural questions, discuss aspects of the candidate's performance, or seek clarification concerning items in the candidate's file or dossier. Similarly, the candidate or the

committee chair may request a meeting between the candidate and the committee for clarification of procedural questions or items in the promotion materials.

6.2.6 Overview of Responsibilities for Promotion to Professor

Responsibilities of the Candidate

The candidate is responsible for knowing the TIU criteria for promotion to full professor and for understanding and following the campus, TIU, and university procedures associated with the promotion process. It is advisable for faculty to attend campus and/or College workshops on the promotion process. The candidate must prepare a dossier in accord with OAA's currently prescribed format and submit three copies (or equivalent electronic copies, at the candidate's or committee's discretion) on schedule to the chair of the campus promotion committee. The candidate must communicate with the TIU head as well as the chair of the TIU's promotion committee to be certain that all materials, procedures, and deadlines meet TIU and university guidelines.

The candidate should also be ready to provide the campus promotion committee with materials or information that may help to clarify or strengthen the dossier. Faculty members who anticipate candidacy will need to arrange for at least three peer evaluations of teaching in the five years prior to the campus promotion process, one of which must be in the last calendar year. Letters summarizing these evaluations must be in the candidate's personnel file. Potential candidates should be aware that some TIUs call for peer evaluation over a three- to five-year period prior to evaluation for promotion and specify what kinds of courses are to be observed. Here again, the candidate is responsible for knowing and fulfilling TIU requirements.

Responsibilities of the Promotion Committee

The campus committee's evaluation of the candidate's teaching and service should be guided by the expectations for promotion to full professor as stated in the P&T document of the candidate's TIU, including the TIU's statement concerning regional campus faculty members. According to OAA guidelines, the committee's letter must make clear "the expectations of the unit against which the candidate is being assessed"; the letter should therefore refer directly to the stated TIU expectations wherever appropriate. The work of the promotion committee should also be guided by relevant university rules (e.g., University Rule [3335-6-02](#)) as well as OAA guidelines (e.g., the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#)).

The promotion committee will have access to all documents related to the candidate's teaching for the previous five years. One member of the committee will prepare a written report presenting either a balanced sample or a detailed summary of students' written evaluations. This summary is also included in the candidate's core dossier. Whenever possible, each member of the promotion committee will visit one or more of the candidate's classes.

A second member of the committee will prepare a summary of the candidate's record of service, focusing primarily on service completed after promotion to associate professor. This committee member should request clarification or documentation of reported service from the candidate as necessary. Occasionally, the committee member responsible for preparing the summary of service may need to seek clarification from the TIU head as to the standing of an activity listed in the dossier (e.g., does the TIU regard the activity as service or scholarship?). The preparation of

teaching and service summaries does not excuse any member of the committee from conducting a thorough examination of all materials submitted for promotion.

One member of the committee other than the chair will serve as the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD). The POD will be responsible for monitoring all aspects of the campus review process, reporting any sign of bias or procedural lapses immediately to the promotion committee chair and the Dean, and completing the procedures oversight checklist (Appendix C).

After the committee has examined and discussed the case, the committee chair will write a review letter that presents a thorough and objective evaluation of the case. The draft of the letter will be distributed to all committee members for comments. If necessary, the committee will meet to discuss suggestions for improving the letter. When committee members have reached agreement concerning the letter, the chair will call a meeting of all full professors on the Mansfield campus. At this meeting, the entire group will review and discuss the case and the letter prepared by the committee. Substantive changes in the letter may be made at this time with approval of a simple majority. The entire group will then vote on a recommendation, which will be recorded in the revised letter. Following this meeting, the chair of the promotion committee will transmit the review letter, the teaching and service summaries, and the procedures oversight checklist to the campus Dean.

Responsibilities of the Campus Dean

The Dean is responsible for evaluating each candidate fairly and shares responsibility with the POD for ensuring that campus procedures are properly followed and that deliberations are free of bias.

Upon receipt of the promotion committee's letter and recommendation, the Dean will examine the candidate's file and dossier. Informed by this examination and by the promotion committee's letter and recommendation, the Dean will prepare a separate letter of evaluation. The Dean will send this letter to the TIU head along with the promotion committee's letter. In cases where opinion is sharply divided or conflicts arise, the Dean will meet with the promotion committee prior to submitting the Dean's letter in order to discuss the case as well as her or his recommendation. Yet the final recommendations of the Dean and the promotion committee need not be the same.

When the campus review is complete, the Dean will promptly inform the candidate of the outcome and will offer the candidate the opportunity to view the letters prepared by the promotion committee and by the Dean. The Dean will notify all members of the promotion committee of the ultimate disposition of each case.

6.3 Documentation

As noted above under Responsibilities of the Candidate, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the OAA [dossier outline](#). While the P&T subcommittee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate. The candidate must also submit separate documentation to his or her TIU according to that TIU's policies.

The campus review typically excludes the evaluation of research otherwise evaluated by the TIU. In most situations, the candidate therefore does not submit research publications for the Mansfield campus review. Yet pedagogical research related to one's teaching at the college level may constitute a teaching contribution. The P&T Committee will consider publications from such research as part of its evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

(Approved by Faculty Assembly on April 16, 2012)

Appendix A

American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics

The statement that follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by the Association's Committee on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Association's Council in June 1987, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting.

Introduction

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The *Statement on Professional Ethics* that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to ensure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and the Committee on Professional Ethics, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, or the applicable provisions of the Association's *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

The Statement

- Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
- As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors

demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

- As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
- As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
- As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Appendix B

Schedule of Faculty Review Process

The schedule for each campus faculty review will be set by the subcommittee chair, after learning TIU scheduling requirements, in consultation with the P&T Committee chair and Dean. Each schedule must include the following elements; it may also include additional subcommittee meetings.

_____ Subcommittee members attend one or more of the candidate's classes (within two years of the candidate's review by the full P&T Committee ["full committee"]).

_____ Candidate submits to subcommittee chair three copies of the dossier (or equivalent electronic version) and one copy of supportive documents. *Recommendation: Do this at least two months prior to the due date of the Dean's letter to the TIU head.*

_____ Subcommittee meets with the candidate to review the dossier.

_____ Subcommittee meets without the candidate to discuss elements of the evaluation.

_____ Subcommittee chair distributes the draft letter of the case to subcommittee members.

_____ Subcommittee meets without the candidate to agree on the evaluation letter.

_____ Subcommittee chair distributes the letter to the full committee chair. *Recommendation: Do this approximately one week prior to distributing the letter to the full committee.*

_____ P&T Committee chair distributes the letter and makes the dossier and other materials available to full committee members. *Do this one week or five business days prior to the meeting of the full committee.*

_____ P&T Committee meets and votes. *Do this approximately one month prior to the due date of the Dean's letter to Columbus.*

_____ P&T Committee chair submits the results of the vote, the review letter (signed by the full committee chair and subcommittee chair), and the procedure oversight checklist to the Dean. *Allow two weeks or 10 business days before it is due to the TIU head for the Dean to review the case and write her or his recommendation.*

_____ Dean forwards recommendation to the TIU head.

Complications can arise in the deliberation of cases if time constraints are not fully appreciated by candidates, by subcommittee chairs, or by the full committee chair. To avoid such complications, the full committee chair should become fully versed with scheduling constraints and should unambiguously express any scheduling concerns to subcommittee chairs.

Subcommittee chairs, in turn, should unambiguously express scheduling concerns to candidates. Candidates should be encouraged to complete dossiers in a timely manner that allows thorough consideration of dossiers by subcommittees and that also provides sufficient time for scheduling meetings. Scheduling meetings of the full committee can take weeks of advance notice or, in the case of summer meetings, even more than a month of advance notice. Thus as candidates, subcommittee chairs, and the full committee chair should all duly note, sufficient lead time in scheduling meetings can be essential to providing timely submission of letters to the Dean.

Appendix C

Checklist for OSU Mansfield Procedures Oversight Designee

Name of Candidate

Name of Procedures Oversight Designee

Items 1 - 2 of this list must be reviewed for each faculty member under review BEFORE the review process commences. All problems must be corrected before the review process.

1. _____ The dossier has been prepared correctly (according to current OAA guidelines), and no extraneous materials are included (e.g. unsolicited letters, news clippings, etc.).
2. _____ Candidate eSEI summaries and summaries of students' discursive evaluations are included with the candidate's dossier.

Items 3 - 5 must be monitored as the OSU Mansfield review proceeds to assure adherence to campus policies and procedures. Read the document carefully. Sometimes units deviate from written procedures without realizing it. Procedural errors, particularly when likely to have affected the outcome of deliberations, are the primary basis for appeals of negative decisions. Should you have concerns about any aspect of the review process, immediately bring them to the attention of the P&T Committee chair and the Dean. The Dean must respond to you in writing regarding the matter.

3. _____ Written OSU Mansfield procedures for reviews have been followed.
4. _____ Reviews have been based on performance and have been free of bias against under-represented groups.
5. _____ The review letter of the campus P&T Committee provides a detailed review of the faculty member's accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses along with the recorded vote.

Faculty Rule 3335-47-01 stresses the primacy of peer review in promotion and tenure reviews; cases are sent back for re-review when this critical assessment provides an inadequate foundation for the remainder of the review process.

Signature of Procedures Oversight Designee

Date