

# Office of Academic Affairs

## Policies and Procedures Handbook: Volume 3

### Promotion and Tenure Review

1.0 TIMETABLE .....	4
2.0 SUBMISSION TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS .....	4
2.1 PLACEMENT OF MATERIALS .....	4
2.1.1 COVER SHEET .....	5
2.1.2 DOSSIER CHECKLIST .....	5
2.1.3 P&T REVIEWS SECTION OF THE TIU'S APT DOCUMENT .....	5
2.1.4 PRESENTATION .....	5
2.1.5 REPORT ON CANDIDATES CONSIDERED .....	6
3.0 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	6
<b>3.1 REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR MID-YEAR HIRES OF PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK, CLINICAL, AND RESEARCH FACULTY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 PUBLIC RECORDS ACT .....	6
3.2 RESIDENCY STATUS .....	6
3.3 ACADEMIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS .....	6
3.4 UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW COMMITTEE .....	7
3.4.1 PROCEDURES .....	7
3.5 PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY .....	7
3.5.1 VERIFYING RESIDENCY STATUS .....	8
3.5.2 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS .....	8
3.5.3 PROCEDURES OVERSIGHT DESIGNEE .....	8
3.5.4 INTEGRITY OF REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	8
3.5.5 VOTING PROCEDURES .....	9
3.5.6 DOCUMENTATION.....	9
3.5.7.1 NON-MANDATORY REVIEWS .....	9
3.5.7.2 MANDATORY REVIEWS .....	10
3.5.7.3 REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR MID-ACADEMIC YEAR START DATES FOR PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK, CLINICAL, AND RESEARCH FACULTY.....	10
3.5.8 VERIFICATION OF CITATIONS .....	10
3.6 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS .....	10
3.7 COMMENTS PROCESS AND INFORMING CANDIDATE OF REVIEW OUTCOMES .....	12
3.7.1 TENURE INITIATING UNIT LEVEL .....	12

3.7.2 COLLEGE LEVEL.....	12
3.7.3 USE OF THE COMMENTS PROCESS.....	13
3.7.4 UNIVERSITY LEVEL AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES (BOT) APPROVAL .....	13
3.8 RECONSIDERATION OF CASE DURING REVIEW PROCESS .....	13
3.8.1 PROCEDURAL ERROR .....	13
3.8.2 SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION .....	13
3.8.3 RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES.....	14
3.9 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND OTHER RECUSALS .....	14
3.9.1 COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY AND P&T COMMITTEE.....	14
3.9.2 TIU HEADS AND DEANS .....	15
3.10 REVIEWS IN RESTRUCTURED TENURE INITIATING UNITS .....	15
3.11 WITHDRAWALS AND NEGATIVE DECISIONS .....	15
3.11.1 WITHDRAWALS.....	15
3.11.1.1 NON-MANDATORY REVIEW .....	15
3.11.1.2 MANDATORY REVIEW .....	15
3.11.2 NEGATIVE DECISIONS .....	16
4.0 DOSSIER.....	16
4.1 OUTLINE .....	17
4.1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	18
4.1.2 CORE DOSSIER .....	18
4.1.2.1 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CANDIDATE .....	18
4.1.2.1.1 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CANDIDATE—OAA APPROVED ELECTRONIC DOSSIER.....	19
4.1.2.2 TIME FRAME .....	19
4.1.2.3 ORGANIZATION.....	19
4.1.2.4 CORE DOSSIER OUTLINE.....	19
4.1.3 LETTERS OF EVALUATION .....	25
4.1.3.1 INTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION.....	26
4.1.3.2 ADDITIONS.....	26
4.1.3.3 EXTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION .....	26
4.1.4 STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION .....	27
4.1.4.1 CUMULATIVE FIXED-RESPONSE SURVEY DATA .....	27
4.1.4.2 FIXED-RESPONSE STUDENT EVALUATION DATA .....	28
4.1.4.3 SUMMARY OF OPEN-ENDED STUDENT EVALUATIONS .....	28
4.1.4.4 APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE INTERNAL REVIEW EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES .....	28
5.0 PROCEDURES FOR CLINICAL AND RESEARCH FACULTY .....	29
5.1 CLINICAL FACULTY.....	29
5.1.1 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION REVIEWS .....	29

5.1.2 LEVELS OF REVIEW .....	30
5.1.3 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE .....	30
5.1.4 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION.....	30
5.2 RESEARCH FACULTY .....	30
5.2.1 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION REVIEWS .....	30
5.2.2 LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION .....	30
5.2.3 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE .....	31
5.2.4 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION.....	31
6.0 PROCEDURES FOR ASSOCIATED FACULTY .....	31
6.1 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR REAPPOINTMENT AT SENIOR RANK .....	31
6.2 LEVELS OF REVIEW .....	31
6.3 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE .....	31
6.3.1 CLINICAL PRACTICE FACULTY .....	31
6.3.2 ASSOCIATED WITH TENURE-TRACK TITLES BELOW 50% FTE AND ADJUNCT FACULTY .....	32
6.4 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION.....	32
7.0 APPROVED EXCEPTIONS .....	32
7.1 COLLEGE OF MEDICINE .....	32
7.2 UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES .....	32
7.3 UNIVERSITY EXTENSION IN COLLEGE OF FOOD, AGRICULTURAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES .....	32
7.4 DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL MEDICINE.....	33
7.5 DEPARTMENT OF PEDIATRICS.....	33

## 1.0 Timetable

Revised: 05/05/16

All colleges are encouraged to deliver dossiers to the Office of Academic Affairs (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, OAA Administrative Manager Bobbie Houser ([houser.73@osu.edu](mailto:houser.73@osu.edu)) should be informed of the status of the case and its anticipated delivery date.

### **Second Friday in January**

These eight colleges without departments and the University Libraries 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 and tenure (P&T) cases.

Dentistry  
Law  
Nursing  
Optometry  
Pharmacy  
Public Affairs  
Public Health  
Social Work  
University Libraries

### **Fourth Friday in January**

Arts and Sciences

### **Second Friday in February**

Business  
Education and Human Ecology  
Engineering  
Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

### **Fourth Friday in February**

Medicine  
Veterinary Medicine

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

## 2.0 Submission to Academic Affairs

Revised: 06/10/15

Colleges submit all promotion and tenure dossiers to OAA via BuckeyeBox at [www.box.osu.edu](http://www.box.osu.edu). The college office will notify OAA when all dossiers have been uploaded.

## 2.1 Placement of materials

Revised: 06/10/15

**2.1.1 Cover sheet**

Revised: 06/10/15

The original signed Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment (Cover Sheet, Form 109), found on the forms page of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook* (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-guidelines-forms>) is placed first in the original dossier. Nothing is to be placed on top of this page. The Cover Sheet should be immediately visible when the dossier is opened.

**2.1.2 Dossier checklist**

Revised: 06/10/15

The original signed checklist (Form 105, <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-guidelines-forms>) is placed directly behind the Record of Review.

**2.1.3 P&T Reviews section of the TIU's APT Document**

Revised: 06/10/15

Include a complete copy of the APT Document that was used for a particular review only if it is not the same one that appears on the OAA website at <http://oaa.osu.edu/governance.html>.

**2.1.4 Presentation**

Revised: 06/10/15

Scan the dossier as a single-sided document.

Use colored sheets of paper between the main sections of the dossier.

Follow the required naming format: *College Code-Department Name-Last Name, First Name.pdf*. This aids in storing and sorting files, and in finding archived copies. For example:

ASC-Economics-Smith, Jacqueline.pdf

DEN-James, Edward.pdf

College Codes:

Arts and Sciences	ASC
Business	BUS
Dentistry	DEN
Education and Human Ecology	EHE
Engineering	ENG
Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences	FAE
Law	LAW
Medicine	MED
Nursing	NUR
Optometry	OPT
Pharmacy	PHA
Public Affairs	PAF
Public Health	PHE
Social Work	SWK
University Libraries	LIB
Veterinary Medicine	VET

Print Form 109 (Record of Review, <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-guidelines-forms>) in color.

### 2.1.5 Report on Candidates Considered

Revised: 06/26/18

Complete one Report on Candidates Considered for Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment (Form 110), 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.

Save a copy of this report in the college's folder in BuckeyeBox.

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

If 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews are completed at a later date than promotion and tenure reviews, a second form should be sent with completed 4<sup>th</sup> year review information.

### 3.0 General considerations

Revised: 05/01/08

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

Revised: 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 2017 is in the 2017-18 cohort and will come up for mandatory review in 2022-23. **NOTE: Moved to 3.5.7.3.**

#### **3.1 Public Records Act**

Revised: 04/01/07

The Ohio Public Records Act (see Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 12.0) 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.

#### **3.2 Residency status**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

#### **3.3 Academic rights and freedoms**

Revised: 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.

### **3.4 University level review committee**

Revised: 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, Arts and Sciences divisions, or University Libraries. 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 convener of the committee.

#### **3.4.1 Procedures**

Revised: 05/05/16

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 candidates are from colleges without units and the University Libraries

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

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

The vice provost for academic policy and faculty prepares a written report of the committee's assessment and vote for inclusion in the dossier.

### **3.5 Procedures for tenure-track faculty**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

### 3.5.1 Verifying residency status

Revised: 04/01/07

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.

### 3.5.2 APT Document used for promotion and tenure reviews

Revised: 06/26/18

All tenure-track faculty members undergoing Fourth-Year Review and mandatory or non-mandatory promotion and/or tenure reviews will be reviewed using the unit’s current APT document (as approved and posted on the OAA website). Faculty members, however, may choose to be reviewed under The Ohio State University document that was in effect **on their start date** or on the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent.

The current document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

A faculty member who chooses to use an earlier document shall notify his/her TIU head of this intent by submitting the APT Document that was in effect **on their start date** or on the date of last promotion when submitting his/her dossier and other materials for review. The deadline for doing so will be the unit’s regular deadline for receiving the dossier and other materials for the review in question.

**Note, regardless of document elected, the current review procedure will be used.**

### 3.5.3 Procedures Oversight Designee

Revised: 12/18/13

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. The committee may select to have multiple PODs, i.e., one for each faculty member being reviewed.

College: The members of the college P&T committee select one of its members as the POD. The POD should not be the chair of the P&T committee. The college P&T committee may elect to have multiple PODs, i.e., one for each faculty member being reviewed.

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

A summary of duties for the POD is available at [https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/links\\_files/PODDuties.pdf](https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/links_files/PODDuties.pdf).

### 3.5.4 Integrity of review procedures

Revised: 12/18/13

The POD is to make reasonable efforts to assure that the review body at the relevant level (TIU or college) follows the written procedures governing its reviews and that its proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner. The written procedures are to be taken from the current approved TIU APT Document. As noted in section 3.6.2 above, the current approved document of record will be the one posted on the OAA website at <https://oaa.osu.edu/appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure>.

Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, rev. June 2018  
<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>



The POD is to 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 are to 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 is to 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 are to promptly informed of the problem.

If concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they are to 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.

### **3.5.5 Voting procedures**

Revised: 07/14/17; 07/20/17; 06/26/18

Only "yes" and "no" are to be considered 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 teleconference or videoconference may vote.

The POD is to verify the number of members needed to constitute a quorum and the percentage of votes needed to recommend a positive decision as defined in the APT Document. OAA recommends that departments require a quorum of two-thirds for action on P&T cases (see Volume 1, Chapter 1, Section 2.4.3).

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

The **Eligible Faculty Committee** chair writes a letter to the TIU head reporting the vote and summarizing the discussion of the eligible faculty. This letter should be evaluative as well as descriptive and contextualize the vote, including any "minority opinions" as appropriate.

### **3.5.6 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 are not to 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 correction and a relaunch of the review.

#### **3.5.7.1 Non-mandatory reviews**

Revised: 04/01/07

External evaluations should not be sought before determining the availability of all documentation required by the dossier outline along with any supplemental documentation required by the TIU and college. A promotion review must be postponed until a future academic year if:

- 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.

### **3.5.7.2 Mandatory reviews**

Revised: 12/18/13

Although substantive missing documentation is grounds for a negative decision, mandatory reviews must proceed even when documentation is missing and unobtainable. In general, the dossier will be reviewed at all levels with only the documentation available at the start of the TIU's review process. If important new information becomes available after the TIU review process, see section 3.9.2: Significant new information, below.

For more information on external evaluations see Section 3.7: External evaluations, below.

### **3.5.7.3 Review schedule for mid-academic year start dates for probationary tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty**

Revised: 06/26/18

All faculty starting within the same calendar year are in the same cohort for promotion and tenure reviews. For example, anyone starting in 2018 is in the 2018-19 cohort and will come up for mandatory review in 2023-24.

### **3.5.8 Verification of citations**

Revised: 04/01/07

One of the responsibilities of the POD at the TIU level is to verify the accuracy of all citations listed in the dossier. This verification is one of the items on the Dossier Checklist. If someone other than the POD carries out this responsibility, that individual must be clearly identified on the checklist.

## **3.6 External evaluations**

Revised: 12/18/13; 07/20/17

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 if they are on letterhead and signed.

Candidates are not to contact prospective or actual external evaluators regarding their case at any stage of the review process, nor are they to 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 provided 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. 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 best that the number of evaluators suggested by the candidate be limited to three or four.

Except under the special circumstances described below, OAA requires a minimum of five external evaluation letters.

It is the unit's obligation to obtain the required number of evaluations and to begin the process of obtaining these letters well in advance of the review. In the event that a unit is unable to obtain the required five external evaluations (four for Department of Internal Medicine, see 7.4), the unit must document its efforts, noting the individuals who were contacted, how they were contacted, and the dates and number of times they were contacted. The unit is to notify the college and OAA as soon as it becomes apparent that it will not be able to obtain the required letters in time for the meeting of the eligible faculty. The lack of five external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding, but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, P&T chair, and the chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and agree that it will not constitute a procedural error.

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

To assure meaningful and credible external evaluations while meeting the above requirement, the following suggestions are offered.

- The TIU head and/or P&T committee should generate a lengthy list of prospective evaluators who are not employed at The Ohio State University. These should be distinguished faculty (or occasionally non-academics who have similar research credentials and experience) who are in a position to comment in an informed way both on the quality of the candidate's scholarly work and on its significance to the broader field in which it resides. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the scholarly work. They should generally hold the rank of professor or must be at the rank above the candidate being considered unless an exception has been granted by the college (or OAA in the cases of colleges that are TIUs). They may not be former advisors, collaborators, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that could reduce objectivity. It is therefore essential that the individual or body generating the list of prospective evaluators ascertain the relationship of prospective evaluators with the candidate before seeking a letter of 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. The candidate should be asked 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. Letters from collaborators may be included in the "Other Letters" section.
- 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, evaluators. Unless the persons so identified do not meet these 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 seek the dean's (or OAA's) approval of each candidate's tentative list of prospective evaluators 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 2, Section 12.0). See Letter 201 (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/Letter201.pdf>) 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 adequate time in which to review the materials, but when the nature of the requested letter is carefully explained. Evaluators should generally be asked to provide only 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 whether the candidate should be promoted and tenured at Ohio State or would be promoted and tenured at their own institution.

### **3.7 Comments process and informing candidate of review outcomes**

Revised: 04/01/07

#### **3.7.1 Tenure initiating unit level**

Revised: 04/01/07

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 executive vice president and 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.

#### **3.7.2 College level**

Revised: 05/01/10

After the college P&T committee completes the letter to the dean and the dean completes the letter to the executive vice president and 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.

### **3.7.3 Use of the comments process**

Revised: 12/18/13

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

### **3.7.4 University level and Board of Trustees (BOT) approval**

Revised: 05/01/10

After the executive vice president 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 executive vice president and 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).

### **3.8 Reconsideration of case during review process**

Revised: 04/01/07

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.

#### **3.8.1 Procedural error**

Revised: 04/01/07

Significant procedural errors (those that reasonably could have affected the outcome of deliberations) are to 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 is to take necessary steps to correct the error at the level of review at which it occurred. The case is to 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 are to 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.

#### **3.8.2 Significant new information**

Revised: 12/18/13; 06/26/18

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

received a license or other commercial activity. An amended record must be reviewed by all parties to the review process.

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

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

### **3.8.3 Recommended procedures**

Revised: 04/01/07

Following review of new information (which need not take place in a meeting), the TIU deliberative body may take a preliminary vote to determine whether to reconsider the case. A preliminary poll 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.

### **3.9 Conflicts of interest and other recusals**

Revised: 05/01/10

#### **3.9.1 Committee of eligible faculty and P&T committee**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

When there is a question about potential conflicts, open discussion and professional judgment are required in determining whether it is appropriate for the faculty member to recuse himself or herself from a particular review. Units may 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.

### **3.9.2 TIU heads and deans**

Revised: 05/01/10

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

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

### **3.10 Reviews in restructured tenure initiating units**

Revised: 12/18/13; 06/26/18

Unless otherwise set forth in the restructuring statement, candidates for promotion or promotion and tenure, are to be given the choice of being reviewed under the APT document in effect on their date of hire, or on the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent; or under the current APT document of the restructured unit. In either case, the eligible faculty of the restructured unit will be responsible for conducting the review.

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.

### **3.11 Withdrawals and negative decisions**

Revised: 04/01/07

#### **3.11.1 Withdrawals**

Revised: 04/01/07

A candidate may withdraw from a review at any time.

##### **3.11.1.1 Non-mandatory review**

Revised: 04/01/07

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 is to 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.

##### **3.11.1.2 Mandatory review**

Revised: 12/18/13

Probationary faculty who withdraw from or decline to participate in a mandatory review for tenure or promotion and tenure are subject to the relevant standards of notice per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#). Their

decision to terminate the review must be accompanied by a letter of resignation to the TIU head (or regional campus dean) stating:

- Last day of employment (no later than May 31 of the year following the mandatory review year). Normally this is the end of the seventh year but may be earlier if the faculty member had a shorter probationary period.
- Acknowledgement that the decision to terminate the review is irrevocable and that tenure will not be granted.

This action requires that the Report of Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointment of Tenure-track, Clinical, and Research Faculty (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/Form101.pdf>) be submitted to OAA, along with a copy of the faculty member's letter, by June 1 of the year in which the decision to terminate the review occurs.

OAA will keep accurate records of such an action since, like a negative decision, it must be assessed before rehiring the individual in another track or unit (see Faculty Appointments Policy, <https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>).

### **3.11.2 Negative decisions**

Revised: 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, <https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>).

The termination date is May 31 regardless of hire date. May 31 will be the final working day for these persons, with a final pay-out effective on that day for both 9-month and 12-month faculty.

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

## **4.0 Dossier**

Revised: 08/01/14

The Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank-Tenure-Reappointment (Cover Sheet: Form 109, <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-guidelines-forms>) 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. Nothing should be placed on top of the Cover Sheet.

The Dossier Checklist (Form 105, ) 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 departments (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:

- Criteria Used for Review (if not submitted, default will be the criteria in the APT document on the OAA website at <http://oaa.osu.edu/governance.html>)
- 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: 06/26/18; 07/05/18

Record of Review (Cover Sheet: Form 109, <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-guidelines-forms>)

Dossier Checklist (Form 105, <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-guidelines-forms>)

APT Document Used for Review (submitted only if the review does not follow the version on the OAA website at <http://oaa.osu.edu/governance.html>)

#### I. Introduction

##### A. Biographical statement of candidate

#### II. Core Dossier

#### III. Evaluation

##### A. Internal Letters of Evaluation

- TIU annual review letters, as required by dossier outline, are arranged in chronological order (oldest to newest); with written explanation if set is incomplete;
  - for assistant professors, all annual review letters since date of hire;
  - for associate professors, or hires with tenure, all annual review letters since previous promotion, not to exceed last 5 years
- Written documents submitted as part of annual reviews (including comments on fourth year review, if generated)
- Fourth Year Review letter to the probationary faculty member
- Additional letters requested by the candidate and solicited by the head of TIU; optional, and can include letters from collaborators (external or from other units at OSU). Candidates with significant service/outreach activities outside the unit may request that the TIU solicit letters from colleagues familiar with the candidate's contributions to these activities
- Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc.) as required by APT document of TIU

##### B. External Letters of Evaluation

- Summary sheet of all evaluators from whom a letter was received ([Form 114](#))

- A representative sample of the letters sent to evaluators
- Letters from at least five (5) external evaluators, consistent with list on summary sheet, with each letter preceded by a complete cover sheet ([Form 106](#))

#### IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction

- Cumulative Fixed-Response Survey Data
- Fixed-Response Student Evaluation Data
- Summary of Open-Ended Student Evaluations

#### V. Review Letters

- Regional campus faculty deliberative body, if applicable
- Regional campus dean, if applicable
- TIU (college without departments) faculty deliberative body
- TIU head
- Head(s) or unit(s) in which the candidate has split FTE appointments, if applicable
- TIU-level comments process letters or notation that the candidate declined to provide comments
- College (with departments) P & T
- College dean
- College-level comments process letters or notation that the candidate declined to provide comments

#### 4.1.1 Introduction

Revised: 04/01/07; 07/20/17

List candidate's name and current appointment (including joint appointments as appropriate), 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

##### 4.1.2.1 Instructions for the candidate

Revised: 04/01/12

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

In Section, III, place the required materials in sequence following the outline, but do not paginate.

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, narrative sections should be 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—OAA Approved Electronic Dossier**

Revised: 06/27/2017; 06/26/18

Tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty members undergoing promotion and tenure review or reappointment are required to use the OAA approved electronic dossier to generate their core dossier. In 2018-19, mandatory reviews or reviews for promotion may use either VITA or a Word document that exactly matches the VITA format. Fourth-year reviews must be in VITA and beginning in 2019, all reviews must be in VITA. Exceptions must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to use VITA.

#### **4.1.2.2 Time frame**

Revised: 07/14/17; 06/26/18

For most of the core dossier (and in particular for teaching and service sections), use the date of hire for probationary faculty, or date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is most recent, for tenured/non-probationary faculty. However, prior material can be included if the eligible faculty consider it relevant to the review.

Other information, such as a full history of publications and creative work, can be included for purposes of reproducing a CV, and/or if this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. While information about scholarship produced prior to the date of hire or date of last promotion may be provided, it is the scholarship performance since the date of hire or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

#### **4.1.2.3 Organization**

Revised: 02/15/12

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

#### **4.1.2.4 Core dossier outline**

Revised: 05/06/16; 07/15/17;; 06/26/18

#### Teaching

##### 1) Undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses taught

In the Core Dossier, list each course taught and all clinical instruction, including the following information since date of appointment for promotion to associate, and since date of appointment or last 5 years, whichever is shorter, for promotion to professor:

- courses taught by quarter (AU, WI, SP, SU), semester (AU, SP), summer session or term and year
- course number, title, and number of credit hours

Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, rev. June 2018

<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>

- official final course enrollment
- percentage of course taught by candidate based on proportion of total student contact hours in course
  - brief explanation (less than 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 for entire career at Ohio State

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.

c) Undergraduate research mentoring: give name of student, title of thesis or project, 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).

3) Involvement with postdoctoral scholars and researchers throughout career at Ohio State

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

4) Extension and continuing education instruction (including UITL and STEP Mentoring) since date of appointment for promotion to associate, and since date of appointment or last 5 years, whichever is

shorter, for promotion to full. 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 since date of hire at Ohio State if this is first review, regardless of rank. If this is a review for professor (career at Ohio State) list the items for the previous five years or since promotion, whichever time period is shorter.

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, **presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences.**

- 6) Briefly describe the candidate's approach to and goals in teaching, major accomplishments, plans for the future in teaching (**approximately** 750 words; do not quote student comments, which should be summarized by someone other than the candidate in section IVC).

- 7) Evaluation of teaching

Briefly describe how the candidate has used the evaluation information to improve the quality of instruction (no more than 250 words).

- 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. This list 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

Briefly describe 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.

- 10) BEGINNING IN 2018-19 REVIEW YEAR: Completion of teaching development programs  
List continuing education programs related to teaching since date of appointment for promotion to associate, and since date of appointment or last 5 years, whichever is shorter, for promotion to professor. **Include Foundation Impact Teaching and Teaching at OSU**, *Endorsements* from the University Institute for Teaching as well as other teaching development programs. Include the following:
- Name of the session
  - Date completed
  - Description of training
  - Impact of training

### Research

While all scholarly/creative works can be listed, please denote outcomes since appointment at Ohio State.

- 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 1a-1g below. Publication refers to both print and digital formats.

Works under review must be listed separately in Item 1k below.

Works being drafted and not yet submitted should be discussed in the narrative section in Section 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.

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 (75% contribution)
- I identified the patients for the study, administered the drug regimen, reported results to the consortium and reviewed the draft manuscript (25% contribution).
- 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 (50% contribution).

Statements such as the following are not acceptable: "All authors contributed equally" or "50% effort." Do not refer to past dossiers for models of how to write the required description, **since requirements have changed.**

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.

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

Include as separate categories:

- 1a) Books (other than edited volumes) and monographs
- 1b) Edited books
- 1c) Chapters in edited books
- 1d) Bulletins and technical reports
- 1e) Peer-reviewed journal articles
- 1f) Editor-reviewed journal articles
- 1g) Reviews (indicate whether peer reviewed)
- 1h) Abstracts and short entries (indicate whether peer reviewed)
- 1i) Papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer reviewed)

- 1j) Unpublished scholarly presentations (indicate whether peer reviewed)
- 1k) 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 Section 2. Do not list each individual letter.)
  - 2a) Artwork
  - 2b) Choreography
  - 2c) Collections
  - 2d) Compositions
  - 2e) Curated exhibits
  - 2f) Exhibited artwork
  - 2g) Inventions and patents, including disclosures, options, and commercial licenses
  - 2h) Moving images
  - 2i) Multimedia/databases/websites
  - 2j) Radio and television
  - 2k) Recitals and performances
  - 2l) Recordings
  - 2m) 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.

This section should include description of work that has not yet been submitted for publication, and should be approximately 750 words.

- 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, or other indicators of the impact of the candidate's work. Individual units should determine what kinds of information could be described here.
- 5) Research funding

In cases of multiple authorship for Items 5a and 5b below, 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.

- 5a) 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
- 5b) 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
- 5c) 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
- 5d) Funded training grants on which the candidate is or has been the equivalent of the principal investigator
- 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
- 5e) 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
- 5f) 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 the organization in which office was held or service performed. Describe the nature of the organization (open or elected membership, honorary).
- 3) List of consultation activity (industry, education, government). Give the 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 the candidate's professional expertise, if not listed elsewhere. Community service not germane to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to P&T reviews.
- 6) Administrative service. Give dates and description of responsibility.
  - 6a) Unit committees
  - 6b) College or university committees
  - 6c) Initiatives undertaken to enhance diversity in the candidate's unit, college or the university
  - 6d) Administrative positions held, e.g., graduate studies chair
  - 6e) Service as a graduate faculty representative on a dissertation in another unit or university
- 7) Advisor to student groups and organizations  
List the group or organization and specific responsibilities as advisor.
- 8) Office of Student Life committees
  - 8a) List Office of Student Life committees on which the candidate has served.
  - 8b) Summarize participation in Student Life programs such as fireside discussions, lectures to student groups outside the candidate's unit, addresses or participation at student orientation, and the Second-Year Transformational Experience Program (STEP) **(unless listed under teaching)**.
- 9) List of prizes and awards for service to the profession, the university, or the 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

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 (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/Letter201.pdf>) in the *OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook* for a sample letter to external evaluators.

All items in this section are to 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. is to be preceded by a colored page noting the item that follows.

#### **4.1.3.1 Internal letters of evaluation**

Revised: 06/15/15; 07/15/17

- 1) Annual review letters:
  - OAA has required written annual evaluations of all tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty since 1993. If annual review letters are lacking for any of the years specified below, a written explanation is required.
  - For untenured candidates, include all annual review letters since date of hire; all fourth-year review letters are to be included here.
  - For tenured candidates, include all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or date of hire with tenure, not to exceed the most recent five years.
- 2) Written comments on the annual reviews: include any comments submitted as part of an annual review; any comments submitted as part of the fourth-year review are to be included here.
- 3) Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching: include any letters or reports generated as part of peer evaluation. The material in this section must match requirements set forth in the TIU's APT document.

#### **4.1.3.2 Additions**

Revised: 12/18/13

Departments and colleges may add to the above list any evaluations that are required in their APT Documents, and place them under III.A.4: Other letters. For example, in some TIUs that have sections or divisions, a letter from the section or division head is required by the unit. TIUs may also solicit and obtain letters regarding scholarship from a list provided by the candidate of colleagues in other units at Ohio State, including other TIUs and academic centers, or from collaborators at other institutions. Such letters may be particularly helpful in the case of candidates who are engaged in significant inter- or trans-disciplinary scholarship. Candidates with significant service and/or outreach activities outside the unit may also request that the TIU solicit letters from colleagues familiar with the candidate's contributions to these activities.

#### **4.1.3.3 External letters of evaluation**

Revised: 04/01/07

- 1) Summary sheet listing (Summary Form for External Evaluators, Form 114 found at <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-guidelines-forms>):
  - 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, professional colleague)

~~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.~~
- 2) 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.

Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, rev. June 2018

<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>

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

- 3) At least five external letters preceded by a cover page (see External Evaluator Cover Page, Form 106 found at <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-guidelines-forms>) for each letter received containing the following information:
- name, title (academic rank as appropriate), 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 OAA.
  - name of person who recommended the evaluator (candidate, chair, or other [specified]).
  - evaluator's relationship to the candidate (expert in the field, professional colleague). This information must match information on Form 114 and in the evaluator's letter. If a professional relationship is noted, the TIU must indicate whether they consider this a conflict of interest.

#### **4.1.4 Student Evaluation of Instruction**

Revised: 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 may be summarized on a single form for each clinical teaching group, since numbers are small, but OAA does not require this.

##### **4.1.4.1 Cumulative fixed-response survey data**

Revised: 02/15/12

Provide a summary table for all courses in which the candidate used a type of fixed-response survey (the SEI or comparable unit form) to obtain student evaluations. Complete documentation as described below is required.

Results for every quarter/semester the course was taught are to be presented horizontally across the page in the summary table. The table should not simply list item numbers, but clearly describe the item to which students were responding. 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 <https://registrar.osu.edu/faculty/sei/instructorreports.asp> for a menu of the Registrar's online services
- Click on the "Faculty Center" link and log in using an OSU username and password. This will take the user to the most recent quarter/semester you taught.
- Click on the "Change Term" button. Select the term for which a report is desired and click "Continue".
- Click on the "SEI Info" button that appears next to the relevant course.
- Click on the "Generate New SEI Cumulative Report" to create a cumulative SEI summary report.

#### 4.1.4.2 Fixed-response student evaluation data

Revised: 02/15/12

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

- a) If the unit uses SEI instruments, include all individual course reports. For promotion to associate professor, include all reports since date of hire; for promotion to professor, include all reports since appointment to associate professor, not to exceed 5 years.
- 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; 07/20/17

Open-ended (discursive) evaluation: For all courses in which the candidate used open-ended evaluation instruments to collect student input (including open-ended questions on fixed-response evaluations if collected by the unit for this purpose), someone other than the candidate must summarize the comments on a course-by-course basis for inclusion in this section of the dossier. 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.

Candidates for promotion to professor are to provide evaluations for the most recent five years.

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

Do not include raw student comments in this section.

#### 4.1.4.4 Appointment, Promotion, Tenure Internal Review Evaluation Responsibilities

Revised: 06/05/16; 07/14/17

- 1.1) Regional campus faculty deliberative body: detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record. The chair of the regional campus faculty deliberative body or the regional campus dean/director must explain the regional campus expectations against which the candidate is being assessed.
- 1.2) Regional campus dean/director: detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.
- 2.1) TIU faculty deliberative body: detailed assessment, to include:
  - thorough assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, and how they compare to the TIU's standards as described in the unit's APT; both strengths and weaknesses should be discussed
  - report of the discussion by the faculty deliberative body

- numerical vote of the full faculty deliberative body and minimum vote required for a positive recommendation (included in 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of letter)
- 2.2) TIU head (or deans in colleges without departments): 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) academic appointment including Discovery Theme appointment: independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. It is the TIU's responsibility to solicit this letter prior to the meeting of the TIU eligible faculty.
  - 2.4) TIU-level comments process: include any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.
  - 3.1) College P&T committee (in colleges with departments): 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, rationale for differing judgments should be addressed.
  - 3.2) College dean (in colleges with departments): independent assessment and recommendation to the executive vice president and provost. If the dean's assessment and/or recommendation differs from any of the prior assessments or recommendations, rationale for differing judgments should be addressed.
  - 3.3) College-level comments process: include any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

## **5.0 Procedures for clinical and research faculty**

Revised: 04/01/07

Positive decisions by the dean to reappoint clinical and research faculty to a new contract period will be approved by OAA without review and forwarded to the BOT for final action. For each positive decision, submit to OAA one original signed Cover Sheet (Form 109, Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment, <http://oaa.osu.edu/forms.html>).

Do not submit reappointment letter, CV, or dossier.

A decision by the dean not to reappoint is final.

### **5.1 Clinical faculty**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

#### **5.1.1 APT Document used for reappointment and promotion reviews**

Revised: 03/01/15

All clinical faculty members being considered for reappointment or promotion will be reviewed using the unit's current APT document (as approved and posted on the OAA website). Faculty members, however,

may choose to be reviewed under the document that was in effect **on their start date**, on the date of their most recent reappointment, or on the date of their last promotion, whichever is most recent.

A faculty member who chooses to use an earlier document will notify his/her TIU head of this intent by submitting the APT document that was in effect **on their start date**, on the date of his/her most recent reappointment, or on the date of last promotion when submitting his/her dossier and other materials for review. The deadline for doing so will be the unit's regular deadline for receiving the dossier and other materials for the review in question.

### **5.1.2 Levels of review**

Revised: 11/03/17

All promotion cases will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for review.

### **5.1.3 Documentation of teaching and service**

Revised: 04/01/07

Complete documentation of teaching and service is required.

### **5.1.4 Documentation of research: external evaluation**

Revised: 04/01/07; 3/40/18

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

External evaluations, when deemed necessary, must meet the criteria set forth in Section 3.7 of this volume. Unless an exception has been approved by OAA, at least five unbiased external evaluations of the individual's research record are normally required.

The presence of 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, teaching and/or professional service may be appropriate.

## **5.2 Research faculty**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

### **5.2.1 APT Document used for reappointment and promotion reviews**

Revised: 03/01/15

Research faculty members being considered for reappointment and promotion reviews will be reviewed using the unit's current APT document.

### **5.2.2 Levels of review for promotion**

Revised: 04/01/07

All promotion cases will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for review.

### **5.2.3 Documentation of teaching and service**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

### **5.2.4 Documentation of research: external evaluation**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

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

## **6.0 Procedures for associated faculty**

Revised: 12/18/13

Associated faculty who have not collected and maintained the documentation necessary to support a fully informed evaluation are to be informed that promotion will be considered only when sufficient documentation has been accumulated (and assisted with understanding what information is required).

### **6.1 APT Document used for reappointment at senior rank**

Revised: 03/01/15

Associated faculty members being considered for reappointment at senior rank will be reviewed using the unit's current APT document.

### **6.2 Levels of review**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

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

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

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

## **6.3 Documentation of teaching and service**

Revised: 07/15/17

Documentation should match that required for tenure-track faculty

### **6.3.1 Clinical practice faculty**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

### **6.3.2 Associated with tenure-track titles below 50% FTE and adjunct faculty**

Revised: 04/01/07

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

### **6.4 Documentation of research: external evaluation**

Revised: 07/24/12

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

### **7.0 Approved exceptions**

Revised: 3/25/04

OAA has approved certain exceptions to the P&T rules. These are set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/index.php?q=rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>).

#### **7.1 College of Medicine**

Revised: 3/25/04

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

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

#### **7.2 University Libraries**

Revised: 3/25/04

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

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.



**7.4 Department of Internal Medicine**

Revised: 11/6/2017

The Department of Internal Medicine 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.

OAA requires only a minimum of four external evaluation letters for the Department of Internal Medicine.

**7.5 Department of Pediatrics**

Revised: 8/01/14

The Department of Pediatrics 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.