

# ASC P&T FAQs

Revised October 5, 2022

## Section 1: Preparation of the Core Dossier

### **Q1: To what documents should candidates undergoing promotion and tenure or promotion review refer?**

A1: Candidates should refer to (1) their TIU's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) document for unit-specific rules and procedures and (2) the College of Arts and Sciences APT document for college-wide criteria and procedures. Both of these APT documents are available on the [OAA website](#).

Detailed instructions for completing the Core Dossier are available in section 4.1.2.1 (p. 19) of the Promotion and Tenure section of the [OAA Handbook](#).

ASC documents and resources relating to dossier preparation can be found on the ASC Intranet ([Promotion and Tenure/Materials](#)).

### **Q2: A unit has adopted a new APT document, which differs from the one in effect when a candidate was hired. Which APT Document is used for promotion and tenure reviews?**

A2: By default, 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](#)). However, faculty members may instead choose to be reviewed under the document that was in effect when they signed their letter of offer or on the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent. A faculty member who chooses to use an earlier document must notify their TIU head of this intent by submitting the APT document that was in effect at the time of offer or on the date of last promotion when submitting their 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, and the unit will forward the alternate APT document to the college with the dossier for review. 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.

### **Q3: To whom should candidates undergoing promotion and tenure or promotion review first turn with questions?**

A3: Candidates should first turn to the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty in their unit and to faculty mentors in their units. Most questions can better be answered at the local level by individuals familiar with the unit's APT Document and departmental practices.



**Q4: What time frame is used for inclusion of materials in the Core Dossier? Can a candidate include material in the Core Dossier that was produced during time spent at a previous institution?**

A4: The review should focus on activities since date of hire or date of last promotion, whichever is most recent. For promotion to professor, classroom teaching descriptions, peer teaching evaluations and student evaluations should be included only for the most recent five years. Teaching evaluations from other institutions are not allowed in the dossier, although teaching experience at other institutions may be discussed in the narrative teaching statement. Graduate student advising from the previous institution can be included but should be clearly labeled to distinguish it from advising at OSU. Research and creative activities prior to the date of hire or date of last promotion can be included if the TIU eligible faculty consider it relevant to the review. In particular, a full history of publications and creative work can be included, particularly if this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record, and if this information is pertinent to questions of scholarly independence. While information about scholarship produced prior to the date of hire or date of last promotion may be provided, it should be clearly labeled, and it is the research performance since the date of hire or date of last promotion that should be the focus of the evaluating parties. Service activities since the date of hire or date of last promotion should be included.

**Q5: A candidate for promotion to full professor wants to include material in the Core Dossier that was included in the mandatory tenure review. Is this permitted?**

A5: OAA discourages including material prior to the date of last promotion since this material is assumed to have met the criteria for the previous promotion. The current review should focus on the accomplishments since that date. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information from before the date of last promotion if it feels such information would provide relevant context for the review. This could include material that was produced between the time of the actual review (usually autumn) and the actual promotion date. Listing of prior publications or creative work is allowed if the eligible faculty consider it relevant to the review (see Q4), but which materials were generated since the previous review should be indicated clearly.

**Q6: A candidate wants to include work on a specific project under both teaching and research in the Core Dossier. Is this permitted?**

A6: The dossier should not contain any duplicative material. If the candidate is unsure where to include a specific project, the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty should recommend the preferred section of the dossier. The candidate may include a brief explanation of how the material is relevant to both sections in the narrative portions of the dossier. Note that publications with graduate coauthors may be listed under both graduate advising and the candidate's research section.



**Q7: What is the expected length of the narrative sections in the Core Dossier (i.e., the “Brief Descriptions” of Teaching Approach, Focus of Research and Service Activities)?**

A7: These narratives should be succinct. Some explanation is valuable but a lengthy narrative and explanation may obscure important accomplishments rather than highlight them. In general, narratives should be no longer than 750 words except where noted. The narratives should stress the impact of the candidate's activities and should not repeat a listing of activities that are elsewhere in the dossier. See the Core Dossier Outline posted on the ASC Intranet ([Promotion and Tenure/Materials](#)).

**Q8: Can a candidate provide verbatim student comments on teaching performance in the Core Dossier?**

A8: No. Verbatim student comments are NOT permitted in the Core Dossier. Rather, a summary of the comments, generated by someone other than the candidate, can be included in dossier section IVC (if the unit APT indicates that this is allowed), and can be described in the TIU Faculty Assessment or the TIU Head Assessment. The POD and the candidate should review the summary to ensure that it is representative of the student comments.

**Q9: Can a candidate list works under review or work in progress in Section 1 (a-g) of the Research and Creative Activity section of the Core Dossier?**

A9: No. Only papers and other scholarly works that have been formally accepted without qualification for publication or presentation, or have actually been published or presented, can be listed in Research and Creative Activity, item 1(a-j). Works that have been submitted for review should be listed in item 1(k). Work that is in progress and not yet submitted for review can be described in the narrative section (3) under Research and Creative Activity.

**Q10: How should a candidate describe the intellectual contribution of co-authored projects?**

A10: In cases involving multiple authors, a narrative description (maximum approximately 50 words) of the candidate's intellectual contribution AND percentage contribution are required. Examples of appropriate formats for this information include:

- I designed and wrote 50% the sections of the article, my co-author wrote the other 50%, and then I edited the whole; 60% contribution.
- My co-author and I discussed the overall argument, and I wrote the first draft; my co-author cite-checked the quotations, added the explanatory footnotes, and edited my draft; 50% contribution.
- I designed all of the surveys (which were administered by the graduate student co-authors), did the statistical analysis, and wrote the article; 70% contribution.
- I designed and directed 25% of the experiments (which were carried out by the graduate student co-authors) and my collaborator supervised the rest of the experiments; I shared equally with my collaborator in the analysis of the data, and we each wrote 50% of the manuscript; 30% contribution.



- I completed and wrote the literature review for the paper, shared equally with the coauthor in the analysis and interpretation of the data, which was collected by my collaborator's students, and reviewed the complete draft manuscript; 25% contribution.
- I led the design research phase of the project by hosting workshops and focus groups and shared equally with my collaborator in the responsibility for interpreting the findings and developing prototypes and the final proposed solution, and wrote the manuscript; 75% contribution.
- I provided materials to my collaborator and the experimental work was carried out in her laboratory; I reviewed and edited the manuscript; 10% contribution.

Statements such as the following are not acceptable: “All authors contributed equally” or “50% Effort.”

**Q11: A candidate was nominated for a prestigious award in his or her field, but did not receive it. Can the nomination be listed in the Core Dossier?**

A11: No, nominations for awards should not be listed. Only awards that were received can be listed in any section (Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Service and Engagement).

**Q12: Do the same expectations in terms of research, teaching and service hold for faculty members on the main and regional campuses?**

A12: As noted in the ASC APT document: “The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the departments and schools within the College of Arts and Sciences will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to research and/or creative activity. Recognizing that the character and quantity of research and/or creative activity by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department or school nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly and/or creative activity as a fundamental requirement for promotion and tenure or promotion” (pp. 22-23). Units describe expectations for regional campus faculty in their own APT documents. In general, research expectations are for lower quantity, but high quality, work.

**Q13: Where in the Core Dossier should a candidate describe activities undertaken to promote and enhance diversity?**

A13: The College of Arts and Sciences embraces diversity as a key component of excellence and the pursuit of eminence. We are committed to promoting the principles of equal opportunity, affirmative action, and multiculturalism in which all individuals are valued, respected, unobstructed in their pursuit of excellence, and provided opportunities to flourish. Depending on the faculty member, these efforts may be documented throughout the dossier. For example, mentoring of students in pipeline programs or from underrepresented groups can be included in



item 9 of the teaching section if not indicated elsewhere, and efforts to diversify the curriculum can be described in item 6. Efforts to study social or cultural diversity may be included in the research statement and supported by listings of conference presentations and publications in the Research and Creative Activity section. Candidates can list other activities undertaken to promote and enhance diversity in item 6(c) of the Service and Engagement section of the Core Dossier, and they can expand on their diversity efforts in the Service and Engagement narrative (item 10) by discussing, for example, the context in which these efforts occurred, the role that commitment to diversity plays in their professional development, or the documentable impacts of their diversity efforts. Each activity should be listed only once in the core dossier, with expanded discussion in the Service and Engagement narrative as appropriate.

**Q14: What types of SEI reports are used in the dossier?**

A14: Both cumulative SEI reports (that show the candidates scores on the 10 SEI questions and the university mean for Q10) and individual course reports (one-page reports for each course that show frequency numbers for each question and comparison to the unit, college and university mean for all questions) are used in the final dossier that is reviewed by the TIU and submitted to the college and OAA. SEIs for courses up to Spring 2018 are available in the [Faculty Center](#); SEIs for courses from Summer 2018 onward are available in the newer [Blue system](#). For the next several years, faculty will need to submit a combination of these reports. An SEI Reports Access document describing the different reports and their use in promotion and tenure reviews is available on the ASC Intranet ([Promotion and Tenure/Materials](#)).

## **Section 2: TIU Review**

**Q15: Who serves on the Committee of the Eligible Faculty?**

A15: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 \(B\)\(1\)](#) states that “with the exception noted below, eligible faculty are tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate excluding the tenure initiating unit chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president. For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors excluding the tenure initiating unit chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.” If the candidate being considered is a full professor at another university (as an external hire), the full professors in the TIU constitute the eligible faculty for that case. The TIU head or others who are not eligible to participate, as noted above or because of a conflict of interest (see Q19) do not count as members of the eligible faculty on form 105.

**Q16: Can clinical/teaching/practice and/or research faculty members participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty?**

A16: No, neither clinical/teaching/practice nor research faculty members can participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure track faculty. However, clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty can participate in promotion and reappointment reviews of



clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty of lower rank if allowed by the TIU APT document.

**Q17: Can units include a table comparing the candidate's record (e.g., publications, citation counts) to previous candidates from the unit who have come up for promotion and tenure, so that they can be explicit about how the current candidate's record compares to past cases? Are there limits on tabular comparisons of this sort?**

A17: A candidate's record should be evaluated holistically, in terms of how they as an individual have met or failed to meet the expectations of the TIU. Comparisons to past candidates in tabular form are not permitted and should not be included in either of the internal recommendation letters.

**Q18: Is there a minimum number of faculty members needed to participate in a promotion and tenure vote?**

A18: Yes. OAA requires that there be a minimum of three faculty members involved in any P&T vote. In the event the TIU does not have three eligible faculty members who can undertake the review, the TIU head, after consulting the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college. In such instances, the individual from outside the department should not serve as chair of or POD for the committee of eligible faculty.

**Q19: What constitutes a conflict of interest for a member of the committee of eligible faculty, and how should it be handled?**

A19: According to the ASC APT document, "A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate."

In general, a conflict of interest exists when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial, professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the P&T process, or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship. 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. The committee of the eligible faculty should discuss the potential conflict and the chair of the committee or the department head (depending on the unit's APT document), in conjunction with the POD, should rule on the conflict. Ideally, questions about conflict of interest should be resolved before discussion begins on the candidate's case, although the issue may arise during discussion. Some units establish formal mechanisms for excluding persons from a review on the basis of a conflict of interest. If a faculty member is





recused because of a conflict of interest, they should not be present at the portion of the meeting in which the case is discussed (i.e., presence at the meeting but nonparticipation in the discussion is not a permissible remedy). Many units also recuse faculty members with a major conflict of interest (e.g., a close interpersonal relationship) from all reviews of faculty members of the same rank to avoid any perception of bias. Faculty members who are recused do not count as members of the eligible faculty on form 105.

**Q20: What are the responsibilities of the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)?**

A20: The POD is responsible for reviewing the core dossier and ensuring that the document is complete and adheres to OAA requirements, prior to the eligible faculty review. The POD is also responsible for reviewing the complete dossier prior to the eligible faculty review to ensure that all required materials are present.

The POD should make reasonable efforts to assure that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias. The POD must make a reasonable effort to ensure that the review follows the relevant written procedures (as outlined in the TIU APT document), and that the review proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner. However, although the POD is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of the eligible faculty must accept full responsibility for the integrity of the review process. The POD should be identified at the outset of the TIU meeting. The POD should briefly outline the procedures that are to be followed, and ask the committee of eligible faculty whether there are any specific concerns or potential conflicts of interest that need to be addressed before the meeting commences. Ideally, these types of concerns will be addressed before discussion of a candidate's dossier begins.

The specific duties of the POD, as assigned by OAA, are summarized on the [OAA website](#).

**Q21: What steps should a POD take if they have concerns about a review?**

A21: If a POD has concerns about a review, these concerns should first be brought to the attention of the person or review body generating the concerns. For example, if there are issues with the core dossier, the POD should consult with the candidate who prepared the dossier, to have these issues addressed before the TIU review; if a faculty member(s) or committee is not following procedures, the concerns should be raised with that individual or committee, preferably before the review is completed. If the concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (TIU head or dean), who must look into the matter and reply in writing to the POD.

**Q22: A department has a tenured faculty member with a 50% FTE appointment in the department, but whose tenure is in the second department. Can this faculty member vote on P&T cases in the first (non-TIU) department?**

A22: No. An individual is only a member of the eligible faculty in the unit where their tenure resides. OAA encourages departments to seek input from joint-appointed faculty through alternate means.



**Q23: If the candidate holds a joint (split FTE) academic appointment or a Discovery Theme initiative appointment, does the non-TIU unit also participate in the promotion and tenure review?**

A23: The head of any unit in which the candidate holds a joint (split FTE) academic appointment should provide an independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. A copy of this assessment should be inserted in the dossier in the Review Letters section V.B.3. Depending on the unit's APT document, the committee of the eligible faculty of the non-TIU unit may also provide an assessment and vote, but this assessment and vote is regarded as advisory, not binding. For faculty who are members of a Discovery Theme focus area, the TIU head should solicit an evaluative letter from the Discovery Theme focus area leader. Letters from a secondary unit or Discovery Theme focus area leader should be included in the material that is reviewed by the TIU prior to the eligible faculty vote.

**Q24: How should administrative work in a college or university center be considered in a departmental promotion review?**

A24: While work done within the TIU is central to the evaluation, the TIU should also take into account broader contributions to the university. It can do so by considering the scope and impact of the work done in centers or a college, and by considering the proportion of time devoted to administrative work when evaluating quantitative measures of scholarly productivity. The college also encourages the chair or P&T chair to solicit a written description and evaluation of this work from administrators who are familiar with the efforts of the faculty member beyond the TIU (see Q36 below).

**Q25: Can members of the committee of eligible faculty abstain from voting in a case? If yes, do abstentions count as votes in determining the percentage of positive votes?**

A25: Abstentions among the committee of eligible faculty members are permitted, although faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Abstentions do not count as a vote; only "yes" or "no" count as votes toward the positive percentage. All three types of decisions – yes, no, and abstentions – must be recorded on the dossier checklist (form 105, p. 4). However, the percentage of positive votes is based only on the total number of yes and no votes. For example: The results of the faculty members' votes in Department X are 9 yes, 3 no, and 2 abstentions. The percentage of "yes" votes is equal to 75% ( $9/[9+3]$ ).

**Q26. What percentage of "yes" votes is necessary for a positive recommendation from the committee of eligible faculty?**

A26: The TIUs define the minimum number of votes required for a positive recommendation, and it is specified in their APT document. The College recommends that a minimum of two-thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty members be used for a positive recommendation.





**Q27: Only five of a unit's 12 tenured faculty members are able to attend a promotion and tenure review meeting. What is the necessary quorum (i.e., required number of faculty members present at the meeting for an official vote to occur)?**

A27: The quorum is determined by the individual unit, and it is specified in the unit's APT document. OAA and ASC recommend that TIUs require a quorum of two-thirds in order for a P&T vote to be valid. The quorum is based on the number of eligible faculty on-duty in a given semester. In the example above, the five members would not meet a 2/3 quorum unless 5 of the 12 tenured faculty members were excused (for example, two of the tenured faculty members were on FPL, one was on unpaid leave, and two were recused because of a conflict). In that case, the eligible faculty would be reduced from 12 to 7, and 5/7 would meet the quorum. Note that the TIU head does not count as a member of the eligible faculty in determining quorum.

**Q28: A faculty member is going to be out of town when the committee of eligible faculty meets to discuss and vote on a candidate's promotion. Can this faculty member vote on the case?**

A28: Individuals who are unable to be physically present for the discussion may vote only if they participate in the meeting "at a distance" via some electronic or digital means such as conference call, Zoom, or other video conferencing. Only faculty members who participate in the meeting (either in person or via one of these electronic formats) are eligible to vote. The voting process to be used is determined by the TIU.

**Q29: Is a department chair permitted to attend the meeting of the committee of the eligible faculty?**

A29: OAA requires that TIU heads be ex officio members of every department/school committee, including being a non-voting member of the eligible faculty. As a member of the committee, the TIU head should attend and is permitted to speak at these meetings, but the TIU head is prohibited from voting. The TIU's APT document may specify additional constraints on the contribution to discussion from the TIU head. In general, the TIU head attends primarily to listen and answer questions that may arise. The TIU head is not included in either the quorum count or in the tabulation of the votes.

**Q30: Can regional campus faculty members vote on the case of a Columbus campus faculty member?**

A30: Yes. All tenured faculty members, regardless of home campus, can vote on the cases of faculty members from other campuses, as long as they attend the meeting in person or through some electronic or digital means. They are considered members of the eligible faculty and count in quorum determination.



**Q31: A faculty member on FPL is excused from participation in the eligible faculty meeting and does not count in determination of quorum. Is a faculty member on FPL allowed to participate if they choose to do so?**

A31. Yes, a faculty member on FPL may choose to participate in the eligible faculty meeting, and to vote if they participate fully in the discussion (either in person or by telephone or video); however, they must then participate in all cases at a given level (e.g., for promotion to associate or to professor).

**Q32. How do the two internal recommendation letters generated at the unit level – i.e., the letters prepared by the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty and the TIU head – differ?**

A32: The letter prepared by the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty should summarize the review and discussion of the case, and report the vote. It should state the TIU's expectations as described in the TIU's APT document, and provide details about the candidate's documented record in the areas of teaching, service, and research, and articulate the committee's evaluation of that record. This letter should detail both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record, and must accurately and fully reflect the general assessment of the case by the eligible faculty at the review meeting, including discussion of the basis for negative votes. The TIU head provides an independent assessment of the candidate's record in their letter. This letter should not repeat the detailed documentation provided in the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty's letter. Rather, the TIU head's letter should provide an overarching summary interpretation and assessment of the candidate's record, including a discussion of how that record relates to the mission of the unit. If the TIU head's assessment and/or recommendation is contrary to that of the committee of eligible faculty, the bases for differing judgments must be addressed.

**Q33: Can a candidate comment on the TIU's evaluation of the case?**

A33: All candidates are given the opportunity to provide written comments on the TIU eligible faculty and/or TIU head's letters. Once those letters are completed, the TIU head notifies the candidate that they are available, provides the letters to the candidate, and gives the candidate the opportunity to provide written comments on those letters for inclusion in the dossier. The candidate has ten days from receipt of this notification from the TIU head to provide those comments. The TIU head and chair of the eligible have the option to respond to the candidate's comments, but there is no further response from the candidate. The TIU head and chair of the eligible faculty also have the option of correcting factual errors in their letters; the corrected letters should be provided to the candidate. The candidate has the same opportunity to comment on the college P&T and dean's letters at the completion of the college level review, following the same process as at the TIU-level. Candidates are advised to use this comments process to amend, correct, or otherwise comment on faculty 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 is central to the review process.



**Q34: Where do I find the most current version of the OAA forms? Can I use older versions of the forms?**

A34: Always use the most recent versions of the OAA forms available on the [OAA website](#). The link is also posted on the ASC Intranet ([Promotion and Tenure/Materials](#)).

## **Section 3: External Letters of Evaluation**

**Q35: How many external letters of evaluation are required?**

A35: OAA requires a minimum of five external evaluation letters, with no more than half of the external letters written by persons suggested by the candidate. It is the unit's obligation to obtain the required number of evaluations and to begin the process of obtaining these letters well in advance of the review. In the event that a unit is unable to obtain the required five external evaluations, the unit must document its efforts, noting the individuals who were contacted, how they were contacted, and the dates and number of times they were contacted. The unit should notify the college and OAA as soon as it becomes apparent that it will not be able to obtain the required letters in time for the meeting of the eligible faculty. The lack of five external letters will not stop a mandatory review from proceeding, but will halt a non-mandatory review from proceeding unless the candidate, P&T chair, and the chair all agree in writing that it may proceed and will not constitute a procedural error. All potential external evaluators must be approved by the college prior to letter solicitation.

**Q36: Can research collaborators be asked to write an external letter of evaluation?**

A36: Letters from collaborators may be appropriate as a means of determining a candidate's contributions to jointly conducted work, but major collaborators must not be asked to write an external evaluation. If an individual asked to write an external review turns out to be a major research collaborator, that letter could either be included with the internal letters of evaluation (under section III.A.4), or it could be removed after consultation with the dean and OAA. The definition of whether a collaboration is minor or constitutes a conflict of interest depends on the nature and degree of the collaboration; this should be discussed with the college deans. The candidate may request that the TIU solicit letters from collaborators (external or from other units at OSU); candidates with significant service/outreach activities outside the unit also may request that the TIU solicit letters from colleagues familiar with the candidate's contributions to these activities. These informational letters must be solicited by the TIU and are placed in the "Additional Letters" section III.A.4.



**Q37: To assist the external evaluators, can names of specific faculty members from other institutions to whom they might compare the candidate under review be suggested?**

A37: While external evaluators can be asked to make comparisons between the candidate and faculty members at other institutions at the same career stage, you may not provide them with names of specific faculty members for those comparisons.

**Q38: Can confidentiality be guaranteed to individuals who are asked to write an external evaluation?**

A38: No. The Ohio Public Records Act 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 the unit must provide access to them (but is not required to provide copies of the letters). Units may inform the evaluators that the candidate has asked to view the evaluation letters, but they are not required to do so under the law. Units may remove the name and address of the reviewer before making them available but must provide the entire letter if specifically requested by the candidate. If letters are requested, OAA recommends that they be supplied once the dossier is complete and during the TIU comments period.

