

POD and CEF (or P&T) Chair

Responsibilities and Best Practices in Promotion and Reappointment Reviews

August 15, 2025

This document outlines the core responsibilities of the TIU-level POD and CEF/P&T chair in faculty reviews for promotion or reappointment in the College of Arts and Sciences. It is based on [Section 3.6 of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) and the [OAA Office of Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure website](#). Additional responsibilities may be outlined in unit APT documents.

DEFINITIONS

- **Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)** - Provides oversight of the eligible faculty's responsibility for the integrity of the review process. Note that all members of the review body accept full responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias for all faculty members.
 - Must be a member of the eligible faculty for all cases it oversees
 - May not be the department chair, CEF chair, or Chair of the P&T Committee (in units that have such subcommittees of the eligible faculty)
 - Units may choose to have multiple PODs (e.g., one for each faculty candidate being reviewed) but must ensure that all such faculty obtain the training and knowledge required to perform the role effectively.
- **Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF Chair) or P&T Chair** (in units with P&T subcommittees responsible for coordinating the review) ensures that all responsibilities of the CEF are carried out, including:
 - Preparing a descriptive summary of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service for distribution to the eligible faculty with the dossier in advance of the review meeting
 - Writing a letter to the TIU head after the review meeting summarizing the meeting of the eligible faculty, the deliberations and conclusions as to whether and how the candidate has met each of the unit's stated criteria for promotion in the APT and reporting the results of the vote.
 - Ensure that the faculty discussions in the review meeting are structured in a way that allow the CEF letter to meet the College of Arts and Sciences requirements (see section below on Review Meeting of the Eligible Faculty)

KEY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POD

- The POD is responsible for reviewing the candidate's core dossier to ensure it is prepared using the current core dossier format. This includes asking the candidate to make any required changes and verifying that such changes have been made. However, the candidate is ultimately responsible for the accuracy of all information in the core dossier.

- The POD must also verify the accuracy of all published and creative works. This verification is one of the items on the Dossier Checklist. The dossier review and verification must be completed before the dossier is provided to the eligible faculty.
- Throughout the review process, the POD makes reasonable efforts to ensure that the eligible faculty follow the written procedures governing its reviews and that proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner. The written procedures are to be taken from the current approved TIU APT document (or the alternate document selected by the candidate) and [Chapter 3 of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The POD also monitors the review process to ensure equitable treatment for all candidates under review.
- If the POD has concerns about the review process, they should first directly address them with the relevant party—for example, asking the candidate to revise a dossier or informing faculty or staff of possible procedural errors. If the issue is not resolved, the POD must escalate it to the TIU head, who must respond in writing with either corrective action or a rationale for inaction. The issue raised by the POD and the response and/or resolution must be documented and included in the dossier. The POD or the TIU head should consult the ASC Office of Faculty Affairs to ensure adherence to required procedures in such cases.
- See the section below on POD Interfolio Forms for an overview of the three forms that the POD is responsible for completing in Interfolio.

COMMON DOSSIER ERRORS

- APT
 - A copy of the currently approved APT should not be put in Interfolio. An APT should be uploaded to Interfolio only if the candidate has chosen to use criteria from a previous version of the APT.
- Core Dossier
 - If candidates include scholarship and/or awards dated before the start date or date of last promotion/reappointment, they must use subheadings of other indicators to distinguish the earlier activities from those that occurred during the review period
 - In Item 4 (Courses Taught table), the student evaluations and peer evaluations columns must accurately reflect the number of SEI reports and peer evaluations included in the case. Only courses taught since date of hire (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion/reappointment (for nonprobationary faculty) should be included in this item.
 - In Items 14 (Scholarly Contributions and Creative Productions), 15 (Research Funding), and 16 (Contracts and Non-Research Grant Funding), all publications and grants with multiple authors/investigators must include a narrative description and percentage of the candidate's intellectual contribution.
- SEI Reports
 - Confirm that all SEI Overview Reports have been included for all classes reported in Item 4 (Courses Taught table) and that earlier reports before the review period are excluded. A full description of [required SEI Reports is available here](#).

- SEI Student Comment Summaries (if used)
 - Units that collect and use student open-ended comments in promotion/reappointment reviews must assign someone other than the candidate to conduct a separate independent summary for every course reported in Item 4. The name and role of the person who created the summary must be included on each summary along with the total number of students in the course and the number of respondents. [A template is available here.](#)
- External Evaluation Letters
 - If an evaluation letter is unsigned, include in Interfolio the email to which it was attached as verification of the sender.

REVIEW MEETING OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

Either the CEF chair or P&T chair presides over the review meeting. This varies across units. However, the TIU head may not vote as a member of the eligible faculty on promotion and reappointment reviews.

At the beginning of the meeting, the POD:

- Verifies that the number of eligible faculty members needed to constitute a quorum are present and notes the number of votes needed to recommend a positive decision as defined in the APT document.
 - Note that faculty on a formally approved leave (FPL, FMLA, sick leave) are automatically excluded from quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave.
 - Faculty with a conflict of interest and those with assistant or associate dean titles (who are therefore excluded from the discussion and vote) should be excluded from the denominator in calculating quorum.
 - Eligible faculty who are absent from the meeting for any other reason must be included in the denominator in calculating quorum.
- Outlines the procedures to be followed, asks the committee of the eligible faculty to identify any conflicts of interest, and informs the eligible faculty of the following requirements:
 - All discussions in the review meeting are confidential and should not be shared with others, including the candidate, except through the official letter to the TIU head prepared by the CEF chair or P&T chair and provided to the candidate.
 - Each candidate is to be evaluated using only information provided in the dossier. New information about the candidate that has not been documented in the dossier should not be introduced or considered by the eligible faculty in the review meeting.
 - The discussion and evaluation of the case should focus on determining whether the faculty member has met each of the unit's criteria in scholarship, teaching, and service listed in the APT document and documenting the evidence that supports the eligible faculty's conclusions. The review meeting is not a time to challenge or amend the criteria in the APT.
 - Each candidate is to be evaluated only in comparison to the APT criteria. Direct comparisons between candidates either within or between units should not be made in the review meeting.

Meeting Structure

ASC strongly recommends the following structure for the review meeting, following the POD's introduction and overview of procedures.

- For the first candidate under consideration, read aloud or show the first criterion in teaching and ask the eligible faculty to comment on the evidence in the candidate's dossier that indicates that they have met that criterion, or whether such evidence is lacking. Repeat this process for each successive criterion in teaching and then open the floor to a broader discussion on whether the candidate has met or not met the standards in teaching required for promotion or reappointment.
- Repeat the process above for scholarship and then for service. The CEF chair or another member of the eligible faculty should take notes on this discussion including any points on which the eligible faculty disagree so that it can be summarized in the letter to the TIU head.
- Open the floor to further discussion on the first candidate before conducting the vote on that candidate.
- Repeat the process outlined above for each additional candidate under consideration.

Voting

- Fully online or hybrid review meetings (in which one or more eligible faculty members participate remotely) require electronic voting via Qualtrics survey as this is the only university-approved method for ensuring that the TIU head can determine who has voted but not how they voted.
- Review meetings that are fully in-person with no faculty participating remotely may vote in the meeting by anonymous paper ballots or Qualtrics surveys, but OAA strongly recommends Qualtrics voting so that the TIU head knows who has voted, but not how they voted.
- A model process for preparing for and managing electronic voting via Qualtrics is outlined on the [OAA Promotion and Tenure website](#) (see Promotion and Tenure Resources—Guidance for P&T Committees and Voting).
- Units may hold preliminary straw poll votes to determine whether further discussion is needed before a final vote.
- Final voting on each case must occur before the meeting concludes.

CEF LETTER ON FACULTY DISCUSSION, EVALUATION, AND VOTE

The CEF Chair or P&T chair should ensure that the key responsibilities of the committee are carried out. These include:

- Preparing a descriptive summary of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service for distribution to the eligible faculty with the dossier in advance of the review meeting.
- Writing a letter to the TIU head after the review meeting that satisfies the following OAA requirements:

The eligible faculty committee chair (or Promotion and Tenure Committee chair, as appropriate) writes a letter to the TIU head reporting the vote and summarizing the discussion of the eligible faculty. This letter should be evaluative, descriptive, and contextualize the vote, including alternate opinions as appropriate. Although a descriptive summary of a candidate's accomplishments provides helpful context, it is critical that the letter from the eligible faculty not be solely descriptive. The evaluation should address how

a candidate does or does not meet the criteria as set forth in the relevant APT document, including the quality and impact of a candidate's work.

- The CEF letter should NOT include reference to any faculty leaves or extensions of the tenure clock. The only consideration is whether the candidate's dossier demonstrates that they have met the criteria. The amount of time taken to meet the criteria should not be a factor in the evaluation.
- ASC recommends that the letter from the CEF/P&T Chair use the following structure:
 - On <DATE>, the Committee of Eligible Faculty of the < TIU NAME> at Ohio State University met to consider <CANDIDATE> for <PROMOTION or REAPPOINTMENT> to <FACULTY TITLE AND RANK>. This letter reports on that discussion and the final vote. Present in the meeting were <LIST NAMES of FACULTY PRESENT>. The meets the required quorum of <ENTER NUMBER REQUIRED FOR QUORUM> eligible faculty members.
 - Use subheadings for each of the areas of evaluation (Teaching, Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity, Service).
 - State each promotion/reappointment criterion from the APT for each area of evaluation and summarize the eligible faculty's views on whether the candidate meets each one. Support each view with multiple, specific forms of evidence in the dossier or note any lack of evidence and highlight any points of disagreement. Focus on evaluation, not simply a descriptive recap of the dossier.
 - For each area of evaluation, state whether the eligible faculty concluded that the candidate met all required criteria, noting the degree of agreement or disagreement. For example, "Following the discussion, the eligible faculty agreed that Dr. XXX met all four teaching criteria, with strong consensus and no dissenting views."
 - Conclude with a subheading labeled "Summary" or similar and describe the final recommendation of the committee, the vote, and the number of affirmative votes required for a positive evaluation. Example: "Having demonstrated that Dr. <CANDIDATE NAME> meets or exceeds each our criteria in research, teaching, and service, the CEF strongly recommends Dr. <CANDIDATE NAME> for promotion to <FACULTY TITLE AND RANK>. The number of affirmative votes required for a positive recommendation was <LIST REQUIRED NUMBER>. The final vote was < # of YES VOTES> in favor of <PROMOTION or REAPPOINTMENT>, <# of NO VOTES> opposed, and <# of ABSTENTIONS>."

POD INTERFOLIO FORMS*

- [POD Form 1 – Dossier](#)
 - The POD completes this form in Interfolio before the dossier is shared with the eligible faculty.
- [POD Form 2 – Deliberative Body Verification](#)
 - The POD completes this form in Interfolio before the complete case is sent to the college.
- [Quorum, Vote, Vote Percentage Form](#)
 - The POD completes this form in Interfolio before the complete case is sent to the college.
 - The POD may delegate completion of this form to the case manager but is responsible for providing the required information and ensuring its accuracy.

**The links above provide a sample of the forms and include detailed instructions for their completion. All forms must be completed on the Interfolio website.*

TIU HEAD ROLE

- The TIU head typically attends the eligible faculty meeting in promotion and reappointment reviews as an observer and to answer procedural questions. However, the TIU head may not vote as a member of the eligible faculty.
- After receiving the CEF letter, the TIU head independently assesses the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, including any joint appointments and the eligible faculty's recommendation. If the TIU head's assessment and/or recommendation differs from the faculty's, the reasons must be explained.
- The TIU head is to inform each candidate in writing after completion of the TIU review process of the recommendations of the eligible faculty and the TIU head and of the availability of their written evaluations for candidate review.
- According to University Faculty Rule 3335-6-01, if the TIU head's recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of the committee of eligible faculty, they "will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reasons that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence."

FAQ

- **Is the TIU head eligible to participate in discussions and vote on promotion and reappointment reviews? What about faculty with assistant or associate dean appointments?**

OAA requires that TIU heads be ex officio members of every TIU committee, including the committee of eligible faculty. As a member of the committee, the TIU head has the right to attend these meetings to observe and answer procedural questions, though the Rules of the University Faculty prohibit the TIU head from voting.

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."

- **Are the POD and CEF Chair (and/or P&T Chair) voting members of the committee of the eligible faculty?**

Yes

- **Can someone other than the POD (e.g., the P&T Chair or CEF chair) serve as the pre-reviewer of candidates' dossiers?**

OAA strongly recommends that the POD serve as the pre-reviewer given that their responsibilities include checking the candidate's dossier to assure that it is prepared correctly using the most current dossier format, asking the candidate to make needed changes, verifying that requested changes were completed, and specifically affirming that the accuracy of all publications and creative works listed in the dossier has been verified.

A distinct POD can be assigned for each individual case or for groups of cases, or a single POD can be assigned to manage the pre-review for all cases in a unit.

- **How should the feedback from the POD's pre-review of the dossier be documented? Is this an official communication from the committee?**

If a dossier is not prepared correctly, the POD is to ask the candidate to make any needed changes. These are not official communications included in the dossier, but the candidate should be given explicit feedback about any changes that are required in the core dossier. The candidate is ultimately responsible for ensuring the accuracy and correct formatting of the core dossier. In general, PODs are encouraged to keep a record of all of their communications with each faculty candidate about the review process.

- **If something irregular happens in a review meeting in the committee of the eligible faculty, what should the chair or POD do?**

Significant procedural errors (those that reasonably could affect 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 the error occurs during the course of a meeting and can be corrected, it should be corrected, and the meeting should continue. If the error cannot be corrected during the meeting, the meeting should be stopped, no vote should occur, and the error should be corrected before the process continues.

ASC recommends contacting the ASC Office of Faculty Affairs and/or the divisional dean for advice on procedural errors if they occur.

- **What if the allotted time for the review meeting is insufficient to allow full deliberation? Must another meeting be scheduled or must a vote happen even if some believe the deliberations were insufficient?**

If the committee believes that further deliberation is required, and members of the committee are not available to continue, another meeting should be scheduled—only to include those people who participated in the first meeting. A vote should not occur if the committee determines that deliberations were insufficient.