P&T Dossier Workshop

Tina Henkin  
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs

College of Arts & Sciences — July 11, 2018

For Whom:  P&T Chairs, PODs, department administrators  
What:  nuts and bolts of dossier preparation  
Why:  to facilitate preparation of complete dossiers  
- focus on fall P&T reviews – 70 expected  
- also relevant to spring 4th yr reviews (minus external letters)
Terminology

P&T: Promotion and tenure
TIU: Tenure Initiating Unit (department or school)
TIU head: department chair or school director
Chair Pro Tem: temporary TIU head for particular P&T case(s)
   (conflict of interest, or TIU head isn’t eligible – e.g., not full prof)
Committee of eligible faculty: TIU voting body (includes regional!)
P&T Chair: Chair of Committee of eligible faculty
POD: Procedures Oversight Designee
   - member of Committee of eligible faculty who verifies dossier
     and fairness of review process (checklist Form 105, p. 2-4)
APT: Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document of TIU
SEI: Student Evaluation of Instruction
OAA: Office of Academic Affairs

2018 Key deadlines for TIUs

May 25: submission of lists of external reviewers for college approval
October 1: deadline for regional campus letters to be sent to TIU
October 15: recommended deadline for TIU P&T committee meetings
     (to allow letter preparation, comments period)
October 16: TIU reviews complete, letters given to candidate
     (start of 10 day comments period)
October 26: deadline for comments period (if starting October 16;
     TIU can add response to comments to dossier)
October 29: submission to college (upload to Box + 1 hard copy)

*If running behind, we will accept dossiers without candidate comments,
and you can add them a few days later – put a placeholder note in the
comments section so we know it will be coming late AND
email henkin.3@osu.edu*
Who Does What?

**Candidate:**
- material for external evaluators (TIU decides what is sent)
- Intro and Core Dossier
- publications etc. for TIU review
- completes and signs checklist Form 105, p. 1

**P&T chair:**
- solicits external reviewers/other letters (e.g., collaborators)*
- reviews dossier **BEFORE** committee of eligible faculty meeting
- assigns someone to summarize student comments (if used)
- runs TIU committee of eligible faculty meeting
- writes TIU committee of eligible faculty letter

**Procedures oversight designee (POD):**
- verifies dossier **BEFORE** committee of eligible faculty meeting
- completes and signs checklist Form 105 p. 2-4
- **ensures fair evaluation by TIU**

**TIU head:**
- solicits external reviewers/other letters (e.g., collaborators)*
- writes TIU head letter

**Departmental staff:**
- assembles final dossier (including forms, divider sheets)
- generates pdf
- submits pdf and hard copy to college

Ways to streamline process?

**September:**
- P&T chair, POD review core dossier to ensure all components are complete (preview checklist form)
- staff can begin assembly of dossiers prior to receipt of full set of external letters
- TIU head solicits letters from joint appointment TIU head/center director/DT focus area leader (as needed)

**October:**
- P&T chair can begin drafting letters prior to meeting
- TIU head can begin drafting letters prior to receiving TIU committee letter

P&T office hours will be available in September and October with Tina Henkin to answer questions, check dossier organization
- hours will be announced in Chairs/Directors mailing
What happens after you send to college?

- quick review of dossiers to ensure everything is complete (TH), TIU contacted for missing items
- divisional panels meet, summary letters generated by divisional dean (November/December)
- executive dean reviews, writes decision letters (by January 7, 2019), letters provided to candidates and TIU head
- 10 day comments period/response
- dossiers submitted to OAA (January 25, 2019)
- OAA provides decision to ASC, executive dean sends letter to candidate and TIU head (March)
- final approval at Board of Trustees meeting (May 31, 2019)
  - promotion takes effect immediately

Notes:
ASC resources: https://ascintranet.osu.edu/promotion-tenure

https://ascintranet.osu.edu/promotion-tenure/processes-guidelines
https://ascintranet.osu.edu/promotion-tenure/materials

Notes:
Form 109: Record of Review

If not US citizen, place copy of documentation after this form.

If 100%, just check that box, no need to fill in these lines!
For promotion to **Associate**

- Match what was in offer letter
- TIU should have copies of forms 111/112

For promotion to **Full**

- if previously denied
Form 109: Record of Review

Need regional campus dean signature for regional campus faculty; electronic signature is OK.

Form 105: Dossier checklist p. 1

Candidate should check boxes AND ensure they have included the required material:
- need cumulative SEI AND individual course sheets.
Form 105: Dossier checklist p. 1

Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Dossier Checklist

CANDIDATE

Jane M. Buckeye

(Student Evaluation of Teaching)

Required Documentation

☑ SEI or other fixed-response survey data included for every course taught since date of hire or date of last promotion whichever is more recent.
☑ Correctly placed in dossier Section IV.

For promotion to Full, use last 5 years (ok if cumulative report includes earlier data)

Candidate signs

Be sure candidate READS this now!

Same format for Vita

% effort is not adequate without explanation!

Candidate is responsible!!!!

Candidate signs
Form 105: Dossier checklist p. 2 (top)

TIU-LEVEL REVIEW

Internal Evaluation

- Annual reviews as required by the Dossier Outline are included in Part III.A. If the set of annual review letters is incomplete, a written explanation is provided.
- Candidates for tenure and promotion or tenure—all annual review letters (including 4th Year Review) since date of hire. ALL 4th yr review letters – TIU + college
- Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc.) as required by the unit’s APT document is included in Part III.A.
  - Number of evaluations required as stated in APT Document: __________
  - Number of evaluations submitted: __________
- Open-ended discursive evaluations, if collected, summarized and included in Part IV.C. Candidates for promotion and tenure should include all courses taught; candidates for promotion only need only provide most recent 5 years.

POD completes p. 2-4 – make sure materials are actually present!

Form 105: Dossier checklist p. 2

External Evaluation

- At least five external letters (where required) included in Part III.B.
- No more than one-half from persons suggested by the candidate.
- None from former PhD or post-doc advisors; collaborators; or those who otherwise have a relationship with the candidate that could reasonably interfere with objective evaluation.

- External evaluation summary sheet
- External evaluation cover page
- A cover page precedes every letter received.
  - Do NOT include a cover page for evaluators from whom no letter was received.
  - Every item on the cover page is filled out and includes sufficient information to establish the evaluator’s:
    - Credibility.
    - Relationship with candidate.
  - Do NOT include a cover page for evaluators from whom no letter was received.

form 115 (non-responding evaluators) is no longer used
Form 105: Dossier checklist p. 3 (top)

This review was based on performance and was free of bias against underrepresented groups. The tenure initiating unit (TIU) level review of this candidate was conducted in full accordance with the unit’s Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document, and the latter document was made available to the TIU deliberative body as part of the review.

All candidates were treated consistently during this year’s review process. A written rationale for any apparent inconsistency* is provided when clear and defensible bases exist for such differences.

*Examples: When neither of two candidates for promotion to professor has advised doctoral students, but one is criticized on this point and the other is not. When neither of two candidates for promotion has a book in contract, but one is criticized on this point and the other is not.

POD verifies that TIU review was fair!

Form 105: Dossier checklist p. 3 (bottom)

The report of the TIU deliberative body contains:

- Detailed assessment of the candidate’s accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses, and a report of and interpretation of TIU vote. Eligible faculty letter should explain expectations!
- Explanation of the expectations of the unit against which the candidate is being assessed.
- Otherwise the expectations of the unit must be explained in the letter by the TIU head or Regional Campus deliberative body or Regional Campus Dean.

The dossier fulfills all requirements stated in the Dossier Outline, with special attention to the points noted above, including all those affirmed by the candidate.

It is particularly important to check for fulfillment of the requirement for narrative description of intellectual contribution to jointly offered papers and grants. Some candidates sign the checklist indicating that this requirement has been fulfilled when it has not, and the omission goes unnoticed by some Procedures Oversight Designees and other reviewers.

**Person who verified accuracy of all citations (if someone other than the Procedures Oversight Designee)**

POD verifies that dossier appropriately describes contributions to joint work AND that citations are accurate; POD (or departmental staff person) MUST verify citations!

Signature [signature of person named above] Date [date]
Form 105: Dossier checklist p. 4

NUMERICAL VOTING RECORD IN THE TENURE INITIATING UNIT

The information below is required in the official record for every review, even when the vote is unanimously positive.

1. Eligible faculty members on leave or excused because of a conflict of interest.
2. Eligible faculty members who are absent and unexcused.
3. Total faculty eligible to vote on this case, e.g., the total number of tenured associate plus full professors, or total number of full professors.*
4. Total faculty participating in the meeting discussing this case.
5. Quorum required by the TIU’s APT document.
6. Number of YES votes on this case.
7. Number of NO votes on this case.
8. Combined YES plus NO votes on this case.
9. Percentage of YES votes from combined YES plus NO votes on this case.
10. Percentage of YES votes required by the TIU’s APT document (e.g., “M” for simple majority or 2/3) in order for its recommendation to be considered positive.
11. Number of faculty attending the meeting abstaining.

The number listed must meet quorum as defined in TIU APT.

POD verifies that numbers are listed correctly

POD signature

*Include the number of clinical associate professors and clinical professors if document allows for their vote in a clinical promotion case.
**The Procedures Oversight Designee in colleges without departments should sign above rather than below since these colleges serve as the TIU for their faculty.

[p. 5-7 filled in by college – include pages, don’t fill out]
Copy of APT??

If APT has been revised, candidate can choose to be reviewed under previous version (rarely happens) – see OAA handbook (promotion to associate: current or when hired; promotion to full: current or when promoted to associate IF less than 10 yrs prior to April 1 of review year)

If candidate uses APT that is different from that on OAA site [https://oaa.osu.edu/appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure](https://oaa.osu.edu/appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure)
insert a copy of the older APT immediately after form 105

If using version of APT on OAA site, do NOT insert copy

Follow current PROCEDURES (e.g., quorum, percent for positive vote) even if using older CRITERIA

Notes:
I. Introduction

insert P&T divider sheets, starting here

printed from Dossier Divider Templates file on ASC intranet (under Dossier Preparation Materials)
- note that there are new ones this year!

print divider sheets on COLORED PAPER!!!!

---

I. Introduction (candidate provides)

Jane M. Buckeye
Campus Address
Campus Phone
e-mail address

Current Appointments
Assistant Professor, Microbiology
Assistant Professor, Molecular Genetics for joint appointment

Other Positions (if appropriate) academic or administrative include DT or courtesy appts here

Degrees
Date Degree, Institution
Date Degree, Institution

Fellowships, Internships, Residency (if appropriate)
II. Core Dossier (candidate provides)

prepared with Vita or using Core Dossier Outline (Word format)
– 2018-2019 ONLY

NOTE: Vita will be required for everyone starting spring 2019!

4th year reviews Spring 2019 MUST use Vita in preparation for upcoming tenure review!

Publications/grants/etc. should not be listed more than once
Any additional information regarding impact can be included within core dossier or as an appendix to the core dossier

OK to download dossier from Vita as Word document and correct things! Especially important for describing quality indicators – TIU sets standards for what is allowed!

III. Evaluation

This section will include all evaluative letters that were generated PREVIOUSLY by the TIU (annual reviews, peer teaching reviews, other letters – e.g., from collaborators) and are part of what the TIU considers in the current review process

The TIU faculty and TIU head letters (etc.) generated DURING the current review (e.g., in fall 2018) will be placed at the end of the dossier

NOTE: this is a change in order that started in 2016, and is designed to make it easier to add the evaluation letters to the dossier pdf file
IIIA. Internal Letters of Evaluation

1. Annual review letters
   - for assistant professors, all since date of hire
   - for associate professors, since previous promotion
     OR since date of hire if hired with tenure
     - **BUT not to exceed last 5 years**
     (if any are missing, include explanatory note)
   - for assistant professors, include all internal
     recommendation letters that were generated for 4th year
     review (regional campus if appropriate, TIU faculty
     panel, TIU head, joint TIU head if appropriate, college
     panel, dean) – all in this section

TIU is responsible for maintaining these letters!
**Arrange in chronological order (oldest to newest)**

IIIA. Internal Letters of Evaluation

2. Written comments submitted as part of annual reviews
   - any correspondence about annual review letters
     - comments from candidate, corrections of errors, etc.
   - includes any comments from 4th yr reviews for promotion
to associate
IIIA. Internal Letters of Evaluation

3. Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching

- peer teaching evaluation letters since hire (for promotion to associate) or since last promotion (for promotion to full), but should be within last 5 years;
  can only use letters from OSU (not previous positions)

- numbers should align with what it says in TIU APT document and on summary table posted on ASC intranet

- numbers should match what it says on Form 105

IIIA. Internal Letters of Evaluation

4. Additional letters – **OPTIONAL!**

- requested by candidate/solicited by TIU head, to provide contextual information

- letters from research collaborators
  - can be from individuals at OSU or outside OSU

- letters documenting exceptional service/outreach activities
  - within or outside OSU

(realize that it’s a little confusing to include non-evaluative letters including letters from outside OSU in a section called “internal letters of evaluation” but this is where OAA says to put them)
IIIB. External Letters of Evaluation

1. Summary sheet of evaluators (form 114)

If an evaluator was Independently suggested by both the candidate and someone else (e.g., P&T committee), can use P&T committee here

No more than half can be suggested by candidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Title/Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Suggested by</th>
<th>Relationship to Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>P&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Jones</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>P&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Brown</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>TIU Head</td>
<td>Professional Colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rodriguez</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Johnstone</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IIIB. External Letters of Evaluation

2. Example of letter sent to evaluators

Set of template letters is available on ASC intranet (.docx)
- standard (to associate or full)
- for regional faculty
- for full profs under flexible process (i.e., higher service/teaching)
(also have templates for collaborator letters)

LETTER MUST STATE RANK FOR PROMOTION
(to Associate vs. to Full)

These are STARTING POINTS and are OPTIONAL
- TIU controls solicitation letter content
- TIU controls what materials are sent to evaluators
- need to indicate here what materials were sent
(either in the letter itself, or as a list appended to the letter here)
IIIB. External Letters of Evaluation

3. External letters preceded by cover sheet (form 106)
(letter must be signed and on letterhead)

**EXTERIOR EVALUATOR FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Jane M. Buckeye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Rank</td>
<td>Professor of Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Affiliation</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Address of Evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907 Althouse Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park, PA 16802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Must indicate rank of evaluator (associate or full professor)

**Highlights** - Whatever you need to establish status/credentials of evaluator

DO NOT ATTACH CV!

If there is a minor collaboration, spell it out and write HERE that TIU considers this not to be a conflict of interest (and explain in letters)
IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction

A. Cumulative Fixed-Response Survey Data
(overall summary – generated by SEI system)

B. Individual Fixed-Response Student Evaluation Data
(pages for each course – last 5 yrs for promotion to full)

C. Summary of Open-Ended Student Evaluations
(if comments were collected, must be summarized by someone other than candidate – don’t include raw comments!)

ONLY include teaching evaluations from OSU!

V. Review Letters

A. Regional campus (if applicable) (include dividers)
   1. Regional campus faculty deliberative body
   2. Regional campus dean

B. TIU
   1. TIU faculty deliberative body
   2. TIU head
   3. Head of TIU or Center (for joint appointments)
      and/or Discovery Theme Focus Area Leader
   4. TIU level comments process
      (letters generated or documentation that candidate declined to provide comments – form 103 optional, email OK)
V. Review Letters

A. Regional campus (if applicable) (include dividers)
   1. Regional campus faculty deliberative body
   2. Regional campus dean

B. TIU
   1. TIU faculty deliberative body
   2. TIU head

TIU letters should be **EVALUATIVE**, not just a list of facts; TIU eligible faculty letter should include **DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA**; TIU head should provide **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE** and not repeat what is in eligible faculty letter

C. College
   1. College P&T committee
      (divisional panel for ASC)
   2. College dean
      (Executive Dean for ASC)
   3. College-level comments process

   (to be added by college; include divider sheets)
New Information

If candidate has new information ABOUT ITEMS ALREADY IN DOSSIER:

- can be added if TIU hasn't yet reviewed

- if TIU review is done but before submission to college, TIU head asks eligible faculty if want to reconsider

- if already at college, alert divisional dean; college will decide if want to return to TIU or divisional panel (depending where it is in the process)

- if already at OAA, only error correction for items already in dossier

General Comments

- Print divider pages on colored paper!
- Document the comments process even if candidate declines to comment
- Do NOT include candidate’s publications!
  - should be retained by the department
- No double-sided printing!
- Follow instructions in guidance document for making PDF
- SCAN IN COLOR!
More Help

Aug 22 and Sept 5: OAA P&T Workshops for TIU Teams
(TIU chair, P&T committee chair, POD)
(RSVP links in Chairs & Directors mailing)

ASC P&T office hours – September and October
- dates will be announced in Chairs & Directors mailing
- drop-in for in-person advice

personal appointments available – just email
henkin.3@osu.edu (email always better than phone)

Vita (for candidates): offered 2 workshops, will do more
early fall (and I answer questions)

Contacts: Tina Henkin  henkin.3@osu.edu  (content)
Meg Piasecki  piasecki.4@osu.edu  (logistics)
ASC resources: https://ascintranet.osu.edu/promotion-tenure
| Division  | College (recommended) | TIU | Peer Review Letters to Assoc | Peer Review Letters to Prof | Student Comments | % for P&T Approval | Quorum |
|-----------|------------------------|-----|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------|
| A&H       | African American and African Studies | 2x/year | 1x/year (minimum of 5) | 2x/year; 3 yrs before | Required | Majority | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Art                     | 2x in years 1 - 2 plus 2 more (5 total) | 0 | Not Required | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Arts Administration, Education and Policy | 1x/year; five total | Every 2 years; min 3 in past 5 years; | Required | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Classics                | 5 in years 2 - 4 | 4 - 2 - 3 years before | Encouraged | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Comparative Studies     | 1x/year | 4; 5 years before | Required (SET form) | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Dance                   | 1x/year at least 5 total | every other year; minimum of 3 | Required | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Design                  | 1x/year; 5 total | Every 2 years, min 2 in most recent 5 years | Midterm evaluations collected directly from students between the | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | East Asian Languages and Literatures | 2x/year | 1x/year | Encouraged | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | English                 | 5 (four by fourth year review) | 3 in 5 years before | Required | 2/3 | 3/5 |
| A&H       | French and Italian      | 8 | 5; 5 years before | Encouraged | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Germanic Languages and Literatures | 1x/year in years 1 - 2; 2 reviews thereafter | 1x/year | Encouraged | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | History                 | 5 required | 1x/year in 3 years before; min 3 | Encouraged | 2/3 | 35% |
| A&H       | History of Art          | 1x/year | 1x every 2 years | Required | Majority | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Linguistics             | 1x/year in years 1 - 3; 2 reviews thereafter, for total of 5 | 1x every 2 years; min. of 2 in past 6 years | Required (Maybe Optional; TH please check) | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Music                   | 1x/year | 2 | not sure; need for all areas of the School employ the university online | 67% | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Near Eastern Languages and Cultures | 5 | 3 in past 5 years | Required | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Philosophy              | 1x/year | 1x every 2 years | Encouraged | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures | 1x/year; min 5 | min 5 | Probabilistic faculty are required to use discursive forms, and all | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Spanish and Portuguese | 1x/year | 1x every 2 years | Encouraged | 2/3 | 1/2 |
| A&H       | Theatre                 | 1x/year; total of 5 | 1x/2 years; min of 3 | Encouraged | Majority | 2/3 |
| A&H       | Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies | 1x/year; total of 5 | 1x/year; min of 4 | Required | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| NMS       | Astronomy               | 1x/each year; 5 total | 1x every 2 years | Strongly encouraged | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| NMS       | Chemistry and Biochemistry | 1x/year | 5 times before promotion | 1x/year; at least 2 before promotion | Not Required | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| NMS       | Earth Sciences          | 5 times before promotion | minimum 3 | Not Required | 80% | 2/3 |
| NMS       | Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology | 2x by 4th year; 1 additional time by 8th; formative activities | 2 plus formative reviews | Encouraged | Majority | 1/2 |
| NMS       | Mathematics             | 2x/yr; 1 for regional | 2 | Not Required | 80% | 50% |
| NMS       | Microbiology            | 1x/year first 2 years, then 2 more (total of 4) | no minimum required, but rather all levels of instruction evaluated over 3 year period | Encouraged | Majority | 2/3 |
| NMS       | Molecular Genetics      | 1x each calendar year (5 before 6th year) | Every two years; minimum 3 | Encouraged | Majority | 2/3 |
| NMS       | Physics                 | 1x/course years 1 - 2, then every other course; min. 5 | 1x/year-minimum of 3 | Encouraged | Majority | 2/3 |
| NMS       | Statistics              | 1x/year | 1x/year | Encouraged | 2/3 | 2/3 |
| SBS       | Anthropology            | 2x in years 1 - 2; 5 total | 1x every 2 years; min. 2 [GW suggested 3] | not required | Majority | 50% |
| SBS       | Communication           | 3 classroom +2 methods (tenure track); every 2 years (clinical) | 1x every 2 years + year before promotion | Not Required | 80% | 50% |
| SBS       | Economics               | 4x in years 1 - 3; 1x thereafter (5 total) | 1x every 2 years; minimum 3 | Not Required | 2/3 | Majority |
| SBS       | Geography               | 1x/year | 1x every 2 years, min 2 | Not Required | Majority | 2/3 |
| SBS       | Political Science       | 1x/year; min 5 | 1x every 2 years; min 3 | Not Required | Majority | Majority |
| SBS       | Psychology              | min. 5; [1 in first two years, 2 in year before fourth year and tenure review] | 2x; 1 year before | Not Required | 2/3 | Majority |
| SBS       | Sociology               | 4x in years 1 - 3; 1x thereafter | 1x; 2 years before | Not Required | 2/3 | 50% |
| SBS       | Speech and Hearing Science | 1 for 1 assistant professor; 4 in years 1-3; 4 for probationary clinical assistant professors (5 year term); 3 for clinical assistant professors (4 year term); 2 for clinical assistant professors (2 year term); additional 2 | 1x every 2 years (TT) and non-probationary (clinical); 2 required for promotion (TT) 2 for clinical | Not required | Majority | 2/3 |

Last updated: 7/9/2018
Dossier Outline July 2018

Record of Review (Form 109)
Dossier Checklist (Form 105)

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 - insert after form 105)

I. Introduction (start colored divider sheets HERE)

II. Core Dossier prepared using Vita or as a Word document that follows the OAA core dossier format; step-by-step guidance is provided in the OAA handbook.

III. Evaluation

A. Internal Letters of Evaluation
   1. Annual review letters (for assistant professors, all since date of hire; for associate professors, all since previous promotion, or hire with tenure, not to exceed last 5 years); for assistant professors, include all fourth year review letters that were generated; arrange in chronological order (oldest to newest)
   2. Written comments submitted as part of annual reviews (including comments on fourth year review, if generated)
   3. Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (include all that are available since date of hire or last promotion, not to exceed last 5 years for promotion to full)
   4. Additional letters requested by the candidate and solicited by 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.

B. External Letters of Evaluation
   1. Summary sheet of evaluators (Form 114)
   2. Example of letter sent to evaluators
   3. External letters preceded by cover sheet (Form 106)

IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction

A. Cumulative Fixed-Response Survey Data
B. Individual Fixed-Response Student Evaluation Data (since date of hire or last promotion, not to exceed last 5 years for promotion to full)
C. Summary of Open-Ended Student Evaluations (summarized by someone other than the candidate; do not include raw comments)

V. Review Letters

A. Regional campus (if applicable)
   1. Regional campus faculty deliberative body (if applicable)
   2. Regional campus dean (if applicable)
B. TIU
   1. TIU faculty deliberative body
   2. TIU head
   3. Head of TIU or center for joint appointment or Discovery Theme Focus Area Leader (if applicable)
   4. TIU-level comments process (letters generated or documentation that candidate declined to provide comments)
C. College
   1. College P&T Committee (to be added by college)
   2. College dean (to be added by college)
   3. College-level comments process (to be added by college)
Top Errors in Dossier Preparation 7-3-18

1. Record of Review (form 109) – use current version!
   - Joint appointment not included on Record of Review sheet and/or letter missing from head of other unit (department, school, center/discovery theme focus area leader)
   - Proposed action (promotion only vs. promotion and tenure) incorrect
   - Years excluded from tenure clock not listed on Record of Review Sheet
   - Record of Review not signed by chair/regional dean
   - Recommendations by chair/regional dean don’t match letters

2. Dossier Checklist (form 105) – use current version!
   - Candidate does not sign page 1 of Dossier Checklist (form 105)
   - Candidate signs other parts of the checklist that are not the responsibility of the candidate
   - POD does not sign checklist, or signs but checklist not complete; items checked are not actually in dossier
   - POD incorrectly signs college checklist (p. 5-7)

3. Numerical Voting Record in the Tenure Initiating Unit (form 105 p. 4)
   - Percentage for positive vote or quorum does not correspond with what’s in TIU's APT document
   - Eligible faculty total includes chair (should not be included)
   - Eligible faculty total includes those on leave or otherwise excused (should not unless they attend meeting)

4. Core dossier
   - Introduction doesn’t include education, previous positions
   - Publications, grants, etc. are listed more than once
   - Information regarding impact (e.g., charts from google scholar) that are referred to in the narrative statement by the candidate are not included in the core dossier
   - Narratives/description of role in joint work are missing or are too long
   - Student comments should NOT be quoted in narratives; these should be summarized by someone other than candidate and placed in IVC

5. Internal letters
   - Annual review letters missing in IIIA1 (if cannot be located, should have explanatory note) – put in chronological order, oldest first
   - Fourth year review letters missing - include all internal recommendation letters that were generated (regional campus letters if appropriate, P & T chair, chair, chair of secondary unit if appropriate, college review panel; executive dean)
   - Written comments from candidate to annual reviews (including fourth year review) should be in section IIIA2
- Peer teaching reviews (IIIA3) – letters must indicate who wrote them; number should match what is indicated in the TIU APT document and on form 105 p. 2; include explanatory note if fewer than required

6. External Evaluators:
   - Summary sheet (form 114) : “Suggested by” column should correspond to the “evaluator suggested by” box on form 106 (e.g., summary shouldn’t list “chair” and the individual form list “candidate”; “relationship to candidate” shouldn’t say “none” if the actual letter in the file starts out by stating a relationship; if an evaluator is suggested by both the candidate and the chair or P & T committee, either option can be used on the sheet and summary form)
   - Summary for non-responding evaluators (form 115) is no longer included
   - External Evaluator form should briefly highlight qualifications (language should be similar to what was provided to the college in pre-approval process but just saying “AAU” is not sufficient; do not include CV); be sure to list name of university (not just “School” if subdivision of university) and evaluator’s academic title
   - Letter of invitation included as sample should ensure that reviewers are aware of what rank candidate is being considered for (i.e., if letter says the person is being considered for professor but they are being considered for associate professor, that is a procedural error)
   - Letters need to be signed (electronically is ok) and on official stationery; e-mail message is ok if necessary but needs to be from institutional address - add comment that TIU has verified

7. Student Evaluations
   - Include both summary table (IVA) and individual course reports (IVB)
   - Student comments (IVC) (if used by your TIU) should be presented as a summary generated by someone other than the candidate; do NOT include raw comments report from SEIs

8. APT Internal Review Evaluations – new outline structure in 2018
   - Include divider pages even if no letter (e.g., regional letters)
   - Include letter from chair/director of joint appointment, Discovery Theme, etc. as appropriate
   - Include documentation of TIU comments process

9. Copies of research publications
   - Should be kept by the department and not submitted with the dossier

10. Dossier structure
    - Divider pages missing or not in color
    - Follow guidance in instructions regarding no double-sided printing
    - Follow instructions for making/naming PDF