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FACULTY RULES AND POLICIES
GETTING PROMOTED TO PROFESSOR

“Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a **sustained record** of excellence in teaching; has produced a **significant body** of scholarship that is recognized **nationally or internationally**; and has demonstrated **leadership** in service.”

*Rules of the University Faculty, 3335-6-02*

Why is promotion to full professor a goal? What is its importance in our academic culture?
Definitions of Areas of Faculty Activity

• **Teaching**
  Classroom, non-classroom, and distance instruction; extension and continuing education; advising; supervising or mentoring students or post-doctoral scholars

• **Research**
  Discovery; scholarly and creative work; applied research; and the scholarship of pedagogy

• **Service**
  Administrative service to the university, professional service to the discipline, and provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university (“outreach and engagement”)

From the *Rules of the University Faculty*
PRINCIPLES/PHILOSOPHY

- Specific criteria developed by the college’s 38 Tenure Initiating Units (TIUs) in their Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) documents
- Every tenure-track faculty has one TIU (even if joint appointment)
- APTs also provide lists of documentation to support specific criteria
- 3 levels of review: unit, college, Office of Academic Affairs, with emphasis on peer-review in TIU
- TIUs establish percentages for a positive vote of the faculty (must be at least a majority)
- Document and evaluate accomplishments in context of assigned duties
- Recognize areas of emerging focus as well as established norms in teaching, research and service
RECOGNITION AND REWARD IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

“In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another.”

Rules of the University Faculty, 3335-6-02
RECOGNITION AND REWARD IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

“In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.”

*Rules of the University Faculty, 3335-6-02*
“Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences takes the pursuit of scholarly and creative excellence as our core value. The College also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on scholarly and/or creative activity, teaching, or administrative/professional service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to full professor typically requires excellence in scholarship and/or creative activity. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in scholarship and/or creative activity.”
PEER REVIEW AS SOCIAL CONTRACT

• Assumes societal deference to peer oversight of the competence and ethics of professional work

DEFINITIONS OF PEER REVIEW IN FACULTY RULES

• Provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure. Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual’s qualifications and performance — normally TIU colleagues or colleagues in related units or centers.

• Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by evidence presented regarding on how the candidate meets the criteria established by the units.
PEER REVIEW:
RESPONSIBILITIES OF CANDIDATES
Ongoing...

- Submit proposals to peer-reviewed conferences and manuscripts to journals
- Serve as a peer reviewer in the profession
- With the help of colleagues and mentors, make connections with faculty at other institutions at conferences, study sections, and other networking events
- Ensure that department chair and/or relevant committee chair arrange peer teaching evaluations (university minimum requirement is 2; varies by TIU)
- Retain relevant documentation
- Provide comments to written reviews as warranted
PEER REVIEW:
RESPONSIBILITIES OF CANDIDATES

Preparing for promotion reviews….

• Review unit APT document to understand specific criteria in the unit (http://www.oaa.osu.edu/governance.html)
• Formulate questions and seek mentoring to understand how these criteria are applied in your unit
• Utilize annual review to gain feedback on progress
• Understand screening processes for non-mandatory review in your unit
NON-MANDATORY REVIEW

• No set period after which one must come up for review

• Annual reviews are key for goal setting and feedback; review letters from the most recent 5 years are included in dossier

• Can only be denied a formal review for one year

• Candidate can withdraw from the review at any point
COLLEGE APT: DEFINITIONS FOR FULL PROFESSOR

• Scholarship: attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have achieved national distinction as a scholar or creative artist and have an emerging international reputation.
UNIT APT: DEFINITIONS FOR FULL PROFESSOR

Scholarship:

Look for key language/discuss expectations regarding:

--publications and creative activities (rate and amount; peer-reviewed/edited/invited)

--grants and fellowships (internal/external; efforts and scoring if not funded; renewals)

--publications and presentations with graduate students and postdocs

--expectations regarding national/international reputation and measures of impact
UNIT APT: DEFINITIONS FOR FULL PROFESSOR

Scholarship:

Look for key language/discuss expectations regarding:

-- new research areas (explain trajectory and any publication gaps)

-- scholarship involving teaching and/or service (e.g., textbooks; case studies; presentations on teaching methodologies)

-- pipeline of work in progress
COLLEGE APT: DEFINITIONS FOR FULL PROFESSOR

- **Teaching**: provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. It can be measured by the attainment of national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes.
UNIT APT: DEFINITIONS FOR FULL PROFESSOR

Teaching:

Look for key language/discuss expectations regarding:

--undergraduate and graduate advising
--curriculum/course development
--what constitutes “sustained” excellence
--ongoing professional development (how you continue to evolve as a teacher)
COLLEGE APT: DEFINITIONS FOR FULL PROFESSOR

• **Service:** provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.
UNIT APT: DEFINITIONS FOR FULL PROFESSOR

Service:

Look for key language/discuss expectations regarding:

--involvement in college or university level committees/initiatives; some APT documents require service at the college and/or university level.

--leadership in service activities

--professional outreach and engagement

--professional service (manuscript reviewing; associations; service on funding agency panels or study sections; consulting)

--administrative service
Teaching: Example of Department of Microbiology

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

• Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.

• Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm.

• Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment.

• Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process.

REVIEW PROCESS
RESOURCES: https://intranet.asc.ohio-state.edu/apt

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY AND STAFF INTRANET

Appointments, Promotion and Tenure

General
- Arts and Sciences APT document [pdf] (rev. August 1, 2014)
- Departmental APT documents approved by OAA
- P&T FAQ [pdf]
- Peer Review Teaching Chart [pdf] (rev Sept. 7, 2016)

Fourth Year and Reappointment Reviews
- Clinical and Research Faculty Reappointment directions [pdf] (posted November 15, 2016)

Promotion and Tenure Reviews

[pdf] - Some links on this page are to Adobe .pdf files requiring the use of Adobe Reader. If you need them in a more accessible format, please contact asc_comm@osu.edu
P&T REVIEW PROCESS: Candidate Responsibilities

- Submit information and department-specific documentation as required in core dossier and APT documents (summer before review year)
  - CV (if sent to external reviewers instead of core dossier)
  - Copies of publications, manuscripts and creative activities as specified in APT document (these are not sent to the college and university review committees)
P&T REVIEW PROCESS: Core dossier

• Use Vita for reviews starting in fall 2017 (information in Research in View will be transferred; let Tina Henkin know if planning for fall 2017; chairs have been asked)
• Include contextual information as needed (e.g., information about an on-line journal; additional measures of impact; contribution to collaborative projects)
• List each item only once
• **Tell your story** in research, teaching and service statements
• Use statements to talk about previous accomplishments if relevant
Core Dossier: Time Frame (unless otherwise specified in APT document)

- **Teaching**: list all activities since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less

- **Research**: list all activities since last promotion (if promoted at Ohio State) or since appointment (if hired as an associate); earlier publications/conferences/grants may be and are often listed to show entire trajectory, but main focus of review will be on activities since promotion

- **Service**: list all activities since last promotion/appointment, with an emphasis on leadership roles; includes outreach and engagement activities; service on grant review panels; and other external service.
Telling Your Story: Teaching Statements

- give examples of your approach/philosophy in action
- give examples of course revisions/new course development
- address responses to SEIs/peer reviews directly; show pattern of sustained engagement
- describe any professional development undertaken with UCAT/ODEE/other office
- include approach to advising/mentoring if appropriate
- don’t cite student comments unless summaries included in dossier
- suggest how you will continue to grow as a teacher
- can refer to prior teaching experience if important to your trajectory (but evaluation will focus on teaching at OSU in the last five years)
Telling Your Story: Research Statements

• Keep college/university audience in mind; don’t be overly technical
• Identify main and sub areas of expertise/interest
• Highlight key indicators of national/international impact that you think are particularly important (prominence of journal or press; selectivity of external grant funding; invitations to keynotes/review panels/journal boards; citations; course adoptions; downloads)
• Clarify how any work in progress/pipeline relates to a new project: show plans for sustained activity in research
• Provide additional information about collaborative work if relevant
Telling Your Story: Service Statements

• Describe work in the community or the profession as well as specific contributions in assigned or voluntary department/college/university committee service

• Student Life committees: includes work with STEP, advising student groups, any work done through the Office of Student Life

• Describe any affiliations with informal or formal interdisciplinary centers or groups (e.g., STEAM Factory)

• Describe any work to enhance community or inclusion in your unit
P&T REVIEW PROCESS: Candidate responsibilities

External reviewers

• Provide names of possible external reviewers to P&T chair or chair as requested - generally full professors at peer institutions

• Review list of possible reviewers to identify any conflicts of interest (no personal or working relationship)

• If you have collaborated with another faculty member either at Ohio State or at another institution, suggest that your department chair request letters from those collaborators (will not count as external reviewers)
TIU LEVEL REVIEW

- Eligible faculty (full professors) review materials
- Materials include letters from regional campus dean/review committee, if appointed to a regional campus, and from chair of secondary department or Discovery Theme focus area as appropriate
- Eligible faculty meet and vote on the case
- Eligible faculty who have a conflict of interest do not participate in discussion or vote
- Quorum and percentage vote needed for positive recommendation are spelled out in the APT document
- P&T chair writes a letter summarizing the review and reporting the vote
- Chair/director makes independent assessment
- Candidate has right to review and comment on the letters within 10 days
COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEW

• College P&T committee reviews dossier and reports from TIU and chair
• Three different committees, arranged by division and convened by divisional dean
  – Arts and Humanities
  – Social and Behavioral Sciences
  – Natural and Mathematical Sciences
• College committee votes and makes recommendation to executive dean through letter written by divisional dean
• Executive dean makes recommendation to provost
• Candidate has right to review and comment on the letters
UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW

• Provost and/or vice provost review all dossiers
• Dossiers with negative or inconsistent recommendations are forwarded to the university promotion and tenure committee, which makes recommendation to the provost
• Provost makes final decision in all cases
• Cases forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final approval
• Negative decisions can be appealed through Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
ASC P&T FAQs
Revised August 1, 2016

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 at https://oaa.osu.edu/governance.html

Detailed instructions for completing the Core Dossier are available here https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/CoreDossier.pdf and in section 4.1.2.1 (p. 19) of the Promotion and Tenure section of the OAA Handbook http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/policies-procedures-handbook/3HBPT.pdf

ASC documents relating to dossier preparation can be found here: https://intranet.asc.ohio-state.edu/apt

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 his/her 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 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. 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. 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: Use the date of hire or date of last promotion, whichever is most recent, for most of the Core Dossier. For promotion to full professor, any discursive teaching evaluations should be submitted only for the most recent five years, and some TIUs have stated that all teaching records can be for past five years only (see individual TIU’s APT document). 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. Other prior activities can be included if the eligible faculty consider it relevant to the review. In particular, a full history of publications and creative work can be included for purposes of reproducing a C.V., 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 is the research performance since the date of hire or date of last promotion that should be the focus of the evaluating parties.

Q5: A candidate for promotion to full professor wants to include material in the Core Dossier that was included in the mandatory 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 only if it feels such information would be relevant to the review. This could include material that was produced between the time of the actual review (usually autumn) and the actual promotion date.

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.

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, the Teaching Approach and Focus of Research narratives should be approximately 750 words or less, and the Service Activities narrative should be approximately 250 words or less.
Q8: Can a candidate provide verbatim student comments on teaching performance in the Core Dossier?

A8: No, verbatim student comments should not be in the Core Dossier. Rather, a summary of the comments, generated by someone other than the candidate, can be included in dossier section IVC, 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 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 Section1 (a-g). Works that have been submitted for review should be listed in Section 1 (k) of Research. Work that is in progress and not yet submitted for review can be included in the narrative section (3) under Research.

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 is required. Examples of appropriate formats for this information include:

- I wrote half the sections of the article, my co-author wrote the other half, and then I edited the whole.
- 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.
- I designed all of the surveys (which were administered by the graduate student co-authors), did the statistical analysis, and wrote the article.
- 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.
- I completed and wrote the literature review for the paper, shared equally with the coauthor in the analysis and interpretation of the data, and reviewed the complete draft manuscript.
- I led the design research phase of the project by hosting workshops and focus groups and shared equally in the responsibility for interpreting the findings and developing prototypes and the final proposed solution.
- I provided materials to my collaborator and the experimental work was carried out in her laboratory; I reviewed and edited the manuscript.
Candidates may also provide the approximate percentage of their contribution to the total intellectual effort involved in the work, but it is not an acceptable substitute for the required narrative description.

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.

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” (p. 20).

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 section 9 of the teaching section if not indicated elsewhere, and efforts to diversify the curriculum can be described in section 6. Efforts to study social or cultural diversity may be included in the research statement and supported by listings of conference presentations and publications. Candidates can list other activities undertaken to promote and enhance diversity in Section 6 c) of the Service section of the Core Dossier, and they can expand on their diversity efforts in the Service narrative (Section 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.

Section 2: TIU Review
Q14: Who serves on the Committee of the Eligible Faculty?

A14: 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, the full professors in the TIU constitute the eligible faculty for that case.

Q15: Can clinical and/or research faculty members participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty?

A15: No, neither clinical nor research faculty members can participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure track faculty.

Q16: 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?

A16: A candidate’s record should be evaluated holistically, in terms of how s/he as an individual has 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.

Q17: Is there a minimum number of faculty members needed to participate in a promotion and tenure vote?

A17: 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 the eligible faculty.

Q18: What constitutes a conflict of interest for a member of the committee of eligible faculty, and how should it be handled?

A18: 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, s/he 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).

**Q19: What are the responsibilities of the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)?**

A19: The POD should make reasonable efforts to assure that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias. S/he 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 personal responsibility for the integrity of the review process. The POD should be identified at the outset of the TIU meeting. S/he 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 in this document [https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/PODDuties.pdf](https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/PODDuties.pdf)

**Q20: What steps should a POD take if s/he has concerns about a review?**

A20: 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 (i.e., the candidate who prepared the dossier; or the faculty member(s) or committees not following procedures). 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.
Q21: A department has a tenured faculty member with a 50% FTE appointment in the department, but whose tenure is in the second department. Can s/he vote on P&T cases in the first (non-TIU) department?

A21: No. An individual is only a member of the eligible faculty in the unit where his/her tenure resides. OAA encourages departments to seek input from joint-appointed faculty through alternate means.

Q22: If the candidate holds a joint (split FTE) academic appointment, does the non-TIU unit also participate in the promotion and tenure review?

A22: 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 Internal Review Evaluations section 2.3. 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.

Q23: How should administrative work in a college or university center be considered in a departmental promotion review?

A23: 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 and 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 Q33 below).

Q24: 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?

A24: 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])

Q25: What percentage of “yes” votes is necessary for a positive recommendation from the committee of eligible faculty?

A25: 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.

Q26: 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)?

A26: 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.

Q27: 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?

A27: Individuals who are unable to be physically present for the discussion may only vote if they attend the meeting “at a distance” via some electronic or digital means such as conference call, Skype, or video conferencing. Only faculty members who attend the meeting (either in person or via one of these electronic formats) are eligible to vote.

Q28: Is a department chair permitted to attend the meeting of the committee of the eligible faculty?

A28: 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 has the right to attend and speak at these meetings, but the TIU head is prohibited from voting. In general, the TIU head attends primarily to listen and answer questions that may arise. If the chair attends the meeting, s/he is not included in either the quorum count or in the tabulation of the votes.

Q29: Can regional campus faculty members vote on the case of a Columbus campus faculty member?

A29: 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.
Q30: 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?

A30: 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 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. The TIU head provides an independent assessment of the candidate’s record in his/her letter. This letter should not repeat the detailed documentation provided in the chair of the committee’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.

Q31: Can a candidate comment on the TIU’s evaluation of the case?

A31: 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, 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 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.

Section 3: External Letters of Evaluation

Q32: How many external letters of evaluation are required?

A32: 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.

Q33: Can research collaborators be asked to write an external letter of evaluation?

A33: 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. If an individual asked to write an external review turns out to be a research collaborator, that letter could either be included with the internal letters of evaluation (under section IIIA4), or it could be removed after consultation with the dean and OAA. 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.

Q34: 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?

A34: 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.

Q35: Can confidentiality be guaranteed to individuals who are asked to write an external evaluation?

A35: 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 unit must provide them. 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 comments period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College (recommended)</th>
<th>TIU</th>
<th>Peer Review Letters to Assoc</th>
<th>Peer Review Letters to Prof</th>
<th>Student Comments</th>
<th>% for P&amp;T Approval</th>
<th>Quorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American and African Studies</td>
<td>2x/year</td>
<td>1x/year (minimum of 5)</td>
<td>1x/year; 3 yrs before</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>6x in years 1 - 2 plus 2 more (5 total)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Administration, Education and Policy</td>
<td>Every 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>6 in years 2 - 4</td>
<td>4-6; 2 - 3 yrs before</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Studies</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>6; 4 yrs before</td>
<td>The peer in majority evaluationREVIEW has both a quantitative part (50%) and a</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>none specified; same as college</td>
<td></td>
<td>none specified; same as college</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1x/year; 5 total</td>
<td>6; 4 yrs before</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>2x/year</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 in 5 yrs before</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Italian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 yrs before</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>4x/year in years 1 - 2; 2 reviews thereafter</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1x/semester</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>1x every 2 yrs</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>1x/year in years 1 - 2; 2 reviews thereafter, for total of 5</td>
<td>1x every 2 yrs; min. of 2 in past 6 yrs</td>
<td>Required (Maybe Optional-This does not apply)</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastern Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 in past 5 yrs</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>1x every 2 yrs</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>5 in 5 yrs before</td>
<td>Elective faculty are required to use discursive forms and all faculty</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Portuguese</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>1x every 2 yrs</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>1x/3 years</td>
<td>1x/3 yrs</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Gender and Sexuality Studies</td>
<td>1x/semester in years 1 - 2; 1x/year thereafter</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>1x/course</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>1x/year; 5 times before promotion</td>
<td>1x/year; at least 2 before promotion</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology</td>
<td>1x/year; 1 additional time by 6th</td>
<td>1 plus formative reviews</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2x/year; 1 for regional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>1x/year first 2 years, then 2 more (total of 4)</td>
<td>1x minimum required, but rather all levels of instruction evaluated over 3 year period</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Genetics</td>
<td>1x/course</td>
<td>2x; 2 years before</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1x/course years 1 - 2, then every other course</td>
<td>1x/year min 2</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>4x in years 1 - 3; 1x thereafter</td>
<td>2x; 2 years before</td>
<td>Encouraged to take electronic form 7</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3 (tenure track); every 2 yrs (clinical assi)</td>
<td>1x every 2 yrs; 1x in year before</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4x in years 1 - 3; 1x thereafter</td>
<td>1x every 2 yrs</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1x/year</td>
<td>1x every 2 yrs, min 2</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1x/year; min 5</td>
<td>2x every 2 yrs; min 3</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2 for 4th YR; then 2 more</td>
<td>2x; 1 year before</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>4x in years 1 - 3; 1x thereafter</td>
<td>2x; 2 years before</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Hearing Science</td>
<td>4x in years 1 - 3; 1x thereafter (includes probationary clinical faculty)</td>
<td>1x every 2 yrs (TT and non-probationary clinical)</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.1.2 Core dossier
Revised: 04/01/07
Edited: 06/01/09

4.1.2.1 Instructions for the candidate
Revised: 04/01/12
Edited: 04/01/12

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

In Parts I and III place the required materials in sequence following the outline, but do not paginate them.

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 these should be approximately 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—Research in View
Revised: 04/01/12
Edited: 04/01/12

Tenure-track faculty members undergoing Fourth-Year Review and mandatory promotion and tenure review are required to use Research in View to generate their core dossier. (See https://osu.researchinview.thomsonreuters.com/ to enter the system.)

4.1.2.2 Time frame
Revised: 06/01/09
Edited: 01/01/11
Use date of hire or date of last promotion, whichever is most recent. Use a date earlier in your career only if it is germane to the evaluation. The candidate should consult with his/her P&T chair to make this determination.

4.1.2.3 Organization
Revised: 02/15/12
Edited: 02/15/12

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

4.1.2.4 Core dossier outline
Revised: 12/18/13
Edited: 02/15/12

Teaching

1) Undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses taught

List each course taught and clinical instruction (see Courses/Clinical Instruction in Forms Section), including the following information:

- courses taught by quarter (AU, WI, SP, SU), semester (AU, SP), session or term (May and summer) and year
- course number, title, and number of credit hours
- official final course enrollment
- percentage of course taught by candidate based on proportion of total student contact hours in course
  - brief explanation (approximately 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

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.

NOTE: Research in View users should note these in the Narrative Section in the form titled Noteworthy Accomplishments—Graduate Students.

c) Senior honor theses: give name of student, title of thesis, 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).

NOTE: Research in View users should note these in the Narrative Section in the form titled Noteworthy Accomplishments—Undergraduate Students.

3) Involvement with postdoctoral scholars and researchers

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

4) Extension and continuing education instruction

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

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.

6) Brief description of the candidate’s approach to and goals in teaching, major accomplishments, plans for the future in teaching.
7) Evaluation of teaching

Brief description of how the candidate has used the evaluation information to improve the quality of instruction.

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. These awards 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

Brief description of 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.

Research

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

Works under review must be listed separately in Item k.

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

NOTE: The candidate does not have the option to specify a discipline-specific format when using Research in View.

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.
- I identified the patients for the study, administered the drug regimen, reported results to the consortium and reviewed the draft manuscript.
- 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.
Statements such as the following are not acceptable: "All authors contributed equally"; "50% effort." Do not refer to past dossiers for models of how to write the required description, since they occasionally include unacceptable statements such as these.

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. This information is not required by OAA and under no circumstances is it an acceptable substitute for the required narrative description.

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

Include as separate categories:

a) Books (other than edited volumes) and monographs
b) Edited books
c) Chapters in edited books
d) Bulletins and technical reports
e) Peer-reviewed journal articles
f) Editor-reviewed journal articles
g) Reviews (indicate whether peer reviewed)
h) Abstracts and short entries (indicate whether peer reviewed)
i) Papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer reviewed)
j) Unpublished scholarly presentations (indicate whether peer reviewed)
k) 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 number 2. Do not list each individual letter.)

a) Artwork
b) Choreography
c) Collections
d) Compositions
e) Curated exhibits
f) Exhibited artwork

g) Inventions and patents, including disclosures, options, and commercial licenses

h) Moving image

i) Multimedia/databases/websites

j) Radio and television

k) Recitals and performances

l) Recordings

m) 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.

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. Individual units should determine what kinds of information could be described here, if any.

5) Research funding

In cases of multiple authorship for Items 5a - 5b, 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. This information is not required by OAA and under no circumstances is it an acceptable substitute for the required narrative description.

a) 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

b) 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

c) 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

d) Funded training grants on which the candidate is or has been the equivalent of the principal investigator

• source and amount of funding
• whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant

e) 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

f) 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 organization in which office was held or service performed. Describe nature of organization (open or elected membership, honorary).

3) List of consultation activity (industry, education, government). Give 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 your professional expertise, (Community service not germane to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to P&T reviews.) if not listed elsewhere.

6) Administrative service. Give dates and description of responsibility.
   a) Unit committees
   b) College or university committees
   c) Initiatives undertaken to enhance diversity in your unit, college or the university
   d) Administrative positions held, e.g. graduate studies chair
   e) Service as a graduate faculty representative on a dissertation in another unit or university

7) Advisor to student groups and organizations
   List name of group or organization and specific responsibilities as advisor.

8) Office of Student Life committees
   a) List Office of Student Life committees on which you have served.
   b) Summarize participation in Student Life programs such as fireside discussions, lectures to student groups outside your unit, addresses or participation at student orientation, and the Second-Year Transformational Experience Program (STEP).

   NOTE: Research in View make sure to select the button denoting that this item is “in service to Student Life” in order for it to print in the correct section of the dossier.

9) List of prizes and awards for service to your profession, the university, or your unit. Nominations for such awards should not be listed.

10) Brief elaboration that provides additional information about service activities listed above.
Board of Trustees (http://trustees.osu.edu/)

Chapter 3335-6 Rules Of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure

3335-6-01 General considerations.

(A) Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure (except when the provisions of paragraph (H) of rule 3335-6-03 of the Administrative Code are invoked.) Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance--normally tenure initiating unit colleagues. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes, to exercise the standards established in faculty rule 3335-6-02 of the Administrative Code and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in faculty rule 3335-6-02 of the administrative code and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, or promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision 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.

(B) In accordance with a policy of equality of opportunity, decisions concerning appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure shall be free of discrimination as to age, ancestry, color, disability, gender identity or expression, genetic information, military status, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, and other categories covered in the university nondiscrimination policy.

3335-02 Criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure of tenure-track faculty.

(A) The Ohio State University will be recognized worldwide for the quality and impact of its research, teaching, and service. For purposes of faculty performance reviews under these rules:

(1) Research is broadly defined to include discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and the scholarship of pedagogy.

(2) Teaching is broadly defined to include didactic classroom, non-classroom and distance instruction, extension and continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars.

(3) Service is broadly defined to include providing administrative service to the university, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university.

Each tenuring unit is responsible for establishing criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure that are consistent with this mission and for ensuring that every faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure recommendation is consistent with this mission.

Appointment decisions for tenure-track faculty positions, as defined in rule 3335-5-19 of the Administrative Code, must be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Appointments at the rank of instructor should normally only be made when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment.

(B) No faculty member attains tenure automatically. Tenure may be acquired either in the original appointment to the tenure-track faculty rank of associate professor or professor or upon promotion from within the university to the rank of associate professor, or following a successful probationary period at the rank of associate professor or professor as specified in rule 3335-6-03 of the Administrative Code. Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor.

(C) The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university. Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

(D) In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established
academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

(E) Each tenure initiating unit shall have an appointments, promotion, and tenure document. The document shall describe, in qualitative terms, the unit's criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure and evidence to be provided to support a case within the context of the unit's mission and the standards set forth in this rule as well as the mission and standards of the college. The document should indicate with some specificity how the quality and effectiveness of teaching, the quality and significance of scholarship, and the quality and effectiveness of service are to be documented and assessed. The document of a tenure initiating unit with regional campus faculty must establish criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure for these faculty within the context of the regional campuses' mission as well as that of the tenure initiating unit. The document shall also describe the unit's procedures for conducting annual performance reviews of probationary faculty and reviews for promotion and tenure.

The document must be drawn up or amended through broad faculty consultation with all voting members of the tenure initiating unit according to the principles articulated in paragraph (C)(3) of rule 3335-3-35 of the Administrative Code and must be approved by the dean of the college and the executive vice president and provost.

(F) Each college shall have an appointments, promotion, and tenure document. The document shall describe, in qualitative terms, the college's criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure within the context of the college's mission and the standards set forth in this rule. The document shall also describe the college's procedures for conducting college level reviews for promotion and tenure.

The document must be drawn up through broad faculty consultation and must be approved by the executive vice president and provost.


3335-6-03 Probationary service, and duration of appointments for tenure-track faculty.

(A) Probationary periods are established for tenure-track faculty members. During a probationary period a faculty member does not have tenure and is considered for reappointment annually.

(B) Length of probationary period.

(1) An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the office of academic affairs upon petition of the tenure initiating unit and college. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the executive vice president and provost.
An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit may be granted for time spent as an instructor if the faculty member requests such credit in writing at the time of the promotion. This request must be approved by the tenure-initiating unit's eligible faculty, the tenure-initiating unit head, the dean of the college, and the office of academic affairs.

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

(2) Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of rule 3335-6-08 of the Administrative Code and the provisions of paragraphs (G), (H), and (I) of this rule.

(3) Probationary tenure-track faculty members will be informed no later than the end of the year in which their mandatory review for tenure takes place as to whether tenure will be granted by the beginning of the following year. If tenure is not granted, a one year terminal year of employment is offered.

(C) Annual review of probationary tenure-track faculty members.

(1) At the time of appointment, probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing tenure initiating unit, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

(2) During a probationary period a tenure-track faculty member shall be reviewed annually in accordance with this rule and with policies of the tenure initiating unit, college and university. The annual review should encompass the faculty member's performance in teaching, in scholarship, and in service; as well as evidence of continuing development. The involvement of tenure initiating unit faculty in annual reviews is strongly encouraged. External evaluations of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the faculty review body or tenure initiating unit chair. The tenure initiating unit chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of the office of academic affairs dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. At the completion of the review the tenure initiating unit chair shall provide the faculty member and the dean of the college with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The assessment should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. If the chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. A recommendation from the chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures (see
paragraph (G) of this rule) and the dean shall make the final decision in the matter. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

(3) When probationary tenure-track faculty receive their annual review, the tenure initiating unit chair shall inform them of their right to review their primary personnel file maintained by their tenure initiating unit and to place in that file a response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file (see rule 3335-3-35 of the Administrative Code).

(4) The fourth year review of probationary tenure-track faculty shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion at the tenure initiating unit and college levels with two exceptions: Solicitation of external letters of evaluation may or may not be required by the tenure initiating unit and review by the college promotion and tenure committee shall be optional in all cases where both the tenure initiating unit and the dean approve the renewal of the appointment. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the dean of the college. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the tenure initiating unit's recommendation, the dean must consult with the college promotion and tenure committee.

(D) Exclusion of time from probationary periods.

(1) There are three circumstances under which probationary tenure-track faculty may obtain an exclusion of time from probationary periods. These exclusions are intended to recognize that there are factors that can impact the ability of probationary faculty to meet the criteria for tenure within the probationary period outlined in paragraph (B) of this rule. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of the reasons listed in paragraphs (D)(1)(a) to (D)(1)(c) of this rule must be made prior to April first of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure is scheduled to occur.

(a) A probationary tenure-track faculty member will have time excluded from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six. This exclusion is guaranteed provided the faculty member informs the head of her/his tenure initiating unit, the dean, or the office of academic affairs in writing within one year of the birth or the adoption unless the exclusion of time is prohibited by paragraph (D)(3) of this rule, and no later than April first of the mandatory review year. It is the responsibility of the unit head to inform the college dean and office of academic affairs of the birth or adoption. The probationary faculty member may decline the one-year exclusion by informing her/his unit head in writing before April first of the original mandatory review year. It is the responsibility of the unit head to inform the college dean and office of academic affairs of the faculty member’s choice to decline the exclusion. The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period per birth event or adoption is one year.

(b) A probationary tenure-track faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful university faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, or service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted in writing to the head of the
faculty member’s tenure initiating unit within one year of the illness, care, or other factors. Requests shall be reviewed by the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee which shall advise the head of the tenure initiating unit regarding the appropriateness of the request. In units that do not have a promotion and tenure committee, the eligible faculty shall review the request. Such requests require approval by the head of the tenure initiating unit dean, and executive vice president and provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to April first of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in reviewing the appropriateness of the request.

(c) Probationary tenure-track faculty members on less than full-time service for part or all of their probationary period may request an exclusion of time from the probationary period on the basis that they are less than-full time. Such requests require approval of the tenure initiating unit chair, dean, and executive vice president and provost. The exclusion shall be for an integral number of years based on the principle that the usual probationary period represents full-time service. The maximum permissible exclusion of a probationary period under this paragraph is one year for a probationary instructor, three years for a probationary assistant professor and two years for a probationary associate professor or professor.

(2) A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a nonrenewal notice has been issued nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the university's right not to renew a probationary appointment.

(3) Except in extraordinary circumstances, a maximum of three years can be excluded from the probationary period for tenure track faculty for any reason or combination of reasons covered in the provisions in paragraphs (D)(1)(a) and (D)(1)(b) of this rule. For probationary faculty who are on appointments of less than full time, the maximum is four years for an instructor, six years for an assistant professor, and five years for an associate professor or professor for any reason or combination of reasons covered in the provisions in paragraphs (D)(1)(a), (D)(1)(b), and (D)(1)(c) of this rule. Exceptions require the approval of the tenure initiating unit chair, dean, and executive vice president and provost.

(4) Tenure-track faculty members will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period for any of the above reasons unless their absence from campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical.

(5) For purposes of performance reviews of probationary faculty, the length of the probationary period is the actual number of years of employment at this university less any years of service excluded from the probationary period under the terms of this rule. Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted under the terms of this rule. Probationary faculty who are on part-time appointments should be reviewed in the context of their reduced duties.

(6) The exclusion of time granted under for reasons specified in this rule in no way limits the award of promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory review year.
(E) Service credit of up to three years may be granted for prior work experience at the time of the initial appointment and requires the approval of the tenure initiating unit chair, dean, and executive vice president and provost. Prior service credit shortens a probationary period by the amount of the credit and once granted cannot be revoked except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

(F) Probationary appointments may be terminated during any probationary year because of inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a nonrenewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with fourth year review procedures as set forth in paragraph (C)(3) of this rule. Notification of nonrenewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in rule 3335-6-08 of the Administrative Code.

(G) Probationary appointments may be terminated for fiscal or programmatic reasons. When nonrenewal is based on fiscal or programmatic reasons, the faculty member should be advised that such nonrenewal is a possibility and formal notice of nonrenewal should be provided as soon as possible after the need for nonrenewal is established. Nonrenewal of a probationary appointment for fiscal or programmatic reasons does not entail a performance review and requires the prior approval of the executive vice president and provost. Because hiring decisions should be based on informed assumptions regarding the future availability of resources and of programmatic needs, approval of such nonrenewals will be based on the extent to which convincing evidence is provided that the fiscal or programmatic reasons for the nonrenewal could not be anticipated when the appointment was made and are expected to be long lasting.

(H) Decisions affecting the nonrenewal of a probationary appointment may not be arbitrary or capricious or carried out in violation of a faculty member's right to academic freedom. Faculty rule 3335-5-05 of the Administrative Code provides a procedural mechanism under which an aggrieved probationary faculty member can challenge a nonrenewal decision believed to have been improper. In that instance, however, the burden of proof is on the probationary faculty member to establish that the nonrenewal decision was improper. (See also rule 3335-6-05 of the Administrative Code).


3335-6-04 Promotion and tenure review procedures for tenure-track faculty.

(A) General considerations.

(1) In consultation with the rules committee or its designee, the office of academic affairs shall develop and promulgate procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews to supplement Chapter 3335-6 of the Administrative Code. These guidelines shall include a dossier outline to be used for the documentation of accomplishments by all candidates to be reviewed for promotion and tenure and by all probationary tenure-track faculty for annual reviews. The guidelines shall also include general information about the review process at the college and university level, information about any legal
considerations affecting promotion and tenure evaluations, examples of criteria by which candidates for promotion and tenure are evaluated, and other information intended to assist academic units in carrying out reviews.

(2) All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed by the eligible faculty and by the chair of their tenure initiating unit. Candidates will also be reviewed at the college and university levels. The tenure initiating unit chair is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the board of trustees (if positive).

(3) The review for tenure during the final year of a probationary period is mandatory and must take place.

A faculty member may ask to be considered for nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The promotion and tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year.

(4) Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the tenure initiating unit chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the tenure initiating unit, the tenure initiating unit chair shall inform the dean or the executive vice president and provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.

(B) Review procedures at the tenure initiating unit level.

(1) Each tenure initiating unit shall establish a mechanism such as a promotion and tenure committee, for presenting the case of a candidate for promotion and tenure to the eligible faculty for consideration and for preparing a report for the tenure initiating unit chair providing the eligible faculty's assessment of quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service. 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.

(2) The candidate shall have primary responsibility for preparing, according to office of academic affairs guidelines, a dossier documenting his or her accomplishments.

(3) The tenure initiating unit chair or chair of the promotion and tenure committee shall be responsible for gathering internal evidence of the quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service from students and peers, as appropriate, within the tenure initiating unit. The tenure initiating unit chair or chair of the promotion and tenure committee shall also be responsible for obtaining letters from external evaluators and from other units at this
university in which the candidate has appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not. Some of the external evaluators should be suggested by the candidate and some by the department chair or promotion and tenure committee; no more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the above authorized persons may not be included in the dossier.

(4) The eligible faculty shall review the candidate's dossier describing accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service and shall vote on the candidate. A report of the faculty assessment, including both strengths and weaknesses, and the numerical vote of the faculty shall be forwarded to the tenure initiating unit chair for inclusion in the dossier.

(5) The chair shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and recommendation for the dean for inclusion in the dossier. As soon as the faculty report and chair's letter have been completed, the candidate should be notified in writing of the completion of the tenure initiating unit review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the tenure initiating unit chair with written comments on the tenure initiating unit review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The promotion and tenure committee and/or chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.

(6) The tenure initiating unit chair shall forward the dossier with all internal and external evaluations, candidate comments on the tenure initiating unit review and promotion and tenure committee and/or chair responses to those comments, if any, to the dean of the college.

(C) Review procedures at the college and university level.

(1) The purposes of promotion and tenure reviews beyond the tenure initiating unit shall be:

(a) To determine whether the tenure initiating unit has conducted its review and reached a recommendation consistent with university, college, and tenure initiating unit standards, criteria, policies, and rules. A faculty review body or administrator at the college or university level may make a recommendation that is contrary to that of the tenure initiating unit if, in its judgment, the tenure initiating unit recommendation is not consistent with those standards, criteria, policies, and rules.

(b) To determine where the weight of the evidence lies in cases in which there is not a clear or consistent recommendation from lower levels of review.

(2) The dean of a college shall have a standing faculty promotion and tenure committee which is advisory to the dean. Members shall not participate in the review of cases from their own departments. The college promotion and tenure committee shall prepare a written report of its assessment and vote for inclusion in the dossier. The dean shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and recommendation for the provost for inclusion in the dossier. As soon as the college promotion and tenure committee report and dean's letter have been completed, the candidate should be notified in
writing of the completion of the college level review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the dean with written comments on the college review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The college promotion and tenure committee and/or dean may provide written responses to the candidate’s comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the college level review is permitted. The dean shall forward the dossier, along with all evaluations and reports, to the provost.

(3) The executive vice president and provost shall have a standing faculty promotion and tenure committee which is advisory to the provost. Members shall not participate in the review of cases from their own departments. Normally, the provost shall refer cases to this committee for advice only when there is concern regarding the appropriateness of lower level recommendations, when there are unclear or inconsistent recommendations from previous levels of review, or when all previous recommendations are negative. The university promotion and tenure committee shall prepare a written report of its assessment and vote for inclusion in the dossier.

(D) Modification of review processes for alternative administrative structures.

(1) Regional campus faculty shall be reviewed by the faculty and dean and director on the appropriate campus using procedures established on each campus. This review shall focus primarily on the faculty member’s contributions in teaching and service. The dean and director shall forward the report of the regional campus faculty and his or her recommendation to the chair of the faculty member's tenure initiating unit and inform the candidate of his or her recommendation. The review shall proceed as described in paragraphs (A) through (C) of this rule with the understanding that the relative weight of teaching and service is ordinarily greater on regional campuses.

(2) If the college is the unit responsible for initiating tenure and promotion recommendations, it should follow the annual review and promotion and tenure procedures described for tenure initiating units. The dean shall forward the annual review letter or promotion and tenure dossier to the executive vice president and provost.

(3) Schools follow the procedures established for tenure initiating unit reviews unless they contain departments that are tenure initiating units. In the latter case, the tenure initiating unit chair shall forward dossiers to the school director. The director shall forward the dossier, with his or her recommendation, to the dean of the college.

(4) A subdivision within a tenure initiating unit may contribute to the evaluation of faculty members as provided for in the tenure initiating unit's appointments, promotion, and tenure document, but this review may not substitute for a review by the tenure initiating unit eligible faculty and chair.


3335-6-05 Criteria and procedures for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions and reappointment nonrenewals and for seventh year reviews for tenure-track faculty.
(A) Appeals. It is the policy of the Ohio state university to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in these rules, supplemented by additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and colleges. If a candidate believes that a nonrenewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in rule 3335-5-05 of the Administrative Code.

(B) Seventh year reviews. Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, a tenure initiating unit may petition the dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the unit and the chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the dean concurs with the tenure initiating unit's petition, the dean shall in turn petition the provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the nonrenewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

A tenure-track faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by his or her tenure initiating unit, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review.


3335-6-06 Tenure initiating unit.

(A) A tenure initiating unit is a division, department, school, or college approved by the council on academic affairs, the university senate, and the board of trustees. A tenure initiating unit has the following responsibilities for all faculty members assigned to it: to assist in professional development; to evaluate; to maintain official personnel records; and to initiate promotion, tenure, reappointment, and nonrenewal recommendations. The office of academic affairs shall be responsible for maintaining the official list of tenure initiating units.

(B) A single division, department, school, or college must serve as the tenure initiating unit for each tenure-track faculty member, including individuals with multiple appointments. Multiple appointments to the tenure-track faculty totaling fifty per cent or more of service to the university shall be considered to be the same as
a single appointment of fifty per cent or more for the purpose of determining eligibility for tenure.

(C) A tenure-track faculty member may change from one tenure initiating unit to another voluntarily; or as a result of the restructuring of academic units, including consolidation, reorganization, or abolition; or as a result of the abolishment of a tenure initiating unit during conditions of financial exigency. The following provisions govern such changes:

(1) A faculty member may voluntarily move from one tenure initiating unit to another upon approval of a simple majority of all tenured faculty members in the receiving tenure initiating unit and, following consultation with the appropriate dean(s), the executive vice president and provost. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made.

(2) A faculty member’s tenure initiating unit may be changed as a result of structural changes in academic units, including consolidation or reorganization of units, or abolition of units, that are approved by the university senate and board of trustees.

(a) When academic units are to be consolidated or reorganized, resulting in the creation of one or more new tenure initiating units, the plan for relocating faculty to the new tenure initiating units shall be part of the approved restructuring proposal. Change in tenure initiating unit resulting from the consolidation or reorganization of academic units shall not require the consent of individual faculty members whose tenure initiating unit is changed. In addition, since a receiving unit does not exist when new units are being created, no vote of such a unit will be required in relocating faculty.

(b) When a tenure initiating unit is to be abolished and is not part of a plan to consolidate or reorganize two or more units into new tenure initiating units, every effort shall be made by the executive vice president and provost to transfer each tenure-track faculty member in that tenure initiating unit to another tenure initiating unit, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (C) of this rule. Should such agreement be impossible, the person's tenure responsibility shall reside with the executive vice president and provost. The executive vice president and provost shall assign the faculty member appropriate duties. If the faculty member's previous assignment has been at a regional campus, the executive vice president and provost shall consult with the dean and director of the regional campus regarding an appropriate assignment.

(3) A tenure-track faculty member whose tenure initiating unit is abolished during conditions of financial exigency, as described in rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code, may be reassigned to a new tenure initiating unit under the terms of paragraph (C)(1) of rule 3335-5-02.2 of the Administrative Code.

(D) When tenure-track faculty members change tenure initiating units under paragraphs (C)(2) and (C)(3) of this rule, the new tenure initiating units shall make reasonable efforts to assist faculty members in adjusting to the expectations of the new unit. Faculty members who believe that some other unit may be more appropriate than their new tenure initiating unit may also explore the possibility of further relocation under the terms of paragraph (C)(1) of this rule.
3335-6-07 Campus assignment.

(A) Every member of the faculty shall be assigned to serve on one of the university's campuses: the central campus in Columbus, the regional campuses in Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark, or the agricultural technical institute (Wooster).

(B) Decisions regarding the selection, assignment, responsibilities, salary, assessment, and promotion of a regional campus faculty member should involve full cooperation between the tenure initiating unit and the regional campus administration. All formal personnel recommendations must bear the signatures of the chair of the tenure initiating unit, the dean of the college of the tenure initiating unit, the dean and director of the regional campus, and the executive vice president and provost or designee.

(C) Campus reassignment may occur only with the voluntary consent of the faculty member, and with the approval of the executive vice president and provost and that of a simple majority of all tenured faculty members in the transferee's tenure initiating unit when the reassignment is from a regional campus to the Columbus campus or all tenured faculty members on the receiving regional campus when the transfer is to a regional campus. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made.


3335-6-08 Standards of notice.

(A) In cases of nonrenewal of an appointment to a tenure-track faculty rank, the university will, insofar as possible, observe the following standards of notice:

1. Not later than March first of the first academic year of probationary service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if a one-year appointment expires during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its expiration;

2. Not later than December fifteenth of the second academic year of probationary service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if an appointment expires during the second academic year, at least six months in advance of its expiration; and

3. At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

(B) These standards of notice need not apply in cases of termination for cause.

(C) In the event of a decision resulting in nonrenewal, the chair shall notify the faculty member in writing of that decision and the reasons for it.
(D) Decisions regarding renewal of members of the associated faculty (adjunct, clinical practice, visiting titles, or lecturers) are made annually in accordance with criteria and procedures of the appointing instructional unit and in accordance with university policies relative to associated faculty positions.


3335-6-09 Exceptions.

Any unit which believes that there is a reason for it to have policies and procedures differing from those set out in this chapter may request an exception. The request must be approved by the procedures established in the unit’s pattern of administration and by the dean of the college, after broad and meaningful consultation with the unit’s tenure-track faculty. The request will then be submitted to the executive vice president and provost and, if approved, to the university senate for approval.

The Ohio State University continues to emphasize retaining and rewarding its faculty by recognizing the significance and impact of their accomplishments. Support of an associate professor’s promotion to full professorship is an integral part of this recognition.

RELEVANT FACULTY RULES
BELOW ARE EXCERPTS FROM IMPORTANT RULES

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service. (3335-6-01.C)

In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphasis on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases, care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. (3335-6-02.D)

A faculty member may ask to be considered for nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate’s accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The promotion and tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year. (3335-6-04.A.3)

To read the full rules, visit trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules. To view APT documents for each unit, visit oaa.osu.edu/governance.
PLANNING FOR PROMOTION

Good ideas about how to move forward from associate to full professor are varied and plentiful at Ohio State.

Faculty, university wide, as well as other experts outside the university, provided suggestions from their own observations and experiences about how to prepare for promotion to full professor. The suggestions presented here are a collection of ideas to consider as you prepare to move to the next level in your faculty career.

Some individuals will find many of the suggestions surprising and helpful, others may already use most of them. All should find that these best practices spark ideas and provide guidance in your pursuit of full professorship.

*Source: Office of Academic Affairs and The Women’s Place

STEPS TO PROMOTION

The first recommendation of the Faculty Career Enhancement Committee’s final report (issued in 2005) notes that, “Faculty are primarily responsible for the advancement of their own careers.” That statement is reiterated here—faculty members must be proactive in planning and guiding their professional lives. Recently promoted full professors report that self-motivation, persistence, and intentional planning are key factors in their success.

The following recommendations focus on your responsibilities as an associate professor and the actions you can take to advance your career at Ohio State.

1 GOAL SETTING AND PLANNING

- Create a plan and timeline toward your promotion in the first year after you become an associate professor. If you are past your first year and have not yet completed this plan, do it now. Discuss the plan and your progress, along with any needed revisions, with your chair as part of the annual review process. Also discuss it with formal or informal mentors at least yearly. As it evolves over time, continue to define and re-define your goals.
- Be intentional about time management and establishing annual priorities.
- Think about what support you might need and discuss it with your chair. Don’t refrain from asking for what you need—and don’t ask for less. Strengthen your negotiation skills and your self-promotion skills, and be prepared to make a case for what you need based on evidence and logic. How will the department/college/university benefit? How will your work benefit? What specific positive outcomes can be expected? Specific discussion points might include the following:
  - planning for Faculty Professional Leave (oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyprofessionalleave.pdf) or for special assignment (oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/specialassignment.pdf)
  - opportunities for college, university, or professional service support for external fellowships or awards
  - specific teaching needs, such as planning for teaching a graduate course, a special topics course, or a specialized seminar to help keep your research current
  - prioritizing and planning for moving from shorter- to longer-term projects

2 ESTABLISH NETWORKS

- Think strategically about developing a plan for expanding your reputation beyond Ohio State. Ask senior faculty in your program or at other universities to help. This plan might include a strategy for:
  - making the most of conferences and invited lectures
  - collaborating with researchers and coauthors beyond Ohio State
  - serving as an evaluator for professional journals, study sections, or evaluation committees for external agencies
  - taking research opportunities and making sure that others in the field know about your work

3 KNOW THE RULES AND REQUIREMENTS

- Become knowledgeable about the promotion process in your unit and your college and read the chapter on promotion and tenure in the Rules of the Faculty (trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6.html).
- Read your unit’s and college’s Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document about criteria for promotion to full professor and appropriate documentation of those criteria (oaa.osu.edu/governance.html).
- Review the memoranda of understanding regarding joint appointments or other special arrangements. If changes are needed or desired, discuss them with the chair(s)
- Ask full professors in your unit who have recently been promoted if you may read their dossiers.
- Participate in promotion workshops offered by your unit, college, or the university; find out whether your professional association offers workshops on promotion and suggest one if they don’t.
- Find and use clear indicators of the importance/value of your work, especially if it is in subfields or outlets with which your colleagues might not be familiar.

- Observe senior professors you admire and talk to them about their own experiences in being promoted to full professor. Use them as models.
- Look for help with pedagogy, for example, at the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT).
- Ask full professor colleagues to observe your teaching and to serve as teaching mentors.
- Look for opportunities to discuss your work with faculty in other departments in the university.