

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Policies and Procedures Handbook: Volume 3

Promotion and Tenure Review

1.0 TIMETABLE.....	4
2.0 SUBMISSION TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS.....	4
3.0 ACADEMIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS	6
4.0 PUBLIC RECORDS ACT.....	6
5.0 PROCEDURES	7
5.1 UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW COMMITTEE.....	7
5.1.1 UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.....	7
5.2 PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	7
5.2.1 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS	7
5.2.2 PROCEDURES OVERSIGHT DESIGNEE.....	8
5.2.3 INTEGRITY OF REVIEW PROCEDURES	8
5.2.4 VOTING PROCEDURES	9
5.2.5 DOCUMENTATION.....	9
5.2.5.1 NONMANDATORY REVIEWS	9
5.2.5.2 MANDATORY REVIEWS	10
5.2.5.3 REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR MID-ACADEMIC YEAR START DATES FOR PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK, CLINICAL/TEACHING/PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH FACULTY	10
5.2.5.4 VERIFICATION OF CITATIONS	10
5.3 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS.....	10
5.4 COMMENTS PROCESS AND INFORMING CANDIDATE OF REVIEW OUTCOMES.....	13
5.4.1 USE OF THE COMMENTS PROCESS	13
5.4.2 TENURE INITIATING UNIT LEVEL.....	13
5.4.3 COLLEGE LEVEL FOR COLLEGES WITH DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS	13
5.4.4 UNIVERSITY LEVEL AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES (BOT) APPROVAL	14
5.5 RECONSIDERATION OF CASE DURING REVIEW PROCESS	14
5.5.1 PROCEDURAL ERROR DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES	14
5.5.2 SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION.....	14
5.5.2.1 RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION.....	15

5.6 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND OTHER RECUSALS	15
5.6.1 COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY AND TIU AND COLLEGE P&T COMMITTEES	15
5.6.2 TIU HEADS AND DEANS	16
5.7 REVIEWS IN RESTRUCTURED TENURE INITIATING UNITS	16
5.8 WITHDRAWALS AND NEGATIVE DECISIONS	16
5.8.1 WITHDRAWALS.....	16
5.8.1.1 NONMANDATORY REVIEW	16
5.8.1.2 MANDATORY REVIEW.....	17
5.8.2 NEGATIVE DECISIONS	17
6.0 DOSSIER.....	17
6.1 OUTLINE	18
6.1.1 INTRODUCTION	19
6.1.2 CORE DOSSIER	20
6.1.2.1 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CANDIDATE.....	20
6.1.2.1.1 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CANDIDATE—OAA APPROVED ELECTRONIC DOSSIER.....	20
6.1.2.2 TIME FRAME	21
6.1.2.3 ORGANIZATION.....	21
6.1.2.4 CORE DOSSIER OUTLINE.....	21
6.1.3 LETTERS OF EVALUATION.....	28
6.1.3.1 INTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION	28
6.1.3.2 ADDITIONS.....	29
6.1.3.3 EXTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION	29
6.1.4 STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION	30
6.1.4.1 CUMULATIVE REPORT	30
6.1.4.2 FIXED-RESPONSE STUDENT EVALUATION DATA AND/OR SEI SUMMARY REPORT	30
6.1.4.3 SUMMARY OF OPEN-ENDED STUDENT EVALUATIONS.....	31
6.1.4.4 APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE INTERNAL REVIEW EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES.....	31
7.0 PROCEDURES FOR CLINICAL/TEACHING/PRACTICE AND RESEARCH FACULTY	32
7.1 CLINICAL/TEACHING/PRACTICE FACULTY	32
7.1.1 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	32
7.1.2 LEVELS OF REVIEW	33
7.1.3 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE.....	33
7.1.4 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION	33
7.2 RESEARCH FACULTY.....	33
7.2.1 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	33
7.2.2 LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION	34
7.2.3 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE.....	34

7.2.4 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION	34
7.3 NON-REAPPOINTMENT NOTICE	34
8.0 PROCEDURES FOR ASSOCIATED FACULTY	34
8.1 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR REAPPOINTMENT AT SENIOR RANK.....	34
8.2 LEVELS OF REVIEW	34
8.3 DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING AND SERVICE	35
8.3.1 ASSOCIATED CLINICAL FACULTY (FACULTY OF PRACTICE).....	35
8.3.2 ASSOCIATED FACULTY WITH TENURE-TRACK TITLES BELOW 50% FTE AND ADJUNCT FACULTY	35
8.3.3 ASSOCIATED FACULTY--LECTURERS	35
8.4 DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH: EXTERNAL EVALUATION	35
9.0 APPROVED EXCEPTIONS.....	35
9.1 COLLEGE OF MEDICINE	35
9.1.1 DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL MEDICINE	36
9.1.2 DEPARTMENT OF PEDIATRICS.....	36
9.2 DEPARTMENT OF EXTENSION IN THE COLLEGE OF FOOD, AGRICULTURAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES .	36

1.0 Timetable

Revised: 05/05/16; 8/15/22

All colleges are encouraged to deliver dossiers to the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) as soon as college-level review, including the comments process, is complete, regardless of due date.

The dates below are the latest time at which dossiers can be delivered for each group of colleges. When the deadline cannot be met for individual cases, [Bobbie Houser](#), OAA's HR Business Partner, is to be informed of the status of the case and its anticipated delivery date.

Second Friday in January

These eight colleges without departments and the University Libraries must submit all Fourth-Year Reviews and any annual reviews with a non-renewal recommendation from the dean by the second Friday in January in addition to their promotion and tenure (P&T) cases.

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

Fourth Friday in January

Arts and Sciences

Second Friday in February

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

Fourth Friday in February

Medicine
Veterinary Medicine

2.0 Submission to Academic Affairs

Revised: 06/10/15, 8/15/21; 8/15/23

Colleges submit all promotion and tenure dossiers to OAA via [OneDrive Interfolio](#). The college office will notify OAA when all dossiers have been uploaded. See also section 4: Dossier.

With the adoption of Interfolio, colleges will no longer have responsibility for generating the full dossier. Rather, at each level of review, forms will be completed, materials will be submitted, and all reviews will occur within Interfolio. Within this system, the dossier will be built automatically as it moves through the review process.

2.1 Placement of materials

Revised: 06/10/15

2.1.1 Cover sheet

Revised: 06/10/15

The original signed Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment (Cover Sheet, Form 109), found on the [forms page](#) of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook* is placed first in the original dossier. Nothing is to be placed on top of this page. The Cover Sheet should be immediately visible when the dossier is opened.

2.1.2 Dossier checklist

Revised: 06/10/15

The original signed checklist ([Form 105](#)) is placed directly behind the Record of Review.

2.1.3 P&T reviews section of the TIU's APT document

Revised: 06/10/15

Include a complete copy of the APT Document that was used for a particular review only if it is not the same one that appears on the [OAA website](#).

2.1.4 Presentation

Revised: 06/10/15; 5/15/20; 8/15/22

Scan the dossier as a single-sided document. Dossiers should be submitted with colored dividers inserted between the main sections. These dividers can be found [here](#).

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

ASC-Economics-Smith, Jacqueline.pdf

DEN-James, Edward.pdf

College Codes:

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

2.1.5 Report on candidates considered

Revised: 06/26/18, 8/15/21

Complete one Report on Candidates Considered for Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment ([Form 110](#)) for each TIU.

List all candidates within the unit on the report for that unit — one report per TIU, not one report per candidate.

Indicate for each candidate the voting recommendation (Y or N, not X) at each level of review including the regional campus review when appropriate.

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

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

If 4th year reviews are completed at a later date than promotion and tenure reviews, a second form is to be sent with completed 4th year review information.

3.0 Academic rights and freedoms

Revised: 02/15/13, 8/15/21

In June 2005 a statement on academic freedom and intellectual diversity on American campuses was released by the American Council on Education (ACE), of which The Ohio State University is a member. The ACE statement includes the following principles:

- Academic freedom and intellectual pluralism are core principles of America's higher education system.
- Government's recognition and respect for independence of colleges and universities are essential for academic excellence.
- Colleges and universities should welcome diverse beliefs and the free exchange of ideas.
- Grades and other academic decisions should be based solely on considerations that are intellectually relevant to the subject matter.
- Neither students nor faculty should be disadvantaged or evaluated on the basis of their political opinions.
- Any member of the campus community who believes they have been treated unfairly on academic matters must have access to a clear institutional process to address grievances.

Ohio's Inter-University Council (IUC), a statewide consortium of public universities, endorsed these principles in October 2005 and passed a resolution recommending that all four-year public universities in Ohio communicate these principles to their campus communities.

In April 2006, Ohio State issued its [reaffirmation](#) of academic rights, responsibilities, and processes for addressing concerns.

4.0 Public Records Act

Revised: 04/01/07; 8/15/23

The [Ohio Public Records Act](#) (see also *OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook* Volume 1, Chapter 2, section 12.0) requires that public records be made available upon request. **All** documents generated for P&T reviews are public records. Candidates and others may request access to these documents and units

must provide them. Evaluators may be informed that candidates have asked to view evaluation letters, though this is not required.

5.0 Procedures

5.1 University level review committee

Revised: 02/15/13; 6/18/19

The Provost's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee is appointed during the summer. The committee consists of nine faculty members from different colleges or University Libraries. Faculty members serve a three-year term with a third of the committee cycling off in a typical year. The vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources serves as the non-voting convener of the committee.

5.1.1 University level review committee procedures

Revised: 05/05/16; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

The Provost's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee reviews cases when:

- the candidates are from the University Libraries or from colleges without departments;
- there is concern from OAA regarding the appropriateness of lower-level recommendations (e.g., recommendations that contradict the evidence presented in letters from lower-level committees, recommendations that do not follow the unit's APT document);
- there are unclear or inconsistent recommendations from the previous levels of review; or
- all previous recommendations are negative.

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

- Recommend approval of proposed action
- Recommend disapproval of proposed action

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

5.2 Procedures for tenure-track faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

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

5.2.1 APT document used for promotion and tenure reviews

Revised: 06/26/18; 07/17/19; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

Tenure-track faculty members undergoing Fourth-Year Review and mandatory or nonmandatory promotion and/or tenure reviews are typically reviewed using the unit's current APT document (as approved and posted on the [OAA website](#)). Tenure-track faculty members, however, may choose to be reviewed under the unit's document that was in effect on their start date or on the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent. The current document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

All clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty undergoing review for promotion are typically reviewed using the unit's current APT document (as approved and posted on the [OAA website](#)). Clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty members, however, may choose to be reviewed for promotion under the unit's document that was in effect on their start date or on the date of their last reappointment, whichever is more recent.

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

If a faculty member selects an earlier document, the criteria for promotion and/or tenure will be from the earlier document will be used in the review. Regardless of document selected, the review procedures in the unit's current APT document will be used.

5.2.2 Procedures Oversight Designee

Revised: 12/18/13, 8/15/21; 8/15/22

TIU: The committee of the eligible faculty (or the Promotion and Tenure Committee, in those units that have such subcommittees of the eligible faculty) selects one or more members of the committee as the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD). The POD(s) may not be the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty (or, as appropriate, the Promotion and Tenure Committee). The committee may select to have multiple PODs (e.g., one for each faculty member being reviewed).

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

Although the POD is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of review bodies must accept full responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias for all faculty members. Review bodies, not the POD(s), are ultimately responsible for the integrity of the review process.

A summary of duties for the POD is available [here](#).

5.2.3 Integrity of review procedures

Revised: 12/18/13; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

The POD is to make reasonable efforts to assure that the review body at the relevant level (TIU or college) follows the written procedures governing its reviews and that its proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner. The written procedures are to be taken from the current approved TIU APT document (or the alternate document selected by the candidate, see section 3.5.1 above). As noted in section 3.5.2 above, the current approved document of record is the one posted on the [OAA website](#). The POD is to monitor the review process in respect to equitable treatment for underrepresented candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review.

If the POD has concerns about a review, these concerns are to be brought to the attention of the person or review body that is the source of the concerns. For example, if a dossier is not prepared correctly, the POD is to ask the candidate who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not being followed by either faculty or staff, then those individuals are to be promptly informed of the problem.

If concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they are to be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (TIU head or dean, depending on the level of review). The administrator must review the matter and respond in writing to the POD regarding either the actions taken or the

reasons that action was judged to be unwarranted. Any documented resolution must be included with the dossier as it moves forward in the review process.

5.2.4 Voting procedures

Revised: 07/14/17; 07/20/17; 06/26/18, 8/15/21; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

Only “yes” and “no” are to be considered votes. Consistent with Robert’s Rules of Order, OAA does not consider abstentions to be votes and they may not be counted in determining whether the unit’s recommendation on a case will be positive or negative. As noted in Volume 1, Chapter 1, OAA strongly encourages TIUs and colleges to exclude abstentions as an option. If a member of the committee of eligible faculty feels they cannot vote for or against a candidate, they should not participate in the discussion and vote. If they are abstaining due to a believed conflict of interest, they should not participate in the discussion or vote. Abstentions have no impact on quorum. That is, the number of eligible faculty members present, regardless of how they vote, represents the count for quorum. Only committee of the eligible faculty members present at the meeting or participating in the meeting by teleconference or videoconference may vote.

The POD is to verify the number of members needed to constitute a quorum and the percentage of votes needed to recommend a positive decision as defined in the APT document. OAA recommends that departments require a quorum of two-thirds for action on P&T cases (see Volume 1, Chapter 1, section 2.2.3). Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave.

OAA also recommends considering both the percent of the vote and the actual count of positive and negative votes when assessing the disposition of a vote at all levels of review, particularly in smaller units. For example, a 60% positive vote in a unit with 50 people (30 yes, 20 no), is qualitatively different from a 60% positive vote in a unit with 5 people (3 yes, 2 no). In the latter case, a single person voting differently drastically changes the outcome (85% positive with a 4 yes, 1 no vote, versus 62% positive with a 31 yes, 19 no vote).

The eligible faculty committee chair (or Promotion and Tenure Committee chair, as appropriate) writes a letter to the TIU head reporting the vote and summarizing the discussion of the eligible faculty. This letter should be evaluative as well as descriptive and contextualize the vote, including alternate opinions as appropriate. Although a descriptive summary of a candidate’s accomplishments provides helpful context, it is critical that the letter from the eligible faculty not be solely descriptive. The evaluation should address how a candidate does or does not meet the criteria as set forth in the relevant APT document, including the quality and impact of a candidate’s work.

5.2.5 Documentation

Revised: 04/01/07; 5/15/20; 8/15/23

The university requires complete documentation of the faculty member’s teaching, research and creative activity, and service (unless one of these is not an expectation of the position) to conduct an informed review.

TIUs are not to start formal consideration of a case until the dossier and associated documentation (such as external evaluations) meet all requirements. Errors in documentation found at a later stage of review often require correction and a relaunch of the review. This should be documented on pages 1 to 3 of Form 105 by the POD before the committee of eligible faculty begins its formal review.

5.2.5.1 Nonmandatory reviews

Revised: 04/01/07

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

- The candidate has failed to obtain or retain student evaluations for all courses taught in the past five years or since start date, if less than five years ago.
- The TIU has not conducted peer evaluation of teaching as required by the unit's APT document.

5.2.5.2 Mandatory reviews

Revised: 12/18/13; 5/15/20

Although substantive missing documentation is grounds for a negative decision, mandatory reviews must proceed even when documentation is missing and unobtainable. In general, the dossier will be reviewed at all levels with only the documentation available at the start of the TIU's review process. If important new information becomes available after the TIU review process, see section 3.8.2: Significant new information, below.

For more information on external evaluations see section 3.6: External evaluations, below.

5.2.5.3 Review schedule for mid-academic year start dates for probationary tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty

Revised: 06/26/18; 6/18/19

All faculty starting within the same calendar year are in the same cohort for promotion and tenure reviews. For example, a faculty member starting in 2023 is in the 2023–2024 cohort and will come up for mandatory review in 2028–29.

5.2.5.4 Verification of citations

Revised: 04/01/07; 5/15/20; 8/15/22

One of the responsibilities of the POD at the TIU level is to verify the accuracy of all published and creative works listed in the dossier (Research Items 1a–1i and 2). This verification is one of the items on the Dossier Checklist. If someone other than the POD carries out this responsibility, that individual must be clearly identified on the checklist. The candidate may not verify the accuracy of published and creative works.

5.3 External evaluations

Revised: 12/18/13; 07/20/17; 6/18/19; 5/15/20, 8/15/21; 8/15/23

The TIU head, chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, or equivalent individual as stated in the TIU's APT document, is responsible for requesting the external letters of evaluation.

External evaluation letters must be submitted on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator's signature. PDFs submitted electronically are acceptable if they are on letterhead and signed.

Candidates are not to contact prospective or actual external evaluators regarding their case at any stage of the review process, nor are they to discuss their case with any evaluator or provide additional materials to any evaluator even if the evaluator initiates the contact. Such contact compromises the integrity of the review process. Soliciting external evaluators and providing materials to them is solely the responsibility of the TIU head, chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, or equivalent individual as provided in the TIU's APT document.

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-04\(B\)\(3\)](#) requires that no more than one-half of the external evaluation letters contained in the final dossier be from persons suggested by the candidate. Therefore, more letters are to be solicited from persons not suggested by the candidate than from persons suggested by the candidate. ~~So as not to exhaust the pool of potential evaluators, it is best that the number of evaluators suggested by the candidate be limited to three or four.~~

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

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

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

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

- Letters from external evaluators should assess the work of the candidate under review. 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 the case of such faculty members, requests to external evaluators should be clear in the focus of the evaluation they are seeking, and committees are encouraged to share with evaluators the section of the APT document describing the TIU's promotion criteria.
- The TIU head and/or P&T committee should generate a lengthy list of prospective evaluators who are not employed at The Ohio State University. ~~The list primarily should be made up of distinguished faculty from peer or near peer programs that are clearly identified in the APT document of each TIU, though it may also include~~ non-academics who have similar research, leadership, teaching, or service credentials and experience. ~~All prospective evaluators must be~~ in a position to comment in an informed way both on the quality of the candidate's scholarly, leadership, teaching, or service work as well as on its significance to the broader field in which it resides. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the scholarly, leadership, teaching, or service work. They should generally hold the rank of professor or must be at the rank above the candidate being considered unless an exception has been granted by the college (or OAA in the cases of colleges that are TIUs).
- External evaluators may not be former advisors, collaborators, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that could reduce objectivity. ~~It is therefore essential that the individual or body generating the list of prospective evaluators ascertain the relationship of prospective evaluators with the candidate before seeking a letter of evaluation.~~ The candidate must be shown the list of prospective evaluators and have the opportunity to identify any conflict of interest or other issue that would interfere with the

objectivity of the review. This review must occur before letters of invitation are sent to prospective evaluators.

- ~~The candidate should be shown the list to identify any conflicts of interest or other issues that would interfere with the objectivity of the reviews, and~~ Upon review of the prospective list, candidates should be invited to augment it with several names of persons who meet the criteria for objective, credible evaluators. Unless the persons so identified do not meet these criteria and the candidate cannot offer acceptable alternatives, the TIU should make every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from a person suggested by the candidate. OAA does not require that the dossier contain letters from persons suggested by the candidate (see Faculty Rule 3335-6-04).
- Letters from collaborators may be appropriate as a means of determining a candidate's contributions to jointly conducted work, but collaborators must not be asked to write an external evaluation. ~~The candidate should be asked to review the full list of potential~~ In reviewing the list of prospective external evaluators, candidates are to identify all who have been collaborators, and to describe the nature and timing of the collaboration. Letters from collaborators may be included in the "Other Letters" section.
- ~~The candidate should be shown the list to identify any conflicts of interest or other issues that would interfere with the objectivity of the reviews, and be invited to augment it with several names of persons who meet the criteria for objective, credible evaluators. Unless the persons so identified do not meet these criteria and the candidate cannot offer acceptable alternatives, the TIU should make every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from a person suggested by the candidate. OAA does not require that the dossier contain letters from persons suggested by the candidate.~~
- The TIU head (or dean) may seek the dean's (or OAA's) approval of each candidate's tentative list of prospective evaluators to minimize the risk that the selection of evaluators will subsequently be judged inappropriate. If such approval is sought, the dean (or OAA) must be provided complete and accurate information about the prospective evaluator's credentials and relationship with the candidate.
- Approximately three months before completed evaluations are due, the person designated by the TIU to solicit external evaluations should send out letters of invitation to the prospective evaluators. The letter of invitation should state expectations, due date for receipt of the completed evaluation, and that evaluations are public records and subject to release upon request. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for clinical/teaching/practice faculty can be found [here](#).
- All evaluators are to be sent the same appropriate materials unless there is a substantive reason for differentiating among evaluators. In a case in which evaluators are sent different materials, the TIU head or chair of the P&T committee or committee of eligible faculty must provide an explanation to be included in the dossier. When evaluators are sent different materials (different research papers), TIUs must take care to assure that sufficient letters are obtained regarding the different sets of papers to provide a meaningful body of evaluative information about each set.
- The likelihood of obtaining a useful letter is greatly increased when the evaluator is not only given adequate time in which to review the materials, but when the nature of the requested letter is carefully explained. Evaluators should generally be asked to provide only a critical analysis of the candidate's primary area of focus (at least partly on the basis of provided materials). Evaluators should specifically be asked not to comment on whether the candidate should be promoted and tenured at Ohio State or would be promoted and tenured at their own institution.

5.4 Comments process and informing candidate of review outcomes

Revised: 04/01/07

5.4.1 Use of the comments process

Revised: 12/18/13; 8/15/22

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

5.4.2 Tenure initiating unit level

Revised: 04/01/07; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

After the letter from the TIU deliberative body to the TIU head and the letter from the TIU head to the dean are completed, the TIU head must immediately inform the candidate of the following **through Interfolio**:

- Nature of the recommendations by the TIU deliberative body and by the TIU head.
- Availability of the TIU deliberative body's letter to the TIU head and the TIU head's letter to the dean **in Interfolio, if the candidate wishes to review them.**
- Opportunity for the candidate, for up to 10 calendar days from receipt of the written notice, to provide written comments on the above letters for inclusion in the dossier when the case is forwarded to the college. If the last day of a designated time period falls on a weekend or a day on which the university is closed, the time period shall expire at the close of business on the next succeeding business day.
- Opportunity for the TIU deliberative body and the TIU head to provide written comments on the candidate's comments, also for inclusion in the dossier when the case is forwarded to the college.
- Outline of the remaining steps in the review process (review at the college and university levels of the recommendations originating in the TIU, and, ultimately, approval by the president and the BOT of positive recommendations by the executive vice president and provost).

The TIU deliberative body and/or TIU head will provide a written response to comments by the candidate contesting the original review or alleging procedural errors that might reasonably have affected the review's outcome. Any response to the candidate is to be included in the dossier.

If the college is the TIU, the above steps are to be followed. Once the comments process is complete, the candidate's materials are to be forwarded to OAA.

5.4.3 College level for Colleges with Departments and Schools

Revised: 05/01/10; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

After the college P&T committee completes the letter to the dean and the dean completes the letter to the executive vice president and provost, the dean informs the candidate and the TIU head of the completion of the college level review and of the availability of these reports. The comments process is repeated as described above.

The dean will provide a written response to comments by the candidate contesting the original review or alleging procedural errors that might reasonably have affected the review's outcome. Any response to the candidate is to be included in the dossier.

3.7.3 Use of the comments process

Revised: 12/18/13; 8/15/22

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

The dean will provide a written response to comments by the candidate contesting the original review or alleging procedural errors that might reasonably have affected the review's outcome. Any response to the candidate is to be included in the dossier.

5.4.4 University level and Board of Trustees (BOT) approval

Revised: 05/01/10, 8/15/21

After the executive vice president and provost has made their decision, they will inform the dean, who will inform the TIU head. The TIU head will inform the candidate of the executive vice president and provost's decision.

When a promotion and tenure decision is negative or a probationary faculty's appointment is not renewed, the TIU head is to advise the candidate of their right to appeal as well as their final date of employment.

5.5 Reconsideration of case during review process

Revised: 04/01/07; 8/15/23

It may occasionally be appropriate, while a review is in process, for one or more parties to the review to reconsider the case. Such a re-review may be prompted either by procedural problems or by significant new information. Consultation with OAA is **strongly recommended required** before an administrator or faculty review body initiates a reconsideration of a case.

5.5.1 Procedural error description and procedures

Revised: 04/01/07

Significant procedural errors (those that reasonably could have affected the outcome of deliberations) are to be corrected before the review continues. If a review body or unit administrator becomes convinced that such an error has occurred, that body or administrator is to take necessary steps to correct the error at the level of review at which it occurred. The case is to be fully reconsidered from that point on.

If internal letters of evaluation and comments letters have already been generated at that level of review and beyond, they are to be saved but not included in the dossier. The new written evaluations should note that reconsideration took place because of a procedural error and state the nature of the error. The comments process must be repeated for the new internal letters of evaluation at the TIU or college level.

5.5.2 Significant new information

Revised: 12/18/13; 06/26/18; 6/18/19; 5/15/20

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

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

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

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

5.5.2.1 Recommended procedures for significant new information

Revised: 04/01/07; 8/15/23

Following review of significant new information (which need not take place in a meeting), the TIU deliberative body may take a preliminary vote to determine whether to reconsider the case. A preliminary poll may take the form of a ballot asking each member of the deliberative body to indicate whether the new information might change their vote. If one person indicates that their vote might change, the TIU deliberative body shall meet to discuss the case with the new information and re-vote. The originally generated reports will then be amended to reflect the content of the reconsideration and the new vote. In this situation:

- Previously generated reports remain in the dossier.
- The comments process is repeated.
- The case then proceeds to the next level in the review process either for initial consideration or reconsideration. If that body has previously considered the case, it must meet to discuss the case with the new information and re-vote. The originally generated reports will then be amended to reflect the content of the reconsideration and the new vote ~~may also follow the two-step process described above to determine whether to re-vote the case.~~

5.6 Conflicts of interest and other recusals

Revised: 05/01/10

5.6.1 Committee of eligible faculty and TIU and college P&T committees

Revised: 04/01/07, 8/15/21; 8/15/23

At a minimum, faculty with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate (e.g., spouse, partner, child, sibling, parent or other close personal relationship) must not participate in a review of that candidate. In addition, a close professional relationship can give rise to a conflict of interest, such as when a faculty member since appointment or last promotion (whichever is more recent) is co-author on a significant portion of the candidate's publications (e.g., collaborated on 50% or more of candidate's work), has collaborated with the candidate on major grants or projects supporting research (e.g., collaborated on 50% or more of grants or projects), has served as the candidate's thesis or dissertation advisor, has a consulting or financial arrangement with the candidate (e.g., receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services), or is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional activities, ~~or has a relationship with the candidate that has created a bias.~~

When there is a question about potential conflicts, open discussion and professional judgment are required in determining whether it is appropriate for faculty members to recuse themselves from a particular review. Units may establish formal mechanisms for excluding persons from a review based on a conflict of interest.

Members of college and university P&T committees are not permitted to participate in reviews of cases from their own TIUs, in cases in which they have any involvement at a previous level of review, or in cases in which the member has a conflict of interest.

5.6.2 TIU heads and deans

Revised: 05/01/10

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

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

5.7 Reviews in restructured tenure initiating units

Revised: 12/18/13; 06/26/18; 8/15/23

Unless otherwise set forth in the restructuring statement, candidates on the tenure track who are up for promotion, or promotion with tenure, are to be given the choice of being reviewed under the APT document in effect on their start date, or on the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent; or under the current APT document of the restructured unit. If the restructuring was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year, the candidate must use the current document of the restructured unit. In any case, the eligible faculty of the restructured unit will be responsible for conducting the review.

The candidate must make the choice and then acknowledge in writing that, once the review commences under the chosen means, the choice is irrevocable. Regardless of the candidate's choice, the current TIU head provides the administrative review of the case.

5.8 Withdrawals and negative decisions

Revised: 04/01/07

5.8.1 Withdrawals

Revised: 04/01/07, 8/15/21

A candidate may withdraw from a review at any time. Only the candidate can stop a review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought.

5.8.1.1 Nonmandatory review

Revised: 04/01/07; 8/15/22

When a faculty member withdraws from a nonmandatory review, the withdrawal is noted on the college report ([Form 110](#)). The dossier should be kept in the candidate's TIU, but not in their primary personnel file, until such time as the candidate either is promoted or is denied tenure.

A candidate who decides to terminate a nonmandatory review is to put the request in writing and address it to the administrator at the level at which the case presently resides (regional campus, TIU, college, OAA). A faculty member who withdraws from a nonmandatory review continues at the rank they held at the start of the review.

The administrator at that level will notify all other relevant administrators.

5.8.1.2 Mandatory review

Revised: 12/18/13; 6/18/19, 8/15/21; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

A candidate who decides to withdraw from or decline to participate in a mandatory review is to put the request in writing and address it to the administrator at the level at which the case presently resides (regional campus, TIU, college, OAA). Probationary faculty who withdraw from or decline to participate in a mandatory fourth year review, tenure review, or promotion with tenure review are subject to the relevant standards of notice per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#). In such circumstances, the dean will inform the faculty member in writing of the following:

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

This action requires that [the Report of Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointment of Tenure-track, Clinical/Teaching/Practice, and Research Faculty](#) be submitted to OAA, along with a copy of the dean's letter to the faculty member, by June 1 of the year in which the decision to terminate the review occurs.

OAA will keep accurate records of such an action since, like a negative decision, it must be assessed before rehiring the individual in another track or unit (see [Faculty Appointments Policy](#)).

5.8.2 Negative decisions

Revised: 02/15/13, 8/15/21; 8/15/23

If the outcome of a nonmandatory review is negative, the candidate continues at the rank they held at the start of the review.

If an untenured candidate is denied tenure, they must be notified promptly of this decision and informed in writing that May 31 of the year following the mandatory review year is the last day of employment. The nonrenewal letter must be accompanied by a copy of the material on appeals (see [Faculty Appointments Policy](#)).

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

A negative decision usually precludes rehiring the individual, particularly in a new tenure-track faculty appointment (see [Faculty Appointments Policy](#)).

6.0 Dossier

Revised: 08/01/14; 5/15/20; 8/15/23

The full record of review will be maintained in Interfolio. Beginning with the 2023–2024 review cycle, no external forms will need to be generated outside of that system.

The Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank Tenure Reappointment (Cover Sheet: [Form 109](#)) gives administrators' recommendations with their signatures along with basic information on the faculty member's appointment and the review. It is the first page of the dossier and should be immediately visible when the file is opened. Nothing should be placed before the Cover Sheet.

The Dossier Checklist ([Form 105](#)) is placed second, immediately behind the Cover Sheet.

A single checklist is used to ensure that every dossier meets all requirements before moving to the next level of review. In four stages, the candidate, the TIU-level POD, the college-level POD, and a designated staff member in the college office will use the same checklist to examine the dossier and to ascertain its accuracy and completeness. The college will serve as the final guarantor of the integrity of every dossier before it is forwarded to OAA for the completion of the review process.

In colleges without departments (colleges that serve as the TIU for their faculty), the POD will fulfill the role of the TIU-level designee.

The dossier should not contain duplicative material. When in doubt, err in favor of including material only once.

Responsibility of the candidate:

- Criteria Used for Review (if not submitted, default will be the criteria in the APT document on the [OAA website](#))
- Part I. Introduction—education and professional positions, **biographical narrative**
- Part II. Core Dossier

Responsibility of the TIU and college:

- ~~Record of Review (Cover Sheet, [Form 109](#))~~
- ~~Dossier Checklist ([Form 105](#))~~
- Part III. Evaluation
- Part IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction
- Part V. Review Letters

6.1 Outline

Revised: 06/26/18; 07/05/18; 5/15/20, 8/15/21; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

~~Record of Review (Cover Sheet: [Form 109](#))~~

~~Dossier Checklist ([Form 105](#))~~

APT Document Used for Review (submitted only if the review does not follow the version on the [OAA website](#))

- I. Introduction
 - a. **Education and professional positions**
 - b. Biographical statement of candidate
- II. Core Dossier
- III. Evaluation
 - A. Internal Letters of Evaluation

1. TIU annual review letters, as required by dossier outline, are arranged in chronological order (oldest to newest); with a written explanation if the set is incomplete;
 1. for assistant professors, all annual review letters since start date;
 2. for associate professors, or hires with tenure, all annual review letters since previous promotion or start date not to exceed last 5 years.
2. Comments and responses submitted as part of annual reviews (including comments on fourth year review, if generated).
3. For assistant professors, Fourth Year (Sixth Year for tenure track faculty with significant clinical duties in the College of Medicine) Review letters to the probationary faculty member (including letters from the committee of eligible faculty, the TIU head, the college P&T committee, and the dean).
4. Additional letters requested by the candidate and solicited by the TIU head; these are optional and can include letters from collaborators (external or from other units at OSU); candidates with significant service/outreach activities outside the unit may request that the TIU solicit letters from colleagues familiar with the candidate's contributions to these activities.
5. Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc.) as required by APT document of TIU.

B. External Letters of Evaluation

- ~~1. Summary sheet of all evaluators from whom a letter was received (Form 114)~~
2. A representative sample of the request letters sent to evaluators with a list of materials shared if not included in the letter
3. Letters from at least five (5) external evaluators, consistent with list on summary sheet, with each letter preceded by a complete cover sheet (Form 106)

IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction

- A. Cumulative Report
- B. SEI Overview Report
- C. Summary of Open-Ended Student Evaluations

V. Review Letters

- A. Regional campus faculty deliberative body, if applicable
- B. Regional campus dean, if applicable
- C. TIU (college without departments) faculty deliberative body
- D. TIU head
- E. Head(s) of unit(s) in which the candidate has split FTE appointments, if applicable (including Discovery Theme appointments)
- F. TIU-level comments process letters or notation that the candidate declined to provide comments
- G. College (with departments) Promotion and Tenure Committee
- H. College dean
- I. College-level comments process letters or notation that the candidate declined to provide comments

6.1.1 Introduction

Revised: 04/01/07; 07/20/17; 5/15/20, 8/15/21; 8/15/23

A biographical statement can include a narrative description of the candidate's educational background, brief summaries of their teaching, research, and service efforts, and effort assignments (e.g., 40%

teaching, 40% research, 20% service). This statement is to be no longer than 750 words and may summarize information provided in greater detail in the core dossier.

List candidate's name and current appointment (including joint and Discovery Theme appointments as appropriate), degrees and professional positions held, with dates for each.

A CV should not be included in the introduction. If a TIU wishes to review a CV, one may be included in the scholarship folder in Interfolio.

6.1.2 Core dossier

Revised: 04/01/07

6.1.2.1 Instructions for the candidate

Revised: 04/01/12; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

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

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

Include every item in the Core Dossier Outline in the dossier. If a particular item is not applicable, or there is nothing to report, write "none" for the item. Do not omit the item.

If a candidate is unsure about the content needed for a particular item, they should consult their TIU head or chair of the committee of the eligible faculty for assistance.

Present accomplishments as succinctly as possible and in outline form to the extent possible. Some explanation is valuable, but lengthy narrative and explanation may obscure important accomplishments rather than highlight them. In general, narrative sections should be no longer than 750 words except where noted. Accomplishments may only be listed once in the dossier. Candidates should consult their TIU head or 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. The Cumulative Fixed-Response Survey Data section~~ should contain only summary tables of SEI (Student Evaluation of Instruction) data or the evaluation data approved by the candidate's college. The SEI Overview Report should be placed in ~~Section IV.B the Fixed-Response Student Evaluation Data section.~~

6.1.2.1.1 Instructions for the candidate—OAA Approved Electronic Dossier

Revised: 06/27/2017; 06/26/18; 6/18/19; 5/15/20, 8/15/21; 8/15/23

Tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty members undergoing promotion or promotion with tenure review or reappointment are expected to use the OAA approved electronic dossier to generate their core dossier. ~~Fourth year reviews, mandatory reviews, or reviews for promotion may use either VITA or a Word document that exactly matches the VITA format.~~

~~Candidates are strongly encouraged to use VITA.~~

6.1.2.2 Time frame

Revised: 07/14/17; 06/26/18; 06/18/19, 8/15/21; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

For the teaching and service sections of the core dossier, use the start date for probationary faculty; for tenured/non-probationary faculty use the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is most recent, for tenured/non-probationary faculty. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information from before the start date or last promotion or reappointment if they believe such information is relevant to the review. Where included, the candidate should clearly indicate what material is work completed since the start date or mandatory review, and what material is from prior to the start date or mandatory review.

For research/scholarship/discovery, use a full history of publications and creative work as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research and creative activity record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence.

For teaching, research and creative activity, and service, although information about activity in these areas conducted prior to the start date or last promotion may be included, it is the performance since the start date or date of last promotion or reappointment, whichever is most recent, that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

6.1.2.3 Organization

Revised: 02/15/12

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

6.1.2.4 Core dossier outline

Revised: 05/06/16; 07/15/17; 06/26/18; 6/18/19; 5/15/20, 8/15/21; 8/15/22

Teaching (see section 4.1.2.2 for timeframe of information to be included)

1) Undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses taught

In the Core Dossier, list each course taught and all clinical instruction, including the information noted below.

- courses taught by quarter (AU, WI, SP, SU), semester (AU, SP), summer session or term, and year
- course number, title, and number of credit hours
- official final course enrollment
- percentage of course taught by candidate based on proportion of total student contact hours in course
 - brief explanation (less than 250 words) of candidate's role, if candidate was not solely responsible for course, including GTA supervision, course management, and team teaching
- indicate whether formal course evaluations were completed by students and/or faculty peers by placing a check mark in the appropriate column

If the candidate has not obtained student evaluations in every regular classroom course, explain why this was not done. Such evaluation is required by [Faculty Rule 3335-3-35\(C\)\(14\)](#).

Do not include in this list extension, continuing education, or other non-credit courses.

2) Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations and undergraduate research for entire career at Ohio State

a) Graduate students—list completed and current students and include:

- i) doctoral students (dissertation advisor): for current advisees, list name of student, and year advising began. For students 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 (this should be listed in Service 6e);
- iii) doctoral students (candidacy examination committee chair);
- iv) doctoral students (candidacy examination committee member): do not include service as a Graduate School representative (this should be listed in Service 6e);
- 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): for advisees who have graduated, list name of student, year of graduation, and provide the current position of the former student, if known;
- vii) master's students (thesis committee member);
- viii) master's students (examination committee member).
- ix) residency candidates (who are not included above with other graduate students)
- x) clinical interns (who are not included above with other graduate students)

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. In this section only, candidates may have duplication; if they have co-authored work with a graduate student, they can list the citation in this section and in the research section.

c) Undergraduate research mentoring: for each student mentored, give name of student, title of thesis or project, quarter or semester of graduation, and noteworthy outcomes of this mentorship such as publications, presentations, honors or student awards.

d) Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of undergraduate students, in particular related to research, for whom the candidate has been the advisor of record (publications, posters, honors or student awards).

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

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

4) Extension, continuing education instruction (including DITL and STEP Mentoring [unless STEP Mentoring is listed under service]), and guest lectures. Summarize briefly the major instructional activities (workshops, non-credit courses) that the candidate has conducted. Identify the candidate's role in the instruction and the number of participants.

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

Give specific examples of the candidate's involvement in curriculum development (role in the design and implementation of new or revised courses); development of new teaching methods or materials (undergraduate, graduate, or professional); creation of new programs. This section may also include examples of teaching methods or materials adopted beyond Ohio State, presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences. Do not include information on presentations on pedagogy and teaching if this information is provided in the Research and Creative Activity section.

If Extension is a specified area of expectation for the candidate, include a description of the overall Extension program (curricular) goals, a brief description of the scope and sequence of instructional activities as they relate to the program (curricular) goals, the target audience(s), the candidate's role in the curriculum/program development, the role of others engaged in that curricular program, and a brief description of the impact of the curriculum.

- 6) Briefly describe the candidate's approach to and goals in teaching and student mentoring, major accomplishments (including positive impact of teaching and mentoring on students), and plans for the future in teaching and student mentoring (**should be** no longer than 750 words; do not quote student comments, which should be summarized by someone other than the candidate in Section IV.C.).

- 7) Evaluation of teaching

Briefly describe how the candidate has used evaluation information (e.g., student evaluations of instruction, peer evaluations of teaching, other feedback) to improve the quality of teaching and student mentoring (**should be** no more than 250 words). Candidates are not to summarize SEI data in this section, as it is provided in Sections IV.A. and IV.B.

- 8) Awards and formal recognition for teaching and mentoring

List awards the candidate has received for excellence in teaching and/or mentoring. Nominations for such awards should not be listed. This list may include citations from academic or professional units (department/school, college, university, professional associations) that have formal procedures and stated criteria for awards for outstanding teaching and/or mentoring performance.

- 9) Other academic advising or mentoring

Briefly describe academic advising of students not included in section 2 under teaching or section 7 under service. Examples might include advising or mentoring of undergraduate majors or of graduate students who are in course work, **as well as consistent informal mentoring**.

- 10) Completion of teaching development programs

List continuing education programs related to teaching (see timeframe in section 4.1.2.2 above). Include teaching endorsements, course design institutes, FIT mentoring, or workshops offered by the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning as well as other teaching development programs. Include the following:

- Name of the program or workshop
- Date completed
- Description of training
- Impact of training

Research and Creative Activity

Although all scholarly/creative works can be listed, clearly denote outcomes since appointment or last promotion at Ohio State.

1) List of books, articles, and other published papers.

Only papers and other scholarly works that have been formally accepted without qualification for publication or presentation, or have actually been published or presented, should be listed in Items 1a–1g below. Publication refers to both print and digital formats.

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

Works being drafted and not yet submitted may be discussed in the narrative section in Section 3 below.

Use the standard citation style for the candidate’s discipline with authors listed exactly as they are listed on the publication. Candidates must list themselves even if they are the only author.

In cases of multiple authorship for Items 1a–1e, a narrative description (approximately 50 words) of the candidate’s intellectual contribution and percentage of contribution are required. Examples of appropriate formats for this information include:

- I designed the experiment (which was carried out by the graduate student co-authors) and wrote the article (75% contribution).
- I identified the patients for the study, administered the drug regimen, reported results to the consortium, and reviewed the draft manuscript (25% contribution).
- I completed and wrote the literature review for the paper, shared equally with the co-author in the analysis and interpretation of the data, and reviewed the complete draft manuscript (50% contribution).

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

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

Include as separate categories:

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

- 1i) Papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer reviewed)
 - 1j) Unpublished scholarly presentations (indicate whether peer reviewed)
 - 1k) Potential publications under review (indicate authorship, date of submission, and to what journal or publisher the work has been submitted)
- 2) List of creative works pertinent to the candidate’s professional focus. (If the candidate has no creative works to list, write “None” for Section 2. Do not list each individual item below.)
- 2a) Artwork
 - 2b) Choreography
 - 2c) Collections
 - 2d) Compositions
 - 2e) Curated exhibits
 - 2f) Exhibited artwork
 - 2g) Inventions and patents, including disclosures, options, and commercial licenses
 - 2h) Moving images
 - 2i) Multimedia/databases/websites
 - 2j) Radio and television
 - 2k) Recitals and performances
 - 2l) Recordings
 - 2m) Other creative works

- 3) Brief description of the focus of the candidate’s research or creative work, major accomplishments, and plans for the future, including works in progress.

This section can also include a description of work that has not yet been submitted for publication, and should be no longer than 750 words. Although future plans may be included, works should be items that are in final edits/process. This section can also include a brief description of any trainings completed by the candidate to prepare for the submission of research funding.

- 4) Description of quality indicators of the candidate’s research, scholarly, or creative work such as citations; publication outlet quality indicators such as acceptance rates, ranking, or impact factors of journal or publisher; or other indicators of the impact of the candidate’s work. Individual units should determine what kinds of information could be described here. **Although VITA provides citation and impact factor tables, if these are not relevant metrics for the unit, they may be deleted.**
- 5) Research funding

In cases of multiple authorship for funded and proposed grants noted below, a narrative description (of the type described above for Item 1, approximately 50 words) of the candidate's intellectual contribution **to the grant proposal** 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 their contribution in relation to the total intellectual effort involved in the grant proposal if the unit or college requires this information.

5a) Funded research, including contracts and clinical trials, on which the candidate is or has been the principal investigator (i.e., lead investigator)

- period of funding
- source and amount of funding
- amount of funding allocated to the candidate
- whether funding is or was in the form of a contract or grant

5b) Funded research, including contracts and clinical trials, on which the candidate is or has been a co-investigator (i.e., not the lead investigator—includes co-principal investigator, co-investigator, collaborator, evaluator, etc.)

- period of funding
- source and amount of funding
- amount of funding allocated to the candidate
- whether funding is or was in the form of a contract or grant
- candidate's role

5c) **Funded research, including contracts and clinical trials, on which the candidate is or has been senior personnel**

- period of funding
- source and amount of funding
- amount of funding allocated to the candidate
- whether funding is or was in the form of a contract or grant
- candidate's role

5d) 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
- candidate's role

5e) Funded training grants on which the candidate is or has been the equivalent of the principal investigator

- date of submission
- title of project
- authors in the order listed on the proposal

- agency to which proposal was submitted
- priority score received by proposal, if applicable

5f) 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

5g) Any other funding received for the candidate's academic work. Provide the type of information requested below as appropriate.

- 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
- candidate's role

6) List of prizes and awards for research or creative activity. Nominations for such awards should not be listed.

Service and Engagement

- 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 and impact of service. List the organization in which office was held or service performed. Describe the nature of the organization (open or elected membership, honorary) and candidate's responsibilities.
- 3) List of consultation activity (industry, education, government). Give the time period in which consultation was provided, candidate's responsibilities, and other information as appropriate.
- 4) Clinical services. State specific clinical assignments.
- 5) Other professional/public community service or engagement directly related to the candidate's professional expertise, if not listed elsewhere. Community service not germane to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to P&T reviews.
- 6) Administrative service. Give dates and description of responsibility.
 - 6a) Unit committees
 - 6b) College or university committees
 - 6c) Initiatives undertaken to enhance diversity in the candidate's unit, college, or the university
 - 6d) Administrative positions held (e.g., graduate studies chair)

6e) Faculty peer mentoring

6f) Service as a graduate faculty representative on a **candidacy examination or** dissertation in another unit or university

7) Advisor to student groups and organizations

List the group or organization and specific responsibilities as advisor.

8) Office of Student Life committees

8a) List Office of Student Life committees on which the candidate has served.

8b) Summarize participation in Student Life programs such as fireside discussions, lectures to student groups outside the candidate's unit, addresses or participation at student orientation, and the Second-Year Transformational Experience Program (STEP) (unless listed under teaching).

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

10) Brief elaboration that provides additional information about service activities listed above.

This section can include a description of the candidate's service goals as well as the impact of the candidate's service and engagement to their profession, the community, and the university (**should be** no longer than 750 words).

6.1.3 Letters of evaluation

Revised: 04/01/07; 5/15/20

Only letters solicited by the TIU head, chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, or other authorized persons may be considered in the review process and/or included in the dossier.

All items in this section are to be placed in the order listed to ensure that necessary items are included and may be easily located during the review process.

~~Every item in Part III.A. is to be preceded by a colored divider noting the item that follows. These dividers can be found [here](#).~~

6.1.3.1 Internal letters of evaluation

Revised: 06/15/15; 07/15/17; 6/18/19, 8/15/21; 8/15/22; 8/15/23

1) Annual review letters:

- OAA has required written annual evaluations of all **tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty** compensated faculty since 1993. If annual review letters are lacking for any of the years specified below, a written explanation is required.
- For untenured candidates, include all annual review letters since start date; all fourth-year review letters are to be included here (**i.e., from the committee of eligible faculty, TIU head, committee of eligible faculty, dean**).

- For probationary clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty, include all annual review letters since start date.
 - For tenured candidates, include all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or start date with tenure, not to exceed the most recent five years.
 - For non-probationary clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty, include all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or date of last appointment **or reappointment**, not to exceed the most recent five years.
- 2) Written comments on the annual reviews (and fourth-year reviews for probationary tenure-track faculty): include any comments submitted by the candidate as part of an annual review and/or fourth-year review.
 - 3) Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching: include any letters or reports generated as part of peer evaluation. The material in this section must match requirements set forth in the TIU's APT document.

6.1.3.2 Additions

Revised: 12/18/13

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

6.1.3.3 External letters of evaluation

Revised: 04/01/07; 5/15/20, 8/15/21; 8/15/22

- 1) See [Letter 201](#) (tenure track and research faculty) and [Letter 203](#) (clinical/teaching/practice faculty) for sample letters to external evaluators.
- 2) Summary form for responding external reviewers (Summary Form for Responding External Evaluators, [Form 114](#)):
 - name and institution of all persons from whom letters were received
 - name of person who suggested each evaluator
 - the relationship of the evaluator to the candidate (expert in the field, professional colleague)
- 2) A single representative example of the **request** letters sent to the evaluators if these letters were identical. If different letters, or different sets of material for review, were sent, an example of each must be included along with an explanation of why evaluators were treated differently. If a simple invitation was sent, followed by more detailed instruction, include both letters.

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

- 3) At least five external letters preceded by a cover page (see External Evaluator Form, [Form 106](#)) for each letter received containing the following information:
- name, title (academic rank as appropriate), and institutional affiliation of the letter writer;
 - concise summary of the person’s qualifications as an evaluator of the candidate; sufficient information must be provided to establish the credibility of the evaluator; simply to note that the evaluator is a professor at university X or does research in the candidate’s area is insufficient; do not, however, include the full CV of each evaluator when forwarding the dossiers to OAA;
 - name of person who recommended the evaluator (candidate, chair, or other [specified]);
 - evaluator’s relationship to the candidate (expert in the field, professional colleague); this information must match information on [Form 114](#)) and in the evaluator’s letter; if a professional relationship is noted, the TIU must indicate whether they consider this a conflict of interest.

6.1.4 Student Evaluation of Instruction

Revised: 06/01/09

Only in individualized teaching situations for relatively small groups, such as grand rounds or clinical teaching, may individual evaluations (one per student) be included in this section. These responses may be summarized on a single form for each clinical teaching group, since numbers are small, but OAA does not require this.

6.1.4.1 Cumulative Report

Revised: 02/15/12; 5/15/20

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

Results for every term the course was taught are to be presented horizontally across the page in the summary table. The table should not simply list item numbers, but clearly describe the item to which students were responding. The table should be self-explanatory to anyone who reviews it.

To obtain a Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Report that meets OAA guidelines, click [here](#) for a menu of the Registrar’s online services. To access reports after summer 2018, follow the instructions for downloading all reports. To access reports from summer 2018 and earlier, follow the instructions in the section on “SEI Reports for Prior Terms.”

6.1.4.2 Fixed-response student evaluation data and/or SEI summary report

Revised: 02/15/12, 8/15/21; 8/15/22

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

- a) If the unit uses SEI instruments, include all individual course reports. Use start date for probationary faculty or date of last appointment, promotion, or last 5 years, whichever is shorter, for non-probationary faculty
- b) If the unit uses another type of fixed-response survey instrument, include here one page per course/quarter/semester taught, listing:

- actual statements to which students responded
- full rating scale of possible responses
- for each statement, number of students that selected each response choice

6.1.4.3 Summary of open-ended student evaluations

Revised: 04/01/07; 07/20/17; 5/15/20

Open-ended (discursive) evaluation: For all courses in which the candidate used open-ended evaluation instruments to collect student input (including open-ended questions on fixed-response evaluations if collected by the unit for this purpose), someone other than the candidate must summarize the comments on a course-by-course basis for inclusion in this section of the dossier. The TIU head will assign this task to a faculty member (not the candidate) or qualified staff member. State in the dossier the name and role (such as faculty member or staff member) of the person who wrote the summaries. OAA recommends that the candidate review these summaries prior to inclusion in the dossier.

Candidates for promotion to professor are to provide evaluations for the most recent five years, or date of last promotion **or reappointment**, whichever is most recent.

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

Do not include raw student comments in this section.

6.1.4.4 Appointment, Promotion, Tenure Internal Review Evaluation Responsibilities

Revised: 06/05/16; 07/14/17; 5/15/20; 8/15/22

- 1.1) Regional campus faculty deliberative body: detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record. The chair of the regional campus faculty deliberative body or the regional campus dean/director must explain the regional campus expectations against which the candidate is being assessed.
- 1.2) Regional campus dean/director: detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.
- 2.1) TIU faculty deliberative body: detailed assessment, to include:
 - thorough assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, and how they compare to the TIU's standards as described in the unit's APT; both strengths and weaknesses should be discussed
 - consideration of all materials related to joint appointments, including Discovery Theme appointments, if applicable, to include annual review letters provided by the joint appointment TIU head and Discovery Theme faculty lead, where appropriate
 - report of the discussion by the faculty deliberative body
 - numerical vote of the full faculty deliberative body and minimum vote required for a positive recommendation (included in 1st paragraph of letter)
- 2.2) TIU head (or deans in colleges without departments): independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses, including consideration of a candidate's joint appointment (including Discovery Theme appointments). This assessment should take into account the faculty deliberative body's recommendation. If the TIU head's assessment

and/or recommendation differs from that of the faculty, bases for differing judgments must be addressed.

- 2.3) Head of any unit in which the candidate holds a joint (split FTE) academic appointment, including Discovery Theme appointment: independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. It is the TIU head's responsibility to solicit this letter prior to the meeting of the TIU eligible faculty.
- 2.4) TIU-level comments process: include any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.
- 3.1) College P&T committee (in colleges with departments): independent assessment, to include a statement about how accurately the TIU deliberative body and TIU head followed stated TIU processes, and also to include the committee's numerical vote and recommendation to the dean. If the college committee's assessment is contrary to the TIU-level assessment, rationale for differing judgments must be addressed.
- 3.2) College dean (in colleges with departments): independent assessment and recommendation to the executive vice president and provost. If the dean's assessment and/or recommendation differs from any of the prior assessments or recommendations, rationale for differing judgments must be addressed.
- 3.3) College-level comments process: include any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

7.0 Procedures for clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty

Revised: 04/01/07; 5/18/19

All decisions regarding reappointment and non-reappointments are to follow the [Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment Policy](#).

Positive decisions by the dean to reappoint clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty to a new contract period will be approved by OAA without review and forwarded to the BOT for final action. For each positive decision, submit to OAA one original signed Cover Sheet ([Form 109](#), Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment). Do not submit reappointment letter, CV, or dossier.

A decision by the dean not to reappoint is final.

7.1 Clinical/teaching/practice faculty

Revised: 04/01/07; 5/18/19, 8/15/21

Clinical/teaching/practice faculty who have not collected and maintained the documentation necessary to support a fully informed evaluation should be informed that promotion will be considered only when sufficient documentation has been accumulated and assisted with understanding what information is required.

7.1.1 APT Document used for reappointment and promotion reviews

Revised: 03/01/15; 5/18/19

All clinical/teaching/practice faculty members being considered for reappointment or promotion typically will be reviewed using the unit's current APT document (as approved and posted on the [OAA website](#)).

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

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

7.1.2 Levels of review

Revised: 11/03/17; 08/15/22

All promotion cases will be reviewed at the same levels as tenure track faculty and will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for review.

7.1.3 Documentation of scholarship, teaching, and service

Revised: 04/01/07; 6/18/19

Complete documentation of scholarship, teaching, and service is required.

7.1.4 Documentation of research: external evaluation

Revised: 04/01/07; 3/40/18; 6/18/19; 5/15/20, 8/15/21; 8/15/23

External evaluations are optional for clinical/teaching/practice faculty for the dimensions of teaching or service. If scholarship research and creative activity are an expectation of the position, then external letters are required. If an insufficient body of work—research and creative activity exists to justify the efforts of external evaluators to review it, the candidate should not be reviewed.

External evaluations, when deemed necessary, must meet the criteria set forth in section 3.6 of this volume. Unless an exception has been approved by OAA, at least five unbiased external evaluations of the individual's research record are required. For a sample letter to an external evaluator, see [Letter 203](#).

The presence of research or creative activity in the dossier of a faculty member whose assignment consists solely of teaching and service does not create a need for external evaluation of research or creative activity. In such cases, evaluators can provide little useful information. However, in some cases, depending on the TIU's requirements for promotion, external evaluation of clinical/teaching/practice work, teaching (for clinical or practice faculty), and/or professional service may be appropriate.

7.2 Research faculty

Revised: 04/01/07, 8/15/21

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

7.2.1 APT Document used for reappointment and promotion reviews

Revised: 03/01/15; 08/15/22

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

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

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

7.2.2 Levels of review for promotion

Revised: 04/01/07; 08/15/22

All promotion cases will be reviewed at the same levels as tenure track faculty and will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for review.

7.2.3 Documentation of teaching and service

Revised: 04/01/07

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

7.2.4 Documentation of research: external evaluation

Revised: 04/01/07; 5/15/20

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

External evaluations must meet the criteria set forth in section 3.6 of this volume. At least five unbiased external evaluations of the individual's research record are normally required. For a sample letter to an external evaluator, see [Letter 201](#).

7.3 Non-reappointment notice

If a clinical/teaching/practice or research faculty member is not reappointed, they must be informed according to the relevant standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#).

8.0 Procedures for associated faculty

Revised: 12/18/13

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

8.1 APT Document used for reappointment at senior rank

Revised: 03/01/15

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

8.2 Levels of review

Revised: 04/01/07

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

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

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

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

8.3 Documentation of teaching and service

Revised: 07/15/17

8.3.1 Associated clinical faculty (faculty of practice)

Revised: 04/01/07; 5/18/19; 8/15/21

Documentation shall be specified by the academic unit as appropriate to its mission.

8.3.2 Associated faculty with tenure-track titles below 50% FTE and adjunct faculty

Revised: 04/01/07

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

8.3.3 Associated faculty—lecturers

Added: 08/15/22

Documentation shall be specified by the academic unit as appropriate to its mission.

8.4 Documentation of research: external evaluation

Revised: 07/24/12; 5/18/19; 5/15/20

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

9.0 Approved exceptions

Revised: 3/25/04; 5/15/20

OAA has approved certain exceptions to the P&T rules. Any exceptions to the P&T rules must be made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-6-09](#).

9.1 College of Medicine

Revised: 3/25/04

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

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

9.1.1 Department of Internal Medicine

Revised: 11/6/2017; 5/15/20

The Department of Internal Medicine may allow a P&T committee that is not a committee of all eligible faculty members to make recommendations to the TIU head regarding P&T cases.

9.1.2 Department of Pediatrics

Revised: 8/01/14

The Department of Pediatrics may allow a P&T committee that is not a committee of all eligible faculty members to make recommendations to the chair regarding P&T cases.

7.2 University Libraries

Revised: 3/25/04; 5/15/20

University Libraries may allow a P&T committee that is not a committee of all eligible faculty members to make recommendations to the dean regarding P&T cases.

9.2 Department of Extension in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

Revised: 3/25/04

The Department of Extension may allow a P&T committee that is not a committee of all eligible faculty members to make recommendations to the TIU head regarding P&T cases.