

Office of Academic Affairs

Procedures and Guidelines Handbook

Chapter 3: Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

1.0 TIMETABLE.....	4
1.1 SUBMISSION TO OAA	5
1.2 PUBLIC RECORDS ACT	5
1.3 REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR MID-ACADEMIC YEAR START DATES FOR PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK, CLINICAL/TEACHING/PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH FACULTY	5
2.0 TYPES OF REVIEWS	5
2.1 MANDATORY REVIEWS.....	5
2.1.1 EXTENSION OF THE TENURE CLOCK	6
2.1.2 BIRTH OF A CHILD OR ADOPTION OF A CHILD	7
2.1.3 ADVERSE EVENTS AND UNPAID LEAVES OF ABSENCE	7
2.1.4 COVID-19.....	8
2.1.5 PART-TIME FACULTY.....	8
2.2 NONMANDATORY REVIEWS	9
2.2.1 REQUESTING A NONMANDATORY REVIEW	9
3.0 ROLES AND PROCESS OVERVIEW	9
3.1 NOTIFICATION AND CONFIRMATION OF REVIEW AND TENURE CLOCK EXTENSIONS.....	9
3.2 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR REVIEWS	9
3.2.1 APT DOCUMENT USED FOR REVIEWS IN RESTRUCTURED TENURE INITIATING UNITS	10
3.3 CREATING THE INTRODUCTION AND CORE DOSSIER	10
3.3.1 TIME FRAME	11
3.4 BUILDING THE FULL DOSSIER.....	11
3.4.1 DOCUMENTATION	12
3.4.1.1 <i>Internal letters of evaluation</i>	12
3.4.1.2 <i>External letters of evaluation</i>	13
3.5 MANAGING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND OTHER RECUSALS.....	19
3.5.1 COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY, COLLEGE P&T COMMITTEES, AND UNIVERSITY P&T COMMITTEE.....	19
3.5.2 TIU HEADS AND DEANS	19
3.6 PROCEDURES OVERSIGHT DESIGNEE (POD) REVIEW	19
3.6.1 VERIFICATION OF CITATIONS	20
3.7 REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY	20

Office of Academic Affairs Procedures and Guidelines Handbook, September 2025

Chapter 3: Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

3.7.1 REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY DELIBERATIVE BODY.....	20
3.7.2 REGIONAL CAMPUS DEAN/DIRECTOR	20
3.7.3 REGIONAL CAMPUS COMMENTS PROCESS.....	20
3.8 TIU-LEVEL REVIEW	21
3.8.1 COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY	21
3.8.1.1 <i>Eligibility and quorum</i>	21
3.8.1.2 <i>Deliberation and vote</i>	21
3.8.2 TIU HEAD	22
3.8.3 TIU LEVEL COMMENTS PROCESS	22
3.9 COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEW	23
3.9.1 COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE	23
3.9.1.1 <i>Committee makeup</i>	23
3.9.1.2 <i>Deliberation and vote</i>	24
3.9.2 DEAN REVIEW	24
3.9.3 COLLEGE LEVEL COMMENTS PROCESS.....	24
3.10 UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE REVIEW	24
3.10.1 MEMBERSHIP	24
3.10.2 UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE PROCEDURES	24
3.11 OAA REVIEW.....	25
3.12 BOARD OF TRUSTEES FINAL DECISION.....	25
3.13 VOTING PROCEDURES	25
3.14 INTEGRITY OF REVIEW PROCEDURES	26
3.15 PROCESS DIFFERENCES FOR CLINICAL/TEACHING/PRACTICE, RESEARCH, AND ASSOCIATED FACULTY.....	27
3.15.1 LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR CLINICAL/TEACHING/PRACTICE AND RESEARCH FACULTY	27
3.15.2 NON-REAPPOINTMENT NOTICE FOR CLINICAL/TEACHING/PRACTICE AND RESEARCH FACULTY	27
3.15.3 LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR ASSOCIATED FACULTY	27
3.16 OAA APPROVED EXCEPTIONS	27
3.16.1 COLLEGE OF MEDICINE	27
3.16.1.1 <i>Department of Internal Medicine</i>	27
3.16.1.2 <i>Department of Pediatrics</i>	27
3.16.2 DEPARTMENT OF EXTENSION IN THE COLLEGE OF FOOD, AGRICULTURAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	28
3.17 LINKS TO FLOWCHARTS REFLECTING PROCESS	28
4.0 RECONSIDERATION OF MATERIALS DURING A REVIEW PROCESS.....	28
4.1 PROCEDURAL ERROR DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES.....	29
4.2 SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION	29
4.2.1 RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION	30

4.3 ONGOING INVESTIGATION OF A FACULTY CANDIDATE	30
5.0 WITHDRAWALS AND NEGATIVE DECISIONS.....	30
5.1 WITHDRAWALS	30
5.1.1 WITHDRAWALS FROM A NONMANDATORY REVIEW	31
5.1.2 WITHDRAWALS FROM A MANDATORY REVIEW	31
5.2 NEGATIVE DECISIONS	31
5.3 APPEALS OF NEGATIVE TENURE, PROMOTION, OR REAPPOINTMENT DECISIONS.....	32
6.0 RESOURCES FOR FACULTY BUILDING THE CORE DOSSIER	32
6.1 GENERATING THE CORE DOSSIER.....	32
6.2 GUIDANCE FOR WRITING NARRATIVES	32
6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOLARSHIP.....	33
7.0 GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION	33
7.1 USING THE CRITERIA IN THE APT DOCUMENT.....	33
7.2 STRATEGIES FOR EFFECTIVE EVALUATION.....	33

1.0 Timetable

Updated 09/2025

All colleges are encouraged to deliver dossiers to the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) as soon as the 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. If an individual case requires delayed submission, a request must be submitted to the vice provost for faculty affairs, with a copy to Bobbie Houser, OAA's HR Business Partner, with the reason for the delay and an indication of the anticipated delivery date. Without such authorization, no dossiers may be submitted beyond the published timetable.

Second Friday in January

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

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

Fourth Friday in January

Arts and Sciences

Second Friday in February

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

Fourth Friday in February

Medicine
Veterinary Medicine

1.1 Submission to OAA

Colleges submit all promotion and promotion with tenure dossiers to OAA via Interfolio. The college office will notify OAA's HR business partner when all dossiers have been released to OAA. See the [OAA Faculty Affairs Interfolio website](#) for more information.

1.2 Public Records Act

The [Ohio Public Records Act](#) (see *OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook*, Chapter 2, section 12.0 for more information on public records) requires that public records be made available upon request. All documents generated for P&T and reappointment 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. More information is available through the [Public Records Office](#) in the [Office of Compliance and Integrity](#).

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

All faculty starting within the same calendar year are in the same cohort for promotion, promotion with tenure, and reappointment reviews. For example, a tenure track faculty member starting in 2025 is in the 2025–2026 cohort and will come up for mandatory promotion and tenure review in 2030–31.

2.0 Types of reviews

2.1 Mandatory reviews

Updated 09/2025

Mandatory reviews for probationary tenure track faculty include annual reviews, fourth-year reviews, and sixth-year reviews. For clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty, reappointment reviews in the penultimate year of each contract are mandatory.

In accordance with [Faculty Rule 3335-6-09](#), for probationary tenure track faculty with substantial clinical service responsibilities in the College of Medicine, the following exceptions exist:

- The maximum probationary period for assistant professors is 11 years (rather than six) 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.

2.1.1 Extension of the tenure clock

Updated 09/2025

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may extend the probationary period, also referred to as “exclusion of time from the probationary period”. Under this rule, the maximum time that may be excluded from the probationary period is three years of service, except in extraordinary circumstances.

As stated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, an extension of the tenure clock (exclusion of time) from the probationary period in no way limits the right of the university to terminate a probationary appointment prior to the time of the mandatory review for promotion and tenure, should circumstances warrant such action.

Faculty seeking an extension of the tenure clock (exclusion of time) who have not yet completed their Fourth-year review may:

- Continue with their mandatory Fourth-year review in the originally scheduled year and move their mandatory tenure review by one year; or
- Move both their mandatory Fourth-year review and their mandatory tenure review by one year.

Faculty seeking an extension of the tenure clock (exclusion of time) who have completed their Fourth-year review will have their mandatory tenure review moved forward by one year.

An extension of the tenure clock (exclusion of time) results in a revised mandatory review year for promotion and tenure. A faculty member who has had time excluded from the probationary period may undergo promotion and tenure review prior to the revised mandatory review year, should the unit faculty judge such a review to be appropriate (see information on seeking a nonmandatory review in section 2.2.1 of this document). The faculty member may request a nonmandatory promotion and tenure review following the procedures outlined in each unit’s Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document. Such action is at the discretion of the unit faculty, not the probationary faculty member. Once a Fourth-year review has been moved (option 2 above), it cannot be moved back. However, a Fourth-year review and a nonmandatory promotion and tenure review can occur simultaneously.

A negative decision resulting from a promotion and tenure review occurring prior to the revised mandatory review year (i.e., a nonmandatory review) will not result in nonrenewal of the

probationary appointment. The faculty member still has the option of undergoing promotion and tenure review in the revised mandatory review year.

Requests are to be made on the relevant form (see sections 2.1.2 through 2.1.4 for links to the forms) with supplemental information where relevant. The completed materials are to be submitted via DocuSign to the vice provost for faculty affairs. With the exception of the COVID-19 extension, all requests must be made within one year of the relevant event. In all cases, requests are to be made by April 1 of the mandatory review year (i.e., April 1, 2026 for a review occurring in Autumn 2026).

Annually, every unit should remind its continuing probationary faculty of this rule. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended.

2.1.2 Birth of a child or adoption of a child

Updated 09/2025

The Notification of Birth or Adoption of Child Form (Form 111) is used to inform the university that a probationary tenure-track faculty member has given birth to or adopted a child while employed at Ohio State so that their tenure clock may be extended by one year. This request will be automatically approved by their TIU head, dean, and OAA.

2.1.3 Adverse events and unpaid leaves of absence

The Request for Exclusion of Service Time from Tenure Probationary Period Form (Form 112) is used to request an exclusion of time for an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the duties associated with being a successful faculty member (see Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(D)(1)(b)). In addition to the form, the following items are required:

- TIU eligible faculty committee review;
- documentation of the adverse event leading to the request including, if not self-evident, why the adverse event was beyond the faculty member's control, and how it interfered with productivity; and
- documentation of the faculty member's productivity to date (usually a CV).

The adverse event providing the basis for the request must be clearly beyond the experience of most probationary faculty. For example, most faculty who conduct laboratory-based research must purchase equipment, obtain various kinds of approvals (e.g., drug licenses or animal research protocols), and obtain funding before they can begin their research. To the extent that such delays are normal, they do not constitute a basis for an extension of the tenure clock (exclusion of time) from the probationary period.

Form 112 is also used to request exclusion of time because of personal illness or care of a seriously ill or injured person (see Faculty Rule [3335-6-03\(D\)\(1\)\(b\)](#)). In addition to the form, the following items are required:

- TIU head review;
- Documentation deemed necessary by Ohio State's Office of Human Resources and the TIU head;
- Documentation of the faculty member's productivity to date (usually a CV).

2.1.4 COVID-19

Probationary tenure-track faculty who were in their probationary period during Spring 2020, Summer 2020, Autumn 2020, or Spring 2021 may use the [Automatic Notification of Extension of Tenure Clock due to COVID-19 form \(Form 116\)](#) to request a one-year extension of the tenure clock (exclusion of time) from their probationary period. This request will be automatically approved by their TIU head, dean, and OAA.

2.1.5 Part-time faculty

Probationary tenure-track faculty whose appointment is less than full-time (but 50% FTE or greater) may request an extension of the tenure clock (exclusion of time) from the probationary period in accordance with [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 \(D\)\(1\)\(c\)](#). The exclusion shall be for an integral number of years based on the principle that the usual probationary period represents full-time service. The maximum permissible exclusion under this paragraph is one year for a probationary instructor, three years for a probationary assistant professor (including time spent at the rank of instructor), and two years for a probationary associate professor in advance of tenure.

OAA policy does not approve exclusions in advance. During the second year of a faculty member's reduced appointment, OAA will approve an exclusion of one year, for example, in recognition of two years of service at 50% FTE. At the appropriate time, the TIU head forwards a letter via DocuSign requesting approval of the exclusion to the dean and then OAA.

The TIU head's letter to the dean should state all relevant information (the amount of the reduction, when it will take effect, and whether it is permanent or temporary). For probationary tenure-track faculty, the letter should include a projected revision of the review schedule and projected year in which the adjusted "Fourth-Year" review would fall, if the Fourth-Year Review has not already occurred.

For additional information on reduction of FTE, see the [Faculty Appointments, Tenure, and Retrenchment Policy](#).

2.2 Nonmandatory Reviews

Nonmandatory reviews are all reviews that are not required to occur on a particular timeline. Examples include nonmandatory promotion and nonmandatory promotion and tenure reviews.

2.2.1 Requesting a Nonmandatory Review

Updated 09/2025

Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(3) indicates that a faculty member may request a nonmandatory review at any time and that the tenure initiating unit may deny a nonmandatory review. A probationary faculty member may be denied a nonmandatory review every year up to the mandatory review year. A non-probationary faculty member may be denied a nonmandatory review only once. If the review is allowed and the outcome is negative, the faculty member continues at the rank they held at the start of the review.

Once a request has been made by the faculty member, the tenure initiating unit is to follow the process detailed in the unit's APT document. If a formal review is denied, it is best practice to provide the candidate with written feedback identifying the reason for the denial and areas for improvement. It is reasonable and appropriate for a unit to deny a formal nonmandatory review if the candidate has not collected and/or maintained the documentation necessary to support a fully informed evaluation.

A description of the nonmandatory review process is provided in the [Steps for Seeking a Nonmandatory Review](#) document.

3.0 Roles and process overview

3.1 Notification and confirmation of review and tenure clock extensions

Following the procedures documented in the APT document, each unit is to notify faculty members of the opportunity for nonmandatory review, notify all candidates scheduled for mandatory review of timeline and process, and remind mandatory review candidates of their opportunity to seek a tenure clock extension (exclusion of time). In all cases, a timeline (with due dates) as well as resources related to process, are to be shared by the unit with all candidates for promotion with tenure, promotion, and/or reappointment.

3.2 APT document used for reviews

Faculty members undergoing mandatory or nonmandatory reviews are typically reviewed using the unit's currently approved APT document, which is posted on the [OAA website](#).

Tenure-track faculty members 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.

Clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty members 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.

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

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, whichever is more recent, 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 previous APT document is used for a review, only the criteria for evaluation from the earlier document are to be used. All processes and procedures for the review are to align with the currently approved APT document, regardless of whether a previous or current APT document is being used to define criteria for evaluation.

3.2.1 APT document used for reviews in restructured tenure initiating units

Unless otherwise articulated 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 (i) under the APT document in effect on their start date, or (ii) on the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent; or (iii) under the currently approved 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 currently approved 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.

3.3 Creating the introduction and core dossier

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, which may be created using either the Faculty Activity Reporting module in Interfolio or manually using this outline and instructions. In Interfolio, the introduction is maintained in the section called Profile and the core dossier is generated from the Activities section.

Tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty members undergoing promotion, promotion with tenure, or probationary reappointment review are expected to use the OAA approved core dossier (as described above). Clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty

members undergoing nonprobationary reappointment and associated faculty seeking reappointment are to provide the documentation outlined in the unit's APT document.

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 as specified in the letter of offer or annual review letter) to conduct an informed review.

TIUs are not to start formal consideration of a case until the core dossier meets all requirements. Errors in documentation found at a later stage of review often require correction and a relaunch of the review.

3.3.1 Time frame

Updated 09/2025

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. 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.

The review date is the date on which the candidate submitted their materials for review. For example, if a faculty member submitted their materials for review in September, their next review would consider materials added since September of the review year, rather than May, when the final decision on their review is rendered.

Although information about activity in areas conducted prior to the start date or last promotion may be included in the core dossier, 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 evaluation.

3.4 Building the full dossier

TIUs are not to start formal consideration of a case until the completed dossier meets all requirements. All parts of the dossier are to be included before the case moves forward to the committee of eligible faculty for review and must include the following items: introduction, core dossier, annual review letters, fourth year review (if applicable), letters requested by the candidate, an evaluation letter from any heads of joint appointments, peer evaluations, external evaluation letters, and student evaluation of instruction. Errors in documentation found at a later stage of review often require correction and a relaunch of the review. Affirmation by the POD that the dossier is complete is required before the committee of eligible faculty begins its

formal review. This affirmation will occur in Interfolio, and the case will not move forward until this step has been completed.

3.4.1 Documentation

The following sections describe the additional documentation that makes up the remainder of the dossier.

3.4.1.1 Internal letters of evaluation

3.4.1.1.1 TIU annual review letters

OAA has required written annual evaluations of all compensated faculty since 1993. Annual review letters from the TIU head are to be arranged in chronological order (oldest to newest). If any required annual reviews are not available, the TIU is to provide a written explanation. For probationary faculty, include all annual reviews since the start date. For non-probationary faculty, or hires with tenure, include all annual reviews since the previous promotion, start date, or date of last appointment or reappointment, not to exceed the last five years.

For all annual review letters, include any comments provided by the candidate to a given letter and any responses given by the TIU head. Comments and responses are to be included with the specific letter being commented on.

3.4.1.1.2 Fourth year review (tenure track assistant professors only)

Updated 09/2025

For tenure track assistant professors, include the letters generated as part of the Fourth Year Review (Sixth Year for tenure track faculty with significant clinical duties in the College of Medicine), including letters from the committee of eligible faculty, the TIU head, the college P&T committee, and the dean as well as any comments provided by the candidate in response to any of those letters.

3.4.1.1.3 Additional letters requested by the candidate and solicited by the TIU head

The candidate may request optional letters be solicited by the TIU head. They can include letters from internal or external collaborators. For example, 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. Letters solicited from external collaborators are not counted towards the five required external letters of evaluation.

3.4.1.1.4 Evaluation letter from joint appointment

The TIU head in any unit in which the candidate holds a joint academic appointment (split FTE) or the faculty director in which the candidate holds a Discovery Theme appointment is to provide an independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses, relative to the expectations of that unit. It is the TIU head's responsibility to solicit this letter prior to the meeting of the TIU eligible faculty. The TIU eligible faculty are not to start formal consideration of a case until such a letter is received and included in the dossier.

3.4.1.1.5 Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching

Include any letters or reports generated as part of peer evaluation of teaching. The material in this section must match requirements set forth in the TIU's APT document.

3.4.1.1.6 Additional information

Units may add materials required in their APT documents to the internal evaluations section, placing them in the Additional Letters section. 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 transdisciplinary 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.

3.4.1.2 External letters of evaluation

3.4.1.2.1 Required external letters of evaluation for tenure track and research faculty

Updated 09/2025

Except under the special circumstances described below, OAA requires a minimum of five external evaluation letters for all promotion with tenure reviews, and promotion reviews for tenure track and research faculty. External evaluation letters should come from faculty working in the five to ten peer programs and the five to ten aspirational peer programs listed in the TIU APT.

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. If 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. (This documentation is NOT to be included in the dossier but is to be maintained in the college.) 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.

For nonmandatory reviews, external evaluations should not be sought before determining that all required documentation is available. 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, or if the TIU has not conducted peer evaluation of teaching as required by the unit's APT document.

Although substantive missing documentation is grounds for a negative decision, mandatory reviews must proceed even when documentation is missing and unobtainable. As such, external evaluations should be sought on the timeline set forth by the TIU.

If external evaluations are sought through Interfolio, only the summary list of evaluators is to be submitted (Summary Form for Responding External Evaluators, [Form 114](#)).

If external letters are sought outside of Interfolio, in addition to Form 114, a single representative example of the request letter sent to the evaluators (if these letters were identical) is to be submitted. 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. Additionally, each external evaluation letter is to be preceded by a cover page (see External Evaluator Form, [Form 106](#)).

3.4.1.2.2 Required external letters of evaluation for clinical/teaching/practice and associated faculty

External evaluations are optional for clinical/teaching/practice faculty for the dimensions of teaching or service. External evaluations are also optional for associated faculty. If research and creative activity are an expectation of the position, then external letters are required. If research and creative activity are an expectation of the position, a sufficient body of research and creative expression must exist to justify the efforts of external evaluators. In the absence of a sufficient body of work, the candidate should not be reviewed.

External evaluations, when deemed necessary, must meet the criteria set forth in section 3.4.1.2.1 of this chapter. Unless an exception has been approved by OAA, at least five unbiased external evaluations of the individual's research record are required. External evaluation letters should come from faculty working in the five to ten peer programs and the five to ten aspirational peer programs listed in the TIU APT.

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.

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 or associated faculty member's work—teaching (for associated, clinical, or practice faculty), and/or professional service—may be appropriate.

3.4.1.2.3 Seeking external letters of evaluation

Updated 09/2025

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. Letters may also be recruited and submitted via Interfolio.

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. Should an external evaluator contact the faculty member directly, the faculty member should share the communication with the TIU head and not respond to the initial communication from the evaluator. 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.

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 strongly encouraged.

- Letters from external evaluators should assess the work of the candidate under review. As the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary 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 as to the focus of the evaluation they are seeking, and committees are encouraged to share with evaluators the relevant section of the unit's 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 qualified 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. 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. The review by the candidate must occur before letters of invitation are sent to prospective evaluators.
- 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. However, 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. 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 "Additional letters requested by the candidate and solicited by the TIU head" section.
- 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.

3.4.1.3 Student evaluation of instruction

Updated 09/2025

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.

Candidates under mandatory review are to include evaluations for all courses taught since start date. Candidates under nonmandatory review are to provide evaluations for the most recent five years, or date of last promotion or reappointment, whichever is most recent.

3.4.1.3.1 Cumulative report

Updated 09/2025

With the adoption of the Survey of the Student Learning Experience (2025) in Autumn 2025, candidates may have reports from both the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) and the SSLE. Within the relevant timeframe, reports from both tools are to be submitted for evaluation. Complete documentation as described below is required.

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."

To obtain and SSLE Overview Report that meet OAA guidelines, click [here](#) for a menu of the Registrar's online services.

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

Updated 09/2025

Copies of individual course response student evaluation reports are to be placed in this section.

- a) If the unit used SEI instruments, include all individual course reports. For probationary faculty, use start date; for non-probationary faculty use date of last appointment, promotion, or last 5 years, whichever is more recent.
- b) Beginning in Autumn 2025, include all SSLE Detailed Reports.
- c) 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

3.4.1.3.3 Summary of open-ended student evaluations

Updated 09/2025

For all courses in which the candidate used an open-ended evaluation instrument to collect student input (including open-ended questions on fixed-response evaluations if collected by the unit for this purpose), an aggregate summary must either use an approved AI/Machine learning application or be compiled by an individual other than the faculty member. OAA strongly recommends using an approved AI/Machine learning application.

If not using an approved AI/Machine learning application, 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.

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

Do not simply quote the comments from students in this section.

3.5 Managing conflicts of interest and other recusals

3.5.1 Committee of eligible faculty, college P&T committees, and university P&T committee

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 or providing compensation of any kind, such as money, goods, or services), is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, or is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional activities. Finally, any other relationship or circumstance that would prevent a sound, objective, and unbiased decision will likewise constitute a conflict of interest.

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.

3.5.2 TIU heads and deans

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

3.6 Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) review

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 each review is 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](#).

3.6.1 Verification of citations

One of the first responsibilities of the POD at the TIU level is to verify the accuracy of all published and creative works listed in the dossier. 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.

The verification of citations is to be completed before the dossier is released for evaluation and review by the larger faculty body.

3.7 Regional campus faculty

3.7.1 Regional campus faculty deliberative body

For faculty candidates on a regional campus, the faculty deliberative body is to conduct a detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service and provide recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record. The chair of the regional campus faculty deliberative body must explain the regional campus expectations against which the candidate is being assessed.

3.7.2 Regional campus dean/director

For faculty candidates on a regional campus, the dean/director is to conduct a detailed and independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service and provide recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.

3.7.3 Regional campus comments process

Updated 09/2025

After the letter from the regional campus faculty deliberative body to the regional campus dean/director and the letter from the regional campus dean/director head are completed, the dean/director must immediately inform the candidate of the following through Interfolio:

- Nature of the recommendations by the regional campus deliberative body and by the regional campus dean/director.
- Availability of the regional campus deliberative body's letter to the regional campus dean/director and the regional campus dean/director's letter in Interfolio.
- Opportunity, 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 TIU. 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. 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.
- If the candidate provides comments, the regional campus faculty deliberative body and/or regional campus dean/director must have the opportunity to provide a written response to the candidate's comments to be included in the dossier moving forward.
- Outline of the remaining steps in the review process (review and recommendations by the TIU committee of eligible faculty, the TIU head, the college, and university, and approval by the president and the BOT of positive recommendations by the executive vice president and provost).

A response from the regional campus faculty deliberative body and/or regional campus dean/director may be provided if the candidate contests the original review and must be provided if the candidate alleges procedural errors that might reasonably have affected the review's outcome. Any response to the candidate is to be included in the dossier.

3.8 TIU-level review

3.8.1 Committee of eligible faculty

3.8.1.1 Eligibility and quorum

Members of the committee of eligible faculty are determined by the APT document for each unit as defined in Section III.A. Definitions. A quorum of eligible members must be met before a deliberation or vote on the case can take place. The required quorum for each unit is indicated in the unit's APT document in Section III.C Quorum.

3.8.1.2 Deliberation and vote

Updated 09/2025

The TIU committee of eligible faculty is to provide a detailed assessment including each of the following:

- a thorough assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, research and creative activity, and service, as applicable, and how they compare to the TIU's standards as described in the unit's APT document—both strengths and weaknesses should be discussed;
- consideration of all materials related to regional campus appointments, to include the letters provided by the regional campus faculty deliberative body and the regional campus dean/director;
- 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 committee of eligible faculty;
- numerical vote of the full committee of eligible faculty and minimum vote required for a positive recommendation (included in 1st paragraph of letter)—see voting procedures below in section 3.13.

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

3.8.2 TIU head

Updated 09/2025

The TIU head is to conduct an independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses, including consideration of a candidate's appointment to a regional campus and/or joint appointment (including Discovery Theme appointments). This assessment should take into account the faculty deliberative body's recommendation as well as the recommendations from the regional campus faculty deliberative body and regional campus dean/director, as applicable. If the TIU head's assessment and/or recommendation differs from that of the faculty, bases for differing judgments must be addressed.

3.8.3 TIU level comments process

Updated 09/2025

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.
- 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 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. 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.
- If the candidate provides comments, the TIU deliberative body and the TIU head must have the opportunity to respond. Written response(s) from the TIU deliberative body and/or the TIU head are to be included in the dossier and 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 may provide a written response to comments by the candidate contesting the original review and must provide a response to comments by the candidate 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.

3.9 College-level review

3.9.1 College promotion and tenure committee

3.9.1.1 Committee makeup

In colleges with departments and schools, the process for identifying members of the college promotion and tenure committee is stated in the POA document for each college (see Section VII.C. College Administration). No member of the candidate's TIU may participate in the deliberation of their case at the college level.

3.9.1.2 Deliberation and vote

The college promotion and tenure committee is to conduct an independent assessment. This assessment is to include a statement about how accurately the TIU deliberative body and TIU head followed stated TIU processes, as well as the committee's numerical vote and recommendation to the dean. If the college committee's assessment is contrary to the TIU-level assessment, the rationale for differing judgments must be addressed.

3.9.2 Dean review

The college dean is to conduct an independent assessment and provide a 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.

3.9.3 College level comments process

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 immediately 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 may provide a written response to comments by the candidate contesting the original review and must provide a written response to comments by the candidate alleging procedural errors that might reasonably have affected the review's outcome. Any response to the candidate is to be included in the dossier.

3.10 University promotion and tenure committee review

3.10.1 Membership

The university promotion and tenure 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 faculty affairs serves as the non-voting convener of the committee.

3.10.2 University promotion and tenure committee procedures

The university promotion and tenure 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.

In the case of candidates with positive recommendations from University Libraries or from colleges without departments, a three-member panel reviews each case and makes a recommendation to the vice provost for faculty affairs. If all panel members are in positive agreement, a positive recommendation is moved forward from OAA.

For all other cases brought to the committee, the full 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 faculty affairs prepares a written report of the committee's assessment and vote for inclusion in the dossier.

3.11 OAA Review

OAA reviews all dossiers forwarded for consideration for promotion, promotion with tenure, reappointment, and fourth year reviews from colleges that are the TIU.

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.

3.12 Board of Trustees final decision

All positive recommendations for promotion, promotion with tenure, and reappointment are sent to the Board of Trustees for final decision.

3.13 Voting Procedures

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. 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. 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).

3.14 Integrity of review procedures

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 3.2 above). The POD is to monitor the review process in respect to equitable treatment for all candidates under review, with special attention to candidates from underrepresented groups, 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.

Although the POD has a primary responsibility ensuring a fair review, it is the responsibility of all members of the eligible faculty to ensure the evaluation process is conducted in a highly professional manner. This includes maintaining confidentiality of the discussion—the record of the deliberation of the eligible faculty is the letter generated by that body.

3.15 Process differences for clinical/teaching/practice, research, and associated faculty

3.15.1 Levels of review for clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty

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

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.

A decision by the dean not to reappoint is final.

3.15.2 Non-reappointment notice for clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty

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.

3.15.3 Levels of review for associated faculty

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.

3.16 OAA approved exceptions

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.

3.16.1 College of Medicine

3.16.1.1 Department of Internal Medicine

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.

3.16.1.2 Department of Pediatrics

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.

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

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.

3.17 Links to flowcharts reflecting process

Updated 09/2025

This document illustrates the process flow for the following review types.

- Pre-submission workflow
- Columbus campus tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty in colleges with TIUs promotion process
- Regional campus tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty in colleges with TIUs promotion process
- Columbus campus tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty with joint appointments in colleges with TIUs promotion process
- Regional campus tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty with joint appointments in colleges with TIUs promotion process
- Columbus campus tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty in colleges that are the TIU promotion process
- Regional campus tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty in colleges that are the TIU promotion process
- Columbus campus tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty with joint appointments in colleges that are the TIU promotion process
- Regional campus tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty with joint appointments in colleges that are the TIU promotion process

4.0 Reconsideration of materials during a review process

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 required before an administrator or faculty review body initiates a reconsideration of a case.

A candidate may raise issues about the review process during the review, through the comments process provided for in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04. When appropriate, these issues should be addressed at the time they are raised. The TIU head may wish to consult with the

dean and/or the vice provost for faculty affairs regarding the best way(s) to address a particular issue.

4.1 Procedural error description and procedures

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.

4.2 Significant new information

Updated 09/2025

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 that may alter the outcome of the review. 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 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.

Should significant new information become available about a candidate that may negatively impact the recommendation from the unit, the vice provost for faculty affairs must be contacted to determine whether and how that information may or may not be included. Where the significant new information arises from allegations of misconduct, the vice provost for faculty affairs will be notified but not tasked to make a decision on its relevance; rather, the allegation will be directed to the appropriate review body: the procedures described in section 4.3 will be followed.

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.

4.2.1 Recommended procedures for significant new information

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 original 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 original reports will then be amended to reflect the content of the reconsideration and the new vote.

4.3 Ongoing investigation of a faculty candidate

Updated 09/2025

Should a faculty candidate be under investigation by the Civil Rights Compliance Office (CRCO), the Office of Human Resources, the Office of Research Compliance, the Office of University Compliance and Integrity, or in the midst of a review of misconduct under University Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 while a promotion with tenure, promotion, and/or reappointment evaluation is underway, the case will proceed through the outlined steps to OAA. Once the case is received by OAA, following review by the regional campus faculty and dean/director (if applicable), CEF, chair/director, college, and dean, it will be held until the investigation is completed. The executive vice president and provost will make the final decision on promotion with tenure, promotion, and/or reappointment using the materials that have been submitted through the full P&T evaluation and any reports generated from the investigation. Candidates will be informed at each stage of the process to ensure transparency.

5.0 Withdrawals and negative decisions

5.1 Withdrawals

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.

5.1.1 Withdrawals from a nonmandatory review

When a faculty member withdraws from a nonmandatory review, the withdrawal is noted in the case in Interfolio. 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.

5.1.2 Withdrawals from a mandatory review

A candidate who decides to withdraw from or declines 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).

5.2 Negative decisions

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](#)).

5.3 Appeals of negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decisions

Section 1.0 in chapter 4: Appeals and Complaints Procedures, outlines the process for appealing a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

6.0 Resources for faculty building the core dossier

6.1 Generating the core dossier

Information on using Faculty Activity Reporting in Interfolio is available on the [Faculty Affairs website](#).

Faculty are strongly encouraged to keep documentation to support the contents of the core dossier. There is no need to maintain a hard copy record; a digital record is sufficient.

Examples of documentation include, but is not limited, to the following:

Teaching: SEI reports (including comments), peer evaluations of instruction, course syllabi for courses taught, records of program development.

Research and creative activity: communication related to manuscripts under review or in press, communication related to funded grants that haven't yet been awarded, conference programs, art installations, creative works and performances.

Service: communication related to ongoing or completed service, documentation of roles and responsibilities of service commitments.

6.2 Guidance for writing narratives

OAA offers [guidance](#) on writing the narratives that accompany the lists of evidence provided in the core dossier. This "[Telling Your Story](#)" workshop is offered once per year in an in-person workshop as well as through an asynchronous online course.

6.3 Recommendations related to interdisciplinary scholarship

This document provides tips and recommendations for creating an interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary core dossier. Additional recommendations on building a description of one's inter- or trans-disciplinary work is provided in the online wokshop "Telling Your Story" offered by OAA.

7.0 Guidelines for evaluation

7.1 Using the criteria in the APT document

It is important that each case be evaluated on its own merits against the criteria set forth in the unit's APT document. To ensure that each case is being judged against those criteria, OAA strongly encourages the P&T committee chair or POD to read aloud the criteria in the unit's APT document for each case it is adjudicating, even if the same action is being considered (e.g., promotion to professor). Committee members are strongly encouraged to review those criteria before reviewing the case in preparation for the meeting. For cases of joint appointments (including Discovery Theme positions), the P&T committee needs to consider the criteria for scholarship achievement in the joint TIU or Discovery Theme unit, in proportion to the candidate's appointment distribution.

7.2 Strategies for effective evaluation

The Best Practices in Faculty Evaluation document provides an overview of assumptions made and strategies to overcome those assumptions when evaluating a candidate's dossier. OAA encourages all committees of eligible faculty to review these practices prior to reviewing their colleagues' cases.