

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Procedures and Guidelines Handbook



THE OHIO STATE
UNIVERSITY

Chapters

Introduction	3
Chapter 2: Unit Administration	10
Chapter 3: Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment	37
Chapter 4: Appeals and Complaint Procedures	68
Chapter 5: Office of Academic Affairs Administration	80
Chapter 6: Faculty Awards and Recognition	89
Chapter 7: Faculty Development	91

Introduction

Revisions.....	4
Rules of the University Faculty	4
Common abbreviations used in this document.....	4

This handbook contains the faculty and academic unit procedures promulgated by the Office of Academic Affairs. It is an accompaniment to the OAA policies available through the [Office of University Compliance and Integrity](#) and posted on the OAA Policies, Guidelines, and [Forms](#) website. It is updated annually or in response to a change to [the Rules of the University Faculty](#) or the [Bylaws of the Board of Trustees](#).

Revisions

Each section includes the dates the last time the section was revised. The structure of the handbook was revised significantly in autumn 2024, and all revision dates were reset. The 2023 version of the handbook is archived on the Faculty Affairs website.

Rules of the University Faculty

When referring the reader to specific language in the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), this handbook will link to the index housed on the [Ohio State Board of Trustees](#) website and provide the chapter and section numbers that will allow the reader to find the specific reference.

Common abbreviations used in this document

ACE: American Council on Education	OFA: Office of Faculty Affairs
APT: Appointments, promotion, and tenure	OHR: Office of Human Resources
BOT: Board of Trustees	OIE: Office of Institutional Equity
CAFR: Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility	P&T: Promotion and Tenure
CEF Committee of Eligible Faculty	POA: Pattern of Administration
FAR: Faculty Activity Reporting	POD: Procedures Oversight Designee
FERPA: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act	RPT: Review, Promotion, and Tenure
FPL: Faculty Professional Leave	SA: Special Assignment
FTE: Full Time Equivalent	SEI: Student Evaluation of Instruction
IUC: Inter-University Council	SHIFT: Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent
LOA: Leave of Absence	TIU: Tenure-Initiating Unit
OAA: Office of Academic Affairs	

Chapter 1: Governance Documents

1.0 Governance Documents	6
1.0 Pattern of administration.....	6
1.0.1 Departments and Schools (hereafter, TIUs) and Colleges	6
1.0.2 Regional Campuses.....	6
1.0.3 Required POA Outlines.....	7
2.0 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document	7
2.0.1 Departments and Schools and Colleges	7
2.0.2 Regional Campuses.....	8
2.0.3 Required APT Outlines	8
3.0 Updating obsolete material in TIU governance documents	8

1.0 Governance Documents

As described in the sections below, every unit is expected to maintain a pattern of administration (POA) and an appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) document. The POA document describes the administration of the unit, including the unit's mission, the faculty's rights and responsibilities, organization of services and staff, decision-making guidelines, roles and composition of committees, the unit's administration, and faculty workload guideline, among others. The APT document describes the procedures for appointments and promotion, including the makeup and responsibilities of the committee of eligible faculty, the unit's criteria for appointment and promotion, and the procedures for candidates seeking promotion.

All approved governance documents are maintained on the [OAA Faculty Affairs Governance Documents web page](#).

1.0 Pattern of administration

1.0.1 Departments and Schools (hereafter, TIUs) and Colleges

[Faculty Rule 3335-3-35](#) requires chairs of departments and directors of schools (hereafter, TIU heads) to develop a POA document in consultation with their TIU faculty. Similarly, [Faculty Rule 3335-3-29](#) requires college deans to develop a POA document in consultation with their college faculty. Both Rules provide guidance about minimum POA content. Neither Rule requires formal faculty acceptance of a POA document. Accordingly, a TIU head or dean may implement changes without consensus. Units may provide for such a process, however, since it is obviously desirable for TIU heads and deans to reach consensus with their faculty on their unit's document.

The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) expects newly appointed or reappointed TIU heads and deans to submit a revised or reaffirmed POA to OAA no later than one year from the date they are appointed or reappointed. TIU-level POAs must be approved by the relevant college office before submission to OAA. Time extensions for submission can only be authorized by OAA and deans need to make the request on behalf of their college or TIU.

If a TIU head or dean wishes to reaffirm the POA without amendment, it must be current with university rules and policies. Specific sections of the document can be revised as the need arises. For TIUs, such revisions must be approved by both the dean of the college and OAA. The current POA remains in effect until a revised or reaffirmed one is approved by OAA. The senior vice provost for faculty encourages TIU heads and deans to submit drafts of POAs to OAA for consultation and advice prior to formal submission of their document.

1.0.2 Regional Campuses

Although not stipulated in [Faculty Rule 3335-3-29.1](#), which details the responsibilities of a regional campus dean and director, OAA requires regional campuses to develop a POA in consultation with their campus faculty. Formal faculty acceptance of the POA is not required, though a regional campus may provide for such a process. However, a dean and director may have to implement changes without consensus.

1.0.3 Required POA Outlines

The required outline for the POA for departments and schools is available in the [TIU POA guideline document](#).

The required outline for the POA for colleges with TIUs is available in the [college with TIUs POA guideline document](#).

The required outline for the POA for colleges that are TIUs is available in the college as TIU POA guideline document.

The required outline for the POA for regional campuses is available in the regional campus POA guideline document.

Directions about individual components of the relevant POA are provided in an instruction sheet that precedes each guideline document.

2.0 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document

2.0.1 Departments and Schools and Colleges

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#) and [Faculty Rule 3335-3-35](#) require every department and school to have an APT document describing the criteria and procedures for making recommendations regarding the appointment, promotion, and compensation of faculty. The creation or revision of the department/school APT requires broad faculty consultation with all voting members of the tenure initiating unit and must be approved by the dean of the college and the executive vice president and provost.

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#) likewise requires each college to have an APT document. The Rule also requires that the college APT be drawn up through broad faculty consultation and must be approved by the executive vice president and provost.

OAA expects newly appointed or reappointed TIU heads and deans to submit a new or reaffirmed APT to OAA no later than one year from the date they are appointed or reappointed. TIU-level APTs must be approved by the relevant college office before submission to OAA. Time extensions for submission can only be authorized by OAA and deans need to make the request on behalf of their college or TIU.

If a TIU head or dean wishes to reaffirm the APT without amendment, it must be current with university rules and policies. Specific sections of the document can be revised as the need arises. For TIUs, such revisions must be approved by both the dean of the college and OAA. The current APT remains in effect until a revised or reaffirmed one is approved by OAA. The senior vice provost for faculty encourages TIU heads and deans to submit drafts of APTs to OAA for consultation and advice prior to formal submission of their document.

TIUs are responsible for providing a copy (or a link to access the document online) of the current APT document to tenure-track, clinical/teaching/professional practice, and research faculty with the letter of offer.

2.0.2 Regional Campuses

Although not stipulated in [Faculty Rule 3335-3-29.1](#), which details the responsibilities of a regional campus dean and director, OAA requires regional campuses to develop an APT in consultation with their campus faculty.

2.0.3 Required APT Outlines

The required outline for the APT for departments and schools is available in the [TIU APT guideline document](#).

The required outline for the APT for colleges with TIUs is available in the [college with TIUs APT guideline document](#).

The required outline for the APT for colleges that are TIUs is available in the college as TIU APT guideline document.

The required outline for the APT for regional campuses is available in the regional campus APT guideline document.

Directions about individual components of the relevant APT are provided in an instruction sheet that precedes each guideline document.

3.0 Updating obsolete material in TIU governance documents

All university titles, rules, policies, offices, and entities must be checked for accuracy with current language and requirements during the required governance document review in the first year of a TIU head's or dean's appointment or reappointment. Units are asked to pay special attention to Faculty Rule [3335-7-02](#), where clinical/teaching/professional practice titles recently have been updated. Units are also asked to pay special attention to the new [Faculty Workload Guideline](#), implemented in May 2024, in reviewing that section of their POA.

Many POA and APT documents that are submitted for approval contain obsolete material. Common examples of such material are summarized below so that units may make the needed corrections before forwarding their documents for review.

All [University Faculty Rules](#) and [university policies](#) are available on university websites (linked with each reference). It is inadvisable for governance documents to quote these extensively as such passages will not reflect later revisions to the material at the website. In place of quoted material, the address of the website should be embedded in the relevant text.

For matters relating to Employee and Labor Relations, please contact OHR, [Employee and Labor Relations](#), (614) 247-6947.

[Faculty Rule 3335-3-29](#) has been revised to require that colleges have a Pattern of Administration with specified content.

[Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#) has been revised. "Track" refers only to tenure-track faculty.

[Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#) has been revised. Clinical associated appointments are now called "clinical practice faculty."

Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 has been revised allowing the tenure-track faculty (and clinical/teaching/professional practice and/or research faculty with TIU voting rights) to enfranchise associated faculty, allowing the associated faculty to participate in college or academic unit governance.

Faculty Rule 3335-7 has been revised to change the titles of clinical faculty to clinical, teaching, or professional practice faculty. Units must write specific criteria to match the title(s) selected by the units.

Faculty Rule 3335-7-03 has been revised. Unless an exception is approved by the University Senate and the Board of Trustees, clinical/teaching/professional practice faculty may comprise no more than forty percent of the total tenure-track, clinical/teaching/professional practice, and research faculty (as defined in Rule 3335-5-19 of the Administrative Code) in each of the colleges of the health sciences and no more than twenty percent of the tenure-track, clinical/teaching/professional practice, and research faculty in all other colleges. In all tenure-initiating units not in health sciences, the number of clinical/teaching/professional practice faculty members must be fewer than the number of tenure-track faculty members in each unit.

The Faculty Recruitment and Selection Policy has been revised removing permanent residency within the U.S. as a requirement to obtain tenure at the university and to adhere to the university-wide faculty recruitment and selection process found within the Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent ("SHIFT") framework.

Chapter 2: Unit Administration

<u>1.0 Tenure initiating unit</u>	12
<u>1.1 Chairs and directors (TIU heads)</u>	12
<u>1.1.1 Definitions</u>	13
<u>1.2 Assistant, associate, and vice chairs and directors</u>	13
<u>1.3 TIU staff</u>	13
<u>1.3.1 Teaching component in unclassified administrative & professional (A&P) staff positions</u>	13
<u>1.4 TIU faculty</u>	13
<u>1.4.1 Units approved for clinical/teaching/practice faculty</u>	13
<u>1.4.2 Units approved for research faculty</u>	15
<u>1.4.3 Duties, responsibilities, and workload</u>	16
<u>1.4.3.1 Teaching</u>	17
<u>1.4.3.1.1 Faculty teaching workload</u>	18
<u>1.4.3.2 Research and creative activity</u>	18
<u>1.4.3.3 Service</u>	18
<u>1.4.3.4 Other elements of faculty workload</u>	19
<u>1.4.4 Evaluation of instruction</u>	20
<u>1.4.4.1 Peer evaluation</u>	21
<u>1.4.4.1.1 Peer evaluation requirements</u>	21
<u>1.4.4.1.2 Peer evaluation recommendations</u>	21
<u>1.4.4.1.3 Peer evaluation of instruction</u>	22
<u>1.4.4.1.4 Peer evaluation of course materials</u>	22
<u>1.4.4.1.5 Revising current peer evaluation processes</u>	22
<u>1.4.4.2 Student evaluation of instruction</u>	22
<u>1.4.4.2.1 Student evaluation of instruction requirements</u>	23
<u>1.4.4.2.2 Student evaluation of instruction recommendations</u>	23
<u>1.4.4.3 Administrator evaluation of instruction</u>	24
<u>1.4.4.4 Self-evaluation of instruction</u>	24
<u>1.4.4.5 Interpretation and integration of teaching evaluation data and feedback</u>	24
<u>1.4.5 Reporting for duty</u>	25
<u>1.4.6 Faculty resignation and retirement</u>	25
<u>1.5 Course scheduling</u>	25
<u>1.6 Continuity of course scheduling</u>	26
<u>1.7 New courses and abolishment of courses</u>	27
<u>1.8 Instruction</u>	27
<u>1.9 Providing accommodations to students</u>	28
<u>1.10 Use of self-authored material</u>	29
<u>1.11 Graduate associates</u>	29
<u>2.0 College administration</u>	30

<u>2.1 Deans</u>	30
<u>2.2 Associate and assistant deans</u>	30
<u>2.2.1 Associate deans</u>	30
<u>2.2.2 Assistant deans</u>	30
<u>3.0 Regional campuses</u>	30
<u>4.0 University Senate</u>	31
<u>5.0 Rules of the University Faculty</u>	31
<u>5.1 Bylaws of the University Senate</u>	32
<u>5.2 Code of Student Conduct</u>	32
<u>6.0 Faculty in memoriam resolutions</u>	32
<u>7.0 Managing situations that are highly charged with emotion or potentially violent</u>	32
<u>8.0 Ethics Law, Ohio</u>	34
<u>9.0 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)</u>	34
<u>10.0 Immunity, indemnification, and representation</u>	34
<u>11.0 Personal use of public property</u>	34
<u>12.0 Public records</u>	35
<u>13.0 Required email</u>	35
<u>14.0 Health and safety</u>	36

1.0 Tenure initiating unit

The concept of the tenure initiating unit (TIU) is described in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-06](#). Characteristics of departments and schools are described in [Faculty Rule 3335-3-34](#). Each tenure-track faculty member, including those with multiple appointments, has a tenure home in a single unit (department, school, division, or in the case of colleges without departments, college). A TIU also serves as the primary appointment home for clinical/teaching/practice faculty, research faculty, and associated faculty.

Multiple faculty appointments totaling 50% or more of service to the university shall be considered to be the same as a single appointment of 50% or more for the purpose of determining eligibility for tenure of a tenure-track faculty member. Eligible faculty members with multiple appointments may vote on promotion and, where appropriate, tenure matters only in their designated TIU (see the APT guidance document, section III.A for information on faculty governance rights). In annual reviews and promotion and tenure reviews, TIUs must seek input from all units where the faculty member has an appointment (see the APT guidance document, sections III.D.1 and III.D.2 for additional information on seeking input).

1.1 Chairs and directors (TIU heads)

The term of service and responsibilities of TIU heads (department chairs and school directors) are described in [Faculty Rule 3335-3-35](#).

TIU heads are appointed by the college dean, subject to the formal approval of the executive vice president and provost, president, and the Board of Trustees (BOT).

The dean determines whether the appointee is to be drawn from the faculty within the unit, usually following an internal search; is to be selected following a national search; or is to be selected in some other way. The dean may also appoint search committees for TIU heads.

TIU heads are normally appointed for a four-year term. Mid-year appointments terminate at the end of the third full academic year of appointment. A shorter appointment period may occasionally be specified in special circumstances.

TIU heads must be members of the faculty of the unit they administer. TIU heads are subject to annual review and may be removed before the end of the appointment period under [Faculty Rule 3335-3-35\(B\)](#). Interim or acting TIU heads must be faculty members or emeritus faculty members from a TIU within the college, unless an exception is made by the executive vice president and provost.

Letters of offer appointing or reappointing TIU heads, including interim and acting, require prior approval by OAA following approval by the college dean. All such appointments are forwarded to the BOT for final approval (except those for a period of less than 90 days). Copies of final letters of appointment, including indication of acceptance by the TIU head, must be sent to OAA to be forwarded to the BOT for final approval.

Appointment of an external TIU head at advanced rank requires approval by the eligible faculty, the college dean, and OAA. The process is to be managed by another TIU head in the college.

Appointments are typically effective on July 1 for 12-month appointees (end date June 30). The July 1 reappointment date is used even if the first appointment as TIU head was on a mid-year date.

1.1.1 Definitions

Interim: formal replacement until a new person is hired; position is vacant.

Acting: stand-in for a person still in the position but on leave; position is filled.

1.2 Assistant, associate, and vice chairs and directors

TIU heads may appoint such assistant, associate, and vice chairs and directors (or for colleges that are TIUs, assistant, associate, and vice deans) as are needed to carry out the business of the department or school.

The TIU head determines the terms of appointment, subject to approval of the dean of the college. Such appointments are subject to annual reviews and may be removed before the end of the appointment period.

1.3 TIU staff

TIU heads can obtain information on staff hiring and supervising procedures from college fiscal officers or human resources professionals and from Employee and Labor Relations (614-247-6947). The Office of Human Resource (OHR) home page may be found [here](#).

1.3.1 Teaching component in unclassified administrative & professional (A&P) staff positions

If the assigned job duties of an unclassified A&P staff position include teaching, the maximum percentage of time that may be devoted to teaching is 33%, as required in OHR [policy 4.20](#).

If teaching is not part of the assigned job duties of an unclassified A&P staff position, teaching may be done for additional compensation, subject to the 20% cap that applies equally to faculty and staff. To learn more about impacts to staff benefits, TIU heads should communicate with OHR.

1.4 TIU faculty

1.4.1 Units approved for clinical/teaching/practice faculty

This is a list of colleges (**bold**), departments, and schools approved for clinical/teaching/practice faculty. Unless an exception is approved by the University Senate and the BOT, clinical/teaching/practice faculty may comprise no more than 40% of the total tenure-track, clinical/teaching/ practice, and research faculty in the following colleges of the Health Sciences: Nursing, Optometry, Pharmacy, Public Health, and Veterinary Medicine.

Clinical/Teaching/Practice faculty may comprise no more than 20% of the tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty in non-Health Sciences colleges. For all units without an approved exception (see below), the number of clinical/teaching/practice plus

research faculty members must be fewer than the number of tenure-track faculty members in each unit.

The Colleges of Nursing, Dentistry, and Veterinary Medicine have approved exceptions.

Clinical/teaching/practice faculty in the Colleges of Nursing and Dentistry may comprise no more than 75% of the total tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty.

Clinical/teaching/practice faculty in the College of Veterinary Medicine may comprise no more than 65% of the total tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty. The College of Medicine has an approved exception and has no appointment cap in clinical TIUs; in all other TIUs in Medicine, clinical/teaching/practice faculty may comprise no more than 40% of the tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty.

Units that impose a stricter limit are noted in parentheses.

Arts and Sciences

African American & African Studies
Art
Arts Administration, Education & Policy
Anthropology
Classics
Communication (10)
Comparative Studies
Dance
Design
Earth Sciences
East Asian Languages & Literatures
Evolution, Ecology & Organismal Biology
French and Italian
Geography
Germanic Languages & Literatures
History
History of Art
Linguistics
Mathematics
Microbiology
Molecular Genetics
Music
Near Eastern and South Asian Languages and Cultures
Philosophy
Psychology
Slavic & East European Languages & Cultures
Spanish & Portuguese
Speech and Hearing Science
Statistics

Theatre, Film & Media Arts

Business

Dentistry (75)

Education and Human Ecology

Educational Studies
Human Sciences
Teaching and Learning

Engineering

Architecture
Biomedical Engineering (20)
Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering (25)
Computer Science and Engineering
Electrical and Computer Engineering
Engineering Education
Integrated Systems Engineering
Materials Science and Engineering
Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (10)

Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

Agricultural Communication, Education and Leadership
Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics
Agricultural Technical Institute
Animal Sciences
Entomology
Environment and Natural Resources (15)
Extension
Food, Agricultural, and Biological Engineering

Horticulture and Crop Science

Plant Pathology

Law

Medicine

Anesthesiology

Biological Chemistry and Pharmacology
(40)

Biomedical Education & Anatomy

Biomedical Informatics

Cancer Biology and Genetics

Emergency Medicine

Family and Community Medicine

Health and Rehabilitation Sciences (40)

Internal Medicine

Microbial Infection & Immunity

Neurological Surgery

Neurology

Neuroscience

Obstetrics and Gynecology

Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences

Orthopaedics

Otolaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery

Pathology

Pediatrics

Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Physiology and Cell Biology

Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery

Psychiatry and Behavioral Health

Radiation Oncology

Radiology

Surgery

Urology

Nursing (75)

Optometry (48)

Pharmacy

Public Health

Public Affairs

Social Work

Veterinary Medicine (65)

Veterinary Biosciences

Veterinary Clinical Sciences

Veterinary Preventive Medicine

1.4.2 Units approved for research faculty

This is a list of colleges (**bold**), departments, and schools approved for research faculty. Unless otherwise authorized by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty in a unit, research faculty must comprise no more than 20% of the number of tenure-track faculty in the unit. In all cases, however, the number of research faculty positions in a unit must constitute a minority with respect to the number of tenure-track faculty in the unit. Units that authorize a different cap are noted in parentheses.

Arts and Sciences

Earth Sciences

Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology

Psychology (10)

Sociology (10)

Speech and Hearing Science

Dentistry

Engineering

Architecture

Biomedical Engineering

Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering

Civil, Environmental, and Geodetic

Engineering (25)

Computer Science and Engineering

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Engineering Education

Integrated Systems Engineering

Materials Science and Engineering

Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (10)

Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

Animal Sciences

Entomology

Environment and Natural Resources

Food, Agricultural, and Biological

Engineering

Food Science and Technology

Medicine

Biomedical Informatics (49)

Biological Chemistry and Pharmacology

Cancer Biology and Genetics
 Family and Community Medicine
 Health and Rehabilitation Sciences
 Internal Medicine
 Microbial Infection and Immunity
 Neurological Surgery
 Neuroscience
 Obstetrics and Gynecology
 Pediatrics
 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
 Physiology and Cell Biology (33)

Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery
 Psychiatry and Behavioral Health
 Radiation Oncology
 Radiology
 Surgery
 Urology
Nursing
Optometry (30)
Pharmacy
Public Health
Veterinary Medicine
 Veterinary Biosciences

1.4.3 Duties, responsibilities, and workload

OAA requires TIUs, in cooperation with their colleges, to establish guidelines that describe the allocation of effort in the unit as a whole (as opposed to that of individual faculty members). Such guidelines must be established within the parameters set by [Faculty Rule 3335-5](#).

Colleges and TIUs are required to build their guidelines based on the revised [Faculty Workload Guideline](#) and describe **the allocation of effort in the unit in general terms (as opposed to that of individual faculty members)**. Each guideline must also define the range and general expectations regarding teaching, research, and creative activity, as well as service responsibilities, in terms of the academic mission of the college and TIU.

To ensure that these guidelines are truly developed through a model of shared governance, the process of approval should include consultation of all faculty in the academic unit, according to Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, providing enough time for faculty discussion.

TIU workload guidelines must, at a minimum, include statements of:

- Overall workload expectations for each faculty type according to their roles and responsibilities, and to ensure a balance of faculty time and effort spent in teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
 - The academic unit leader (chair, director, dean of college without department, regional campus dean) is responsible for achieving this balance of time and effort for the academic unit (e.g., department/school, colleges without departments, regional campuses) through the assignment of duties to individual faculty.
 - If TIUs have tenure track faculty on regional campuses (Lima, Mansfield, Marion, Newark), then their workload expectations and APT documents should align to allow faculty to achieve the specific criteria required for promotion, given the higher proportion of time allocated to teaching duties for regional campus faculty compared to tenure track faculty on the Columbus Campus.
- Types and amounts of instruction needed to accomplish the teaching mission of the unit.
 - Normally, this will include an analysis of the likely numbers and types of courses/sections necessary to satisfy the demand for undergraduate general education,

undergraduate major and minor programs, and graduate and/or professional programs.

- No faculty should be at 0% contribution to teaching unless they are in a 100% administrative role, on faculty professional leave (FPL), or under temporary special assignment/research buyout. Even research faculty have instructional responsibility. Traditionally, the OSU standard for a faculty with a 100% teaching load (e.g. Lecturers/ Sr. Lecturers) has been 24 credit hours (eight 3-credit courses, or equivalent) for
- 9-month contracts and 30 credits (or equivalent) for 12-month contracts. This standard is to be re-evaluated by each academic unit, and equivalencies for credit hours need to be developed at the unit level in an equitable and proportional way across 9-month and 12-month decreased.
- Expectations of time allocation to research/creative activity by faculty types.
- Expectations of time allocation to service and/or extension by faculty types.
- Expectations of clinical practice not related to teaching or service, where appropriate.

1.4.3.1 Teaching

For academic units in which formal course offerings are the primary mode of instruction, the guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities must include an indication of time allocation (aligned with required ranges for each faculty type) and not use average, minimum, and maximum course load per year (in terms of either courses or credit hours).

Equivalencies for meeting such effort content could include expectations with respect to numbers of undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional students advised, development of instructional materials, and/or other instructional activities of importance to a particular unit. In specifying formal course loads, units may also choose to distinguish type and level of course and course size.

Every department and school, college without departments, and regional campus must have written guidelines for the equitable assignment and distribution of faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload. Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 requires that such guidelines be a part of the academic unit's POA. These guidelines do not constitute a contractual obligation. Fluctuations in demands and resources in the department (college, regional campus) and the individual circumstances of faculty members may warrant temporary deviations from the policy.

A unit's guidelines should address how variations in scholarly activity and formal classroom instruction will be balanced to assure a reasonably equitable distribution of responsibilities among faculty. Academic units that offer little or no formal classroom instruction should indicate how variations in scholarly activity and instructional activity, however measured, will be balanced. Additional detail is optional.

The TIU head is responsible for assuring that every faculty member has duties, responsibilities, and workload commensurate with their appointment and that unit workload is distributed equitably among faculty. Although faculty members are expected to exercise "self-

determination” in conducting their research or other scholarly activity, the TIU head is responsible for assigning teaching (including mode of instruction) and, in most cases, TIU service. Once teaching assignments are made by the TIU head, the course must be taught in the mode (i.e., distance, hybrid, or in-person) assigned. The mode of instruction is not at the discretion of the faculty.

In making these assignments, the TIU head must balance the needs of the TIU with the preferences of the faculty member within the context of the TIU’s guidelines policy on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload.

1.4.3.1.1 Faculty teaching workload

In setting college workload guidelines, it is important to recognize the need for flexibility with respect to ranges in teaching, research and creative activity, and service expectations among TIUs, as well as among the faculty within departments. The dean of each college, in consultation with the executive vice president and provost and the college’s TIU heads, is responsible for approving the appropriate division of workload expectations for each TIU according to the TIU’s level of activity in the degree programs it offers. In determining the relative emphasis that a given TIU would place upon undergraduate programs, research and creative activity, and graduate and professional programs, the dean should consider the research productivity of the faculty, including externally funded research, and the average number of graduate and/or professional degrees granted annually.

At all times, consideration should be given to the fact that students at Ohio State learn in a research-intensive environment where research and creative activity and teaching are seen as two inseparable facets of the learning experience for both faculty and students.

1.4.3.2 Research and creative activity

A unit’s guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload must include a statement describing the average level of scholarly productivity expected within a time frame appropriate to the discipline.

In TIUs in which seeking and obtaining external funding is customary, the guidelines should state the expectations for seeking and obtaining such funding.

The degree of specificity in all such statements will vary widely across disciplines. Given that scholarly activity is self-generated rather than assigned, however, the language in this section should be sufficiently explicit to communicate expectations clearly and to provide a basis for adjusting duties, responsibilities, and workload in instruction and service in response to variations in the level of scholarly productivity.

1.4.3.3 Service

A unit’s guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload must include a statement regarding expectations for faculty participation in TIU, college, university, and, for regional campus faculty, regional campus governance, and for participation in professional organizations, and professional consultation.

Many faculty members voluntarily take on a variety of professional activities that fall outside the TIU's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities. These activities often benefit the TIU or university and, to the extent possible, should be taken into account in considering a faculty member's total distribution of duties.

However, fairness to other faculty and the TIU's need to meet its programmatic obligations may become issues when a faculty member seeks relief from departmental obligations to devote considerable time to personal professional interests that may not contribute to TIU goals. The TIU head may decline to approve such requests when approval is not judged to be in the best interests of the TIU or that may create a conflict of commitment.

1.4.3.4 Other elements of faculty workload

It is anticipated that unit level policies will differ given the wide range of fields and field norms represented across the University. Nonetheless, unit level policies should address minimally the following additional elements when relevant to the work of the faculty in the unit:

Faculty with Clinical Appointments in Health Science Colleges. Faculty with such clinical appointments may require clarification of the equivalencies in their instructional activities that contribute to their teaching workload. Examples include conducting formal educational activities for medical and health professions students during required and elective clerkships; participating in formal teaching activities for residents/fellows serving within the specific division and the Department; and participating in evaluations of medical and health professions students, residents, and fellows.

Faculty with Extension Appointments. Faculty with extension appointments may require different determinations of teaching, research and creative activities, and service due to their extension roles and assignments. Faculty with extension appointments should have a set of articulated (curricular) goals, a clear scope and sequence of instructional activities relating to the program (curricular) goals, appropriate target audience(s) given the position description and funding, and partners both within and external to the university. While extension teaching does fall under the broad category of teaching, extension effort should be called out separately from for-credit teaching to provide clarity for the faculty member and those evaluating them.

Joint appointment. Faculty workload assignments for faculty with joint appointments (e.g., in other academic TIU or centers and institutes) should be proportional to the assigned FTE in the respective units.

Unit Administration. Assumption of administrative responsibilities within the unit (e.g., chair/director, vice/associate chair/director, program director, director of special departmental projects) requires reduction of expectations for teaching, research and creative activities, and/or service. The reduction may be dependent on the size of the unit, the scope of the administrative responsibilities, and other relevant factors.

Clinical Work. Contributions to patient care in a clinical setting, without the engagement of learners, requires reduction of expectations for teaching, research and creative activities, and/or service. The reduction may be dependent on the scope and frequency of clinical patient care responsibilities, and other relevant factors.

Other Administration. There may be instances in which faculty members will be asked to assume significant administrative roles, for example when a faculty member is assigned to lead a research center or strategic initiative. Assignment of additional time in the areas of administration and the consequent reduction of expectations for teaching and/or research and creative activity and/or service should be directly related to the duration and the extensiveness of the administrative commitment.

New and Early-Career Faculty. Assignments for new and/or early-career faculty members should take into consideration their need to develop or teach new courses, to begin or establish a research program, to establish extension programs, or other factors to become established in their roles.

Time interval. Unit policies should determine the interval considered for faculty workload expectations. For example, some units may assess faculty workload on an annual basis, while others may choose to assess faculty workload over a multi-year period (e.g., 2–3 years). Individual workload should be discussed annually during the annual review process.

Workload adjustments. Unit policies should address how faculty workload is rebalanced when a faculty member voluntarily expresses a desire to adjust their workload (e.g., a desire to engage in additional teaching in lieu of some research activity, a desire to decrease one's FTE proportion). Similarly, unit policies should address how faculty workload is rebalanced based on review processes (e.g., annual, 4th year), which determine that a faculty member has not met unit performance expectations in one or more areas (e.g., research productivity, teaching, service). Workload adjustments must be equitable and meet the needs of the unit.

Complaint mechanism. The TIU chair/director has the role of assigning courses. Unit policies should include a process for faculty members to file complaints regarding their assigned workload, if they exceed the designated number of courses (or equivalent teaching assignments).

- Faculty members in departmentalized colleges should first seek to resolve the matter with their TIU head/director. If the matter cannot be resolved, the complaint should be reviewed by the Dean.

Faculty members in colleges that are the TIU/regional campuses should first seek to resolve the matter with their dean or dean/director. If the matter cannot be resolved, the complaint should be reviewed by OAA.

1.4.4 Evaluation of instruction

Without systematic forms of teaching assessment, there is little basis on which to evaluate either the quality of instruction or the performance of individual faculty members. TIUs should establish measurable criteria for evaluation of teaching. Criteria that are research-based and specific to the unit's teaching mission are most useful in faculty evaluation of teaching. The TIU's documentation and procedures for peer evaluation and for student evaluation must be included in its APT document.

Assessment may be made by peers within the unit or external evaluators as determined by procedures established by the TIU. Such reviews should, in general, be completed by associate professors or professors for probationary faculty and by professors for associate professors.

Peer evaluation conducted for the purpose of informing reviews for promotion and tenure or promotion should be completed early enough to allow for the use of feedback for improvement and often enough and across a sufficient range of instructional contexts to provide a meaningful body of evidence.

The Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning offers a [Teaching Portfolio Development guide](#) with links to resources at Ohio State and at other institutions that outline principles and methods for formative and summative evaluation of teaching. These resources are intended to assist both individual faculty planning to evaluate their teaching and academic units developing statements on policy and procedures.

1.4.4.1 Peer evaluation

Successful peer evaluation entails a commitment of time and resources as units educate faculty on evidence-based practices and develop and implement specific policies and procedures. OAA does not require a particular form for peer evaluation; however, units are required to develop detailed plans that are appropriate for their instructional contexts. Additionally, any peer evaluation of teaching should provide critical feedback to the faculty member being reviewed so they may use that feedback to improve their teaching.

Resources on peer evaluation of teaching are available [here](#).

1.4.4.1.1 Peer evaluation requirements

Periodic peer evaluation is required for all tenure-track faculty, clinical/teaching/practice faculty, and associated faculty with multiple-year appointments who deliver formal course instruction. In addition, if teaching is a component of a faculty member's assignments, peer evaluation for promotion is required and must include at least two new summative evaluations occurring at each promotion (assistant to associate and associate to professor) and reappointment, with the exact number to be determined by the TIU in line with college guidelines. OAA recommends a greater number of summative peer evaluations for faculty members with high teaching loads. If faculty members teach in multiple modes, for example, online and in-classroom, all methods should be evaluated.

Peer evaluation is the responsibility of the TIU head and faculty of the TIU, not the individual faculty member being reviewed. However, the individual faculty member is responsible for knowing how many peer reviews are expected, and to confirm with the TIU head that they will occur. The TIU head and the TIU faculty must determine the methods of peer evaluation that work best for the particular unit and apply them consistently.

1.4.4.1.2 Peer evaluation recommendations

Peer evaluation should focus on aspects of teaching most effectively assessed by experts in the discipline such as appropriateness of curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction,

choice of examination/evaluation materials, and consistency with highest standards of disciplinary knowledge/research and evidence-based practices. Peer evaluation should have clear goals and be grounded in a unit culture that values teaching excellence. Classroom observations should not serve as the sole method for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness. All faculty should also be encouraged to seek formative assessment of their teaching prior to mandatory reviews for tenure or promotion.

1.4.4.1.3 Peer evaluation of instruction

Peer evaluation of instruction should focus on assessing the appropriateness of evidence-based teaching strategies deployed in the particular learning context (survey, major-required course, lab, seminar, etc.). This assessment may include evaluating delivery of content, engagement of students, relevance of topics covered, and evidence that the objectives of the session were met.

1.4.4.1.4 Peer evaluation of course materials

Peer evaluation of teaching should include a review of syllabi, assignments, projects, and examinations to determine the extent to which:

- learning outcomes and course objectives are appropriate;
- course materials and assignments are current, relevant, and consistent with course objectives;
- syllabi are effective maps of the course and invitations to students to actively engage in their learning process;
- feedback on assignments is appropriately detailed and contributes to learning;
- examinations and projects offer opportunities for students to demonstrate learning and mastery of learning outcomes; and
- there have been responses to formative peer evaluations and SEI feedback, including comments by students.

1.4.4.1.5 Revising current peer evaluation processes

The Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning has resources available to units to support the revision of peer evaluation of teaching processes. Departments, programs, and units may request a unit-level consultation on needs related to teaching and learning by emailing drakeinstitute@osu.edu.

1.4.4.2 Student evaluation of instruction

Faculty Rule 3335-3-35(C)(14) requires units to assure that students are given the opportunity to evaluate each course every time it is taught. The university recognizes the value of soliciting commentary from students on their experiences in the classroom. TIU faculty must develop and implement policies for collecting student input, including qualitative and quantitative data as appropriate, and establish procedures for interpreting data collected from students. TIUs should

not rely solely on student responses to courses and instruction such as the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) in assessing the quality of a faculty member's teaching.

1.4.4.2.1 Student evaluation of instruction requirements

Every TIU's APT document must specify a single required method of soliciting student feedback. Faculty members may supplement this with other methods.

Student feedback must be solicited in every course regarding:

- instructor's preparedness for class;
- clarity of communication;
- ability to generate interest in the course content;
- accessibility;
- ability to create a conducive learning environment; and
- timeliness of and quality of responses to student work.

When the results of soliciting student feedback are a component of a performance review, the process cannot be under the control of the faculty member. TIUs must have a mechanism for assuring that faculty members themselves do not collect student feedback required for performance reviews.

If instruments are used in the P&T process that are not automated, the TIU must identify an individual other than the faculty member to summarize the results for inclusion in the dossier. Units may determine whether comments received on the electronic SEI should be collected and summarized for the purposes of P&T review. Information about the retention schedule for SEI comments can be found at the [Registrar's website](#).

1.4.4.2.2 Student evaluation of instruction recommendations

Open-ended or semi-structured questions may be used to solicit student feedback; however, an aggregate summary must be compiled by an individual other than the faculty member. Student comments on instruction may be useful in identifying both areas of excellence and areas for improvement. When few student responses are available, they offer minimal basis for generalization unless themes arise across courses taught and over time. Student comments that aid specifically in the interpretation of the statistical data are useful.

Efforts should be made to maximize response rates.

When assessing teaching, TIUs should not rely solely on whether a faculty member does or does not meet or exceed the college or university mean in the cumulative average on the SEI. The focus of evaluation should be on patterns of responses, rather than on small differences in mean values.

1.4.4.3 Administrator evaluation of instruction

TIU heads play a particularly important role in the definition, development, and implementation of appropriate practices of peer evaluation of teaching. Administrator evaluation of classroom teaching should focus on:

- evaluating drop rates, failure rates, and other data associated with the course;
- judging whether a pattern of negative data is a direct consequence of the quality of instruction or is possibly related to other factors;
- providing important corroborating evidence related to the quality of teaching by faculty in a particular unit;
- identifying particular teaching contributions of the faculty member to the teaching mission and mandates of the unit;
- evaluating the effectiveness of extra classroom teaching of faculty; and
- reviewing and documenting significant course redesign completed by a faculty member.

1.4.4.4 Self-evaluation of instruction

Reflective practice and self-assessment by faculty members are necessary components of the systematic evaluation of instruction. Individual faculty members should be given every opportunity to:

- explain the goals and intentions of their courses and assignment designs;
- describe the philosophy of teaching and learning that informs their practice;
- interpret the relationship between student ratings and classroom events; and
- reflect on evaluation information to improve their teaching.

Although self-assessment cannot be the only source of data for making credible personnel decisions, the personal narrative that provides an explanation of a faculty member's teaching goals is a valuable source for promotion and tenure decisions.

1.4.4.5 Interpretation and integration of teaching evaluation data and feedback

Units must develop procedures for interpreting evaluation of teaching in a fair and responsible way and must develop a system to integrate the data from all relevant sources within the context of the discipline using the TIU's criteria for judging teaching effectiveness and excellence.

Systems of evaluation must make both summative judgments about the quality of teaching and provide timely and formative feedback with the opportunity for faculty to use this feedback to improve their instruction of Ohio State students.

1.4.5 Reporting for duty

Nine-month faculty members are generally expected to report for duty August 15th through May 14th. The period from Spring Commencement through May 14 is on duty for 9-month faculty members and may be used for end-of-the-year meetings. Twelve-month faculty are expected to report for duty on their start date.

1.4.6 Faculty resignation and retirement

A faculty member who intends to resign or retire from the university should meet with their TIU head and make those intentions known as early as possible when the timeline is defined. Upon deciding to resign or retire, a faculty member must either (1) submit in writing (i.e., letter or email) to the TIU head their intent to resign or retire with an effective date, or (2) submit the resignation or retirement via Workday. The TIU is to submit a request for resignation or retirement via Workday if not completed by the faculty member. In cases where a date has not been given, the TIU head is to acknowledge receipt of the resignation or retirement in writing and seek confirmation of the effective resignation or retirement date after the faculty member has (1) submitted in writing to the TIU head their decision, or (2) after Workday has automatically generated a confirmation message to the TIU.

A faculty member may submit a written request to rescind their resignation or retirement. The request may be submitted through and including the effective date of their resignation or retirement. Although the TIU has sole discretion to accept or reject a faculty member's request to rescind their resignation or retirement, the TIU must consult with the dean of the college prior to accepting or rejecting the request.

Upon terminating employment with the university, separating faculty must take action to assure that all obligations to the university have been fulfilled prior to departure. Before leaving, faculty should contact the Office of Human Resources to confirm benefit transition arrangements and to turn in ID cards, keys, and any other university property.

1.5 Course scheduling

Although TIU heads must give consideration to the teaching specialties and preferences of faculty, the primary consideration in scheduling classes must be to provide for the needs of students, both the unit's own students and those from other units who need specific courses to meet their degree requirements. Unit heads are to make every effort to assure the regular availability of required courses and the sensible timing of high-demand offerings so that all students have a fair chance of fitting such courses into their schedules.

It is the unit head's responsibility to assure that the schedule of course offerings each semester makes the most effective use of the unit's instructional resources. Faculty Rule 3335-8-16 establishes a standard that courses should have an enrollment of at least 15 students. Courses enrolling fewer than fifteen may be offered if sufficient resources and programmatic justifications exist.

Units should review annually the patterns of enrollment in their course offerings, especially their elective offerings. Unit heads are to identify offerings that may represent a less than optimal

use of instructional resources. Units are to discontinue, or not re-offer, courses with enrollments that are frequently below the minimum until there is reason to expect adequate enrollment. Unit heads should assign other courses to faculty who teach such courses, or whose courses are cancelled because of low enrollment. Faculty may not cancel courses on their own. The unit head is responsible for determining whether a scheduled course is to be cancelled.

1.6 Continuity of course scheduling

Ohio State strives to remain open and operational to ensure continuity of instruction and services to its students. However, extreme conditions, such as severe weather, can warrant the usage of the university's Weather or Other Short-Term Closing Policy resulting in the closure of parts of the Columbus campus and/or any of the regional campuses. The safety and well-being of students, faculty, and staff are the university's highest priority.

When a decision is made to close the university or cancel in-person classes, it will be done in a manner that minimizes disruption to students and employees. As such, the university's Weather or Other Short-Term Closing Policy allows instructors teaching in-person to keep their class on schedule during disruptive times through alternative teaching methods. Unless otherwise announced by the university, online or distance-learning classes will occur as scheduled.

To maintain course continuity, clear communication is essential. Communication begins the first week of new term and with the syllabus. Faculty are encouraged to discuss their continuity plan with students and include the following language in their syllabus:

“Should classes be cancelled on the Columbus campus and/or regional campuses, you will be notified as to whether alternative methods of teaching will be offered to ensure continuity of instruction for this class. Communication will be via (mode of communication, e.g., Carmen or other electronic means). Faculty teaching online are encouraged to include the following: “Unless otherwise announced by the university, online or distance-learning classes will occur as scheduled.”

It is at the discretion of the instructor as to whether an alternative method of teaching will occur when classes have been cancelled under the Weather or Other Short-Term Closing Policy. Instructors teaching multiple sections of the same course are to consult with their Chair or Dean to ensure consistency with the course continuity plan.

Live or synchronous class sessions are to be held at the same time as the regularly scheduled class, while self-directed study options through asynchronous activities may proceed once communicated.

Upon a university closure announcement, colleges and departments are to inform students, interns, and residents of their expectations in fulfilling their regularly scheduled clinic obligations. This includes clinic rotations and individual patient care assignments. Students taking part in practicums, internships, student teaching, or other experiential learning should follow their participating organization's closing procedures.

For additional information, please refer to the [Weather or Other Short-Term Closings Frequently Asked Questions](#).

1.7 New courses and abolishment of courses

The [Academic Organization, Curriculum, and Assessment Handbook](#) contains information on the creation of new courses and the abolishment of courses.

1.8 Instruction

The Rules of the University Faculty contain policy on instruction that applies to all faculty members at the university.

Precedence of scheduled hours:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-11](#)

Class rosters:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-13](#)

Student assessment:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-19](#)

Schedules for final examinations:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-20](#)

Marks:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-21](#)

Report of marks:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-22](#)

Alteration of marks:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-23](#)

Retention or disposal of materials submitted to meet course requirements:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-23.1](#)

Credit hours:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-24](#)

Admission to courses as an auditor:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-8-29](#)

Absences:

- [Faculty Rule 3335-9-21](#)

Group absences:

- Faculty Rule 3335-9-22

1.9 Providing accommodations to students

Every student is expected to participate in academically related activities and attend every class session for which the student is duly registered.

In accordance with Ohio law, instructors shall provide students with reasonable alternative accommodations with regard to examinations and other academic requirements with respect to students' sincerely held religious beliefs and practices by allowing up to three absences each semester for the student to attend or participate in religious activities. Instructors are expected to provide information about how absences will be managed to students during the first week of classes (both orally and within the syllabus). Faculty are expected to work with students to reasonably accommodate their religious obligations and observances. Examples of religious accommodations can include, but are not limited to, rescheduling an exam, altering the time of a student's presentation, allowing make-up assignments to substitute for missed class work, or flexibility in due dates or research responsibilities. If concerns arise about a requested accommodation, instructors are to consult their TIU head for assistance.

A student's request for time off shall be provided if the student's sincerely held religious belief or practice severely affects the student's ability to take an exam or meet an academic requirement and the student has notified their instructor, in writing during the first fourteen days (14) of the semester, of the date of each absence. The instructor is then responsible for scheduling an alternative time and date for the course requirement, which may be before or after the original time and date of the course requirement. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that all course assignments are completed.

Students who know they will require a religious accommodation, but who may not know the date of the religious observance, should ideally communicate with their instructors about this possible need at the start of the semester, although a later request, if feasible and agreed upon, should not bar the student from receiving the reasonable accommodations. Although students are required to provide notice within the first fourteen (14) days of the semester, instructors are strongly encouraged to work with the student to provide a reasonable accommodation if a request is made outside the notice period. A student may not be penalized for an absence approved under this policy.

Instructors shall not question the sincerity of a student's religious or spiritual belief system and shall keep requests for accommodations confidential. A statement with information about this policy, the general procedure to request accommodations, and contact information for a person to whom students can direct questions about the policy must be provided in each course syllabus.

An instructor shall include in each course syllabus the following statement:

It is Ohio State's formal expectation that instructors align with Ohio law to reasonably accommodate the sincerely held religious beliefs and practices of all students. Students are permitted to be absent for up to three days each academic semester for reasons of faith or religious or spiritual belief.

Students planning to use religious beliefs or practices accommodations for course requirements must inform the instructor in writing no later than 14 days after the semester begins. The instructor is then responsible for scheduling an alternative time and date for the course requirement, which may be before or after the original time and date of the course requirement. These alternative accommodations will remain confidential. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that all course assignments are completed. Students with concerns or complaints under the policy are strongly encouraged, but not required, to first discuss those concerns with their instructor and/or the TIU head. Students may also report their concerns or file a complaint with the Office of Institutional Equity via the [online reporting form](#), email at equity@osu.edu, or phone at 614-247-5838.

A non-exhaustive list of religious holidays is available on the [OAA website](#). Exclusion of a holiday or festival from the calendar or the non-exhaustive list may not be used to deny an accommodation. Instructors may contact the Testing Center in the office of the University Registrar for more information regarding the make-up exam policy. Faculty may use these calendars as a planning tool when determining dates for course requirements.

For assistance or questions about this policy, please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs at academicaffairs@osu.edu.

1.10 Use of self-authored material

Should a faculty member wish to use a textbook or other material that is authored by the faculty member and the sale of which results in a royalty being paid to them, such textbook or material may be required for a course by the faculty member only if (1) the faculty member's TIU head and/or dean or designee have approved the use of the textbook or material for the course taught by the faculty member, or (2) an appropriate committee of the TIU or college reviews and approves the use of the textbook or material for use in the course taught by the faculty member. Sales of such items shall not be conducted directly between a faculty member and a student.

1.11 Graduate associates

The annually updated [Graduate School Handbook](#) contains the university policies on graduate associate appointments.

2.0 College administration

2.1 Deans

The term of service and responsibilities of deans are described in [Faculty Rule 3335-3-29](#). The BOT appoints deans for five-year terms subject to an annual performance review. Deans undergo a reappointment review after the fourth year of service if they wish to be considered for reappointment.

The dean title implies both academic responsibilities (responsibilities related to curriculum and faculty) and decision-making authority. The title should be used only for positions involving academic responsibilities and the incumbent should have appropriate credentials.

2.2 Associate and assistant deans

Deans may appoint associate and assistant deans as are needed to carry out the business of the college. The dean determines the terms of appointment. Vice dean may be used as a working title for associate dean.

Letters of offer to associate and assistant deans require prior approval by OAA. OAA suggests that these appointments be for a length of one year and that they be renewable. Associate and assistant deans are subject to annual review and may be removed before the end of the appointment period.

2.2.1 Associate deans

Associate deans' duties may include considerable decision-making authority in academic areas such as research and creative activity, curriculum development and implementation, academic support services for students, academic support services for faculty, and space and facilities.

Associate deans may also have responsibility for faculty appointments, grievances, discipline, and other personnel matters specific to faculty. Associate deans must be tenure-track or clinical/teaching/practice faculty members.

2.2.2 Assistant deans

Assistant deans' duties may include both support activities and some decision-making authority in academic areas such as curriculum development and implementation, academic support services for students, and academic support services for faculty.

Ideally, assistant deans should hold the terminal degree in a discipline in the college in which they serve or a related discipline, but do not need to be faculty members. However, if an assistant dean has authority in the area of faculty appointments, grievances, and related matters, that individual must have faculty status.

3.0 Regional campuses

The four regional campuses—Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark—offer Associate of Arts degrees, Bachelors of Arts and Bachelors and Science degrees in selected areas, as well as undergraduate and graduate programs in selected areas (e.g., master of social work, master of arts in educational studies).

Courses and programs on these campuses must be approved by the relevant units on the Columbus campus. All courses and programs taught on the regional campuses are Ohio State courses and programs, not regional campus courses.

Regional campus faculty members are assigned to the campus that hired them for the duration of their employment with the university unless a campus transfer is made under the terms of Faculty Rule 3335-6-07.

The TIU of regional campus faculty is the discipline-based unit on the Columbus campus. This arrangement necessitates considerable cooperation between the regional campus and the Columbus campus TIU to assure that appointments, annual reviews, and P&T reviews are carried out in a manner fair to the faculty and consistent with the needs and standards of both the TIU and the regional campus.

4.0 University Senate

For the powers of the University Senate, see Faculty Rule 3335-5-41.

The University Senate is the shared governing body of The Ohio State University. It is comprised of 71 faculty, 41 students (26 undergraduate, 10 graduate, and 5 professional), 5 staff members, and 24 administrators. Faculty members are elected from each of the 15 colleges, with the number of representatives proportional to the size of the college. Faculty representatives are also elected from each regional campus, the University Libraries, and the armed services departments. Student members are elected from the Undergraduate Student Government (USG), the Council of Graduate Students (CGS), and the Inter-Professional Council (IPC). Staff members are selected by the University Staff Advisory Committee. The administrative members of the Senate include the deans of each college, the president, the executive vice president and provost, and other senior leaders. Most of the business of the University Senate is conducted through its 19 committees.

5.0 Rules of the University Faculty

Chapters of the Rules of the University Faculty with special relevance to faculty and academic administrators are:

3335-3 Administration

3335-5 Faculty, Governance and Committees

3335-6 Tenure-track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotion and Tenure

3335-7 Clinical/Teaching/Practice & Research Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Non-reappointment, and Promotion

The remaining Chapters of the Rules of the University Faculty are:

3335-8 Instruction

3335-9 Attendance and Graduation

3335-11 Student Affairs

3335-13 University Property

3335-15 Miscellaneous Provisions

5.1 Bylaws of the University Senate

3335-17 Election Bylaws of University Senate

3335-19 Bylaws of University Senate

5.2 Code of Student Conduct

3335-23 Code of Student Conduct

6.0 Faculty in memoriam resolutions

The BOT Office makes reasonable efforts to stay informed of deaths of active and emeritus faculty. When a death is noted (for example, in local newspaper obituaries) the BOT Office contacts the dean of the faculty member's college and requests that a memoriam be written and sent to the BOT Office. That resolution is then taken to the next BOT meeting for approval. After the BOT meeting, a certified copy of the memoriam and a letter from the president are sent to the family of the deceased.

7.0 Managing situations that are highly charged with emotion or potentially violent

Ohio State must always be aware of and respond carefully to incidents or circumstances that increase risks to the university community. Below are general guidelines, including information about when and how to access these resources for assisting and/or taking action when anyone of the university community experiences distress or causes a disruption.

Workplace violence does not occur in a vacuum but is preceded by patterns of problematic behaviors and interactions. Individuals should be encouraged to speak out to others if actions, words, or behaviors cause uncomfortable situations in the workplace.

If initial attempts to bring a stop to behaviors such as verbal outbursts or intimidation are not effective or are met with an escalation of anger, appropriate assistance is available from departmental Senior HR professionals, the Office of Human Resource Consulting, the Office of Institutional Equity, or the University Employee Assistance Program (contact information for the latter two offices appears below).

When reasonable attempts do not work, it may be necessary to convene a meeting of a university Crisis Assessment Team (CAT Team; contact information appears below), consisting of representatives from the Office of Human Resources, University Police, Employee Health, University Employee Assistance Program, Environmental Health and Safety, and other units when appropriate, such as the Office of Legal Affairs, the Office of Institutional Equity, and/or

the Office of Academic Affairs. The Crisis Assessment Team will meet with leaders from the affected area, conduct a risk assessment, and make specific recommendations to be implemented.

911 should be called any time there is concern for personal safety.

The most important point is to not tolerate or excuse inappropriate behavior but to reach out for consultation and guidance. Directors and peers should remember the following:

- A goal of The Ohio State University is to provide a workplace in which violence of any kind is neither tolerated nor excused.
- Extremely violent acts do not occur in a vacuum but are often the culmination of a pattern of escalating negative interactions.
- Zero tolerance for violence and intimidation, whether verbal or physical, must become part of the culture of the organization through education, performance expectations, and predictable administrative response to offenses.

The Ohio State University provides multiple resources to assist leaders and others in responding appropriately and with support to inappropriate workplace behavior.

- Non-Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct Policy
- Workplace Violence Policy (HR policy 7.05)
- Senior Human Resource Professionals in academic and work settings
- The Office of Institutional Equity, OIE (614-247-5838)
- The University Employee Assistance Program, EAP (1-800-678-6265)
- Crisis Assessment Team (CAT team)
- OSU Wexner Medical Center Security (614-293-8500); emergency (911)
- Guide to Assist Disruptive or Distressed Individuals, found on the front page of the Suicide and Mental Health Task Force site
- Columbus campus: OSU Police Department (614-292-2121); emergency (911)
- Lima campus: Campus Security Office (567-242-7400); emergency (911)
- Mansfield campus: Campus Security Office (419-755-4346 or -4218); emergency (911)
- Marion campus: Public Safety Office (740-725-6300); emergency (911)
- Newark campus: Public Safety Department (740-366-9237); emergency (911)

8.0 Ethics Law, Ohio

The State of Ohio requires all university personnel, including faculty members, to adhere to the Ohio Ethics Law. Additional information can be found on the [Office of Legal Affairs \(OLA\) website](#) with its [Legal Topics page](#) and on the [Ohio Ethics Commission website](#).

9.0 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974, as amended, sets forth requirements designed to protect the privacy of student educational records. The law governs access to records maintained by educational institutions and the release of information from those records. Additional information can be found in the [Privacy and Release of Student Education Records policy](#).

10.0 Immunity, indemnification, and representation

Ohio law provides university employees with immunity from liability in lawsuits filed in state courts. Individuals seeking to recover damages for the wrongful acts of a university employee must file a state court lawsuit in the Ohio Court of Claims. The defendant in such a case is the university; employees cannot be named individually in the Ohio Court of Claims.

University employees may in some circumstances be named as individual defendants in lawsuits filed in federal courts. However, the university may provide legal representation and pay the amount of any judgment in these cases.

University employees must satisfy two conditions to obtain the benefit of the immunity in state courts and the indemnification in federal court cases:

- The actions of the employee giving rise to the lawsuit must be within the scope of the employee's duties.
- The employee cannot be found to have acted with malice, in bad faith, or with reckless disregard as to the consequences of their actions.

Further information concerning the legal liabilities of faculty members, including TIU heads, may be obtained from [OLA](#).

11.0 Personal use of public property

Unauthorized use of university property for personal purposes is prohibited and could result in criminal charges. In certain limited circumstances, faculty members may use university property in connection with activities authorized under the [Outside Activities and Conflicts policy](#). However, faculty members must obtain prior approval from their TIU head and must reimburse the university for the fair market value of such use.

12.0 Public records

The Ohio Public Records Act defines a “record” as any document, device, or item, regardless of physical form or characteristic, created or received by, or coming under the jurisdiction of, any public office of the state or its political subdivisions, which serves to document the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the office.

Such records shall be promptly prepared and made available for inspection to any persons at all reasonable times during regular business hours. Upon request, a person responsible for public records shall make copies available at cost, within a reasonable period of time.

An academic unit should have a single person responsible for dealing with routine public records requests and in most cases that person should be the TIU head. The TIU head or other person responsible for handling such requests may wish to immediately contact the Public Records unit in the Office of University Compliance and Integrity when they receive a records request that is other than routine (e.g., the request is from an attorney and/or involves legal issues; appears to be ambiguous or overly broad; or is worded in manner such that the office cannot identify the public records being requested).

The Act does not require that records be created in response to a request. If there is no record that corresponds to a request, then there is no record to be provided.

The Act allows public entities to charge reasonable costs for making copies. If a unit receives a request for copies of records that appears to justify cost recovery, it should seek the advice of the Office of University Compliance and Integrity. To facilitate prompt access to public records and to ensure compliance with the Ohio Public Records Act, all employees are expected to comply with the university’s public record policy.

The Ohio Revised Code requires public institutions and agencies to abide by the rules for the disposition of public records as established by the State Records Administrator. However, the law exempts public institutions of higher education from the State Records Administrator and authorizes them to establish their own programs of records retention and disposition.

At Ohio State, authority for matters of records retention and disposition is vested in the University Archives. University Archives maintains a schedule governing the retention and disposition of records common to university units. University Archives also develops schedules for units in cases when they have records not listed on the General Schedule. These schedules are specific to units and are in conformity with *Records Retention for Public Colleges and Universities in Ohio: A Manual*.

13.0 Required email

The Ohio State University is committed to protecting the information created by and entrusted to us. Faculty and staff conducting university business by electronic mail are required to use the university-managed osu.edu mailbox and related systems. Using the OSU email account

ensures that we are protecting information as required under state or federal laws and regulations.

14.0 Health and safety

Faculty must comply with all health and safety requirements mandated by the university to ensure the health and safety of the campus community. Faculty who fail to comply may be subject to corrective actions, including but not limited to disciplinary action under University Faculty Rule 3335-5-04.

Chapter 3: Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

1.0 General Administration	40
1.1 Timetable.....	40
1.2 Submission to OAA.....	41
1.3 Public Records Act	41
1.4 Review schedule for mid-academic year start dates for probationary tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty	41
2.0 Types of reviews.....	41
2.1 Mandatory reviews.....	41
2.1.1 Extension of the tenure clock.....	42
2.1.2 Birth of a child or adoption of a child.....	42
2.1.3 Adverse events and unpaid leaves of absence.....	42
2.1.4 COVID-19	43
2.1.5 Part-time faculty	44
2.2 Nonmandatory Reviews	44
2.2.1 Requesting a Nonmandatory Review.....	44
3.0 Roles and process overview	45
3.1 Notification and confirmation of review and tenure clock extensions	45
3.2 APT document used for reviews.....	45
3.2.1 APT document used for reviews in restructured tenure initiating units.....	45
3.3 Creating the Introduction and Core Dossier	46
3.3.1 Time Frame	46
3.4 Building the full dossier	47
3.4.1 Documentation	47
3.4.1.1 Internal letters of evaluation	47
3.4.1.1.1 TIU annual review letters	47
3.4.1.1.2 Fourth year review (tenure track assistant professors only)	47
3.4.1.1.3 Additional letters requested by the candidate and solicited by the TIU head	47
3.4.1.1.4 Evaluation letter from joint appointment.....	48
3.4.1.1.5 Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching.....	48
3.4.1.1.6 Additional Information	48
3.4.1.2 External letters of evaluation	48
3.4.1.2.1 Required external letters of evaluation for tenure track and research faculty.....	48
3.4.1.2.2 Required external letters of evaluation for clinical/teaching/practice and associated faculty	49
3.4.1.2.3 Seeking external letters of evaluation.....	50
3.4.1.3 Student evaluation of instruction	52
3.4.1.3.1 Cumulative report	52
3.4.1.3.2 Fixed-response student evaluation data and/or SEI summary report	53
3.4.1.3.3 Summary of open-ended student evaluations	53
3.5 Managing conflicts of interest and other recusals	53

3.5.1 Committee of eligible faculty, college P&T committees, and university P&T committee.....	53
3.5.2 TIU heads and deans	54
3.6 Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) review	54
3.6.1 Verification of citations.....	55
3.7 Regional campus faculty.....	55
3.7.1 Regional campus faculty deliberative body	55
3.7.2 Regional campus dean/director	55
3.7.3 Regional campus comments process	55
3.8 TIU-level review.....	56
3.8.1 Committee of eligible faculty	56
3.8.1.1 Eligibility and quorum.....	56
3.8.1.2 Deliberation and vote	56
3.8.2 TIU head.....	57
3.8.3 TIU level comments process.....	57
3.9 College-level review	58
3.9.1 College promotion and tenure committee	58
3.9.1.1 Committee makeup.....	58
3.9.1.2 Deliberation and vote	58
3.9.2 Dean review.....	58
3.9.3 College level comments process.....	58
3.10 University promotion and tenure committee review	58
3.10.1 Membership.....	58
3.10.2 University promotion and tenure committee procedures	59
3.11 OAA Review	59
3.12 Board of Trustees final decision	59
3.13 Voting Procedures	60
3.14 Integrity of review procedures.....	60
3.15 Process differences for clinical/teaching/practice, research, and associated faculty.....	61
3.15.1 Levels of review for clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty	61
3.15.2 Non-reappointment notice for clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty	61
3.15.3 Levels of review for associated faculty	61
3.16 OAA approved exceptions	61
3.16.1 College of Medicine.....	62
3.16.1.1 Department of Internal Medicine.....	62
3.16.1.2 Department of Pediatrics.....	62
3.16.2 Department of Extension in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences.....	62
3.17 Links to flowcharts reflecting process	62
4.0 Reconsideration of materials during a review process	63
4.1 Procedural error description and procedures	63
4.2 Significant new information	63
4.2.1 Recommended procedures for significant new information.....	64
4.3 Ongoing investigation of a faculty candidate	64

5.0 Withdrawals and negative decisions.....	64
5.1 Withdrawals	64
5.1.1 Withdrawals from a nonmandatory review.....	64
5.1.2 Withdrawals from a mandatory review	65
5.2 Negative decisions	65
5.3 Appeals of negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decisions	65
6.0 Resources for faculty building the core dossier.....	66
6.1 Generating the core dossier	66
6.2 Guidance for writing narratives	66
6.3 Recommendations related to interdisciplinary scholarship.....	66
7.0 Guidelines for evaluation	66
7.1 Using the criteria in the APT document	66
7.2 Strategies for effective evaluation.....	67

1.0 General Administration

1.1 Timetable

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 academic policy and faculty resources, with copy to Bobbie Houser, OAA's HR Business Partner, with 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 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	Engineering
Education and Human Ecology	Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

Fourth Friday in February

Medicine
Veterinary Medicine

1.2 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.

1.3 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](#).

1.4 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 and tenure reviews. For example, a tenure track faculty member starting in 2024 is in the 2024–2025 cohort and will come up for mandatory promotion and tenure review in 2029–30.

2.0 Types of reviews

2.1 Mandatory reviews

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

2.1.1 Extension of the tenure clock

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.

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. Such action is at the discretion of the unit faculty, not the probationary faculty member.

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 academic policy and faculty resources. 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, 2025 for a review occurring in Autumn 2025).

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

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 had or adopted a child while employed at Ohio State so that their tenure clock may be extended by one year. Candidates may inform their TIU head, dean, or OAA in writing of the birth or adoption.

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 to exclude 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 (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.

Faculty 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 who choose one of the options above, but later decide that they do not need the additional year in their probationary period, may request a nonmandatory promotion and tenure

review following the procedures outlined in each unit's Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document. 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.

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 or professor.

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 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

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 tenured 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.

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 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.

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

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.

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 relevant), letters requested by the candidate, an evaluation letter from any heads of joint appointments (including Discovery Theme faculty directors), 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)

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.

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. 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 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.

3.4.1.2 External letters of evaluation

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

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. 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.

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

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. 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 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 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. This review 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. 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

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

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.

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."

If a Cumulative SEI Report cannot be generated, 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. A fillable report template is available [here](#).

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

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

- a) If the unit uses 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) 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

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), 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.

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 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 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 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 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](#).

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 bodies.

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

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. After the regional campus faculty deliberative body and regional campus dean/director complete their recommendations, the candidate is to be informed of the recommendations and given ten calendar days to provide comments. 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, that the regional campus faculty deliberative body and/or regional campus dean/director have the opportunity to provide written comments on the candidate's comments, also for inclusion in the dossier when the case is forwarded to the TIU.

Outline of the remaining steps in the review process.

The regional campus faculty deliberative body and/or regional campus dean/director 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.

3.8 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

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, 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 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

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 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.

3.8.3 TIU level comments process

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 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 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.

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 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.

3.10 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 academic policy and faculty resources 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 academic policy and faculty resources. 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 academic policy and faculty resources 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

The following documents illustrate the process flow for the various 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 academic policy and faculty resources 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

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 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 information become available about a candidate that may negatively impact the recommendation from the unit, the vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources must be contacted to determine whether and how that information may or may not be included.

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 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.

4.3 Ongoing investigation of a faculty candidate

Should a faculty candidate be under investigation by the Office of Institutional Equity or the Office of Human Resources while a review is underway, the case will proceed through the outlined steps to OAA. OAA will hold the case until the investigation is completed, and the executive vice president and provost will make the final decision using the materials that have been submitted by the college and any reports generated from the investigation.

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 workshop "[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.

Chapter 4: Appeals and Complaint Procedures

<u>1.0 Appeals of negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decisions</u>	69
<u>1.1 Allegation of improper evaluation</u>	69
<u>1.1.0 Issues not considered improper evaluation</u>	69
<u>1.1.1 Formal appeal process</u>	70
<u>1.2 Allegation of discrimination</u>	70
<u>1.3 Reviews in the final year of probation</u>	70
<u>2.0 Faculty salary equity appeal process</u>	71
<u>2.1 Eligibility</u>	71
<u>2.2 Salary reporting considerations</u>	72
<u>2.3 Parties to the appeal process</u>	72
<u>2.3.1 Academic unit head</u>	72
<u>2.3.2 Dean or dean/director</u>	72
<u>2.3.3 College faculty salary appeals committee</u>	73
<u>2.3.4 Regional campus faculty salary appeals committee</u>	73
<u>2.4 Time frame for appeal</u>	73
<u>2.5 College and regional campus salary appeals policies</u>	73
<u>2.6 TIU salary appeals policies</u>	73
<u>2.7 Appellant responsibilities</u>	74
<u>2.8 Academic unit head responsibilities</u>	75
<u>2.9 College or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee responsibilities</u>	75
<u>2.10 Dean or dean/director responsibilities</u>	76
<u>2.11 Salary equity adjustments proposed under these procedures</u>	76
<u>2.12 Decisions that can be appealed</u>	76
<u>2.13 Decisions that cannot be appealed</u>	77
<u>3.0 Complaints against faculty members</u>	77

1.0 Appeals of negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decisions

A reevaluation of a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision may occur if the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFR) determines an improper evaluation occurred (see Section 1.1: Allegation of improper evaluation), or if the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) determines that discrimination has occurred (see Section 1.2: Allegation of discrimination). For probationary tenure track faculty, a new review in the seventh year may occur if the head of the tenure initiating unit (TIU) determines there is significant new information (see Section 1.3: Seventh-year review).

In any of the appeal proceedings, unsolicited commentary by colleagues, students, or others on behalf of a candidate will not be considered at any time during the promotion and tenure or probationary renewal review process and will not influence the course of an appeal.

During the appeal process, the termination date for the faculty member remains the date provided in the letter informing the faculty member of the negative decision, unless changed by the executive vice president and provost.

TIU heads, deans, and the executive vice president and provost will not discuss a promotion and tenure or reappointment decision with individuals who are not a party to the decision-making process.

1.1 Allegation of improper evaluation

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision. Improper evaluation includes violations of (1) written procedures that could reasonably have affected the outcome of a review, and/or (2) failure to consider evidence material to a fair determination.

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 academic policy and faculty resources regarding the best way(s) to address a particular issue.

1.1.0 Issues not considered improper evaluation

Members of faculty review bodies, TIU heads, and deans are required to exercise professional judgment in considering the evidence that is material to making a fair determination in a tenure, promotion, or reappointment case. Differences in, or disagreements with, professional judgments do not provide a valid basis for appealing a negative decision.

Favorable annual reviews are not a basis for appealing a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment. A favorable annual review during the probationary period serves as the basis for a positive annual reappointment decision but does not imply a commitment to granting promotion or tenure with promotion. The review for tenure for faculty on the tenure-track and the penultimate year review for clinical/teaching/practice or research faculty entails a much weightier decision than the annual review and includes assessment of both cumulative

performance and promise of high-quality performance. Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of tenure, promotion (see [Faculty Rule 3335-6-05](#)), or reappointment.

1.1.1 Formal appeal process

Only the candidate may make an appeal of a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision regarding allegations of improper evaluation. A formal appeal cannot begin until the executive vice president and provost has rendered a negative decision in a promotion or promotion and tenure case for tenure-track faculty, in a promotion case for clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty, or the dean has rendered a decision in a reappointment case. An appeal alleging improper evaluation is reviewed in accordance with procedures described in [Faculty Rule 3335-5-05](#).

All appeals must occur within 30 days of the date of the letter from either the TIU head or dean informing the faculty member of the executive vice president and provost's negative decision in a promotion or promotion and tenure case for tenure-track faculty, in a promotion case for clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty, or the dean has rendered a negative decision in a reappointment case. The faculty member may appeal by sending a written complaint describing the alleged improper evaluation to the chair of CAFR, copied to the executive vice president and provost and vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources in cases involving promotion or promotion and tenure, or the dean in the case of clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty reappointments, and shall meet with the chair of CAFR regarding the complaint and next steps.

The faculty member is to promptly inform the chair of CAFR and OAA if they decide not to pursue the appeal once it has been filed.

1.2 Allegation of discrimination

An appeal also may be based on an allegation of discrimination. Such an appeal will focus on discrimination based on protected status (see [Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity Policy](#)). A complaint alleging discrimination is to be presented in writing to the [OIE](#), with a copy to the executive vice president and provost and vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources, within 30 days of the date of the letter from either the TIU head or dean informing the faculty member of the executive vice president and provost's or dean's (in the case of reappointments without a promotion review) negative decision. OIE shall have the sole discretion for investigating complaints of discrimination. The executive vice president and provost shall take any steps as deemed necessary upon receiving a decision from OIE.

1.3 Reviews in the final year of probation

In rare instances, a TIU may petition the dean to conduct a Seventh-Year Review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure (see [Faculty Rule 3335-6-05\(B\)](#)). Although the term "seventh-year review" is used in the University Faculty Rules, these review procedures are to be used for probationary tenure track faculty who have been given a negative tenure or tenure with promotion decision. For example, assistant professors who have used one or more tenure clock extensions to move their mandatory review year, assistant professors with significant clinical duties in the College of Medicine in their last probationary

year, and associate professors who have been denied tenure during their mandatory tenure review may also be considered for a final-year review following these same procedures.

The committee of eligible faculty and the TIU head must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh-year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment so the review can be completed before the candidate's last day of employment.

If the dean concurs with the TIU's petition, the petition will be forwarded to OAA for review. If the executive vice president and provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the nonrenewal of the appointment and does not presume a positive outcome. Should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

The candidate may not request a seventh-year review (the TIU head must make the request), appeal the denial of a seventh-year review petition, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh-year review, as the candidate has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth-year review.

2.0 Faculty salary equity appeal process

All faculty members have the opportunity to discuss salary equity issues with their TIU head or dean/director during the annual review process. When a faculty member perceives that inequities persist despite such discussions, and they meet the eligibility criteria specified below, they may initiate an appeal by notifying the TIU head or regional campus dean/director. Regional campus faculty must initiate their appeal with the regional campus dean/director.

The faculty salary equity appeal process is intended to address only salary appeals that are based on the belief of the faculty member (appellant) that their salary is lower than comparable faculty within their academic unit and that the salary disparity cannot be explained by factors that appropriately affect salary levels.

Subject to OAA approval, department, school, college, and regional campus patterns of administration (POAs) may contain additional policies pertinent to this process.

2.1 Eligibility

All of the following criteria must be met for the faculty salary appeal process to proceed.

- The appellant is a tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, research, or associated faculty member;
- The appellant's salary is 5% or more below the average salary of all other faculty of the same rank and faculty category in their academic unit or in a recognized discipline or subdiscipline with a distinct salary market within their academic unit (TIU for Columbus faculty; regional campus for regional campus faculty).

- In addition to the appellant, there must be at least two such faculty of the same rank and category within the TIU or regional campus comparison group for these procedures to apply.

Further, the appellant must allege that the salary disparity cannot be accounted for by

- differences in years of service and years in rank
- productivity in teaching, research and creative activity, and service
- past/present administrative duties
- market factors
- other factors set forth as legitimate bases for salary determination in the appellant's academic unit or regional campus APT document or POA or otherwise consistently communicated and applied in hiring and merit salary increase decisions.

Three full academic years must have passed since a final decision was rendered on an appellant's previous appeal under this process. For example, if an appellant uses this process during academic year 2024–2025 and a final decision is rendered in that time period, they may not use the process again until the 2028–2029 academic year.

This process is not intended to address all bases of dissatisfaction with salary. Faculty with salary concerns who are not eligible for review under this process may seek information about, and resolution to, their concerns through discussion with the head of their academic unit.

2.2 Salary reporting considerations

When a unit has faculty within a comparison group who have different appointments (e.g., 9/12 vs 12/12 faculty contracts), OAA strongly recommends that TIU heads or regional campus deans/directors provide the FTE Equivalent Base Salary (rather than 12/12 equivalent or simple base salary). Although 9-month faculty may earn additional compensation in the summer, this additional salary is not guaranteed. Comparisons made on 'potential salary' introduce inequity in the evaluation process by using the maximal potential earning for one group versus actual university pay in another. Using the FTE Equivalent Base Salary provides equivalency across different appointments.

2.3 Parties to the appeal process

Individuals involved in the appeal process include the appellant, the academic unit head, the dean or dean/director, the college faculty salary appeals committee and the regional campus faculty salary appeals committee.

2.3.1 Academic unit head

For the purposes of this process, the academic unit head on the Columbus campus is the head of the TIU (i.e., department, school, college). The academic unit head for regional campus faculty is the regional campus dean/director.

2.3.2 Dean or dean/director

For the purposes of this process, the dean or dean/director is the dean of a college or University Libraries, or the dean/director of a regional campus. The academic unit head and dean are the same person for the nine colleges (including the University Libraries) that serve as TIUs.

2.3.3 College faculty salary appeals committee

A faculty salary appeals committee shall be established at the college level. The committee may exist solely for the purpose of reviewing salary appeals under this process or may be an existing committee (e.g., the promotion and tenure committee or college investigation committee).

A two-level review process (department and college) is not possible for the nine colleges (including the University Libraries) that serve as TIUs. In these cases, the appellant may select, if they wish, an additional faculty member to serve on the college-level committee. If the appellant is a tenure-track faculty member, the additional member must be a full-time tenured faculty member. For all other faculty categories, the additional member may either be a full-time tenured faculty member or a non-probationary associate professor or professor from the appellant's faculty category (i.e., clinical/teaching/practice, research, associated). Any additional faculty member must be from the appellant's college and may not be a member of the comparison group.

2.3.4 Regional campus faculty salary appeals committee

The faculty salary appeals committee for the regional campuses shall consist of one faculty member from each regional campus appointed by the dean/director of that campus. This committee shall be constituted upon the appellant's appeal to the dean/director.

2.4 Time frame for appeal

Appeals under these procedures must be initiated no later than September 30 to facilitate completion of the review before salary recommendations are made for the next academic year. Every reasonable effort must be made by the parties to the review process to complete consideration of a salary appeal by mid-April of the academic year.

In the event it is not possible to conclude a review of an appeal in this time frame, the administrator who makes salary recommendations for the appellant will carry out that role as usual. Following the annual raise process, the appellant's salary appeal materials will need to be updated to reflect the new salaries of the appellant and the comparison group.

2.5 College and regional campus salary appeals policies

A college (whether it has TIUs or not) or regional campus POA may establish college-wide or regional campus policies for the documentation of salary appeals under this process if the college or regional campus wishes to have such policies. College and regional campus salary-appeals policies must be approved by OAA before they are implemented and may amend these policies as needed subject to approval of OAA.

2.6 TIU salary appeals policies

Except where college-wide standards for documentation of appeals are established, TIU POAs may establish written policies for the documentation of salary appeals under these procedures if TIUs wish to have such policies. These policies must be approved by the college office and OAA before they can be implemented. Units may amend these policies as needed subject to the required approvals.

2.7 Appellant responsibilities

The appellant is to provide the recommended documentation for a salary appeal as detailed in Appendix A: Directions for Faculty Making a Salary Appeal by February 1. Documentation also must be consistent with any TIU and/or college or regional campus written requirements as well as with the eligibility requirements set forth in Section 2.1: Eligibility.

Unless TIU, college, or regional campus POAs specify otherwise, the comparison group must include all other faculty of the same rank and appointment type in the TIU (excluding the academic unit head). When a TIU contains distinct and recognized disciplines or subdisciplines that have different salary markets, the comparison group will be limited to all other faculty of the same rank in the appellant's discipline or subdiscipline within the academic unit (excluding the academic unit head).

For an appellant on a regional campus, once the dean/director notifies the appellant of the names and current salaries of the comparison cohort (see Section 2.8 Academic unit head responsibilities), the appellant takes over the process and develops the documentation for the appeal.

As noted in Section 2.1: Eligibility, there must be at least two faculty members, in addition to the appellant, who meet the requirements for this process to be applicable.

Although not required, an appellant on the Columbus campus initially may present their documentation to the chair of the college faculty salary appeals committee for informal advice as to whether the appeal appears to meet the eligibility and documentation requirements set forth in this document and in any written TIU and college salary appeals policies. An appellant on a regional campus may communicate with their campus dean/director or the faculty ombudsperson if they have questions. Following such a discussion, the appellant may then determine whether to proceed with a salary appeal. The salary appeals committee chair shall not express an opinion as to whether the appeal has merit, given that judgment cannot be made based only on the appellant's perspective.

The faculty member may appeal to the college or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee if the academic unit head dismisses the appeal or proposes a resolution that is judged to be unsatisfactory by the appellant (see Section 2.8: Academic unit head responsibilities).

For a regional campus appellant, the dean/director works with the head of the appellant's TIU to determine an appropriate comparison cohort. The cohort will consist of Ohio State faculty holding the same rank as the appellant and matching as closely as possible the appellant's discipline, years since terminal degree, years of service to the university, and campus affiliation. With the small size of many programs on the regional campuses, the dean/director and head of the appellant's TIU often will need to approach the cohort-determining process with creativity and flexibility. They may wish to consult with the appellant and other regional deans. Principles for determining the cohort include the following:

- The cohort must consist of faculty closest to the appellant in number of years since receiving a terminal degree and number of years of service to the university. The appellant should be in the middle of the cohort with plus-or-minus x years since the terminal degree or x years of service, as appropriate. The ideal cohort will be symmetrical and composed of five or six individuals; the minimum size is two individuals, in addition to the appellant. If the appellant requests a particular individual to be included in the cohort, the cohort may be enlarged to include that person if that person is not already part of the comparison cohort. In such a case, the value of x is increased symmetrically to include the specified individual, as well as others who fall within the range of the new x. Current and former deans/directors are excluded; others who have had salary adjustments outside the merit system can be included only when such adjustments are noted and considered.
- Ideally, the entire cohort should come from the same discipline as the appellant and from the regional campuses (e.g., regional campus professors in Philosophy). When this is impossible, the disciplinary field can be conceived more broadly to bring in related disciplines (e.g., regional campus professors in the humanities). In rare circumstances the regional campus restriction can be loosened to include Columbus faculty in the discipline (e.g., Columbus campus professors in Philosophy). In considering salary differences in relation to differences in productivity within the cohort, the dean/director will take into account market differences between disciplines and campuses as well as differences in faculty members' years since terminal degree and years of service.

2.8 Academic unit head responsibilities

On receipt of documentation alleging salary inequity from an appellant, the academic unit head shall review the documentation. They may request additional information from the appellant and/or meet with them as appropriate.

The academic unit head will respond in writing (by email) to the appeal and will make every effort to do so within 30 days. The response may provide additional analysis, as deemed necessary, and must provide a rationale for the conclusions.

The academic unit head may dismiss the appeal or propose a salary adjustment (see Section 2.11: Salary equity adjustments proposed under these procedures). Salary adjustments should not be communicated to the appellant until the required approvals have been obtained.

If the academic unit is a TIU within a college, the TIU head will forward to the college office a copy of all written material generated by the appeal for record keeping purposes.

2.9 College or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee responsibilities

On receipt of an appeal from a faculty member who is dissatisfied with the academic unit head's or regional dean/director's disposition of that appeal, the college or regional campus faculty salary review committee will review the documentation submitted by the faculty member and the written conclusions of the academic unit head or regional dean/director in light of the unit's salary criteria.

Although the committee may, on occasion, request additional information from either the academic unit head or regional dean/director or appellant, its review should be based primarily

on the appellant's documentation and the academic unit head's or regional dean/director's response to that documentation. The committee does not develop new documentation. An inadequately documented appeal will be dismissed.

The college or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee shall provide an explanation of its conclusions and a recommendation to the dean or dean/director regarding:

- whether a salary adjustment for the appellant is or is not warranted;
- whether their recommendation aligns with that of the academic unit head or regional dean/director;
- the approximate adjustment amount if an adjustment is warranted that is different from the adjustment proposed by the academic unit head or regional dean/director.

The committee's recommendation to the dean or dean/director is advisory.

2.10 Dean or dean/director responsibilities

On receipt of a recommendation from the college or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee, the dean or dean/director will accept, amend, or reject the faculty committee's recommendation. If the dean or dean/director determines that a salary adjustment shall be made, they shall determine the amount and timing of that increase (see Section 2.11: Salary equity adjustments proposed under these procedures).

The dean or dean/director will communicate the final decision to the appellant and to the appellant's academic unit head if that person is different from the dean or dean/director. The dean or dean/director also will communicate to the faculty salary appeals committee the final action taken on an appeal and, if the action differs from the faculty committee's recommendation, the reason for that action.

The dean or dean/director will maintain in the college or regional campus office a record of all appeals including those dismissed by the academic unit head and not appealed to the college or regional campus faculty committee. Each record will include all written materials developed for and generated by the appeal.

2.11 Salary equity adjustments proposed under these procedures

To the extent possible, salary equity adjustments proposed from using these procedures should be funded from annual raise monies available during the annual raise cycle. A proposal to provide an equity salary increase from other academic unit funds, regardless of the proposed timing of the increase, requires the approval of the dean (in colleges with TIUs) and OAA.

2.12 Decisions that can be appealed

If the dean or dean/director dismisses an appeal that was not dismissed by the faculty salary appeals committee, or if they propose a salary adjustment that is less than 75% of the amount recommended by the faculty salary appeals committee, the appellant may appeal to the executive vice president and provost. The executive vice president and provost or designee will review the matter and render a final decision.

2.13 Decisions that cannot be appealed

A decision is final under these procedures and cannot be appealed when the academic unit head's or regional dean/director's written conclusions regarding the matter are not appealed to the college or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee within 30 days of the date of the academic unit head's or regional dean/director's letter to the appellant reporting conclusions; when the dean or dean/director accepts a recommendation of the college or regional campus faculty salary committee to dismiss an appeal; or when the dean or dean/director accepts a recommendation of the college or regional campus faculty salary appeals committee to provide a salary adjustment and offers an adjustment that is at least 75% of the amount recommended by the committee.

3.0 Complaints against faculty members

Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 establishes the procedures for formal complaints against all faculty, including tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, research, and associated faculty members. This rule also applies to administrators who hold faculty appointments when the complaint is related to their faculty duties.

Under this rule, complaints may be filed against faculty in four categories. Under track one (Faculty Rule 3335-5-04.1), complaints can be made alleging failure to meet faculty obligations. Under track two (Faculty Rule 3335-5-04.2), complaints can be made alleging research misconduct. Under track three (Faculty Rule 3335-5-04.3), complaints can be made alleging sexual misconduct, workplace violence, whistleblower retaliation, discrimination, harassment, and retaliation based on protected status. Under track four (Faculty Rule 3335-5-04.4) complaints can be made alleging violations of applicable law, university policies or rules, or unit governance documents.

All records of the proceedings are to be maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-04.

APPENDIX A

Directions for Faculty Making a Salary Appeal

1. Affirm the following statements are true:
 - a. You are a tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, research, or associated faculty member;
 - b. Your salary is 5% or more below the average salary of all other faculty of the same rank and faculty category in your academic unit or in a recognized discipline or subdiscipline with a distinct salary market within your academic unit (TIU for Columbus faculty, regional campus dean/director for regional campus faculty); and
 - c. There are at least two faculty, in addition to you, who can be included for comparison.
2. Inform your TIU head or dean/director of your intent to appeal your salary by September 30.
3. Review your TIU, college, and regional campus (if applicable) POA document to determine if there are any additional requirements for a faculty salary appeal.
4. Work with your TIU head or dean/director (or designee) to gather data for your analysis. Together, you will need to identify your comparison group—there must be at least two faculty, in addition to you, included for comparison. You will need the CVs and the teaching records of the past five years for all members of the comparison cohort. The TIU head and/or dean/director (or designee) will assist with providing CVs and teaching records from the campus and/or will assist in securing such information from other campuses and TIUs as needed.
5. Unless your TIU, college, or regional campus (if applicable) POAs specify otherwise, the comparison cohort must include all other faculty of the same rank and category in the TIU (excluding the academic unit head). When a TIU contains distinct and recognized disciplines or subdisciplines that have different salary markets, the comparison group will be limited to all other faculty of the same rank in your discipline or subdiscipline within the academic unit (excluding the academic unit head).
Additional guidance around comparison cohorts for regional campus faculty is provided in section 2.7 in Chapter 4: Appeals and Complaint Procedures of the *OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook*.
6. Organize the collected data in a spreadsheet format (side-by-side columns) for easy comparison across the cohort within specific categories. In this spreadsheet, identify yourself by name, but use only a number (e.g., faculty #1, faculty #2) to identify comparison faculty. Use the following guidelines and any additional guidelines from your unit's POA as you generate the spreadsheet.
 - a. In the first five columns, include title, rank, salary, years of service, and years in rank. If you are a faculty member on a regional campus, add department/school and campus as sixth and seventh columns.

- b. In the next set of columns, present relevant data on research and creative activity for all years since the terminal degree using the standard major categories from the Promotion and Tenure dossier (e.g., authored books, edited books, refereed journal articles, book chapters). To the extent possible, present comparative data on rates of citation, excluding self-citations, and other metrics as deemed appropriate by the TIU and college or regional campus from the unit APT and POA documents.
 - c. In the next set of columns, present relevant data on teaching for the past five years at The Ohio State University using the standard major categories from the Promotion and Tenure dossier (e.g., numbers of lower division, upper division, and graduate courses taught, and number of PhD and MA committees on which the faculty member has served). Note, reduction in teaching loads for individuals holding administrative or research appointments, and individuals who have not served at The Ohio State University for at least five years, are to be excluded from this section of the comparative analysis.
 - d. In the next set of columns, present relevant data on service for the past five years at The Ohio State University using the standard major categories from the Promotion and Tenure dossier (e.g., TIU or campus committee assignments, TIU or campus administrative assignments, university committee assignments, major community outreach and engagement, and major service to professional organizations). Individuals who have not been Ohio State faculty for at least five years are to be excluded from this section of the analysis, except that data on service to the profession may be included.
7. Based on the data gathered into the spreadsheet, write a brief statement (no more than 250 words) summarizing the research and creative activity, teaching, and service comparisons, highlighting your standing in relation to the cohort. End the statement with your requested salary adjustment, based on your place within the cohort.
8. The analysis must confirm that the salary disparity cannot be accounted for by any of the following:
 - differences in years of service and years in rank
 - productivity in teaching, research and creative activity, and service
 - past/present administrative duties
 - market factors
 - other factors set forth as legitimate bases for salary determination in the faculty member's academic unit APT document or POA or otherwise consistently communicated and applied in hiring and merit salary increase decisions
9. Submit the required comparative data and summary statement to your TIU head or dean/director by February 1. The TIU head or dean/director may request additional information, if needed.

Chapter 5: Office of Academic Affairs Administration

<u>1.0</u>	<u>Regional campus advisory boards</u>	81
<u>1.1</u>	<u>Composition and administration</u>	81
<u>1.2</u>	<u>Nominations and appointments</u>	82
<u>1.3</u>	<u>Responsibilities</u>	82
<u>1.4</u>	<u>Meetings</u>	83
<u>1.5</u>	<u>Conflict of interest</u>	83
<u>1.6</u>	<u>Officers</u>	84
<u>1.7</u>	<u>Committees</u>	84
<u>2.0</u>	<u>Faculty fellow program</u>	84
<u>2.1</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	84
<u>2.2</u>	<u>Compensation</u>	85
<u>2.3</u>	<u>Appointment process</u>	85
<u>2.4</u>	<u>Carole A. Anderson Fellow</u>	85
<u>2.5</u>	<u>Fellow leadership development program</u>	85
<u>3.0</u>	<u>Dual career hiring cost-sharing fund</u>	86
<u>4.0</u>	<u>Waiver of a National Search</u>	87
<u>4.1</u>	<u>Dual Career Program Candidates</u>	87
<u>4.2</u>	<u>Internal Candidates</u>	87
<u>4.3</u>	<u>External Candidates</u>	87
<u>4.4</u>	<u>Approval</u>	87
<u>5.0</u>	<u>Faculty Emergency Fund</u>	87

1.0 Regional campus advisory boards

1.1 Composition and administration

A regional campus advisory board has been established for each of the university's regional campuses located in Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark. Composition and administration of the regional campus advisory boards shall be as follows:

- (1) Each of these advisory boards shall be composed of ten members appointed by the executive vice president and provost ("the provost") in consultation with the dean/director of each regional campus.
- (2) Nine members of each advisory board shall be private citizens. One member of each board shall be a student who is currently enrolled and in good standing on their campus.
- (3) Citizen members shall be appointed for terms of three years. Terms will be staggered so that three terms end each year. If a vacancy develops, the provost may appoint a citizen member to fill the remaining part of the unexpired term, based upon the recommendation of the dean/director. No citizen member shall serve more than three terms, consecutive or otherwise. (In determining eligibility for reappointment, an initial appointment of two years or more shall be construed as a term.)
- (4) The student member shall serve a term of one year and is eligible for reappointment as long as they remain a student in good standing on their campus.
- (5) Terms of the appointed members shall begin on July first.
- (6) Board members shall serve without compensation but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. Board members shall be provided immunities or indemnification against any claims or liabilities which may arise from the performance of their duties to the full extent permitted by law.
- (7) The dean/director of each campus, in collaboration with the senior vice provost for external engagement and provost, shall establish campus priorities. The chair of each board shall advise the dean/director in establishing board agendas that promote these priorities. Reasonable staff services and other assistance as may be required by a board will be provided by the dean/director. The dean/director may attend all meetings of the board.
- (8) The provost or the provost's designee, in cooperation with the deans/directors, shall serve as the liaison between the regional campus boards and the various colleges, TIUs, and offices of the university, and may attend all meetings of these boards.
- (9) The chairs of the Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark campus faculty assemblies shall serve as resource persons to their campus's board and, to serve that function may attend all public meetings of the board.

1.2 Nominations and appointments

Nominations for and appointments to regional campus advisory boards shall proceed as follows, with the goal of continually ensuring a strong, independent group of dedicated members of diverse backgrounds who represent a range of professions and experiences.

- (1) All members of the regional campus advisory boards are appointed by the provost, in consultation with the dean/director of each campus.
- (2) The deans/directors will consult with their boards in determining nominees.
- (3) The following criteria shall guide the nominations of community members:
 - (a) They are well acquainted with their respective campus and its region; with the other regional campuses; and with The Ohio State University as a whole;
 - (b) They have a record of community service;
 - (c) Consideration should be given to nominating individuals with diverse professional expertise and perspectives; and
 - (d) Employees of the university and their immediate family members, employees of the co-located technical college and their immediate family members, and members of the board of the co-located technical college are ineligible to serve as citizen members.
- (4) Student members are to be in good standing on their respective campuses, with an active interest in improving the campus and The Ohio State University in general, and must be willing to inform themselves about the needs, interests, and concerns of other students. However, in their capacity as board members, the student member's role is as that of any other board member—to balance the needs and issues of all constituencies in their deliberations, not to represent a single constituency.
- (5) Deans/directors will communicate their nominations to the provost no later than the Tuesday following Memorial Day of each year.
- (6) Vacancies shall be filled by the provost in the same manner and subject to the same qualifications as appointments for full terms.
- (7) Members of the regional campus boards serve at the pleasure of the provost.

1.3 Responsibilities

The regional campus boards shall serve in an advisory capacity to the dean/director of their respective campuses. Each board shall:

- (1) Assist in maintaining key relationships with external constituencies by:
 - (a) Developing support for its campus;

- (b) Being knowledgeable about The Ohio State University, in general, and, in particular, about the campus served by the board;
 - (c) When appropriate, serving as a knowledgeable and effective advocate for its campus and for The Ohio State University with the state legislature and state and local agencies;
 - (d) Ensuring effective coordination with the board of the co-located technical college in all areas of common interest; and
 - (e) Ensuring effective coordination with the Columbus campus through service by appointed board members on appropriate Columbus-based councils and committees.
- (2) Offer advice and guidance, as appropriate, about its campus's strategic plan, campus plan, student life plan, safety and security plans, etc. The regional campus boards shall have no jurisdiction with respect to faculty. The hiring, evaluation, promotion, tenure status, duties and responsibilities, and compensation of faculty shall be conducted in accordance with established university rules. The advisory board has no jurisdiction regarding the hiring, review, and/or compensation of staff members.
- (3) The deans/directors of the regional campuses may, at their discretion, seek the advice of their respective boards on such matters as annual budgets, capital projects, partnerships, etc.

1.4 Meetings

Regular meetings of the regional campus advisory boards shall be held on such schedule as may be established by these boards in consultation with the dean/director at times that shall be set and publicly announced.

- (1) Special meetings may be called at the direction of a board chair, in consultation with the dean/director, or may, in consultation with the dean/director, be called by a chair at the request of three members of their board. In such cases, notice to all members of that board shall be given not less than five days prior to the meeting and publicly announced.
- (2) Non-binding recommendations to the dean/director may be passed by a majority of the voting members present.

1.5 Conflict of interest

No regional campus advisory board member shall participate in deliberations on a university contract, action, or transaction when the board member has a financial or personal or fiduciary interest in any person or entity affected by such contract, action, or transaction. The board member having the prohibited interest shall make full disclosure thereof and shall abstain from any deliberations on any such matter. Board members shall provide the provost on or about August first of each year with a full disclosure of any financial or fiduciary interest the board member, a member of the board member's family, or any business associate of the board member may have in any service provider who may be qualified to do business with the university.

1.6 Officers

Officers of regional campus boards shall be as follows:

- (1) The executive committees of the regional campus boards shall consist of a chair, vice chair, and a recording secretary of each board. These officers shall be elected annually by their respective board on a schedule to be determined by that board. No officer may serve more than two consecutive, one-year terms in the same office.
- (2) The chair shall preside at all meetings of their board, shall appoint members of any committees created by the board, shall serve as an *ex officio* member of all standing and special committees, and shall approve the agenda for all board meetings.
- (3) The vice chair shall perform the duties and exercise the powers of the chair during the absence of the chair or in the event of the chair's inability to act.
- (4) The recording secretary shall be responsible for ensuring that minutes of board meetings are produced and maintained; for ensuring that board members are kept informed about board activities and campus issues; for ensuring that correspondence of the board is properly conducted; and for posting board minutes to a designated location on their campus's website in a timely fashion.

1.7 Committees

Committees of regional campus boards may form and operate as follows:

- (1) In consultation with their respective deans/directors, the regional campus boards shall establish such committees, both standing and *ad hoc*, as needed to inform their advice and recommendations to the deans/directors.
- (2) The charge and composition of the regional campus board committees shall be determined by the board chairs in consultation with their respective dean/director.
- (3) The work of the regional campus board committees shall be facilitated by such offices on the regional campus as student life, student academic success, diversity and inclusion, business and finance, and other units as may be appropriate to a committee's charge. The provost or the provost's designee will assure the regular and ongoing contact of the regional campus board committees and Columbus campus offices/leaders as appropriate.
- (4) The regional campus board committees shall also work with individuals and entities, as appropriate, at the technical school co-located on their campus to ensure the continuing collaboration and mutual benefit of both institutions.

2.0 Faculty fellow program

2.1 Purpose

This program enables OAA to obtain the services of tenure track or clinical/teaching/practice associate professor or professor for an in-depth, time-limited administrative project, releasing

them from 20% or more of their regular duties. The program also is designed to provide a leadership development opportunity for faculty who are in a later stage of their careers.

2.2 Compensation

A faculty fellow appointment does not entail additional compensation. OAA will transfer funds to the faculty fellow's home unit to cover their compensation in proportion to the percent FTE that OAA is obtaining for their time.

OAA Administration Compensation can include summer funding for faculty who are on 9-month appointments.

2.3 Appointment process

Vice provosts, vice presidents, or senior vice provosts will submit a proposal for an administrative project for a faculty fellow to lead beginning the following academic year. Projects will usually be one year but could be proposed for two years. Proposal due dates will be announced each spring. The senior vice provost for academic leadership will appoint a screening committee to review proposals and make a recommendation to the provost for a maximum of eight projects. The provost will approve the final proposals for projects to be undertaken.

Once the proposals are approved, OAA will call for nominations, including self-nominations, through *OnCampus* and an electronic message sent to faculty, department chairs, school directors, and deans. Applicants will be requested to provide a statement of interest, and a CV. The statement of interest is to include the candidate's vision for their future academic leadership roles.

The hiring individual will interview and recommend a faculty fellow for their proposal to the provost and senior vice provost for academic leadership who must approve the final candidate. The selection process must include consideration for future leadership potential. Faculty members who have demonstrated academic leadership (e.g., a chair, department-level leadership, college-level leadership such as an associate dean or center director) will be given preference. Selections will be completed by May 1.

2.4 Carole A. Anderson Fellow

Participation in a leadership development program or significant university service will be a factor in the selection of the Carole A. Anderson Fellow, named in honor of Carole A. Anderson, professor emerita of Nursing, retired July 31, 2011, passed away June 5, 2023. Only one Anderson Fellow will generally be appointed at any given time. A vice provost, vice president, or senior vice provost whose project has been approved may propose a candidate for this distinction when recommending that candidate for selection by the provost and senior vice provost for academic leadership.

2.5 Fellow leadership development program

The senior vice provost for academic leadership will lead the leadership development program of the OAA faculty fellows. The cohort of OAA faculty fellows will join the Big Ten Academic

Alliance Academic Leadership Program cohort in on campus program meetings with academic leaders and will participate in monthly programs.

3.0 Dual career hiring cost-sharing fund

Ohio State is committed to enhancing academic excellence. Recruiting, supporting, and retaining faculty of the highest caliber is a core component of this commitment. As part of this commitment, OAA has established a hiring fund to help support dual career academic appointments. This fund provides up to three years of partial salary support for dual career partner opportunity hires in which a potential or current tenure-track, clinical/teaching/professional practice, or research faculty member has a spouse or partner who also is interested in an academic appointment. In such cases, the chair or dean of the hiring unit may engage the Office of Dual Careers and Faculty Relocation (DCFR) to assist with identifying a possible unit(s) of interest for the dual careers partner. The office also can assist in establishing (in collaboration with both the requesting unit and the potential hiring unit) whether the dual career partner is to be given consideration based on appointment criteria in the hiring unit.

If there is alignment between the dual career partner and the hiring unit, that unit will determine the appropriate type of appointment and consult with its faculty in accordance with its own APT document. The unit can either perform this appointment review as part of a national search or following obtaining a search waiver (all TIUs' processes of reviews and recommendation need to be followed after that point).

Once there is an agreement to offer an appointment, OAA will provide one-third of the initial salary, on a cash basis, for a period of up to three years. The remaining salary and all of the benefits will be split between the hiring units, or in the case of a dual career couple being hired into the same unit, assumed by that unit. The unit making the initial hire is responsible for initiating a Memorandum of Understanding that outlines how the funding will be split and administered. The OAA dual career hiring fund applies to any faculty or postdoctoral position. The units can be within a single college, as well as across colleges. Colleges should submit requests for cost-sharing from this fund using the Faculty Affairs Request process. Once the unit has initiated the dual career funding request, it will route to the vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources for review and response. If a Dual Career Search Waiver is desired, the Faculty Affairs Request process is to be used to initiate the search waiver for the dual careers partner hire. Allocations to this fund are made annually and disbursements are subject to the availability of funds at the time of the request.

Units may choose among three funding packages, all equivalent to a year of salary support, excluding benefits:

- 75% of the salary in the 1st year and 25% in the 2nd year
- 50% of the salary in the 1st and 2nd years
- 33% of the salary over each of 3 years

The university does not expect any department/school/college to hire candidates that do not meet the same quality standards as candidates hired in the receiving department.

The process will be conducted with all deliberate speed to reach a final agreement in time to allow a successful recruitment of the faculty candidate.

4.0 Waiver of a National Search

4.1 Dual Career Program Candidates

Units considering a partner hire through the dual-career program may request a national search waiver.

4.2 Internal Candidates

Units moving an internal candidate from an associated faculty position (e.g., lecturer, senior lecturer) to a clinical/teaching/practice or research faculty position do not need to request a search waiver. The change of title is recommended following a review by the TIU, a positive recommendation from the TIU head, and approval by the dean.

Units moving an internal candidate to a tenure track position must conduct a search.

The Department of Extension is the only exception. In that instance, the department will not request a search waiver. The change of title is recommended following a review by the TIU, a positive recommendation from the TIU head, and approval by the dean.

Units moving a staff member (e.g., research scientist, staff position with teaching duties included in the role) to a clinical/teaching/practice or research faculty position must request a search waiver. If the waiver is granted, the TIU must complete a full review, the TIU head must provide a recommendation, and the dean must approve the hire.

4.3 External Candidates

A search must be conducted for all external candidates, regardless of the faculty position. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in section 4.1 above.

4.4 Approval

All search waivers are to be submitted for approval via DocuSign to the vice provost for academic policy and faculty resources. No additional steps in a search may be conducted until approval is granted.

5.0 Faculty Emergency Fund

The Ohio State University Faculty Emergency Fund is available upon request to full-time faculty. The purpose of this fund is to support faculty in meeting expenses associated with the successful continuation of their work at Ohio State. Although these resources are limited, the university attempts to make emergency funds readily available to ease the financial burden of unexpected expenses, including, but not limited to, relocation expenses and emergency dependent care expenses. Each full-time faculty member is eligible to borrow up to \$1,500. The application form is available [here](#). Faculty receiving funds will be required to submit an

application to the Office of Academic Affairs. Normal processing of the application should result in the distribution of funds to the faculty member in the next paycheck processed.

The program is administered through the Office of Academic Affairs. This revolving fund is available on a first-come, first-served basis. New funds are released as previous recipients repay their funds. If a faculty member wishes to use the emergency fund more than once, they must repay in full the previous funds and remain in the queue until funds are available. The funds released to faculty are interest free.

Because this is a revolving fund, individuals are required to repay the fund through an automatic payroll deduction or by check to the Office of Academic Affairs. There will be a payment of \$300 each month beginning the semester following the loan dispersal and continue for a total of 5 months. There is no penalty if faculty wish to repay the funds more quickly.

Chapter 6: Faculty Awards and Recognition

<u>1.0 University faculty awards</u>	90
<u>2.0 College, department, and school faculty awards</u>	90
<u>3.0 External Awards</u>	90
<u>4.0 Documenting work for award consideration</u>	90

1.0 University faculty awards

Information about university-level faculty awards is available and updated on the [Faculty Awards](#) website. Faculty, administrators, and unit-level awards committees should use this website to learn about eligibility for awards, materials required for nomination, and deadlines for submission. Questions can be addressed to the [Office of Faculty Affairs](#).

2.0 College, department, and school faculty awards

During annual review meetings, TIU heads should discuss with faculty members possible awards for which they may be eligible. Information about identifying faculty for awards can be found on [Faculty Awards FAQ](#) website.

Faculty members should communicate with their mentoring team (if they have one) and their TIU head to learn about awards internal to the college and department/school. If the faculty member reviews the award information and believes they are a good candidate for the award, they may ask other faculty and/or their TIU head to nominate them.

3.0 External Awards

Information on external faculty awards is available and updated on the [Faculty Awards External Awards](#) website. Additional information about external awards is available on the [Faculty Awards FAQ](#) website.

4.0 Documenting work for award consideration

Faculty should maintain their core dossier, including narratives, so that it is ready to share at any time should a nomination opportunity become available. Although the lists included in a core dossier are helpful to possible letter writers and nominators, the narratives in the core dossier will provide important context in helping them to understand a faculty member's work.

Information about increasing online visibility is available on the [Faculty Awards FAQ](#) website.

Chapter 7: Faculty Development

<u>1.0 University Faculty Development Opportunities</u>	92
<u>1.1 Office of Academic Affairs</u>	92
<u>1.1.1 Faculty Affairs</u>	92
<u>1.1.2 Outreach and Engagement</u>	92
<u>1.1.3 National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity</u>	92
<u>1.2 Office of the Enterprise for Research, Innovation and Knowledge</u>	92
<u>1.3 Keenan Center for Entrepreneurship</u>	92
<u>2.0 Local Faculty Development Opportunities</u>	92
<u>3.0 Academic Leadership Development Opportunities</u>	92

1.0 University Faculty Development Opportunities

1.1 Office of Academic Affairs

1.1.1 Faculty Affairs

The Office of Faculty Affairs offers several faculty development opportunities, including New Faculty Orientation, the P&T Achievement Conference, Faculty Pathways, the New Chair Program, and the All Chairs Program, among others. Information about faculty development opportunities offered through the Office of Academic Affairs can be found on the [Faculty Development](#) website. The office also provides a number of [multimedia resources](#).

1.1.2 Outreach and Engagement

The Office of Outreach and Engagement offers professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. Information about these programs can be found on the office's [Professional Development](#) website. Development opportunities include the Engaged Scholarship Faculty Community of Practice and workshops designed to increase the understanding of broader research impacts.

1.1.3 National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity

The Office of Diversity and Inclusion maintains an institutional membership to the [National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity](#), which offers a host of faculty development opportunities.

1.2 Office of the Enterprise for Research, Innovation and Knowledge

The Office of the Enterprise for Research, Innovation and Knowledge offers numerous faculty development opportunities that can be found at the [Knowledge Discovery and Development Programs](#) website. Programs range from developing a research program to building large, team-science-focused grants.

1.3 Keenan Center for Entrepreneurship

The [Tim and Kathleen Keenan Center for Entrepreneurship](#) offers [programs](#) to support the entrepreneurial development of faculty and students. Faculty interested in a start-up are encouraged to work with the Center to ensure the proper process is followed.

2.0 Local Faculty Development Opportunities

Faculty are encouraged to meet with their mentoring teams (if they have one), TIU head, associate deans, and dean to learn about faculty development opportunities in their department, school, and/or college.

3.0 Academic Leadership Development Opportunities

Several university-level academic leadership development programs are available. Information about these programs can be found at [this](#) website.