

University Promotion & Tenure Review Screening Checklist

20__/__

Candidate _____ TIU/College _____

LAST FIRST Other MOU attached if needed
RESIDENCY [] US Citizen Date appointed or last promotion _____

- [] TENURE Track [] To Tenure only
To Promote only [has tenure] [] Professor [] Assoc Prof
To Promote with TENURE [] Professor [] Assoc Prof [] Asst Prof
To Promote without TENURE [] Professor [] Assoc Prof [] Asst Prof

OAA adds one screening checklist to each candidate's dossier. This document will look slightly different for faculty from colleges that are the TIU and regional campuses.

- [] CLINICAL [] RESEARCH [] Reappointment Only
To Promote only [] Professor [] Assoc Prof [] Asst Prof
To Promote and Reappoint [] Professor [] Assoc Prof [] Asst Prof

- ASSOCIATED Appointment [] Tenure Track (<50% FTE) [] Clinical [] Adjunct
To Promote only [] Professor [] Assoc Prof [] Asst Prof

TIU VOTE: ___ POS + ___ NEG = ___ TOTAL votes cast. ___ % POS of total

[___ Abstentions]
___ % POS REQUIRED for TIU recommendation to be considered positive. [] POS [] NEG

TIU HEAD [chair/director] recommendation

COLLEGE VOTE: ___ POS ___ NEG [___ Abstentions]

COLLEGE DEAN [] POS [] NEG

DOCUMENTATION—TEACHING

- Student evaluations summarized [] YES [] NO
Student evaluation reports included in Appendix [] YES [] NO
Peer evaluations included [] YES [] NO

DOCUMENTATION—RESEARCH

- Dossier guidelines followed for publications [] YES [] NO
External eval < 1/2 rec.by candidate; arms-length [] YES [] NO [] N/A
College evaluation explains context (expectations, assignments) [] YES [] NO
Strengths/ weaknesses adequately explained [] YES [] NO
TO COMMITTEE [] YES [] NO

Office of Academic Affairs Final Decision [] APPROVE [] DISAPPROVE

Signature of Provost or Vice Provost

Date

Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Dossier Checklist

CANDIDATE

(Print name)

Research Required Presentation

- Authors in *Item 1* are listed:
 - in the order in which they appear on each publication
 - in the standard citation style for my discipline or in the style provided by the approved OAA electronic dossier.
- Multiple authorship in *Items 1a–1e* for jointly authored papers or *Item 5* for research funding, includes:
 - narrative description of my intellectual contribution
 - percentage of contribution to the writing of the funding application (in 5c), not the percentage of effort or salary release.

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 17):

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

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

I have followed the examples of narrative description provided in the current Dossier Outline per Volume 3 of the *OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook*. I understand that statements such as "all authors contributed equally" or "50% effort" do NOT constitute adequate narrative description of intellectual contribution.

Student Evaluation of Teaching Required Documentation

- SEI or other fixed-response survey data included for every course taught since start date or date of last promotion whichever is more recent.
- Correctly placed in dossier Section IV (see Dossier Outline in Section 4.1 of the *OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook*).

I have prepared my dossier in accordance with the current Dossier Outline, and it fulfills all requirements, with special attention to those noted above.

I understand that the review process cannot commence until I have submitted a correctly prepared dossier, and that if substantive errors or omissions are discovered at any stage of the process, the dossier may be returned to me for revision.

Signature* of candidate _____ Date _____

*signature must occur prior to the TIU review

TIU-LEVEL REVIEW**Internal Evaluation**

If a different APT document from the one approved by OAA is used for the review, it is to be included following this form.

- All citations are verified by the POD for accuracy.
- APT document year _____ is attached to be used in the review (only if the current APT document is not being used—see Volume 3 of the *OAA Policy and Procedures Handbook*).
- Annual reviews and any comments provided as required by the Dossier Outline are included in Part III.A. If the set of annual review letters is incomplete, a written explanation is provided.
 - Candidates for tenure and promotion or tenure—all annual review letters (including 4th Year Review) since start date.
 - All other candidates—all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or year of hire with tenure, not to exceed the most recent 5 years.
- Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc.) as required by the APT document being used for the review is included in Part III.A.
 - Number of peer evaluations of teaching required as stated in APT Document: _____
 - Number of peer evaluations of teaching submitted: _____
- Open-ended student evaluations, if collected, summarized and included in Part IV.C. Candidates for promotion and tenure should include all courses taught; candidates for promotion should only provide most recent 5 years (e.g., SEI comments from students).

External Evaluation

- At least five external letters (where required) included in Part III.B.
 - No more than one-half from persons suggested by the candidate.
 - None from former PhD or post-doc advisors; collaborators; or those who otherwise have a relationship with the candidate that could reasonably interfere with objective evaluation.
- External evaluators summary sheet
 - Completed summary sheet (Form 114) for external reviewers who agreed to evaluate candidates. All persons who were requested to write and agreed are listed, including reviewer's name; institution; title/rank; suggested by; and relationship to candidate.
- External evaluator cover page
 - A cover page (Form 106) precedes every letter received.
 - Do NOT include a cover page for evaluators from whom no letter was received.
 - Every item on the cover page is filled out and includes sufficient information to establish the evaluator's:
 - Credibility.
 - Relationship with candidate.

The dossier fulfills all requirements stated in the current Dossier Outline per Volume 3 of the *OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook*, with special attention to the points noted above, including all those affirmed by the candidate.

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

I verify the accuracy of all citations, that the dossier fulfills all requirements, and that the review for accuracy occurred before the dossier was provided to the committee of eligible faculty for formal review.

(Print name)

Signature _____ Date _____
Procedures Oversight Designee

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

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

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

The report of the TIU deliberative body contains:

- Detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses, and a report of and interpretation of TIU vote.
- Explanation of the expectations of the unit against which the candidate is being assessed.
- Otherwise the expectations of the unit must be explained in the letter by the TIU head or regional campus deliberative body or regional campus dean.

I verify that this review was based on performance, was free of bias against underrepresented groups, was conducted in accordance with the unit's APT document, and that candidates were treated consistently.

(Print name)

Signature _____ Date _____
Procedures Oversight Designee

NUMERICAL VOTING RECORD IN THE TENURE INITIATING UNIT

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

The quorum needed is identified in the unit's APT document and varies by unit.

Quorum*

		Number or Percentage
1	Faculty eligible to vote on this case—does not include TIU head (line 8) or faculty who are excused (line 2). Eligible faculty are defined in each unit's APT document and are dependent on category and rank.	
2	Eligible faculty on previously approved leave or excused because of a conflict of interest	
3	Eligible faculty members who are absent and unexcused	
4	Total faculty eligible to vote present in the meeting and discussing the case (line 1 minus line 3)	
5	Percentage of eligible faculty in the meeting discussing the case (Line 4 divided by line 1, converted to a percentage)	
6	Percentage of eligible faculty that must be exceeded for quorum (>66.7% for 2/3 rule or >50% for simple majority)	
7	Is quorum met (Is line 5 greater than line 6—mark Yes or No)	
8	Non-eligible faculty participating in the meeting (e.g., TIU head)	

Vote*

1	Number of YES votes on this case	The percentage of yes votes required for a positive recommendation is identified in the unit's APT document and varies by unit.
2	Number of NO votes on this case	
3	Number of combined YES and NO votes on this case	
4	Percentage of YES votes relative to combined YES plus NO votes on this case	
5	Percentage YES votes required by the APT document being used for this review for the eligible faculty's recommendation to be considered positive	
6	Number of eligible faculty attending the meeting abstaining (these votes are NOT counted in 3)	

Note: Abstentions are not counted as votes consistent with the Office of Academic Affairs' guidelines for APT documents and with Robert's Rules of Order.

I understand that if the tenure initiating unit reviews and forwards a dossier lacking key information and/or containing less than credible external evaluation, the review process may have to begin anew.

TIU** Procedures Oversight Designee _____
(Print name)

Signature _____ Date _____

*Include the number of clinical/teaching/practice associate professors and clinical/teaching/practice professors if document allows for their vote in a clinical promotion case.

**The Procedures Oversight Designee in colleges without departments should sign on this page rather than on page 5 since these colleges serve as the TIU for their faculty.

COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEW
Only for colleges with TIUs

I verify the following:

- The TIU has conducted its review consistent with university, college, and TIU policies and rules.
- This review was based on performance and was free of bias against underrepresented groups.
- The report of the college P&T committee adequately explains the bases for its recommendation and for differing with TIU recommendations where such differences exist.
- The dossier fulfills all requirements stated in the current Dossier Outline per Volume 3 of the *OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook*, with special attention to the points noted above, including all those affirmed by the candidate and by the TIU Procedures Oversight Designee.

NUMERICAL VOTING RECORD IN THE COLLEGE

The information below is required in the official record for every review, even when the vote is unanimously positive. College committees are recording a vote on proposed action (i.e., promotion or promotion with tenure).

_____ Number of YES to recommend approval on proposed action votes on this case.

_____ Number of NO to recommend approval on proposed action votes on this case.

_____ Number of Abstentions on this case.

Note: Abstentions are not votes per the Office of Academic Affairs' guidelines for APT documents and consistent with Robert's Rules of Order.

I understand that if the college reviews and forwards a dossier to the Office of Academic Affairs that lacks key information and/or containing less than credible external evaluation, the review process may have to begin anew.

College Procedures Oversight Designee _____
 (Print name)

Signature _____ Date _____

FINAL CHECK OF DOSSIER CONTENTS

by College Office Staff Member

- Record of review signed by regional campus dean; TIU head; college dean (as applicable).
- Dossier checklist [this document] signed by candidate; Procedures Oversight Designee for TIU (or college without departments); Procedures Oversight Designee for college with departments; college office staff member performing final check.
- Copy of approved criteria used for review (only if using criteria that is different from current criteria).
- PART I: INTRODUCTION.
 - A. Biographical statement of candidate.
- PART II: CORE DOSSIER.
- PART III: EVALUATION.
- PART III.A. Internal Letters of Evaluation. Every item in Part III.A. should be preceded by a divider noting the item that follows.
 - 1. TIU annual review letters, as required by Dossier Outline, are arranged in chronological order (oldest to newest); with written explanation if set is incomplete.
 - For assistant professors, all annual review letters since start date.
 - For associate professors or hires with tenure, all annual review letters since previous promotion, not to exceed last 5 years.
 - 2. Written documentation submitted as part of the annual reviews.
 - 3. Fourth Year Review letter to the probationary faculty member, written documentation submitted as part of the review.
 - 4. Additional letters requested by the candidate and solicited by the head of the TIU. These are optional and can include letters from collaborators (external or from other units at OSU). Candidates with significant service/outreach activities outside the unit may request that the TIU solicit letters from colleagues familiar with the candidate's contributions to these activities.
 - 5. Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc.) as required by APT document being used in this review.
- PART III.B. External Evaluation.
 - 1. Summary sheet of all evaluators from whom a letter was received (Form 114).
 - 2. A representative sample of the letters sent to evaluators.
 - 3. If not included in the letter sent to evaluators, a list of materials submitted to external reviewers by candidates.

4. Letters from at least five (5) external evaluators, consistent with list on summary sheet, with each letter preceded by a completed cover page (Form 106).
- PART IV. Student Evaluation of instruction.
- A. Cumulative Fixed-Response Survey Data.
- B. Fixed-Response Student Evaluation Data.
- C. Summary of Open-Ended Student Evaluations (e.g., student comments).
- PART V. Appointment, Promotion, Tenure Internal Review Evaluation.
- A. Regional campus faculty deliberative body, if applicable [otherwise no "N/A" page].
- B. Regional campus dean, if applicable [otherwise no "N/A" page].
- C. TIU (or college without departments) faculty deliberative body.
- D. TIU head.
- E. Head(s) of unit(s) in which the candidate has split FTE appointments, if applicable.
- F. TIU-level comments process letters or notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.
- G. College (with departments) P&T committee.
- H. College dean.
- I. College-level comments process letters or notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

I have reviewed the contents of this dossier as summarized above and verify that all required material is included and located in the correct section of the dossier in accordance with the Dossier Outline. I understand that if any substantive omissions are discovered when the dossier is reviewed in the Office of Academic Affairs, the dossier will be returned to the college office for correction before the review may continue.

This dossier contains no extraneous material (i.e., not specifically requested in the Dossier Outline), such as articles, book reviews, news clippings, unsolicited letters, etc. **Any material of this kind that was examined during the TIU- or college-level review must be removed before the dossier is forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs.**

College office staff member doing final check:

(Print name)

Signature

Date _____

I. Introduction

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 19)

A biographical statement can include a narrative description of the candidate's educational background, brief summaries of their teaching, research, and service efforts, and effort assignments (e.g., 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service). This statement is to be no longer than 750 words. List candidate's name and current appointment (including joint and Discovery Theme appointments as appropriate), degrees and professional positions held, with dates for each. A CV should not be appended.

I. Introduction

Name

The Ohio State University

University Address

Columbus, Ohio, 43210

Phone:

URL:

Biographical Narrative

Current Appointments

-

Academic Appointments

-

Other Appointments

-

Degrees

-

Fellowships, Internships, Residency

Certifications

-

Licensures

II. Core Dossier

The following section provides an outline of the core dossier.

II. Core Dossier

Teaching

1) Undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses taught

Period Offered	Course Number and Title (Credit Hours)	Enr.	% Taught, Role	Stdnt Eval.	Peer Eval.	Other Eval.	Instr. Method
----------------	--	------	----------------	-------------	------------	-------------	---------------

2) Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research

a) Graduate Students: Number Completed and Number Current

Category	Current	Graduated
i) Doctoral Students (Dissertation Advisor)		
ii) Doctoral Students (Dissertation Committee Member)		
iii) Doctoral Students (Candidacy Examination Committee Chair)		
iv) Doctoral Students (Candidacy Examination Committee Member)		
v) Master's Students Plan A (Thesis Advisor)		
vi) Master's Students Plan B (Advisor)		
vii) Master's Students (Thesis Committee Member)		
viii) Master's Students (Examination Committee Member)		
Totals		

i) Doctoral Students (Dissertation Advisor)
 ii) Doctoral Students (Dissertation Committee Member) Doctoral Students (Candidacy Examination Committee Chair) Doctoral Students (Candidacy Examination Committee Member) Master's Students Plan A (Thesis Advisor) Master's Students Plan B (Advisor) vii) Master's Students (Thesis Committee Member) Master's Students (Examination Committee Member) b) Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of graduate students for whom you have been the advisor of record, for example, publications during or emanating from graduate program, awards for graduate work, prestigious post-docs or first post-graduate positions. In this section only, candidates may have duplication; if they have co-authored work with a graduate student, they can list the citation in this section and in the research section.

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

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

3) Involvement with Postdoctoral Scholars and Researchers: List completed and current postdoctoral scholars and/or researchers under the candidate's supervision.

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

Date	Title	Sponsor	Enr.	% Taught	Candidate's Role	Formal Eval.	Times Offered

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

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

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

6) Brief Description of your approach to and goals in teaching, major accomplishments, plans for the future in teaching (no longer than 750 words). Do not quote student comments, which should be summarized by someone other than the candidate in Section IV.C.).

7) Evaluation of Teaching

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

8) Awards and Formal Recognition for Teaching

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

9) Other Academic Advising or Mentoring

In spring and summer 2015, two of my doctoral advisees and two of my master's advisees graduated. In autumn 2015, I will begin advising one new master's student, one new doctoral student, and will continue

advising two third year doctoral students, two second year doctoral student, and two master’s students. I also began co-advising one of our doctoral students. All six doctoral students are working on research projects with me, and I am advising each of them on at least one project that they are leading. Together, we have submitted three manuscripts for possible publication.

10) Teaching Professional Development

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

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

Research

1) List of Books, Articles, and Other Published Papers

Published Work Type	Number of Publications
Chapters In Edited Books	
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles	
Abstract And Short Entries	
Total	

- a) Books (Other than Edited Volumes)
- b) Edited Books
- c) Chapters in Edited Books
- d) Bulletins, Tech Reports, Fact Sheets
- e) Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles
- f) Editor-Reviewed Journal Articles
- g) Reviews (Indicate Whether Peer Reviewed)
- h) Abstract and Short Entries (Indicate Whether Peer Reviewed)
- i) Papers in Proceedings (Indicate Whether Peer Reviewed)
- j) Unpublished Scholarly Presentations (Indicate Whether Peer Reviewed)

k) Potential publications under review (indicate authorship, date of submission, and to what journal or publisher the work has been submitted)

2) List of creative works pertinent to your professional focus

Creative Work Type	Number
Inventions And Patents	
Total	

- a) Artwork
- b) Choreography
- c) Collections
- d) Compositions
- e) Curated Exhibits
- f) Exhibited Artworks
- g) Inventions and Patents
- h) Moving Image
- i) Multimedia / Database / Website
- j) Radio and Television
- k) Recitals and Performances
- l) Recordings
- m) Other Creative Works

3) Brief Description of the Focus of the Candidate's Research, Scholarly or Creative Work, Major Accomplishments, and Plans for the Future, including Works in Progress

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

4) Description of Quality Indicators of Your Research, Scholarly or Creative Work Such as Citations, Publication Outlet Quality Indicators Such as Acceptance Rates, Ranking or Impact Factors of Journal or Publisher

Journal Name	Impact Factor	# of Pubs
--------------	---------------	-----------

Article Citations

5) Research Funding

a) Funded Research, including Contracts and Clinical Trials, on Which the Candidate is or has been the Principal Investigator

b) Funded Research, including Contracts and Clinical Trials, on Which the Candidate is or has been the Co-Investigator

c) Proposals for Research Funding that are Pending or were Submitted but not Funded

d) Funded Training Grants on Which the Candidate is or has been the Equivalent of the Principal Investigator

e) Proposals for Training Grants that are Pending or were Submitted but not Funded

f) Any other Funding Received for the Candidate's Academic work

6) List of Prizes and Awards for Research, Scholarly or Creative Work

Service

1) List of Editorships or Service as an Editorial Reviewer or Board Member for Journals, University Presses, or Other Learned Publications

2) List of Offices Held and Other Service to Professional Societies. List of Organization in Which Office was Held or Service Performed. Describe Nature of Organization (Open or Elected Membership, Honorary)

3) List of Consultation Activity

4) Clinical Services State Specific Clinical Assignments

5) Other Professional/Public Community Service directly related to the Candidates's Professional Expertise, if not Listed Elsewhere

6) Administrative Service

a) Unit Committees

b) College or University Committees

c) Initiatives Undertaken to Enhance Diversity in your Unit, College or the University

d) Administrative Positions Held, e.g. Graduate Studies Chair

e) Service as a Graduate Faculty Representative on a Dissertation in another Unit or University

7) Advisor to Student Groups and Organizations

8) Office of Student Life Committees

a) List Office of Student Life Committees on which You have served

b) Summarize participation in Student Life programs such as fireside discussions, lectures to student groups outside of our unit, addresses or participation at student orientation

9) List of prizes and awards for service to your profession, the university or your unit

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

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

III. Evaluation

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 27)

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

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

III. A. Internal Letters of Evaluation

Internal Letters of Evaluation include annual review letters, written comments on annual reviews, documentation of peer evaluation of teaching, and other letters the unit may include.

III.A.1. Annual Reviews

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, pp. 27–28)

OAA has required written annual evaluations of all tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, and research faculty since 1993. If annual review letters are lacking for any of the years specified below, a written explanation is required.

For tenure-track candidates who do not have tenure, include all annual review letters since start date; all fourth-year review letters are to be included here.

For probationary clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty, include all annual review letters since start date.

For tenured candidates, include all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or start date with tenure, not to exceed the most recent five years.

For non-probationary clinical/teaching/practice and research faculty, include all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or date of last appointment, not to exceed the most recent five years.

III. A. 2. Written Documents Submitted as Part of Annual Reviews

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 28):

Include any comments submitted by the candidate as part of an annual review; any comments submitted by the candidate as part of the fourth-year review are to be included here.

III.A.3. Fourth Year Review Letter (For Assistant Professors)

The fourth year review is only to be included for tenure track assistant professors.

III.A.4. Additional Letters Requested by the Candidate and Solicited by the TIU Head

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 28):

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

III.A.5. Documentation of Peer Evaluation of Teaching

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 28):

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

III.B. External Letters of Evaluation

III.B.1. Summary Sheet of all Evaluators (Form 114)

This form will include the name and institution of all persons from whom letters were received, name of person who suggested each evaluator, and the relationship of the evaluator to the candidate (expert in the field, professional colleague).

SUMMARY FORM FOR RESPONDING EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Candidate: _____

Department/College: _____

Evaluator	Title/Rank	Institution	Suggested by	Relationship to Candidate
<p>From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol 3, p. 11):</p> <p>Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(B)(3) requires that no more than one-half of the external evaluation letters in the dossier may be from persons suggested by the candidate.</p> <p>Except under the special circumstances described below, OAA requires a minimum of five external evaluation letters.</p> <p>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.</p>				

III.B.2. Sample of Letters Sent to Evaluators

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 28):

A single representative example of the letters sent to the evaluators if these letters were identical. If different letters, or different sets of material for review, were sent, an example of each must be included along with an explanation of why evaluators were treated differently. If a simple invitation was sent, followed by more detailed instruction, include both letters.

III.B.3. External Letters Preceded by Cover Sheet (Form 106)

At least five external letters preceded by a cover page (see External Evaluator Form, [Form 106](#)) for each letter received containing the following information:

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

EXTERNAL EVALUATOR FORM

Candidate _____

Evaluator _____

Title/Rank _____

Institutional Affiliation _____

Complete Address of Evaluator _____

One form should be completed for each external evaluator. A description of who should be sought as external evaluators is provided below.

From the OAA Policies & Procedures Handbook (Vol 3, p. 11):

These should be distinguished faculty (or occasionally non-academics who have similar research, leadership, teaching, or service credentials and experience) who are in a position to comment in an informed way both on the quality of the candidate's scholarly, leadership, teaching, or service work and 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). They may not be former advisors, collaborators, post-doctoral supervisors, close personal friends, or others having a relationship with the candidate that could reduce objectivity.

Qualifications as an Evaluator

(PROVIDE DETAIL SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH THE EVALUATOR'S CREDIBILITY)

Relationship to candidate:

Evaluator suggested by:

Candidate Department Chair P&T Committee Other _____

IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction

From OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 29):

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.

IV.A. Cumulative Fixed-Response Survey Data

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 29):

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

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

IV.B. Fixed-Response Student Evaluation Data

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 29):

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

- a) If the unit uses SEI instruments, include all individual course reports. Use start date for probationary faculty or date of last appointment, promotion, or last 5 years, whichever is shorter, for non-probationary faculty.
- b) If the unit uses another type of fixed-response survey instrument, include here one page per course/quarter/semester taught, listing the actual statements to which students responded, the full rating scale of possible responses, and for each statement, the number of students that selected each response choice.

IV.C. Summary of Open-Ended Student Evaluations

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 30):

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

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

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

Do not include raw student comments in this section.

V. Internal Review Evaluation Letters

V.A. Regional Campus (if
applicable)

V.A.1. Regional Campus Faculty Deliberative Body (if applicable)

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 30):

Regional campus faculty deliberative body: detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record. The chair of the regional campus faculty deliberative body or the regional campus dean/director must explain the regional campus expectations against which the candidate is being assessed.

V.A.2. Regional Campus Dean (if applicable)

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 30):

Regional campus dean/director: detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.

V.B. Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU)

V.B.1 TIU Faculty Deliberative Body

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 30):

TIU faculty deliberative body: detailed assessment, to include:

- thorough assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, and how they compare to the TIU's standards as described in the unit's APT; both strengths and weaknesses should be discussed
- consideration of all materials related to joint appointments, including Discovery Theme appointments, if applicable, to include annual review letters provided by the joint appointment TIU head and Discovery Theme faculty lead, where appropriate
- report of the discussion by the faculty deliberative body
- numerical vote of the full faculty deliberative body and minimum vote required for a positive recommendation (included in 1st paragraph of letter)

V.B.2. TIU Head

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 30):

TIU head (or deans in colleges without departments): independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses, including consideration of a candidate's joint appointment (including Discovery Theme appointments). This assessment should take into account the faculty deliberative body's recommendation. If the TIU head's assessment and/or recommendation differs from that of the faculty, bases for differing judgments must be addressed.

V.B.3. Head of TIU Joint Appointment or Discovery Theme Focus Area (if applicable)

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, pp. 30–31):

Head of any unit in which the candidate holds a joint (split FTE) academic appointment, including Discovery Theme appointment: independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. It is the TIU head's responsibility to solicit this letter prior to the meeting of the TIU eligible faculty.

V.B.4. TIU-Level Comments Process

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 31):

TIU-level comments process: include any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

Comments Form

Candidate Name _____ to respond to the:

TIU faculty

TIU Head

Dean

Candidates have two opportunities to provide a response to evaluations provided.

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol 3, p. 13):
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.

Or: ____ I do not have any comments

Signature

Date

V.C. College

V.C.1. College P&T Committee

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 31):

College P&T committee (in colleges with departments): independent assessment, to include a statement about how accurately the TIU deliberative body and TIU head followed stated TIU processes, and also to include the committee's numerical vote and recommendation to the dean. If the college committee's assessment is contrary to the TIU-level assessment, rationale for differing judgments must be addressed.

V.C.2. College Dean

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 31):

College dean (in colleges with departments): independent assessment and recommendation to the executive vice president and provost. If the dean's assessment and/or recommendation differs from any of the prior assessments or recommendations, rationale for differing judgments must be addressed.

V.C.3. College Level Comments Process

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol. 3, p. 31):

College-level comments process: include any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments.

Comments Form

Candidate Name _____ to respond to the:

TIU faculty

TIU Head

Dean

Candidates have two opportunities to provide a response to evaluations provided.

From the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (Vol 3, p. 13):
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.

Or: ____ I do not have any comments

Signature

Date