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 bibliography or author/date format provided by the approved OAA electronic dossier.
- ☐ Multiple authorship in *Items 1a–1e* for jointly authored papers, in *Item* 2 for creative works, in *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.

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. If my start date is August 2018 or later, I used Vita.

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

- ☐ 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 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 evaluations required as stated in APT Document: _____
- ☐ Number of evaluations submitted: _____
  - ☐ Open-ended discursive 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.

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.

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.

_____
(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.

Quorum*

Step	Description	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*

Step	Description	Number or Percentage
1	Number of YES votes on this case	
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 associate professors and clinical 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.

- ☐ 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)

_____ **Date** _____

Signature