Welcome and Introductions

Shari Speer
The Purpose of this Workshop

- For: P&T Chairs, PODs, TIU Heads, Dept. Staff
- What: Overview of Dossier Preparation
- Why: To Help Facilitate Preparation of Complete Dossiers
  - Focus on AU23 Reviews
  - Relevant for 4\textsuperscript{th} Year Reviews

➢ Chat function is available for questions
Agenda

- Introductions of ASC Faculty Affairs Team and Logistics
- Dossier Preparation
- Navigating the Intranet
- BREAK
- Forms 109 & 105
- Core Dossier Overview
- Internal & External Evaluation Letters
- SEIs
- Review Letters
- Final Logistics
Faculty Affairs Team:

Shari Speer
Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs
Professor of Linguistics
speer.21@osu.edu

Toni Calbert
Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs
calbert.5@osu.edu

Kyle Williams
Faculty Affairs Specialist
williams.5301@osu.edu

General Email Account:
ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu
Dossier Preparation

Shari Speer
Common Initials and Terms

- **P&T**: Promotion and Tenure
- **TIU**: Tenure Initiating Unit (department or school)
- **TIU Head**: Chair or Director
- **Chair Pro Tem**: Temp. TIU Head
- **CEF**: Committee of Eligible Faculty
- **P&T Chair**: Chair of CEF
- **POD**: Procedures Oversight Designee
- **APT**: Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Doc.
- **POA**: Patters of Administration Doc.
- **SEI**: Student Evaluations of Instruction
- **OAA**: Office of Academic Affairs
### Who Does What (TIU Version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>✓ prepares material for external evaluators (TIU decides what is sent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Intro and Core Dossier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ publications, etc. for TIU review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ completes and signs checklist Form 105, p. 1 BEFORE CEF meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POD</td>
<td>✓ verifies dossier BEFORE CEF meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ completes and signs checklist Form 105 p. 2-4 (after CEF meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ensures fair evaluation by TIU (CEF also responsible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T chair</td>
<td>✓ solicits external reviewers/other letters (e.g., collaborators)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ reviews dossier BEFORE CEF meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ chairs the TIU CEF meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ writes TIU CEF letter, addressed to TIU head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIU head</td>
<td>✓ solicits external reviewers/other letters (e.g., collaborators)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ assigns someone to summarize student comments (if used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ writes TIU head letter, addressed to College Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental staff</td>
<td>✓ assembles final dossier (including forms, divider sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ generates pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ submits pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Oversees What for P&T?

**Shari:**
- External Evaluator approvals
- P&T process consultations for Chairs, Directors, P&T Chairs, PODs
- Dossier narratives, internal and external review letters, candidate comments
- OAA, Legal Affairs liaison (negative cases, errors)

**Toni:**
- P&T process consultations for Chairs, Directors, P&T Chairs, PODS, and Staff
- 1st round of college dossier reviews (OAA policy, dossier format, TIU/College records, and SEI reporting)
- Final review of dossiers and submission to OAA
- OAA liaison

**Kyle:**
- 1st Round of College Dossier Reviews
- College Panel Document Logistics
- College Dean Document Logistics
Key Dates for TIUs

• May 27  Submission of external reviewers for approval
• Sept. 23 Deadline for regional campus letters to be sent to TIU
• Sept. 29 Recommended deadline for CEF meeting
• Sept. 29 Recommended deadline for preliminary dossier checks
• Oct. 9  Recommended deadline for TIU letter to candidate
          *(10 calendar days)*
• Oct. 20 Recommended deadline for submission to college
          *(information on Interfolio forthcoming)*
Timing Issues?

If your TIU is having scheduling/deadline/other issues, please contact us immediately.

For example, if needed, we can accept final dossiers without the candidate 10-day comments with the understanding we will receive this form as soon as possible.
What happens after you send to the college?

- **October/November**: Review of Dossiers & Revisions
- **November**: Divisional Panels Meet
- **December/January**: Dean Reviews Cases and Writes Letter
- **Late-January**: Final Dossiers Submitted to OAA
- **April**: Provost makes decisions; ASC notified
- **May**: BOT makes final approval; Promotion/New Rank Takes Immediate Effect
Ways to streamline the process? Start EARLY.

August
- P&T Chair and POD review core dossier to ensure completeness
- Staff begins to assemble dossier (even if still waiting on external reviewers)
- TIU Head solicits letters from any joint appointments

September
- P&T Chair begins drafting letter prior to meeting
- TIU Head begins drafting letters prior to receiving CEF letter
To streamline the process (2)

• Preliminary College dossier review consultation will be available by appointment or email in September and October to answer questions, check dossier organization.
• Questions from staff and candidates welcome!
Questions?
Navigating the ASC Intranet

(https://aschintranet.osu.edu/)

Toni Calbert
Questions?
Form 109 (cover page) & Form 105 (dossier checklist)

Kyle Williams
Table of Contents

Form 109
- Record of review (first document in dossier)
  - High-level overview of candidate and decision for ASC & OAA

Form 105
- Detailed checklist from TIU & ASC for OAA
- Confirms appropriate review occurred and records vote
  - Double check that you have the updated versions from OAA
    - Next slides will have detailed examples
    - We are all in this together!
Click 100% if faculty is solely in your TIU. If they have a joint appointment, provide the TIU name and percentage.

IMPORTANT: Both TIUs should provide letters for the case.

Ex: COVID, Child, FMLA, etc.

Must have both a check and signature. Regional campus dean must check and sign as well if applicable.
Clinical/Teaching/Practice Faculty (C/T/P) Example

**RECORD OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION IN ACADEMIC RANK-TENURE-REAPPOINTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye</td>
<td>Brutus</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSU Employ ID</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12345678</td>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIU Psychology</th>
<th>TIU Org ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACULTY APPOINTMENT**

- Tenure-track
- Clinical
- Research
- Associated
- Tenure title under 50% FTE
- Adjunct
- Clinical Practice

**PROPOSED ACTION CONSIDERED**

- Reappoint only* [ ]
- Tenure only [ ]
- Promotion only [ ]

**NEW RANK IF PROMOTION ACTION IS APPROVED**

- Professor [ ]
- Associate Professor [ ]

*For reappointments (with or without promotion) reappointment length (years): 5

**Date of initial faculty appointment in current appointment at Ohio State** 08/01/2018

**Date of last reappointment (clinical/research appointments only)**

**Years prior service credit**

**Years excluded** (probationary tenure-track only)

**Last approved P&T action**

**Last non-approved P&T action**

**RECOMMEND**

- Regional Campus Dean [ ]
- TIU Head (Chair/Director) [ ]
- Dean [ ]

**DO NOT RECOMMEND**

**RECOMMEND**

- Kyle Williams

**Indicate their correct faculty appointment**

**Default for C/T/P faculty are eligible for “promotion and reappointment”**

**Must list reappointment contract term**

**Must have both a check and signature**
Promotion to (full) Professor Example

Some faculty may have a Temp. Work Authorization. Please check both boxes with expiration date and attach MOU in dossier. See example here.

Be sure to select the right proposed action.

Candidate was hired as an Assoc. Prof. in 2018 under an expedited summer review; these circles are only for candidates post tenure review.

Do not provide green card or any immigration papers in dossier.
Every checkbox must be confirmed and checked by candidate

Candidate must sign prior to CEF meeting
This is rare and not usually checked unless candidate wants to use APT they were hired under due to changes in standards of promotion.

Make sure you include all evals in the dossier.

Contact Shari immediately if 5 external reviewers cannot be included.

Double check your TIU’s APT.
The POD cannot be the P&T Chair or TIU Chair

The POD signed this AFTER the candidate checked page one

Every checkbox must be confirmed and checked by POD
The TIU Head does not count towards quorum.

This is for faculty who could be at the meeting, but aren’t.

Double check APT.
Questions?
Intro & Core Dossier

Toni Calbert
P&T Divider Sheets

- Insert P&T divider sheets, starting here
- Printed from Dossier Divider Templates file on ASC intranet
  - (under Dossier Preparation Materials)
  - (separate set for 4th year review – no evaluator pages)
- **USE CURRENT VERSION** (minor changes)
- Divider sheets must have **COLORED BACKGROUND**
- Include all divider sheets, even if section is empty.
  - (If extra Introduction/Core Dossier dividers are included with what candidate gives you (e.g. generated by Vita), remove and replace with colored dividers from templates)
I. Introduction (candidate provides)

Brutus T. Buckeye
Campus Address
Campus Phone
e-mail address

Biographical Narrative – Puts previous appointments and/or interdisciplinary work in context (750 word limit)

Current Appointments
Assistant Professor, Microbiology
Assistant Professor, Molecular Genetics

Other Positions (if appropriate)

Degrees
Date Degree, Institution
Date Degree, Institution

Fellowships, Internships, Residency (if appropriate – can delete if not)
II. Core Dossier - Time Frame

- **Teaching and Service:**
  - Assistant Professors/Probationary Faculty: include activities from date of hire/start of current appointment
  - Associate Professors/Non-probationary Faculty: include activities from date of last promotion or last five years, whichever is most recent (e.g., 2018-2023)
  - CEF may allow earlier information if they determine it is important, must explain in CEF/TIU Head letter

- **Research/Awards:**
  - All candidates may include their full research and award history (e.g., publications, creative works, grants, etc.)

Candidate must clearly indicate through subheadings or other notation entries before and after start of current appointment or last promotion

- P&T reviewers will focus on activities since start date or date of last promotion.
II. Core Dossier (candidate provides)

VITA Formatting

- VITA OFFLINE AS OF AUGUST 1, 2023
- OAA still requires dossier format “that exactly matches the Vita format”
- We recommend candidates export dossier from Vita as Word document before Aug. 1 and MAKE EDITS as needed
  - Vita generates a variety of tables (auto populates teaching table)
  - Word template matching current Vita format on ASC Intranet (Dossier Prep Materials)
II. Core Dossier (candidate provides)

What/Where/How

- TIU sets standards for what is allowed/expected in core dossier (field, APT)
- Candidates should refer to core dossier section of OAA P&T Handbook for detailed instruction how to include activities (e.g., word counts for narratives, what info about advisees, grants included). TIU is responsible to enforce these

Narratives should focus on IMPACT of activities

- Avoid redundancy with citation lists included later
- Research narratives should be written for general audience
- If too long/technical, won’t be read (which defeats the purpose)

Publications/grants/etc. should be listed ONCE

- Exception is publications by grad students, which can be listed under both teaching and research

Summary Tables (Grad student advisees, research, creative works)

- Items and numbers in tables should match entries listed below
II. Core Dossier (candidate provides)

Teaching

Check teaching table – SEIs/peer reviews should match what is in the dossier. Vita will populate this table to default values – all ‘yes’ for SEIs, all ‘no’ for peer review. EDIT THIS. TIU should CHECK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Offered</th>
<th>Course Number and Title (Credit Hours)</th>
<th>Enr.</th>
<th>% Taught, Role</th>
<th>Stdtnt Eval.</th>
<th>Peer Eval.</th>
<th>Other Eval.</th>
<th>Instr. Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2023</td>
<td>ENGLISH 3378 Special Topics in Literature (3)</td>
<td>41(UG)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Not yet available</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Didactic / Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>ENGLISH 2367 Second-Year Writing (3)</td>
<td>24 (UG)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Didactic / Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2022</td>
<td>ENGLISH 8999 PhD Dissertation Research (1)</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Precepting / lab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Core Dossier (candidate provides)

Research with multiple authors/investigators

- Must include a narrative description of candidate’s intellectual contribution and percentage of contribution
  - Publications – not required for presentations or publications under review
  - Grants – applies for proposals and unfunded grants
- OAA guidance explicitly recommends against the use of language such as “we all contributed equally” and “50% effort”

Core dossier must be checked by TIU (POD/mentors/etc.) BEFORE eligible faculty meeting
Questions?
&
5min Break
Internal Evaluation Letters

Shari Speer
III. Evaluation

Evaluation sections will include all previously completed evaluation letters

1. Annual Reviews
2. 4th Year Reviews
3. Additional Letters
4. Peer Reviews

All of these letters must be included when the dossier goes to the CEF meeting
III.A. Internal Letters of Evaluation

III.A.1 Annual Review Letters
   o Assistant Professors -> include all since date of hire
   o Associate Professors -> include all since recent promotion or date of hire (but no more than 5 years)

III.A.2 Written Documents Submitted As Part of Annual Reviews
   o Could be reports, committee documents, candidate comments, etc.
   o This section is not required but the divider section is still included
III.A. Internal Letters of Evaluation

III.A.3 4th Year Review Letters (promotion to associate)
- All internal recommendation letters from 4th year review
- TIU CEF
- TIU Head/TIU Joint Appointment Head
- College Panel
- College Dean

III.A.4 Additional Letters Requested By Candidate
- Research Collaborators
- Commendation of Service
  - If additional letters are included, they must be reviewed by CEF
III.A. Internal Letters of Evaluation

III.A.5 Documentation of Peer Evaluation of Teaching

- Assistant Professors  -> include all since date of hire
- Associate Professors  -> include all since recent promotion or date of hire (but no more than 5 years)
- Only OSU peer reviews

Peer Reviews Letters Must

- Include the name of reviewer
- Include as many as required by TIU APT
- Match number on Form 105
- Match teaching table
External Evaluation Letters

Shari Speer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Title/Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Suggested by</th>
<th>Relationship to Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shari Speer</td>
<td>Assoc. Dean and Professor</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Dept. Chair</td>
<td>Professional Colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Degrasse</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Dept. Chair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Goodall</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Darwin College, Cambridge</td>
<td>P&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noam Chomsky</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Fauci</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No more than one reviewer from a single institution

No more than half can be suggested by candidate (OAA rule)
III.B. External Letters of Evaluation

2. Example of letter sent to evaluators

Set of template letters is available on ASC intranet (.docx)
   - standard (to associate or full)
   - for regional faculty
   - for full profs under flexible process (i.e., higher service/teaching)
     (also have templates for collaborator letters)

**LETTER MUST STATE RANK FOR PROMOTION**
   (to Associate vs. to Full)

These are **STARTING POINTS** and are **OPTIONAL**
   - TIU controls solicitation letter content
   - TIU controls what materials are sent to evaluators
   - letter should include a list of what materials were sent
     (either in the letter itself, or as a list appended to the letter here)
### EXTERNAL EVALUATOR FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Brutus T. Buckeye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Shari Speer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Rank</td>
<td>Assoc. Dean and Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Affiliation</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Complete Address of Evaluator
The University of Texas at Austin,
110 Inner Campus Drive, Stop G0400
Austin, TX 78712-1713

#### Qualifications as an Evaluator
(PROVIDE DETAIL SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH THE EVALUATOR’S CREDIBILITY)

Shari Speer is an Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs and Professor in the Department of Linguistics whose primary research area is Psycholinguistics. She received a PhD in Human Experimental Psychology from the University of Texas at Austin in 1988. Her research concerns the relationship between language production and comprehension, with a particular focus on contributions from intonation and prosodic structure.

Dr. Speer has held many roles at UT Austin including Department Chair and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs. She has numerous publications in top-tier journals.

Dr. Speer and Dr. Buckeye have no professional collaborations, though they have attended the same conferences and are aware of each other’s work.

#### Relationship to candidate:
N/A

#### Evaluator suggested by:
- [ ] Candidate
- [x] Department Chair
- [ ] P&T Committee
- [ ] Other

---

**Must match Form 114**
Questions?
Student Evaluation of Instruction

Toni Calbert
IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction

IV.A. Cumulative Fixed-Response Survey Data
(summary of all courses – generated by SEI / Blue systems)

IV.B. Individual Fixed-Response Student Evaluation Data
(single page overview for each course – last 5 years or since last promotion, whichever is shorter, for promotion to full)

See “SEI Reports for P&T Dossiers” document for explanation of different reports and which to use for P&T
Cumulative SEI pre-2018

Cumulative SEI 2018 - present

Mean Scores, all questions

Courses are listed in order by course number, then term

Q1: The subject matter of this course was well organized
Q2: This course was intellectually stimulating
Q3: The instructor was genuinely interested in teaching
Q4: The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves
Q5: The instructor was well prepared
Q6: The instructor was genuinely interested in helping students
Q7: I learned a great deal from this instructor
Q8: The instructor created an atmosphere conducive to learning
Q9: The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly
Q10: Overall, I would rate this instructor as

Response Count and University Comparison

Comparison of the instructor’s mean score for Q10 to the University mean for classes in the same size group during the same term

Subject | Course | Class | Term | Size | Resp | Mean Inst. | Mean Univ.
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
SINGLE | 1100 | 12345 | 1138 | M | 26 | 4.50 | 4.34
SAMPLE | 2200 | 5070 | 1138 | M | 23 | 4.26 | 4.43
Fixed SEI pre-2018

Student Evaluation of Instruction Report

AUG 2017

Response rate: 61.5% of 10 rated.
Works student ratings for this report collected on the web. Yes
Date of Report: 02/08/2015

Item
N 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

1. Well organized
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
2. Intellectually stimulating
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
3. Instructional materials are interesting
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
4. Encouraged independent thinking
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
5. Instruction well prepared
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
6. Instruction encouraged students to think for themselves
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
7. Learnt properly from instructor
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
8. Created learning atmosphere
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
9. Completed subject matter clearly
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0
10. Overall rating
11 1 0 0 0 0 91 0 0 0 0

Your mean scores are listed below. The College and University comparison groups are based on the size of your class. The
Department group s not. Class size groups are 1-19, 20-49 and 50+.

- Overall, I would rate this instructor as
- Overall, I would rate this instructor as
- Overall, I would rate this instructor as

Fixed SEI 2018 - present

Classes included in this report:
Subject Catalog Number: 8650
Class Number: 8998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The subject matter of this course was well organized</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This course was intellectually stimulating</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This instructor was genuinely interested in teaching</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This instructor encouraged students to think for themselves</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor was well prepared</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The instructor created an atmosphere conducive to learning</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall, I would rate this instructor as</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Student Evaluation of Instruction

IV.C. Summary of Open-Ended Student Evaluation

• if comments were collected, must be **summarized** by someone other than candidate
• indicate who generated the summary (name and title)
• for each class, include total number of students enrolled and total completing evaluations
• POD and candidate should review
• **don’t include raw student comments**

See “SEI Summary of Student Comments Template” on the ASC Intranet
(Dossier Prep Materials)
Questions?
Review Letters

Shari Speer
V. TIU Review Letters

V.A. Regional campus (if applicable) (include dividers)
V.A.1. Regional campus faculty deliberative body
V.A.2. Regional campus dean

V.B. TIU
V.B.1. TIU faculty deliberative body (EVALUATIVE & Include Standards)
V.B.2. TIU head (independent assessment; not repetitive of CEF letter; addresses abstentions/negative votes)
  V.B.3. Head of TIU joint appointment or discovery theme focus area (if applicable)
V.B.4. TIU-Level Comments Process
V. TIU Review Letters

V.C. College
  V.C.1. College P&T committee
       (divisional panel for ASC)
  V.C.2. College dean
       (Dean for ASC)
  V.C.3. College-level comments process

(to be added by college; include divider sheets)
Questions?
Logistics

Shari Speer
New Information

If a candidate has new information about items already in dossier:

- Can be added if TIU hasn’t yet reviewed
- If TIU is done but before submission to college, TIU head asks CEF if this new information would change their vote even if the vote was positive and/or unanimous
- If at the college, alert Shari and divisional dean; college will decide next steps
- If at OAA, no new information can be added
General Comments

- Document the comments process (Form 103) even if candidate declines to comment
- **Follow instructions** in P&T Review Submission Process Document [here](#)
- **Read**
  - P&T FAQs
  - Things to Check
  - What’s new documents
Reminders

- OAA P&T Workshops for TIU Teams (TIU chair, P&T committee chair, POD)

- ASC P&T office hours/Personal appointments
  - By appointment
  - Preliminary dossier review can be done by email
Submission Date: October 20th

Upload pdf to TIU’s TEAMS channel

• Make sure uploader has access
• Faculty Affairs reviews dossiers before releasing them to panels
• Any changes to this year’s process will be communicated
Faculty Affairs Team:

Shari Speer  
Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs  
Professor of Linguistics  
speer.21@osu.edu

Toni Calbert  
Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs  
calbert.5@osu.edu

Kyle Williams  
Faculty Affairs Specialist  
williams.5301@osu.edu

General Email Account:  
ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu
Thank you!