

College of Health (COH) Promotion & Tenure Committee Dossier Review Guidance

Committee Charge

1. Our charge is to conduct an unbiased, independent review of candidate dossiers. This is probably the most important college-level service we do as faculty.
2. According to the OSU Faculty Handbook: The college faculty committee review letter shall provide: (i) an independent evaluation of the merits of the candidate as presented in the dossier, (ii) an opinion as to whether the departmental-level letters of evaluation fairly and uniformly assess the merits of the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier, and (iii) an assessment of the consistency of standards applied to all candidates in the college. In addition, the committee should check that each dossier has been properly prepared, and all required elements are included. The dossier components should align with the Form A checklist found in the [Dossier Preparation Guidelines](#).
3. The committee typically convenes the first full week of December and meets regularly until final letters are submitted to the Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs (ADAFA) office (typically in mid-January).

Committee Process

4. **The College P&T Committee is led by a Chair and Co-Chair** who are elected from among the committee membership. Committee Chairs guide the process, assist committee members, represent the committee to leadership and liaise with the Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs (ADAFA) when questions arise. One Co-Chair must be a full tenured professor.
5. **To facilitate equitable reviews**, the first step is to identify any conflicts of interest (COI) that might prohibit a committee member from providing an equitable review. Please review the [COH P&T Conflict of Interest Guidance](#) and be prepared to share and discuss any potential conflicts of interest.
6. The committee collaborates to determine a primary and secondary reviewer for each candidate who will work together to develop the first draft of a review letter. To the extent possible (considering committee make-up and the pool of candidates), one writer should be familiar with the candidate's disciplinary area (e.g., be a faculty member from the candidate's program or school). Both reviewers should be at or above the rank the candidate is seeking and at least one reviewer should be from a similar position line/type as the candidate (*i.e., tenure-line or fixed term*).
 - All reviewers should read the [University P&T Guidelines](#) for the specific position-type under review.
 - Reviewers should start by reading everything EXCEPT the school/head review letters. This will promote an unbiased, independent assessment of candidates. This includes reviewing the candidate statement, CV, student and peer review summary letters, external review letters, position descriptions and FTE distribution in each criterion area over the review period.
 - Next, reviewers compare their assessment with the school/head letters; note and discuss differences. Ask the co-chairs for help or clarification as needed.

- Primary and secondary reviewers should read assigned dossiers **in detail** as they will lead committee discussions on their assigned dossiers prior to the committee vote.
7. **Letter templates are available by position.** Templates are intended to guide consistent presentation of accomplishments/metrics within position types. Use of the template does not preclude reviewers adding the unique accomplishments of candidates whose work may not be fully represented by existing examples which tend to emphasize traditional metrics (e.g., publications, funding, etc.).
 8. **Draft letters for each candidate are presented** to the committee for review that are prepared by at least 2 of the committee members, emphasizing important accomplishments and areas of concern. Letter should attest to whether the candidate meets the criteria for promotion to rank.
 9. **Committee discussions** are critical to an equitable review process. All committee members are expected to read each dossier prior to the discussion and participate in discussions. Primary and/or secondary writers will record feedback and revise letters as necessary including reconciling differences in assessments. Revisions may be minor or comprehensive and may include follow-up committee discussion.
 10. Committee members are expected to review revised letters prior to submission. When the committee agrees all questions have been answered and suggested edits to the draft letter have been recorded, the committee votes on whether the candidate under discussion has **MET or NOT MET the requirements** in each criterion area (e.g., Research, Teaching, Outreach, Service, etc.). Finally, an overall assessment and vote is conducted of whether the candidate has MET or NOT MET the criteria for promotion to rank based on the criteria provided by the [University P&T Guidelines](#). Unless there is a documented conflict of interest, all eligible voting members participate in the vote for each candidate.
 11. Individual committee members' votes are recorded for each candidate in a password protected spreadsheet. Following the vote, the Committee Co-Chairs review the final letters for errors. Final letters are made available for all committee members to review prior to circulating for signatures. Co-chairs then communicate to the COH ADAFA's office that letters are ready for routing to obtain signatures.