Governance Documents

(Last updated December 4, 2024)

─────

Revisions

- New TIU heads are required to revise or affirm unit governance documents in first year
- Interim chairs and acting chairs are exempt
- Nonmandatory revisions may be made at any time
- Revisions require separate review and approval by ASC and OAA; Each review requires at least one round of additional revision in response to comments.
- New: Units must provide a description of their plan for mentoring probationary tenure-track faculty as an Appendix to the APT. Sample plans may be found here: ASC Mentoring Plans
- Plan ahead and get started early on this year-long process.

Templates

- POA Template
- APT Template

Best Practices

- Submit POA and APT together
- Engage with faculty and seek feedback and consensus where possible
- Use the chart format in OAA APT template for P&T criteria and evidence.
- In describing committees in POA, include # of members (or range) and their roles (faculty type, staff, student), length of terms, how members and committee chair are selected, and any members with restricted voting rights.
- Consultations available at ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu

TIU Head Timeline

Nonmandatory governance document revisions (those not required of new TIU heads) need not follow the timeline below.

August OAA provides new chairs with "pre-read" governance documents that place current documents in required format current documents and add in any new required language/policies.

Autumn TIU head should begin consultation with faculty about proposed changes (including required mentoring plan if new) and criteria and evidence for P&T. Work toward finalizing draft document.

By March 1 Governance documents due to ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu. Documents returned to TIU head with comments in 30 days.

April 1 - May 1 Use "Track Changes" to accept and/or respond to ASC changes and comments. Return finalized documents to ASC Faculty Affairs by May 1.

By May 15 ASC completes review and forwards to OAA for their review.

June Use "Track Changes" to respond to comments and revisions from OAA and submit final documents

July 1 Use "Track Changes" to respond to comments and revisions from OAA and submit final documents for approval and posting on OAA website.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Office of Faculty Affairs
ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu

FAQ

Why is the chart format required in the APT for listing criteria and evidence for promotion of tenure-track faculty? This section is used by higher-level review bodies in evaluating your candidates for tenure and/or promotion. The chart format helps to ensure that higher level review bodies are using the same required criteria and types of evidence as used by the unit. Narrative formats make it more difficult to differentiate between required/expected criteria and examples of the types of evidence that are used to demonstrate that a criterion has been met.

How should I respond to ASC and OAA comments and revisions after their review?
- Use "Track Changes" for your changes
- Accept all tracked changes made by ASC and OAA that you can. Most such changes will have a comment explaining the reason for the change linked to it. When you accept a change, please use the thumbs up icon on the ASC/OAA comment or reply to the comment indicating you have made the change.
- Highlight any changes you do not wish to accept and add an explanatory comment or reply to the linked comment.
- Please also respond to any remaining comments or queries within the comment thread.

Is there a style guide that answers questions about capitalization, word usage, etc.? Yes, thanks for asking! ☺ Ohio State Editorial Style Guide. See especially the guidelines on capitalization and note that "department chair" is not capitalized, nor is "department," "dean," or "president" unless followed by a specific name (the Department of Sociology; the sociology department; the dean of the college; Dean Horn). Also, for singular pronouns, "he/she" may be used but "they," "one," or eliminating the pronoun altogether is preferred. Finally, instead of "OSU," use "Ohio State," "The Ohio State University" or "the university."

The OAA APT Template requires that we identify 10 peer institutions from which we will seek external letters writers for P&T. Can we reference BTAA/AAU institutions traditionally used in ASC instead of identifying a narrower range of peer institutions? Yes, ASC has worked with OAA on an approved alternative to the OAA template in Section VI.B.4 of the APT (External Evaluations). See the underlined text in the following two paragraphs:

A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences, the department will primarily obtain evaluations from faculty at institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). The department further defines peer or near-peer institutions to include: <FILL IN or remove this *sentence if you do not have additional institutions to list*>. Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee *[for eligible faculty]*, the TIU head, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution, a brief written justification will be provided.

What other additions has ASC made to the OAA Template? In addition to the requirement to provide an appendix to the APT outlining the unit's mentoring plan (see first page of this document), ASC has added language on (1) annual review letters and (2) evaluations of teaching. These are outlined below.

1. Annual Reviews (APT Section V. Annual Performance and Merit Review)

Add the following paragraph to the end of the introduction (Before A. Documentation):

Annual review letters are not merely descriptive summaries of activities but instead evaluate performance in relation to the unit's mission and the faculty member's assigned workload and previously articulated goals and expectations for the year. The annual review will also describe, when appropriate, actions the unit or its head will undertake to support the faculty member in achieving goals. When relevant, annual review letters will recognize engagement with partners beyond the university, which may take the form of research/creative work, teaching, service, and/or commercialization. Department chairs may also comment upon and/or recognize ways in which individual faculty members exemplify and reinforce the university's shared values, including creating unit cultures that are inclusive, supportive, and characterized by civility and mutual respect. The full range of activities assigned to a faculty member should be formally recognized and, when done well, rewarded.

2. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluations of Teaching (APT Section XI):

Add the following to the end of the introduction, before A. Student Evaluation:

Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement.

Evaluation of teaching should be holistic, considering a variety of evidence of accomplishment in the classroom: for example, student evaluations (quantitative and narrative), peer evaluations, examples of curricular or pedagogic innovation, and efforts to improve teaching by taking advantage of college or university resources.

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom and to work systematically to the disadvantage of women, non-native English speakers, and faculty of color.

Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, considering the particular challenges of teaching different kinds of material to different kinds of audiences, and situating each year's performance in relation to previous years and to goals set by the department.