



College of Arts and Sciences

P&T Dossier and Interfolio Workshop for Faculty Candidates



Welcome and Introductions

Kristi Williams



The Purpose of this Workshop

- For: Candidates
- What: Overview of P&T Process and Core Dossier Outline
- Why: To Help Facilitate Preparation of Complete Dossiers for sixth-year promotion and tenure reviews and non-mandatory promotion reviews for Tenure-Track, Clinical/Teaching/Practice, and Research Faculty
 - Chat function is available for questions

Agenda

- Responsibilities and Timeline
- Navigating the Intranet
- Core Dossier Overview
- SEI/SSLE Reports
- Interfolio Overview
- Notifications and Comments Process
- Final Logistics



Responsibilities and Timeline

Kristi Williams



Common Initials and Terms

P&T	Promotion/Promotion and Tenure
TIU	Tenure Initiating Unit (department or school)
TIU Head	Department Chair or School Director
CEF	Committee of Eligible Faculty
P&T/CEF Chair	Chair of the CEF
POD	Procedures Oversight Designee
Case Manager	Staff member supporting P&T
College Panels	College divisional committee of senior faculty
APT	Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document
SEI/SSLE	Student Evaluations of Instruction / Survey of Student Learning Experience
Interfolio RPT	Review, Promotion, and Tenure in Interfolio
Interfolio FAR	Faculty Activity Reporting in Interfolio
OAA	Office of Academic Affairs

Candidate Responsibilities

Dossier Requirements

- Review promotion/promotion and tenure requirements in TIU APT document
 - [OAA approved APT documents](#)
- Compile publications, annual review, peer teaching evaluations, SEI/SSLE reports and any other review materials requested by TIU
- Complete Core Dossier

Interfolio Requirements

- Upload Core Dossier
- Upload SEI/SSLE Cumulative and Overview Reports
- Complete Student Evaluation of Teaching Checklist Form
- Complete Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Dossier Checklist Form

TIU Responsibilities

POD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ verifies dossier before CEF meeting✓ ensures fair evaluation by TIU (CEF also responsible)
P&T Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ reviews dossier for CEF meeting✓ chairs the TIU CEF meeting✓ writes TIU CEF letter
TIU Head	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ solicits and includes review letters from Joint Appointment✓ assigns someone to summarize student comments (if used)✓ writes TIU head letter
Case Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ collects and uploads materials to Interfolio RPT<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ annual reviews○ peer evaluations○ external evaluations○ summary of student comments (if used)✓ generally supports review and submission process

Regional Campus Responsibilities

Faculty Deliberative Body Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ reviews dossier for Regional Campus faculty meeting✓ chairs the Regional Campus Faculty Deliberative Body meeting✓ writes Regional Campus Faculty Deliberative Body letter and uploads to Interfolio RPT
Dean and Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ assigns someone to summarize student comments (if used)✓ writes Regional Dean and Director letter and uploads to Interfolio RPT
Case Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ collects Regional Campus review letters and assists with uploading to Interfolio RPT

Who does what in Faculty Affairs

- **College Interfolio Coordinators** – All
 - Creates cases, troubleshoot Interfolio issues
- **Faculty consultations** – Kristi & Toni
- **Preliminary dossier reviews** – Toni and Elizabeth
- **College panels** – Elizabeth and Destanie

Contact us at ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu

Regional Campus Interfolio Coordinators

Lima Campus

Robin Pohl
pohl.60@osu.edu

Mansfield Campus

Amy Brunell
brunell.2@osu.edu

Marion Campus

Chris Deel
deel.26@osu.edu

Newark Campus

Melissa Buelow
buelow.11@osu.edu

Shelly Frank
frank.465@osu.edu

John Maharry
Maharry.1@osu.edu

Nichole Lenglé
lengle.3@osu.edu

Lisa Miller
miller.11896@osu.edu



Recommended Deadlines for Regional Campus Candidates

Jul 20	Candidates submit draft dossier to ASC Faculty Affairs for (optional) preliminary college review
Aug 3	Candidates submit final dossier and review materials to Faculty Deliberative Body
Aug 31	Regional campus notifies candidates of review decision and share internal letters (10 calendar day comments period)
Sept 11	Regional campus uploads letters, comments, and completes forms in Interfolio RPT

Regional campus deadlines are recommended only. Please check with your dean or faculty committee chair for specific deadlines.

Recommended Deadlines for TIUs

Aug 17	Columbus candidates submit draft dossier and other review materials to POD
August 31	Columbus candidates submit draft dossier to ASC Faculty Affairs for (optional) preliminary review
Sept 11	Columbus candidates submit final dossier to CEF
Sept 25	Last date recommended for CEF meeting
Oct 9	TIU notifies candidates of review decision and shares internal letters (10 calendar day comments period commences)
Oct 23	TIU submits full dossier to college via Interfolio RPT

TIU deadlines are recommended only. Please check with your P&T Chair for your unit's specific deadlines.

What happens after you send to the college?

October - November	College Review of Dossiers & Revisions
December	College Panels Review Cases, Meet and Writes Letter
January	Dean Reviews Cases and Writes Letter; Candidates notified of results
Late-January	Final Dossiers Submitted to OAA
April	Provost makes decisions; ASC notified
June	BOT makes final approval and notifies candidates; Promotion/New Rank Takes Immediate Effect

Ways to streamline the process? Start EARLY.

May/June

- All candidates prepare dossier materials
- Regional campus candidates send draft dossier to ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu for a preliminary review

July/August

- Candidates work with P&T Chair and POD to review and revise dossier
- Columbus candidates send draft dossier to ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu for a preliminary review

Reach out to ASC Faculty Affairs with questions at any time! 😊

Questions?



Navigating the ASC Intranet (<https://ascintranet.osu.edu/>)

Elizabeth Murphy



Questions?



Core Dossier Overview

Kristi Williams



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/reappointment or last five years, whichever is most recent (e.g., AU2021-SP/SU2026)

- **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/reappointment**

CEF may allow earlier information if they determine it is important, must explain in CEF/TIU Head letter

- P&T reviewers will focus on activities since start date or date of last promotion/reappointment.

Core Dossier – General

What to Include in the Dossier

- TIU sets standards for what is allowed/expected in core dossier (field, APT)
- Candidates should refer to the ASC Intranet instructions for detailed information on how to include activities (e.g., word counts for narratives, required info about advisees, grants, etc.)
- Candidate and TIU are responsible for ensuring accuracy of all entries

Narratives should focus on **IMPACT** of activities

- Avoid redundancy with citation lists included later
- Research narratives should be written for general audience
- Narratives should be around 750 words

Publications/grants/etc. should be listed ONCE

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



Core Dossier – General

Reverse Chronological Order

- All activities listed in the core dossier should start with current/most recent first

Include all item headings and subheadings

- If a candidate has no entries for a particular section, enter “None” or leave blank. Delete and tables or bullet lists that are not applicable.

Introduction and Core Dossier

Candidates have two options for creating the introduction and core dossier for the 2026-2027 P&T cycle:

- Core Dossier Outline available on the ASC Intranet [Recommended]
- Interfolio FAR

Two different ways to create the same document. Please check with your P&T chair for unit specific requirements. Otherwise, up to candidate's preference.

Core Dossier Outline

- The ASC Core Dossier Outline and Instructions 2026-2027 is available as a Word document on the ASC Intranet. This is the most recent version and should be used for this year's promotion and promotion and tenure reviews.
- Includes both the Introduction and the Core Dossier in a single file.

SEI/SSLE Reports

Toni Calbert



SEI/SSLE Reports

Candidates are responsible for downloading the 2 types of SEI/SSLE reports required for P&T reviews:

Cumulative Reports

- Summary of all courses in a single report
- This report may include classes outside of the review period. That is expected. Do not alter the report.
- SEI Cumulative Report (SU2018-SU2025)
- SSLE Cumulative Report (AU2025-SU2026) may not yet be available, but if you have one, please upload it

Overview Reports

- SEI/SSLE Overview Report – 1-3 page report for each course taught – since date of hire for probationary faculty; since last promotion/reappointments, or last 5 years whichever is shorter, for non-probationary faculty
- Okay to include the “SEI All Overview Report” – please double check that all classes from the review period are included.
- 2025-2026 SSLE reports may need to be uploaded separately.

See “SSLE Reports for P&T Dossiers” document on the ASC Intranet for explanation of different reports and which to use for P&T

SEI Cumulative Report



Brutus Buckeye SEI Cumulative Report

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: This 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

Subject	Course	Class	Term	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Overall				4.16	4.05	4.51	4.40	4.44	4.45	4.01	4.18	4.11	4.38
SAMPLE	1100	12345	AU 18	4.27	4.23	4.81	4.58	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.50
SAMPLE	2200	5678	SU 18	4.04	3.87	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.43	3.57	4.09	3.91	4.26

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, Instr	Mean, Univ
SAMPLE	1100	12345	1188	M	26	4.50	4.34
SAMPLE	2200	5678	1184	M	23	4.26	4.43

SEI Overview Report



Brutus Buckeye SEI Overview Report Autumn 2018

Classes included in this report:

Subject	Catalog Number	Class Number
ABCDE	1100	99999

	Invited#	Response#	%(1)	%(2)	%(3)	%(4)	%(5)	%(N/A)
1. The subject matter of this course was well organized	39	39	3 %	0 %	3 %	41 %	54 %	0 %
2. This course was intellectually stimulating	39	39	0 %	0 %	3 %	38 %	59 %	0 %
3. This instructor was genuinely interested in teaching	39	39	0 %	0 %	0 %	10 %	90 %	0 %
4. The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves	39	39	0 %	0 %	0 %	15 %	85 %	0 %
5. The instructor was well prepared	39	39	0 %	0 %	3 %	21 %	77 %	0 %
6. The instructor was genuinely interested in helping students	39	39	0 %	0 %	0 %	15 %	85 %	0 %
7. I learned a great deal from this instructor	39	39	0 %	0 %	3 %	54 %	44 %	0 %
8. The instructor created an atmosphere conducive to learning	39	39	0 %	3 %	3 %	18 %	77 %	0 %
9. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly	39	39	0 %	3 %	0 %	38 %	59 %	0 %
10. Overall, I would rate this instructor as	39	39	0 %	0 %	5 %	15 %	79 %	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, 20-60 and 61+.

Question	Instructor		Department (ABCDE)		College (Sample M)		University (1188 M)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. The subject matter of this course was well organized	4.44	0.79	4.17	0.98	4.21	0.99	4.22	0.99
2. This course was intellectually stimulating	4.56	0.55	4.30	0.95	4.15	1.02	4.14	1.03
3. This instructor was genuinely interested in teaching	4.90	0.31	4.59	0.73	4.41	0.91	4.44	0.89
4. The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves	4.85	0.37	4.51	0.78	4.35	0.91	4.37	0.89
5. The instructor was well prepared	4.74	0.50	4.37	0.88	4.32	0.96	4.34	0.95
6. The instructor was genuinely interested in helping students	4.85	0.37	4.47	0.79	4.40	0.92	4.42	0.90
7. I learned a great deal from this instructor	4.41	0.55	4.14	1.04	4.10	1.10	4.12	1.08
8. The instructor created an atmosphere conducive to learning	4.69	0.66	4.27	0.94	4.23	1.00	4.24	1.00
9. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly	4.54	0.64	4.21	1.01	4.15	1.09	4.17	1.07
10. Overall, I would rate this instructor as	4.74	0.55	4.40	0.89	4.31	1.00	4.34	0.98

SSLE Overview Report



Bella Buckeye SSLE Overview Report Autumn 2025

Classes included in this report:

Subject	Catalog Number	Class Number
CLASS	1101.01	000025

	Invited#	Response#	% (1)	% (2)	% (3)	% (4)	% (5)	% (N/A)
The instructor was available to answer questions and provide help if/when needed (in class, in person, by email, office hours, etc.)	70	65	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
The instructor provided constructive feedback (during class meetings, in person, on my work, etc.) that helped me to learn.	70	65	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
The instructor used teaching methods (such as class activities, discussions, group work, projects, lecture) in ways that encouraged my learning.	70	65	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
This course design and instruction helped me actively engage in my own learning.	70	65	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
The instructor demonstrated genuine interest in teaching.	70	65	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
I felt welcomed in this course (for example, instructor expressed interest in students' well-being, welcomed students' perspectives).	70	65	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
The instructor created an environment that valued diverse perspectives and experiences.	70	65	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%

Question	Instructor		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
The instructor was available to answer questions and provide help if/when needed (in class, in person, by email, office hours, etc.)	5.00	0.00	5.00
The instructor provided constructive feedback (during class meetings, in person, on my work, etc.) that helped me to learn.	5.00	0.00	5.00
The instructor used teaching methods (such as class activities, discussions, group work, projects, lecture) in ways that encouraged my learning.	5.00	0.00	5.00
This course design and instruction helped me actively engage in my own learning.	5.00	0.00	5.00
The instructor demonstrated genuine interest in teaching.	5.00	0.00	5.00
I felt welcomed in this course (for example, instructor expressed interest in students' well-being, welcomed students' perspectives).	5.00	0.00	5.00
The instructor created an environment that valued diverse perspectives and experiences.	5.00	0.00	5.00

MLY Analysis of Student Comments

A MLY analysis of student comments identified the following topics and recommendations. The three most common topics or recommendations from each question are listed, along with the percent and total number of comments that were relevant. Instructors can access their [MLY dashboard](#) for more details.

What specific aspects of this course were effective in promoting your learning (for example, teaching practices, assignments, class material, class structure)?

Sentiments [Polarity]	Categorized topics [No. of comments]	Overall [2]
Positive	Course Component > Assessment & Evaluation > Assignments > Helpfulness	50% (32)
Positive	Course Component > Course Material & Structure > Course in General > Pace	50% (32)
Positive	Teaching Effectiveness > Teaching Style > Assistance > Availability	50% (32)

What changes, if any, could be made to improve the learning experience for future students (for example teaching practices, assignments, class material, class structure)?

Categorized recommendations [Type]	Categorized topics [No. of comments]	Overall [2]
Do more	Course Component > Assessment & Evaluation > Assignments > Quantity	50% (32)

Required Questions for Public Institutions in the State of Ohio

Are students encouraged to discuss varying opinions and viewpoints in class?

Options	Count	Percentage
Yes	49	75%
No	0	0%
Not Applicable	16	25%

Does the faculty member create a classroom atmosphere free of political, racial, gender, and religious bias?

Options	Count	Percentage
Yes	65	100%
No	0	0%

On a scale of 1-10, how effective are the teaching methods of this faculty member? The scale of 1-10 in the question above measures the effectiveness of the faculty member with 1 being not effective at all and 10 being extremely effective.

Options	Count	Percentage
1 - Not effective at all	0	0%
2	0	0%
3	0	0%
4	0	0%
5	0	0%
6	0	0%
7	0	0%
8	0	0%
9	13	20%
10 - Extremely effective	52	80%

Questions?

Interfolio Overview

Toni Calbert



Interfolio RPT

Review, Promotion & Tenure (RPT)

- Required for all faculty
- Promotion/Promotion and Tenure Reviews
- Also used for Annual and Reappointments Reviews
- Cases will be created over the summer
 - Interfolio Video Guide on Uploading P&T Materials – coming soon!

Interfolio FAR

- Interfolio FAR is a section of Interfolio that allows direct entry of faculty activities (teaching, research, service) into the website. It is intended to eventually replace the core dossier Word document.
- Candidates are NOT required by ASC to use FAR for promotion or promotion and tenure in 2026-2027.
 - **We recommend using the Word outline available on the ASC Intranet**
 - **Some units may require use of FAR. Check with your P&T Chair**

Interfolio FAR in 2026-2027

- You have the option to use FAR to create your core dossier, as long as your unit approves.
 - Please be aware that the system is still a work in progress, and you may experience glitches and rough spots.
 - You will need to generate a “Vita,” download it as a Word or PDF document, depending on if additional edits are needed, and upload it to the Candidate Packet in the Core Dossier section. There is not currently functionality to import FAR activities directly into RPT.
 - There is an option to have staff or student employees assist with entering activities into FAR. Please contact [ASC Faculty Affairs](#) for more information.

Contact ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu for any Interfolio issues.

Interfolio FAR – Courses Table

All candidates may use FAR to generate the table of courses (#4 in the core dossier outline):

- Generate a “Vita” under the “Vitas & Biosketches” tab
- Export the file as a Word document
- Copy and paste the course table into your core dossier outline

Questions?



Notification and Comments Process

Elizabeth Murphy



Candidate Notification and Comments Process (Regional Campus Candidates)

- After the Regional Campus Faculty and Dean reviews are complete, the Candidate must be notified of the results, given the option to review the Faculty and Dean letters, and provided at least 10 calendar days to comment
- Regional Campus (three stages): regional comments, TIU comments, college comments
- Candidate must respond either with any comments or a statement that they have no comments.
 - If Candidate has comments, Regional Campus Faculty and/or Dean may respond as appropriate
 - Only one round of comments is permitted
- The comments process can be completed outside of Interfolio via Outlook. Candidate comments and any responses should be uploaded at the "Regional Campus Candidate Comments" step and forwarded to the "Faculty Affairs Review" step.
- Comments should be reviewed by the CEF and TIU Head as part of the TIU review.



Candidate Notification and Comments Process (All Candidates)

- After the CEF and TIU Head reviews are complete and their letters finalized, the Candidate must be notified of the results, given the option to review the TIU Faculty and TIU Head letters, and provided at least 10 calendar days to comment
- Candidate must respond either with any comments or a statement that they have no comments.
 - If Candidate has comments, TIU Head or CEF may respond as appropriate
 - Only one round of comments is permitted
- TIU Head or Case Manager can complete the comments process outside of Interfolio via Outlook. Case Manager then uploads candidate comments and any responses at the TIU Candidate Comments step and forwards case to Faculty Affairs Review step.



Final Logistics

Kristi Williams



Interfolio: Things to Note

Interfolio remains a work in progress:

- Occasional glitches may occur.
- Candidates and units will be held harmless for issues due to software change.
- Contact ASC Faculty Affairs with any concerns or questions.

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 Kristi Williams (.2339) and divisional dean; college will decide next steps

Next Steps:

- Talk to your TIU Head, P&T Chair, and/or POD about timeline and due dates and required review materials
- Work on your core dossier and compile other review materials
- Periodically check the [ASC Intranet Promotion and Tenure](#) page for updated guidance documents
- Reach out to [ASC Faculty Affairs](#) with any questions

ASC Faculty Affairs Team



General Faculty Affairs Email Account:
ascfacultyaffairs@osu.edu

Kristi Williams

Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs
Professor of Sociology
williams.2339@osu.edu

Toni Calbert

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

Elizabeth Murphy

Faculty Affairs Specialist
murphy.926@osu.edu

Destanie Scales

Executive Assistant
scales.106@osu.edu

Questions?





Thank you!

