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This Pattern of Administration for the Department of Geography is divided into two major sections. A companion document addresses General Aspects; this section addresses matters related to Appointment, Annual, Fourth-Year, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews. University rules and guidelines of the Office of Academic Affairs supersede this Pattern of Administration in any instance where there is a conflict.

### A. Preamble and Mission Statement

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure), Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the College and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the Department shall follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years or on appointment-reappointment of the Department Chair.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01.

The Department of Geography contributes to The Ohio State University's mission of attainment of international distinction in education, scholarship, and public service. Geography provides a highly regarded research and educational environment for increased understanding of: (1) Urban and Regional Systems [URS]; (2) Spatial Analytic Methods [SAM]; (3) Atmospheric and Climatic Studies [ACS]; and (4) People, Society, and Environment [PSE]. The Department maintains expertise in these four areas.

The Department is currently (2008-09) proposing a far reaching revision of many details of its programs but remains committed to these four areas.

The Department serves undergraduate and graduate students by teaching a spectrum of courses in Geographical knowledge. It serves the national and international research community by carrying out and reporting original research in the major areas of focus listed above (URS, SAM, ACS, and PSE). The Department participates in national, state and local service through a broad range of editorial, administrative, and scientific activities. The teaching mission involves diverse courses including: (1) large sections of undergraduate courses required as part of basic educational and capstone experiences; (2) comprehensive, in-depth courses for upper-level undergraduate and beginning graduate students; and (3) advanced graduate courses which are...
critical in the diffusion of new research and theories. Our graduate program consistently ranks as one of the most productive PhD granting programs in the country. Excellence in teaching, research and service by faculty are critical for maintaining our mission. The primary emphasis in the Department is scholarly excellence; the creation of new knowledge is the paramount aim. Thus, faculty are expected to be active in publishing and research. Outstanding teaching, quality instruction, and conduct of innovative, exploratory, state-of-the-art seminars are also expected of our faculty. At the senior ranks, quality service also is expected.

The goal of the Department over the next several years is to increase its already high ranking and stature. To attain this, the Department expects productivity and excellence from all its members. The department has articulated a set of mechanisms to achieve this objective, which are embodied within our criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure, merit salary increases, and other recognitions.

B. Appointments

1. Criteria: Tenure Track Faculty

The Department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the Department. The key criteria for each appointment are as follows: at senior levels, research productivity and professional reputation must be clearly in evidence from publications, research grants, and the like. At the Assistant Professor level, evidence of research potential, of a caliber likely to lead to grants and publications, is required. In addition, evidence of outstanding research communications skills, based on a presentation of original research to the members of the Department and other professionals, is required. The PhD must be completed by the time of appointment for Assistant Professorship. In all cases, evidence of substantial peer support from outside reviewers, and evidence of high quality teaching, are weighed in forming a judgment on the potential candidate.

As discussed in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 a minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study. Appointment of tenure track faculty at the rank of instructor will only be made when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 provides information about the duration of probationary periods and appointments for regular faculty.

(1) An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. As permitted by this language, Geography restricts the appointment to 1 year maximum, and follows University standards for notice of termination.
(2) An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and is informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

(3) An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the tenure initiating unit and College.

2. Criteria: Auxiliary Faculty

**Compensated** auxiliary faculty members include lecturers and senior lecturers and may include faculty with regular titles below 50 percent or visiting faculty. Visiting faculty, whose appointments may not exceed three continuous years, include individuals on leave from other academic institutions.

**No-salary** auxiliary faculty include adjunct faculty and faculty with regular titles at zero percent time. They may also include visiting faculty.

Appointment and reappointment of *compensated* and *no-salary* auxiliary faculty are governed by simple criteria. The person must have the appropriate degree(s) and, in the case of visitors, rank at a comparable institution. Also, an auxiliary faculty member must substantially contribute to the intellectual life of the Department, be substantially involved in its academic mission, and interact with students and faculty in research or classroom settings.

The criteria for appointment of auxiliary faculty with modified faculty titles (*such as adjunct and visiting*) are comparable to the criteria for appointment at the regular ranks. These criteria will also serve as a basis for evaluating the occasional auxiliary faculty member who desires promotion.

Auxiliary appointments may be made for only one year at a time and thus require formal annual renewal if they are to be continued. As stated in Rule 3335-5-19, persons holding auxiliary titles are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. The title of lecturer and senior lecturer shall be used for all compensated instructional appointments where other titles are not appropriate. Lecturers' responsibilities shall be limited to formal course instruction.

3. Criteria: Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

**Courtesy** appointments apply to persons who hold a regular faculty position at Ohio State in a department other than Geography. These appointments are (1) non-salaried and (2) made at the
discretion of the Chair. Such positions will be made only to fully-qualified individuals who contribute to the Department's research, service, or teaching mission.

In general terms the courtesy appointment is used to recognize substantial (uncompensated) involvement in the life of this Department. This interaction must be ongoing, and it must be of sufficient magnitude to warrant formal recognition. Thus, frequent membership on our exam committees, co-authorship of publications with our faculty, and service in the form of invited lectures and presentations to our Department are indicators of suitable intellectual interaction.

4. Procedures: Tenure Track Faculty

Search procedures: A national and international search, including advertising in the AAG Newsletter, is the norm for all tenure track appointments. The job description is approved by the faculty in a general meeting. The scope of the advertisement is designed to draw candidates with expertise in the areas which the Department has agreed to develop and strengthen its faculty. The search is convened by the Personnel Committee, augmented where appropriate by additional faculty members. The composition of the Personnel Committee is defined in Part I of this Pattern of Administration.

Short List: The application materials are sorted and analyzed by the Personnel Committee. It develops and provides a short list [typically five or six names] to be considered at a meeting of the faculty, and that list may be supplemented by faculty vote. To select and rank-order finalists from the short list pool of candidates, the voting procedure is as follows: faculty review the short list of candidates, and casts one vote per iteration in favor of their preferred candidate. The first round winner is removed from the list, becoming the first picked finalist, and the vote repeats. The selection process for interviewees may be shortened if there is broad agreement among the faculty on a small number of the most outstanding cases.

Interview and Selection: At the discretion of the Chair, one or more finalists are invited for interview. Interviews are scheduled as soon as possible after selecting the final candidates. When all invited finalists have been interviewed, a faculty discussion and vote is called. A ballot is used to conduct the voting process. Faculty indicate whether or not they favor an offer to each candidate and, at the same time, complete a ranking of the candidates. For an offer to be made a candidate should have support from at least 50% of the voting faculty. Normally, an offer made to a candidate by the Chair will reflect the rank ordering by voting faculty; deviation from this is addressed in 1.B.iv above. The Chair negotiates with acceptable candidates, in consultation with the College office.

Regional campus searches are done in conjunction with regional campus deans and faculty. These searches are based on similar criteria as for the main campus, with the additional consideration of the candidate’s ability to handle a heavier teaching commitment.

Vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates is obviously in the best
interest of the Department's intellectual health, and every effort is made to encourage the best people to apply. *In accordance with a policy of equality of opportunity, decisions concerning appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure shall be free of discrimination as to race, creed, religion, national origin, age, sex, disability, Vietnam-era veteran status, or sexual orientation.* [Faculty rule 3335-6-01 (B)]

All offers at the associate professor and professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

5. Procedures: Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary appointments are handled on a case by case basis. In the instance of securing the services of a visiting professor from another institution, the Chair proceeds on the basis of the criteria stated above.

6. Procedures: Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Courtesy appointments will be made by the Chair, on the basis of a majority faculty vote, for a three year period. Individuals who are approved will be listed with the Geography Faculty as courtesy appointments. Although these appointments will not involve separate Graduate Faculty status in Geography, individuals may participate as MA, MS, or PhD committee members for Geography graduate students if they have Graduate Faculty status in their home department. They may not serve as graduate student advisers, but may serve as co-advisers if authorized to do so in individual cases by the Geography Graduate Studies Committee. They will not ordinarily serve on other departmental committees or attend Geography faculty meetings except on occasions deemed appropriate by the Chair. If the Chair deems circumstances to be appropriate, a review of an individual's courtesy appointment status may be carried out. Ordinarily, the Geography Department will not participate in reviews of courtesy faculty carried out by their home departments.

The Chair may decide at the end of the three year period whether to renew a courtesy appointment, i.e. continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing contributions. For example, the Chair might ask to see evidence that publications authored during the time of a courtesy appointment acknowledge the Geography Department. Unlike auxiliary appointments, courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal.

C. Annual Reviews

1. Procedures: Probationary Tenure Track Faculty
These procedures must be consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (C) as well as with Office of Academic Affairs policies described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook. Below is relevant material from the Faculty Rules regarding annual reviews for probationary faculty.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 Probationary service, duration of appointments for regular faculty.

Annual review of probationary faculty members.

(1) At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing tenure initiating unit, College, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

At the completion of the review the tenure initiating unit Chair shall provide the faculty member and the Dean of the College with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development and an indication as to whether the faculty member will be reappointed for an additional year. The assessment should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

The Chair of the Department reviews every faculty member annually, generally in January or February, on the basis of departmental criteria articulated in this document, and a report provided by that faculty member. The details of the procedure for the Chair's review are explained below (section entitled Merit Salary Increases and Other Performance-based Rewards). In addition, the Personnel Committee performs an annual review of the probationary faculty, generally in Winter Quarter. These annual reviews take on added elements in the fourth and sixth years, and in those cases are conducted earlier in the academic year.

The Personnel Committee annual reviews will be constructive and candid. The review process is a means to provide balanced and evaluative information for untenured faculty. The review should communicate aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to make acceptable progress, and also should highlight areas of excellence and strength. The Department will not renew a probationary appointment following any annual review in which it is apparent that the candidate's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor.

a. Definition of Terms
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In the sections that follow, the following terms are used in quite specific ways: the Personnel Committee is one of the Department’s standing committees, and it serves as a “reading committee” for all faculty reviews including P&T cases. In this role, the Personnel Committee is sometimes referred to as a Reading Committee by the College. The Promotion and Tenure Committee is the set of all faculty of eligible rank: with the exception noted below, eligible faculty are tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate excluding the TIU chair and administrators. For the unusual case of tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors (again excluding the TIU chair and administrators [see precise list in Rule 3335-6-04]). A Reporter is a faculty member charged with the responsibility of drafting a summary of the discussion at a Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting. The report must be a balanced and informative review of the proceedings and discussion that leads to a clear understanding of the outcome of the vote. A faculty member is designated as the Procedural Oversight Designee (POD). The POD oversees Promotion and Tenure procedures and acts to prevent procedural defects. It is important that this task be taken seriously as the discovery of a procedural defect may result in the entire process having to be re-done from the point of error.

In all relevant sections below where a vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is called for, the appropriate quorum will be defined as follows:

A minimum of 50 percent attendance of eligible faculty (excluding those on leave) is required as a quorum. The department strongly encourages informed participation of all eligible faculty at P&T committee meetings and arranges these to accommodate faculty schedules to the greatest extent possible.

Eligible faculty will review the candidate's dossier and vote, by secret ballot, on the candidate. A simple majority of the voting eligible faculty must vote positively for the faculty report to carry a positive recommendation for promotion or for promotion and tenure for the candidate.

b. Annual Review

i. An annual review is required. The review will typically take place in winter quarter.

ii. The probationary faculty member (reviewee) provides the Personnel Committee with a dossier of professional activities as a faculty member since being appointed. The Office of Academic Affairs dossier format must be used and must cover research, service, and teaching activities, as well as work in progress and future plans in any of those categories. It also must be appended with supporting materials such as an updated curriculum vitae, file copies of papers, SEI scores and teaching evaluations.

iii. The Chair and Members of the Personnel Committee evaluate the file.

iv. The Personnel Committee meets with the reviewee to answer any questions that have arisen through the evaluation. The meeting includes general assessments of
the file, the reviewee's progress toward P&T, discussion of career choices, etc.

v. The Personnel Committee gives its final evaluation letter to the Chair and to the reviewee. The evaluation letter and related materials are placed in the reviewee's file. If the chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. A recommendation from the chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures (II.C.1.c. below), and the dean shall make the final decision in the matter.

vi. The reviewee has the right to comment in writing with respect to the summary, and this statement must be included in the reviewee's file.

c. Fourth Year Review

The Fourth Year Review requires a college-level evaluation. In the Fourth Year Review the Dean makes the final decision on reappointment for the fifth year.

i. The timing of this review depends upon the various deadlines by which departmental recommendations must be submitted to the Office of the Dean, but in general should take place in the Winter Quarter of the faculty member's fourth year.

ii. The reviewee provides the Personnel Committee with a dossier of professional activities as a faculty member since being appointed. The Office of Academic Affairs dossier format must be used and must cover research, service, and teaching activities, as well as work in progress and future plans in any of those categories. It also must be appended with supporting materials such as an updated curriculum vitae, file copies of papers, SEI scores and teaching evaluations. External evaluations are not required for the Fourth Year Review.

iii. The reviewee materials are made available to the P&T Committee for their evaluation.

iv. The Personnel Committee (in the role of the Reading Committee) prepares a draft report, and circulates the report among Promotion and Tenure Committee members prior to the Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting.

v. The Promotion and Tenure Committee meets to discuss the preliminary evaluation. Letters from absent members should not be read at the meeting. A member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, serving as the Reporter, drafts a summary description of discussion at the meeting and observations made; the vote, taken by anonymous ballot, also is reported. The draft is revised and the
final version produced and approved by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This report is included in the Fourth Year Review dossier.

vi. In addition to the procedures above, Regional Campus faculty are subject to their campus review, and a letter from that campus is provided to the Department Chair who provides it to the reading committee.

vii. The Department Chair draws up a summary letter and places it in the reviewee’s file, along with the report from the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Once the Chair’s letter is signed and the candidate notified, a formal period of 10 days for comment from the candidate is open. If necessary, the Promotion and Tenure Committee meets again following the 10 day period to reply to comments.

viii. The Chair submits the necessary document(s) to the College.

Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires approval of the dean of the college.

Policy concerning modification in the length of the probationary period after beginning an appointment is described in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D). In brief, it automatically excludes time from the probationary period, in increments of one year, for the birth or adoption of a child, and it allows faculty to request an exclusion of time from the probationary period for a variety of personal circumstances beyond the faculty member’s control. Additionally, at the faculty member’s election, time spent in the Instructor rank may be excluded as prior service credit. The Department also may consider, during the annual review, recommending that a faculty member apply for an exclusion, but may not require such application. The complete rule should be consulted for the details of time exclusion from probationary periods and related matters.

2. Procedures: Tenured faculty

These review procedures must be consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policies described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook. A written annual review is required and a meeting of the Chair and faculty member is required if requested by either. The Full Professor members of the personnel committee periodically evaluate Associate Professors with a view to their readiness for promotion.

D. Merit Salary Increases and Other Performance-based Rewards

1. Criteria

As outlined in the Department's Mission statement, the primary emphasis in the Department is on scholarly excellence. The creation of new knowledge is the paramount aim. Thus, faculty are
expected to be active in publishing and research. Outstanding teaching, quality instruction, and conduct of innovative, exploratory, state-of-the-art seminars are also an expectation of our faculty. Papers in high quality journals, books, monographs, other publications, and grant activity are taken into account in assessing performance for purposes of merit salary increases.

2. Procedures

The Chair annually reviews the productivity of all faculty. The scope of this review includes publications, teaching, and service contributions in the most recent three calendar year period. The aim of this review is to place the faculty member's contributions into perspective, relative both to other faculty and to expectations for the faculty as a whole. The result of this comparative assessment is a letter from the Chair to the faculty member: this letter places the overall record in perspective, and gives a summary rating that falls into a continuum formed by the following scale, as applied to teaching, research, and service: well below satisfactory; below satisfactory; satisfactory; above satisfactory; well above satisfactory.

These categories may also be shaded up or down slightly, but essentially, the Chair rates effectiveness in such terms, emphasizing the positive contributions, but also pointing both to strengths and weaknesses in performance. In addition, the Chair, in these annual review letters, communicates a general impression of the outlook for future advancement, based on the current rating and assessment. Recommendations regarding merit and salary, as well as teaching assignments, are based on the outcome of this rating.

The Chair makes comparative assessments of the productivity of the faculty members, recognizing the importance of averaging over a time span, and accounting for unusual increases or changes in faculty responsibilities. Indicators of extraordinary merit in the form of external recognition, awards, grants, and impact on the discipline are weighed in the merit assessment.

Faculty are expected to produce to a very high standard in areas that are central to their responsibilities. In all cases, however, our faculty has a shared goal in the conduct of innovative research and scholarship. Accordingly, a less-than-satisfactory performance in this area would not be counterbalanced by excellent performance in an area that is a smaller part of the overall, shared goal. Faculty members also should be held to a high standard of departmental citizenship. Poor departmental citizenship at best imposes additional service burdens on other faculty; at worst it may obstruct a department's ability to function and damage the department's reputation.

3. Documentation

The Chair, typically in December, requests documentation for the purpose of reviewing faculty in terms of the merit of their performance over the most recent three-calendar-year period. Documentation requested includes the following.
Chronological List of Books, Articles, and Other Published Papers

a) Books (other than edited volumes) and monographs.
b) Edited books.
c) Chapters in edited books.
d) Bulletins and technical reports.
e) Peer-reviewed journal articles.
f) Editor-reviewed journal articles.
g) Reviews and abstracts (indicate whether peer reviewed).
h) Papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer reviewed).
i) Unpublished scholarly presentations (indicate whether peer reviewed).
j) Potential publications in review process (indicate authorship, date of submission, and to what journal or publisher the work has been submitted).
k) Encyclopedia entries

Papers-Books in progress (indicate stage)
Grants Ongoing (include agency, amount, title, beginning and end year, co-PIs)
Proposals Submitted (include agency, amount, title, beginning and end year, co-PIs)
Courses Taught (include copy of SEI summary results)
Graduate Students Advised (include name, degree, and expected or actual completion date)

Committees (include beginning and end years, role as member or chair)
Classify as Editorial Board Memberships, Review Panel Memberships, Professional Organization Positions, University-Level Committees, College-Level Committees, Department-Level Committees

Recognitions

E. Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (D): In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the University enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Further, the substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship will continue needs to be established for all promotions. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported. Internal cases for promotion to a higher rank and external hires at that rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Internal cases should also be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired,
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controlling for rank and stage of career.

1. Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C): The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the University.

Further, according to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (B): Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor.

Every candidate will be held to a standard of high attainment in all aspects of performance. The record is expected to show clear evidence of an ongoing, coherent, focused research agenda which, in addition, has developed beyond the topic of the PhD dissertation.

2. Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of high quality teaching, has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally, and has demonstrated leadership in service. The pattern of performance over the period prior to review should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally, and continue to be highly productive.

The Department also expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. While the individual seeking promotion will be assessed in relation to assigned responsibilities, exceptional performance in these responsibilities is required.

3. Criteria: Regional Campus Faculty

The criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and promotion to Professor for regional campus faculty are similar to those for equivalent ranks on the main campus. In addition the criteria are adapted to reflect the following considerations: that the primary mission of the regional campuses is undergraduate teaching; that the teaching and service responsibilities of regional campus faculty are often more substantial than those of Columbus-based faculty; that regional campus faculty do not have graduate teaching associates to assist them in their teaching; and that regional campus faculty may not have access to research facilities comparable to those of Columbus-based faculty. Taking these factors into consideration, the criteria for promotion to
Associate Professor with tenure include the production of research at a high quality level that indicates an active research agenda, publication in recognized peer reviewed journals, but with a lower expectation in terms of the rate of publication than that held for Columbus Campus faculty. Effective, high quality teaching is given primary weight. The criteria for promotion to Full Professor include high quality teaching and service, and recognition of scholarly achievement as evidenced by publications in major journals, and as supported by peer review. The pattern of performance over the period prior to review should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally, and continue to be highly productive.

4. Procedures

Department procedures for promotion and tenure reviews follow those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04.

The above Faculty Rule does not delineate all aspects of the review. Listed below are Department-specific issues to supplement the procedures set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04.

The Chair, on the basis of materials provided by the faculty, assesses the progress of Associate Professors towards the goal of promotion to Full Professor, and the readiness of Assistant Professors for a non-mandatory (i.e. early) review for promotion and tenure. Such screening is designed to avoid premature reviews and is based on the Chair's judgment, in consultation with the Chair of the Personnel Committee, as to the level of productivity. As stated in Faculty Rule 335-6-04 (A) (3), however, a faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review, or for promotion review, at any time; but the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure review, or promotion review, if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The Promotion and Tenure Committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.

Reasonable care and good judgment will be exercised to prevent conflicts of interest. At a minimum, faculty members with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate will not participate in the review of that candidate. In addition, a close professional relationship may give rise to a conflict of interest. For example, it may be difficult for a faculty member to objectively review a candidate when the faculty member is co-author on a significant portion of the candidate's publications or when the faculty member is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional services. The Chair is to assure that all such conflicts are avoided.

Many of the detailed mechanics of the procedure are listed in the following multi-step procedure, which is based in substantial part on long-standing practices within the Department of Geography. The Department will follow suggestions from the Office of Academic Affairs for generating a list of external referees.
The timing of the review is set to coordinate with College deadlines, bearing in mind the importance of leaving appropriate time for the "comment" period. The candidate prepares the dossier; the Promotion and Tenure Committee meets, and votes on the case and provides a written assessment of the case; the Chair adds an independent assessment and communicates the case to the College. The Department’s Personnel Committee (in the role of the Reading Committee) verifies the accuracy of citations, and interacts with the candidate to obtain help with any aspects of the dossier needing clarification.

\[ a. \text{Sixth Year Review for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure} \]

i. The timing of this review depends upon the various deadlines by which departmental recommendations must be submitted to the Office of the Dean. The review will be initiated as late as possible within these constraints, but it generally will begin during the summer quarter of the reviewee's fifth year in the rank of Assistant Professor.

ii. The Personnel Committee and Department Chair formulates a list of potential referees. The candidate is shown the list of names generated by the department. The candidate may identify from the list any potential cases where "arm’s length" evaluations would not occur, and may also suggest up to three additional names. Typically, no more than 25% of the letters in the final dossier will be from persons suggested by the candidate.

iii. After confirming the cooperation of external reviewers, a full \textit{curriculum vitae}, and reviewee materials pertaining to research, are provided to them by the Chair, and a written evaluation requested. Selected publication reprints will be included by the Chair in consultation with the reviewee. The \textit{Guidelines and Procedures} of the Office of Academic Affairs, for communicating with external referees, will be followed. (Typically these requests are made in the summer prior to the deadline.)

iv. The reviewee provides the Personnel Committee with a dossier of professional activities as a faculty member since being appointed (typically this occurs in early fall). The Office of Academic Affairs dossier format must be used and must cover research, service, and teaching activities, as well as work in progress and future plans in any of those categories. It also must be appended with supporting materials such as an updated \textit{curriculum vitae}, file copies of papers, SEI scores and teaching evaluations.

v. All reviewee materials are made available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, comprised of tenured faculty of Associate Professor rank and above, for their evaluation.

vi. The Personnel Committee (in the role of the Reading Committee) prepares a \textit{draft}
vi. The Promotion and Tenure Committee meets to discuss the preliminary evaluation. Letters from absent members should not be read at the meeting. A member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, serving as the Reporter, drafts a summary description of discussion at the meeting and observations made; the vote, taken by anonymous ballot, also is reported. The draft is revised and the final version produced and approved by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This report is included in the dossier.

In addition to the procedures above, Regional Campus faculty are subject to their campus review and letters from that unit are provided to the Department Chair.

The Chair shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and recommendation for the Dean for inclusion in the dossier. As soon as the faculty report and Chair's letter have been completed, the candidate should be notified in writing of the completion of the tenure initiating unit review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the tenure initiating unit Chair with written comments on the tenure initiating unit review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or Chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted. [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 B (5)]

The tenure initiating unit Chair shall forward the dossier with all internal and external evaluations, candidate comments on the tenure initiating unit review and Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or Chair responses to those comments, if any, to the Dean of the college. [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 B (6)]

In the event of the appointment to the Department of an Associate Professor without tenure, the above procedures must be conducted no later than the final year of the probationary period.

b. Review for Promotion to Full Professor

With appropriate modifications for rank, the procedures in II.E.4.a. (Sixth year Review for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure) will be used for the review of an Associate Professor being considered for promotion to Full Professor.

5. Documentation

The Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline serves as a basic standard for
a. Teaching Evaluation

High quality teaching is expected of every colleague in this Department. We share a commitment to the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students. Our role in setting an example for our own graduate students also is important, as is the fact that this Department prides itself on fostering the teaching talents of its senior graduate students by giving them full responsibility for sections of undergraduate courses.

SEIs are administered in all classes, and summary statistics are reported by all instructors (including faculty, lecturers, and GTAs) as part of the teaching evaluation. Such SEIs must be administered by someone other than the actual instructor. The chair receives summary reports from individual instructors and faculty. The chair may request tabulations of scores for all members of the department (including graduate teaching assistants) from the Registrar’s data. (Care should be taken to request production of SEIs even for class sizes that fall below the automatic generation threshold.)

Peer reviewers are selected by the chair, who arranges for peer review of teaching for Assistant and Associate Professors. Faculty from the candidate’s area visit classes of untenured faculty throughout the probationary period. Short evaluation reports are written, and accumulated in the dossier, concerning the quality of the teaching.

These visits should take place on average once per year during the probationary period. The preplanned, mutually agreed upon, visits should be initiated by the chair. The documentation of teaching excellence is especially important for Associate Professors in that this is a requirement of the dossier for promotion to Full Professor.

In preparing an analysis of these data for Promotion and Tenure cases, the Personnel Committee should try to compare the SEI scores with scores in similar level courses, and ideally to data from the same course. The variability in scores from 200, to 600, to 800 level courses is likely to be wide, and some effort to make direct comparisons inside the Department (or inside the College if the data can be broken out this way) would be especially helpful. In view of the relative ease of "satisfying" students in a more advanced class, and the role of "duty" in teaching core courses, we feel that there is a need to categorize SEI results by course level.

It is recognized that, apart from the above mentioned "core" element of the data collection and analysis, the individual faculty member is free to develop other materials. Especially useful in this regard might be the widely used concept of a teaching dossier. This could include syllabi, exercise material, comments from other faculty on how the syllabus fits into or extends the curriculum. Remarks on the level of outcome, or preparation of students from a course in entering the next course in a sequence, would be valuable if the curriculum structure is such that there is an organized sequence of courses. Other ideas available to the faculty member seeking to
improve teaching include "self assessment", and mid-quarter in-course evaluations from students.

The formal dossier must nevertheless follow OAA guidelines which explain how such ancillary materials are to be summarized. Certain data (such as SEIs and the teaching evaluation letters) must be collected regularly. The Promotion and Tenure case is to be based on an incisive analysis of these data, not simply a statistical summary of standard scores.

There are no uniform guidelines for the content and style of teaching evaluation letters. There will be variability in the types of commentary afforded by the different reviewers, but this kind of variation is itself a source of worthwhile information. At the request of the chair, letters should be collected from a variety of faculty offering both varied perspectives and comparative judgments. The letters should however be a combination of reporting how the class was conducted and, if appropriate, a set of suggestions in the form of helpful or constructive advice to a colleague.

b. Research

Research and scholarship are evaluated through evidence such as the quantity and quality of publications; quality of outlets in terms of their selectivity, impact, reputation, and importance in the discipline overall or in specialty areas; coherence of research efforts with one another; developing distinct areas of expertise and professional visibility; peer evaluations; external grants; formal recognition and awards; citation analysis; and assessments both by persons familiar with the candidate's area of specialization and by persons with a broad disciplinary perspective. The ultimate objective of this multi-faceted evaluation is to gauge the candidate's research and scholarship in terms of its impact professionally and otherwise.

c. Service

Activities generally considered to be service include administrative work for the Department, College, or University; service to the profession such as leadership roles and editorial and reviewing activities; and application of professional expertise in service to the community. Community service not germane to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to promotion and tenure reviews. Efforts should be made to identify indicators of the quality as well as the quantity of service roles. The quality of departmental service will be generally known. Indicators of the quality of service beyond the Department and external to the University would include election or appointment to leadership roles, other evidence that the candidate's services are sought after rather than volunteered, and awards. Depending on the nature of a candidate's service activities, it may be appropriate for the chair to solicit written evaluations from those who are in a position to evaluate specific contributions. An important measure of professional service contributions is that they should lead to broad visibility and high professional recognition and standing.
F. Appeals

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

G. Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year review.