

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Criteria for the
Department of Women's, Gender and Sexuality
Studies

August 3, 2017

OAA Approved October 29, 2017

Table of Contents

I. PREAMBLE	3
II. DEPARTMENT MISSION	3
III. DEFINITIONS	3
A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY	3
1. Tenure-track Faculty	3
2. Conflict of Interest	4
3. Minimum Composition	4
B. PROMOTION AND TENURE (P&T COMMITTEE).....	4
C. QUORUM	5
D. RECOMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY	5
1. Appointment	5
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion.....	5
IV. APPOINTMENTS	5
A. CRITERIA.....	6
1. Tenure-track Faculty	6
2. Associated Faculty	7
3. Courtesy Appointments.....	8
B. PROCEDURES	9
1. Tenure-track Faculty	9
2. Regional Campuses 11	
3. Associated Faculty	12
4. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	12
V. ANNUAL REVIEWS	12
A. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	13
1. Regional Campus Faculty	14
2. Fourth-Year Review	14
3. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	15
B. TENURED FACULTY	17
C. TENURED FACULTY: REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY.....	17
D. ASSOCIATED FACULTY	17
VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	17
A. OVERVIEW	17
B. PROCEDURES	18
C. DOCUMENTATION	18
1. Teaching	19
2. Scholarship	19
3. Service	20
VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION	20
A. CRITERIA.....	20
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	20
2. Promotion to Professor	21
3. Regional Campus Faculty	22
B. PROCEDURES	22
1. Candidate Responsibilities	23
2. Promotion & Tenure Committee Responsibilities	23
3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities.....	25
4. Department Chair Responsibilities.....	25

5. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	26
6. External Evaluations	27
C. PROCEDURES: PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS.....	28
D. DOCUMENTATION	28
1. Excellence as a teacher.....	29
2. Excellence as a scholar.....	30
3. Excellence in Service	31
VIII. APPEALS 32	
IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS 32	
X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING 32	
A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING	32
B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	32
XI. APPENDICES 34	

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policy and Procedures Handbook](#), 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 on appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's [policy on equal opportunity](#).

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Department of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) is to generate new interdisciplinary forms of knowledge about the complex, globalized interplay of power and difference, especially as inflected by categories such as gender, sexuality, race, class, age, ability, and nationality, across a vast array of contemporary and historical cultures. We interrogate the conditions that render specific populations vulnerable to violence in a range of local and transnational contexts. We also study and cultivate strategies of resistance. To achieve these goals, we foster multiple modes of intellectual inquiry, transformative pedagogies, public engagement and activism. We strive to enhance the Department's national and international leadership role in the growing field of women's, gender and sexuality studies through continued excellence in research, teaching and service.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) states that “eligible faculty are tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate [being considered for tenure and/or promotion] excluding the tenure initiating unit chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.”

Eligible faculty members are those who are tenured in the department in which tenure is being considered. A tenured faculty member who holds a joint appointment is only a member of the eligible faculty in the department where her/his tenure resides.

For faculty recommendations on initial appointment, the committee of eligible faculty includes assistant professors. A second vote is taken by faculty members of higher rank than the candidate when the initial appointment is at senior rank. For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty members are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department. As WGSS has a high number of faculty in joint appointments, these faculty may provide their input on tenure and promotion decisions via written evaluations.

2. Conflict of Interest

Faculty with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate must not participate in a review of that candidate. A close professional relationship, such as when a faculty member is a co-author on 50% or more of the candidate’s publications, has served as the candidate’s dissertation advisor, or is dependent in some way on the candidate’s professional activities, also constitute a conflict of interest and faculty members must recuse themselves.

3. Minimum Composition

A minimum of three faculty members need to be involved in any P&T vote. In the event that the Department does not have three eligible faculty members to conduct the review, the Chair, after consultation with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

B. PROMOTION AND TENURE (P&T COMMITTEE)

The P&T Committee manages the personnel and tenure issues of the Department. The Department Chair appoints a chair of this committee who also chairs the committee of the eligible faculty.

Membership: Two tenured core faculty members on staggered three-year terms. The Chair may meet with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, but is not a voting member.

Function: To advise the Chair on tenure and promotion decisions and salary decisions; to follow procedures outlined in the Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in the WGSS Department document; and to present a report on the tenure and promotion cases to the

tenured faculty of the Department, whose vote will constitute the committee's recommendation in all cases.

C. QUORUM

Quorum is the required number of members present at a meeting for official action to occur, including taking a vote. The WGSS Department requires a quorum of two-thirds which is based on the number of eligible faculty members on duty in a given semester.

Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

D. RECOMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY

A vote is defined as a “yes” or “no” vote; abstentions are not votes. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1. Appointment

A two-thirds majority vote by confidential ballot is required to achieve a positive recommendation for hiring a candidate.

If the top candidate receives more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes, the Chair in consultation with the Dean will decide whether to make an offer to the top-ranked candidate on the basis of a simple majority or to end the search and begin again.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the committee of the eligible faculty in the WGSS Department requires at least two-thirds of the votes to be cast in the affirmative.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

The WGSS Department will make only those faculty appointments that enhance or have the potential to enhance the quality of the department and its effectiveness in pursuing its mission. Since the department expects that its senior members will be respected scholars within their areas of research and that junior faculty members will be persons who have reasonable promise of achieving that status, excellence in scholarship is, therefore, a necessary condition for appointment or promotion to any continuing position. Since the department expects excellence in teaching from all of its members as part of its mission, entry-level appointments will require evidence of potential as effective teachers and senior appointments will require evidence of effectiveness in the classroom and in other educational forums.

A. CRITERIA

1. Tenure-track Faculty

i. Instructor

An appointment to the rank of instructor should normally be made only 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. The appointment is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

ii. Assistant Professor

The 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 a relevant field of study, including the field of women's, gender and sexuality studies, or possession of equivalent experience and the promise both of a strong research profile and the ability to advance through the ranks. The candidate should demonstrate either in the dissertation or in published material (or both) the potential for significant published contributions to scholarship in her or his field and should demonstrate excellence or the potential for achieving excellence as an effective teacher.

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 informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

iii. Professor or Associate Professor

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. 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 Department and College. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor and/or offers of prior service credit

require prior approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost. A candidate for promotion to full professor should demonstrate excellence in teaching, research, and service. For a fuller description of excellence for promotion from associate to full professor, see p. 16. “Criteria: Promotion to the Rank of Professor.”

iv. Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

2. Associated Faculty

The Department may make associated appointments to faculty who provide significant resources for the department in teaching or research, depending on the terms of their individual appointments. These are not tenured or tenure-track appointments. Associated appointments are made by the Chair of the Department after consultation with appropriate faculty committees. An individual with an associated appointment may serve on appropriate departmental committees and may vote in departmental faculty meetings if so agreed upon by the tenure-track faculty. The criteria for appointment of associated faculty with modified faculty titles (such as “adjunct” and “visiting”) are comparable to the criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks. These criteria will also serve as a basis for evaluating the occasional associated faculty member who desires promotion.

Associated appointments shall be made for a specified period of time not to exceed three years and thus require formal renewal if they are to be continued beyond that period.

Associated appointments in the WGSS Department include the following:

i. Senior Lecturer

Appointment at the rank of senior lecturer will require either the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent or the completion of all course requirements for a Ph.D. or its equivalent. In most cases, since the primary responsibility of WGSS senior lecturers is to teach, they must demonstrate skill in effective teaching before being appointed. The Chair will work with the College office to negotiate the terms of the appointment. Senior lecturers may teach at any level for which they are qualified. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and by the Chair or her/his designee and by others among the tenure-track faculty. Such appointments may be renewed, provided the record in teaching or research has served the Department’s mission and that there is a continuing need for their services. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

ii. Lecturer

Lecturers will normally have at least an M.A. and will have demonstrated skill in effective teaching. Lecturers are appointed on a course-by-course basis, and their employment depends entirely on the instructional needs of the Department. Normally, lecturers will teach lower division courses. Their appointments will be made on a course-by-course and on a semester basis. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and by the Chair or her/his designee. Lecturers may be reappointed if there is a continuing need for their services and if their teaching has been effective. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

iii. Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty must have credentials as scholars and teachers similar to those of a tenure-track appointment at the same level (as stated elsewhere in this document). Visiting faculty members are eligible to teach at any level for which they are qualified as scholars and teachers. Such appointments will be made by the Chair upon consultation with the faculty and in accordance with a two-thirds vote by confidential ballot in a faculty meeting. When appropriate, the Chair will convene a search committee and follow the regular search procedures of the department as outlined below under “D. Procedures: Tenure-track Faculty.” Visiting faculty whose appointments may not exceed three continuous years include individuals on leave from other academic institutions and temporary faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

iv. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty must have credentials as scholars and teachers similar to those of a tenure-track appointment at the same level (as stated elsewhere in this document). Adjunct faculty members are eligible to teach at any level for which they are qualified as scholars and teachers. Such appointments will be made by the Chair upon consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a two-thirds confidential ballot vote in a faculty meeting. Such appointments typically take advantage of opportunities and are not the result of a departmental search. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion but not tenure, and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

3. Courtesy Appointments

A courtesy appointment in the WGSS Department can be extended only to Ohio State faculty who hold a faculty appointment in a department or school other than WGSS. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual’s current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Such appointments carry with them the expectation that the appointee will contribute substantially to the Department’s mission. Most courtesy appointments in WGSS are for faculty who wish to be part of the department’s Affiliated Graduate Faculty. Faculty with courtesy appointments may attend Department meetings and may be appointed to certain Department committees. Affiliated Graduate Faculty must hold graduate faculty

status in the Department, upon the recommendation of the Graduate Studies Committee and approval of the Graduate School, and they may co-chair graduate exam and dissertation committees. Continuation of the appointment will reflect ongoing contributions to the Department's mission and will be terminated when those contributions cease to exist or cease to serve the Department's or faculty member's needs. Unlike associated appointments, courtesy appointments do not require formal renewal.

B. PROCEDURES

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

1. Tenure-track Faculty

After consultation with the faculty, the Department Chair shall initiate the formation of a search committee for any tenure-track or tenured appointment by, first, designating a committee chair. Then, in consultation, the Chair and that committee chair will determine the composition of the full search committee, including at least three core faculty and possibly an Affiliated Graduate Faculty or others from outside the Department, as appropriate. Once constituted, the search committee must be approved by the Executive Dean.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#).

The Chair is an ex officio member of all search committees.

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.

- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications, including advertisements in journals and professional organizations, online listings, letters to graduate institutions and leading scholars asking for nominations, and invitations to potential candidates asking them to apply. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally prominent professional journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a short list and invite the faculty at large to read those files; faculty may also choose to read all files, if they so desire. With the consent of the faculty (to be reached via email, unless a meeting of the faculty is required for extensive deliberation), the search committee will conduct personal interviews via video conference and/or at appropriate professional meetings with roughly 10-12 candidates. Following the personal interviews, the search committee will present the list of the top 2-4 candidates to bring to campus at a meeting of the faculty. At least one of these top candidates must contribute to the diversity of the unit; if the search committee judges that there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the unit, it will explain this decision at a meeting of the faculty before asking the faculty to vote on inviting the finalists to campus for an interview. It will also explain this decision on the college's Faculty Diversity Search Report, which must be submitted to and approved by the divisional dean before the department invites any candidates to campus. If the faculty does not agree with the list for campus interviews, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

During and after candidate campus interviews, the search committee will solicit responses from students as well as faculty. At a departmental meeting, the chair of the search committee will make a recommendation about hiring from among the interviewed candidates. (See Section III, D for details regarding eligible faculty, quorum, and voting thresholds for faculty appointments.)

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

The Chair of the Department will then present the decision of the department to the Dean of the Division and will negotiate the terms of the appointment in consultation with the Dean of the Division and Executive Dean of the College.

2. Regional Campuses

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description, but it should consult with and seek the agreement of the Department Chair and faculty of the Columbus department. The Chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director will agree on a single search committee for the position, consisting of members of both units. Candidates should be interviewed by the regional campus Dean/Director, the Chair of the Department, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties.

Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the Columbus faculty taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. At the end of the evaluation process, the search committee will make a recommendation to the department Chair and the regional campus Dean/Director. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the department faculty and of the regional campus Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement and a letter of offer must be signed by the Chair of the Department and the Dean/Director of the regional campus.

3. Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the department Chair.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department Chair.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester or annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Appointment Criteria above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

4. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Tenure-track faculty from other units who wish to have courtesy appointments—in WGSS these are mostly Affiliated Graduate Faculty— in the department must apply or be nominated by WGSS faculty or by the Graduate Studies Committee for their formalized relationship to the Department. The Graduate Studies Committee will oversee the process of appointment and determine eligibility for both initial appointments and their continuation. The faculty must vote on all courtesy appointments and Affiliated Graduate Faculty.

V. ANNUAL REVIEWS

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review](#).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the department chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes.

The Department Chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing Department, 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.

The Chair of the Department and the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review all untenured faculty members in each year of their probationary service. The annual review enables the Department to communicate its performance expectations to probationary faculty and to evaluate progress towards those expectations. The Department Chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment and in a timely fashion each year thereafter when the annual review will take place, and provide a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be used by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. The annual review will encompass the untenured faculty member's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and will require evidence of continuing development or sustained excellence in each area. External evaluations of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the Department Chair.

For the purpose of annual review, the Department Chair will ask the Promotion and Tenure Committee to evaluate all members of the probationary faculty and make a recommendation regarding reappointment. The Department Chair will write a letter providing the faculty member, Divisional Dean and Executive Dean with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. All annual review letters will become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the fourth-year review and review for promotion and tenure. Probationary faculty members will meet annually with the Chair to discuss their annual reviews and future plans. If they choose, they

may respond in writing to any part of the review. If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final.

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Regional Campus Faculty

The review procedures for probationary faculty on the regional campuses will be the same as those followed for probationary faculty on the Columbus campus (see Section V. A.). Probationary faculty on regional campuses will be reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean/Director and by the tenured faculty and the Chair of Department on the Columbus campus. Ideally, the regional campus review, which focuses mainly on teaching and service, should take place first. The Dean/Director's report of that review and a copy of the faculty member's annual report, along with the Dean/Director's report of that review, will be forwarded to the Chair of the Department with a copy to the Executive Dean for inclusion in the Department review. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work and on the appropriateness of course content and course standards, but will consider all aspects of her/his record. The Department Chair should give a written review to the faculty member under consideration and a copy to the regional campus Dean/Director. It is important that the Chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director be alert to any developing discrepancy for the probationary faculty member between the quality of teaching and service, on the one hand, and the quality and quantity of scholarly work, on the other, in order to minimize the possibility that the regional campus and the Department may disagree on a tenure recommendation.

2. Fourth-Year Review

At the start of Spring semester of the fourth year of service, faculty under review are responsible for providing to the Promotion and Tenure Committee the OAA-designed dossier for reporting teaching, research, and service activities. The Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee may solicit or provide additional information that they consider relevant. If such material is added, the completed dossier will be returned to the faculty member at least ten days before the annual review so that she/he may provide explanation for, or otherwise comment on, any information included in the dossier. The contents of the dossier will constitute the evidence upon which evaluation will be made.

The fourth year review of probationary faculty shall follow the same process as the review for promotion and tenure at the Department and College levels with two exceptions: (a) external letters of evaluation are not may be solicited for fourth-year review cases and (b) renewal of the appointment for the fifth year requires the

approval of the Executive Dean of the College after review by the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.

For the fourth and sixth year reviews, the Department Chair and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will write separate letters to the faculty member and the Executive Dean. In the case of a continuing appointment, both letters will become part of the faculty member's dossier. In the event that the Chair does not concur with the eligible faculty's recommendation, the Chair will explain her/his disagreement and separate assessment to the tenured faculty in writing before officially communicating her/his decision regarding reappointment to the faculty member.

The Chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the candidate should pay careful attention to the guidelines and materials—and the format of their presentation – specified by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be responsible for verifying the accuracy of the candidate's citations and other aspects of the candidate's dossiers. The Procedures Oversight Designee will also check the dossiers to ensure the appropriateness of their contents.

Regardless of the vote and in any annual review, the faculty member under review will be invited to review the Chair's letter, and, in the case of the fourth and sixth year reviews, the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair's letter. The faculty member will be invited to comment on any details he or she wishes. The Department Chair may respond to these comments, but the departmental review process ends there.

In a decision for nonrenewal, the Chair will notify the probationary faculty member in writing of the decision for nonrenewal and of University appeal procedures [see Section VIII of this document]. The Chair shall supply to the faculty member the reasons for nonrenewal after obtaining the prior approval of the Executive Dean. In the case of a negative decision, the appointment of the probationary faculty member will not be renewed beyond the succeeding academic year.

**3. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period
(Adapted from Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#))**

- (1) An untenured tenure-track faculty member will have time excluded from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six. The Department chair will inform the Office of Academic Affairs within one year of the birth of a child or the adoption of a child under age six of a probationary faculty member unless the exclusion of time is prohibited by paragraph (D)(3) of this rule. The probationary faculty member may choose to decline the one-year exclusion of time from the probationary period granted for the birth or adoption of a child under six years of age by so informing her/his TIU head, dean, and the office of

academic affairs in writing before April 1 of the new mandatory review year following granting of the declination. The exclusion of time granted under this provision in no way limits the award of promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory review year. The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period per birth event or adoption of children under age six is one year.

- (2) A probationary faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful University faculty member (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service). Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Department. Requests shall be reviewed by a meeting of the tenured faculty, which shall advise the Department Chair regarding their appropriateness. Such requests require approval by the Department Chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to the April 1 in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.
- (3) A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a nonrenewal notice has been issued, nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the University's right not to renew a probationary appointment.

The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period for any reason or combination of reasons is one year for an instructor, three years for an assistant professor (including time spent as an instructor) and one year for an associate professor, except in extraordinary circumstances. Exceptions require the approval of the Department Chair, Executive Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost.

Faculty members will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period for any of the above reasons, unless their absence from the campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical.

For purposes of performance reviews of probationary faculty, the length of the probationary period is the actual number of years of employment at this University less any years of service excluded from the probationary period under the terms of this rule. Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted under the terms of this rule.

B. TENURED FACULTY

Each year each member of the tenured faculty will provide the Chair with a current vita, peer evaluations, SEIs, and an Annual Faculty Report summarizing recent professional activities in the form provided. The Chair, along with eligible members of the P&T Committee, will review these and other documents, as necessary, and will use them as the basis for an annual performance review of each tenured member of the Department on the Columbus campus

The Chair will meet with each faculty member to discuss the materials submitted, including plans for research, teaching, and service. Following that meeting, the Chair will provide each faculty member with written feedback regarding her/his performance and future plans. That review will enable the Chair to highlight performance problems where they exist and to assist faculty in carrying out their professional plans. The faculty member may respond in writing to the Chair's performance evaluations.

C. TENURED FACULTY: REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

The annual reviews of tenured regional campus faculty are conducted by the regional campus Dean/Director according to policies set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs [*Policies and Procedures Handbook*](#). A copy of the Dean/Director's review letter should be sent to the Department Chair, and should form the basis for the annual salary decision agreed to by both the Dean/Director and the Chair. Whenever concerns are raised about a faculty member's performance, particularly in the area of scholarship, the Chair should communicate these concerns to the faculty member in writing. In addition, the faculty member, the Chair, or the Dean/Director may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns.

D. ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. OVERVIEW

The annual performance evaluations described in section V above will serve as the basis for the Chair's annual salary recommendations, which may be included in the written evaluation which the Chair shall provide to each Department member. Unless

the Provost or the Arts and Sciences Executive Dean directs otherwise, all money made available to the Department for annual increments is distributed on the basis of merit in the categories of research, teaching, and service. The WGSS Department has developed a document, Criteria for Allocation of Salary Increases (see Appendix A), which is used by the P&T Committee and the Department Chair to provide a numerical score for each faculty member annually. This score reflects performance in the three areas of research, teaching and service and covers a wide range of faculty contributions within each of these categories. The Department Chair will utilize this tool to make recommendations regarding salary increases. Faculty members may request to see the final score of their annual report, as determined by the Chair in consultation with the eligible members of the P&T Committee.

In making salary recommendations to the Executive Dean, the Chair will normally consider only the previous year's performance of individual faculty, but may take into account the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall performance over several years. Merit salary increases for all jointly appointed faculty members will be negotiated with the respective Chair of the other department. The Dean shall determine the amount of incremental money made available to the Department, and the Chair shall discuss salary recommendations with the Dean. When they have agreed on the salary recommendations, the Dean will forward his/her recommendations to the Provost's office for concurrence. Final responsibility for all salary and contractual agreements rests with the Board of Trustees.

B. PROCEDURES

Early in the Spring semester, the Chair will notify all faculty of the forthcoming annual salary review and invite a report of the previous calendar year's activity, from January 1 to December 31. If there was an agreement at the beginning of the year, this report should reflect and comment upon that agreement in terms of the year's accomplishments. It will be up to the individual faculty member to provide the Chair at the time of the review with a current Curriculum Vitae, together with any reasons for considering past performance or the general appropriateness of current salary to performance. In making salary recommendations, the Chair takes the advice of the senior faculty members serving on the P&T Committee.

Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the Department Chair should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

C. DOCUMENTATION

All WGSS tenure-track faculty must follow the departmental annual review format (see Appendix B) to record their performance. Probationary tenure-track faculty also must follow the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs to record their performance for fourth year and tenure reviews. In addition, it is recommended that faculty provide the Chair with a copy of the comments of anonymous referees, unsolicited letters from students and alumni, and any other

indicators of the quality and impact of the faculty member's work on others. The Chair together with the P&T Committee will evaluate each faculty member's accomplishments in contributing to the Department's mission.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.

1. Teaching

Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.

Discursive evaluation summaries by faculty members who provide peer evaluation reports.

Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in section X.B of this document).

Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.

Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

2. Scholarship

Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

Documentation of grants and contracts received.

Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

3. Service

Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION

A. CRITERIA

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The Department has no quantitative measure which either bars or guarantees promotion to tenure. To be eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and for tenure, the candidate must have shown superior intellectual attainment through a significant body of scholarship in her/his field; have demonstrated excellence as a teacher of graduates and undergraduates; and have established a record of good departmental citizenship through a willingness to serve when asked and conscientious performance. Excellence in both research and teaching constitutes the most important criterion for promotion and tenure. While it is recognized that some faculty are stronger in one area than the other, there nonetheless must be a balance between the two areas. Extraordinary teaching cannot compensate for a poor record in publication and extraordinary research cannot compensate for poor teaching

i. Scholarship

The candidate must show significant achievements that will have an impact on scholarly discussion and the ability to undertake sustained and continuing original

work. Typically, books and articles based on original research have primary importance as evidence of scholarly accomplishment. Books should be published or in production at a university press or a press with a strong academic reputation that uses a rigorous peer review process. Articles should be in leading refereed journals contributing, broadly, to women's, gender and sexuality studies scholarship. Other evidence of scholarly success includes invited book chapters, articles in edited volumes, editorial work on special issues of journals or anthologies, book reviews, presentations at major associations, creative activity (e.g., art installations or photo exhibits), and the winning of grants in national and international competitions. There must also be evidence that the assistant professor will continue to make original and significant scholarly contributions in the future; this is, typically, provided by a consistent record of productivity beyond the dissertation and a well-articulated research agenda.

ii. Teaching

The candidate must have demonstrated excellence as a teacher of graduates and undergraduates. Elements of this excellence should include: contemporary pedagogical content at an appropriate level in every institutional setting; continuing growth in subject matter, including subjects that are not in the domain of the candidate's fields of research expertise; creativity in the use of various modes of pedagogy, including classroom technology; active engagement of students in the learning process to encourage independent thought and creativity; and the introduction and/or revision of courses in the WGSS curriculum.

iii. Service

While an assistant professor in the WGSS Department will have limited committee responsibilities, she/he should have established a record of good departmental citizenship through a willingness to serve when asked and conscientious performance. Candidates are also expected to have demonstrated the potential for contributing service to the profession.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

2. Promotion to Professor

The WGSS Department expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for more junior faculty, for students, and for the profession. While individuals seeking promotion are assessed only in regard to their assigned responsibilities, exceptional performance in these assignments is required. To be eligible for promotion to professor, a faculty member must have made demonstrably significant scholarly contributions that have secured her or him a national or international reputation for intellectual eminence in women's, gender and sexuality studies. There is no single or quantitative measure that either guarantees or bars promotion to full professor rank. In the typical case, a successful candidate for promotion to full professor will have a second body of original scholarship beyond that required for tenure, notably a second book or a series of

articles, and additional scholarly work. It is further required that the scholar's work has made an original contribution to the field. In the typical case, evidence may include a book with excellent reviews and/or an extensive citation history, national and international grants and fellowships, invitations to speak at prestigious conferences and universities, and visiting appointments at other colleges or universities. The body of scholarship presented in support of promotion may include scholarly monographs as well as other evidence of scholarly productivity, such as journal articles, book chapters, edited work, and creative activities such as art installations or photo exhibits. There must be evidence not only of continuous past accomplishment, but also of a strong ongoing scholarly agenda that predicts continued eminence in the field. In addition, the candidate must have demonstrated continued excellence as a teacher of graduates and undergraduates, as evidenced by SEIs, peer evaluation, course development, and advising. The candidate must also have an excellent record of service to the Department, the University, the scholarly community, and possibly also to the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, and/or the nation.

The WGSS Department also recognizes that an academic career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on scholarly activity, teaching or administrative/professional service creates a composite professional life. While promotion to full professor typically requires excellence in scholarship, where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, promotion may be warranted in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in scholarship.

3. Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will therefore ordinarily be greater. The Department expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of quality scholarship. The Department recognizes, however, that the greater teaching and service commitments of regional campus faculty require a different set of expectations. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching loads and lesser access to research resources. Given these considerations, a minimal reasonable expectation for regional campus faculty is the maintenance of a clear and active agenda of research that aims at the completion of a substantial publication.

B. PROCEDURES

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#)

(<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the department.

1. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

A candidate must also submit a copy of the department's APT Document that was in effect at the time of that candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Promotion & Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

2. Promotion & Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Promotion & Tenure Committee are as follows:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required

documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
- **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this Department's cases.

3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are as follows:

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

4. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this Department.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to any questions during the meeting.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the Department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

5. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which

point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

6. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from full professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined by the extent to which the letter is analytical, rather than perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html>, for letters requesting

external evaluations and also consults the college templates available at <https://intranet.asc.ohio-state.edu/apt>.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier. If concerns arise about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the department's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

C. PROCEDURES: PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS

1. In the case of a faculty member who has a joint appointment and whose tenure-initiating unit is the WGSS Department, the dossier will include the teaching evaluations for courses taught in each unit. The WGSS department and the other department will consult about the selection of external evaluators, with the WGSS Department taking the lead in recruiting the reviewers. The WGSS Department will share the candidate's dossier with the chair of the other unit. The chair of the other unit will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for inclusion in the dossier.
2. In the case of a faculty member who has a joint appointment and whose tenure-initiating unit is not the WGSS Department, the WGSS chair will provide a letter of evaluation to be included in the candidate's dossier. In order to provide input on that letter, the eligible faculty will review the dossier and provide an advisory vote to the chair on the question of whether the candidate should be tenured and/or promoted.

D. DOCUMENTATION

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of

scholarship and service noted below is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

Documentation of every promotion and tenure or promotion case will, where appropriate, include the following:

1. Excellence as a teacher

It is not enough that a teacher conscientiously meets her/his obligations and successfully conveys knowledge. The WGSS Department expects clear evidence of an effective interest in students, stimulation of student interest in the subject matter, high standards of intellectual performance, and the continuous updating of scholarship used in teaching.

Evaluation of a candidate's performance as a teacher will be based on the widest possible range of evidence. It will include (1) evidence solicited by the Department Chair or by the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and (2) evidence offered by the candidate.

Evidence submitted to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure regarding teaching will normally include the following:

- a) Student evaluations for all courses for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, student evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion or the previous five years, whichever is less. For all courses taught, both SEIs and discursive student evaluations are required. Student evaluations for all faculty members must be administered and collected by someone other than the faculty member her/himself.
- b) Syllabi, exams, and course assignments for a representative selection of courses for the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, for a representative sample of courses taught since the last promotion or in the last five years (whichever is less). The candidate may want to call attention to innovations, improvements, and adjustments made in courses over time.
- c) Detailed written evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations by colleagues, including senior faculty members. These peer evaluations should also include a review of syllabi, exams, assignments, and other course material and should make explicit reference to the general criteria outlined in VII.A.1 and 2 above. Fulltime faculty should have four observations by fourth year review and six by sixth-year review. Faculty in joint appointments should have from the WGSS Department two peer teaching observations by the time of fourth year review and three by the time of tenure review, with the understanding that the same number of observations is done by her/his other department. Observations will be arranged by the Chair of the P&T committee every Autumn semester.
- d) Other data that the Department Chair, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, or the candidate may judge pertinent to an evaluation of the candidate's performance in the area of teaching might include:

- Explanations or demonstrations of especially successful or innovative teaching techniques;
- Explanations of special teaching accomplishments, awards, and the like;
- Information regarding publication of teaching materials and articles on teaching techniques;
- Descriptions of technical innovations and use of new technology in preparing course material, delivering information, setting learning tasks and evaluating performance.

2. Excellence as a scholar

Scholarly excellence entails significant and original contributions to published scholarship. In the field of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies, such published scholarship typically includes the following: contributions that offer new knowledge; contributions to feminist theory, epistemology, and pedagogy; contributions to the research mission of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies as a field; invention or exploration of new fields of inquiry; application of new concepts to traditional areas of research; and in general any application or interpretation of concepts that advance understanding and knowledge in the field or in the study of women, gender and/or sexuality in a particular field.

The typical media for scholarly contributions are books (published or in production); articles in recognized, refereed journals; essays solicited prestigious invitations to contribute to edited books and publications that advance, rather than summarize, knowledge and understanding; presentations at scholarly meetings; scholarly materials designed for use with new technologies; and other demonstrations of scholarly work appropriate to a faculty member's particular field.

The candidate's achievement and the likelihood of further long-term scholarly accomplishments will be evaluated on the basis of the widest possible range of evidence, including both evidence offered by the candidate and that solicited by the Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Such evidence will normally include:

- a) Publications. In evaluating publications and manuscripts, considerations of quality and consistency of production will take precedence over those of quantity. Quantity is only an appropriate measure of distinction when the individual publications are themselves distinguished. The committee will consider the nature of each publication, the type of refereeing, the reputation of a publisher or journal, and any other external measure, but will not allow extrinsic concerns to modify their scholarly judgment regarding the intrinsic merit of the publication. Ordinarily, the Committee will consider monographic or interpretive publications based upon original research as providing primary evidence of scholarly development, rather than textbooks or source books conceived primarily for elementary undergraduate instruction. Collaborative work involving multiple authors will be judged by the same kinds of intellectual criteria and should not constitute the entirety of a scholar's production. The development of materials involving the use of new

technologies (e.g., digital media) and online publications will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The Department Chair or Chair of the Committee may solicit, and the candidate may present, published reviews from scholars in the field. The candidate may be asked to offer or may present the reports of anonymous referees.

- b) Scholarly activity at professional meetings. The quality of the contributions will be the primary consideration in evaluating this activity. Papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, and participation in colloquia will be evaluated. If possible, senior colleagues should attend the presentations of junior colleagues; their evaluations should be placed in writing in the candidate's file. Again, the Committee may seek and the candidate may present evaluations from scholars in the field.
- c) Creative activity (e.g., art installations or photographic exhibitions) and scholarly reviews thereof. The quality of such activity as assessed by peer experts will be of primary consideration in its evaluation.
- d) Reviews of scholarly works for journals. The scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear will be appraised.
- e) Scholarly recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to serve in leadership positions in professional organizations, to chair sessions at professional meetings and/or to serve on program committees for such meetings, to serve on award committees, to speak at other institutions or to assume the post of visiting professor at other universities.
- f) Recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation.
- g) Any other evidence which the candidate, the Department Chair or the senior faculty believe pertinent to the candidate's development as a scholar. The candidate may include in her/his dossier any manuscripts of articles or papers, whether they have been published.

3. Excellence in Service

A member of the WGSS Department at The Ohio State University has an obligation to use her/his talents to collaborate effectively with colleagues for the betterment of the Department, the University, and the larger community. A faculty member's profile of service may vary over time. The Committee on Promotion and Tenure may consider any information that the candidate, the Department Chair, or the Committee considers pertinent to a full evaluation of the candidate's ability to render effective service to these communities, including evidence relating to the quality and the quantity of such service. The information may include the number of committee meetings attended, specific projects undertaken, administrative responsibilities assumed, and individual, community or professional contributions. The Department Chair, the Committee or the candidate may solicit written assessments of a candidate's service from those who are in a position to provide them. Other information may include:

- a) Service on Department, College, and University committees;
- b) Service as an adviser to student groups and organizations;

- c) Presentations made in the classes of others, contributions to University publications, lectures to the Departmental faculty and similar activities;
- d) Activities in the University community and in the community outside the University based on and related to one's professional training and professional concerns;
- e) Activity in the national/international scholarly community and its institutions.

VIII. APPEALS

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) 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 (mandatory tenure) review.

X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty should encourage students to complete the evaluation online. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

The WGSS department also requires the use of discursive evaluations. Faculty should choose a class meeting late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high to distribute the form. The faculty member should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation.

B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The Department's P&T Committee oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching. The Committee chair assigns faculty members to observe classes of their peers and provide letters of review. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model is followed to the extent possible. The P&T Committee and the Department Chair review the peer teaching evaluations along with student evaluations as part of the process of annual review.

The responsibilities of the P&T Committee and Department Chair regarding teaching reviews are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year; the department must meet the college minimum requirement of five peer reviews for probationary faculty
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three year period; the department should provide a minimum of four peer reviews to support nominations for promotion
- to review the teaching of tenured professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review
- to review the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (www.ucat.osu.edu).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the Department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to

give feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

XI. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Department of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Criteria for Allocation of Salary Increases**

I. RESEARCH: 45%

A. Publications: List your publications

1. Single-authored books (credit for 3 years starting with book in production; indicate which year you are claiming for this period) **16**
2. Co-authored books (credit for 3 years; indicate which year) **12**
3. Edited or co-edited books (credit for one year) **10**
4. Textbooks (one year counted) **10**
5. Translated editions: your book translated into another language (credit for one year) **7**
6. Revised editions (credit for one year) **6**
7. List books in progress (provide a short description of what you have accomplished this year) **0**
8. Academic articles and book chapters (published in the year under review) **8**
9. Academic articles or book chapters in press (may be listed in this form only once) **4**
10. Articles published online (not peer reviewed; for a general audience) **6**
11. Book reviews **2-4** (according to length and importance)
12. Encyclopedia entries **2-4** (according to length and importance)
13. Creative activities (multimedia work or film/video; digital narrative, etc.) **8**

B. Grants

1. List your successful external grants and amounts, as well as applications pending (successful **10**; pending or unsuccessful **5**)
2. List your successful internal grants and amounts, as well as applications pending (successful **4**; pending or unsuccessful **2**)

C. Awards for scholarly work (clearly explain each)

1. List national awards (book awards, fellowships, etc.) **20**
2. List regional/state or press awards **10**
3. List departmental or OSU awards (departmental **2**; OSU **6**)

D. Professional presentations (conferences, university seminars)

1. List invited presentations **6**
2. List papers presented at professional meetings **4**
3. List service as chair, commentator, or panelist at professional meetings and local events. Describe nature of your contribution **2**

II. TEACHING: 35%

A. Please list all courses taught. Only one from below can be applied to a given course:

Newly developed courses (+ or *) **6**
GTA supervision **6**
No GTA supervision **4**
Course with 60 or more students **6**

B. Teaching evaluations 0-12 [Excellent = 12; Good = 8; Fair = 4; Poor = 0]

1. Attach SEIs for the courses you taught during the review period. As soon as your SEIs for Autumn come in, get a copy to the chair. Note: Indicate if SEIs are missing because of low response on SEI summary (you can check with Office of the University Registrar regarding missing SEI reports)
2. Attach summaries of discursive evaluations prepared by your peer observer; if summaries are not available, attach copies of the discursive evaluations or a typed list of comments

C. List any teaching honors or awards you received this year 10

D. Ph.D. student service for the year under review

1. List dissertations you are chairing or co-chairing, or for which you are a committee member (Chair **10**; Co-chair **8**; member of committee **6**)
2. List Ph.D. exam committees you have chaired or for which you were a committee member (Chair **8**; member of committee **4**)
3. List Ph.D. students not listed above whom you advised or for whom you supervised dissertation hours **8**

E. List M.A. students you advised and/or exam or thesis committees you have chaired or for which you were a reader (Advisor/Chair **6; Reader **2**)**

F. List all honors theses of UG majors that you directed during the year under review Indicate expected graduation date for each student (Advisor **4; Reader **2**)**

G. List independent studies you have offered for undergraduate majors and graduate students. Indicate UG/G rank (Graduate **6, UG **4**)**

H. Describe any curriculum development activities in which you have engaged. Please be specific (e.g., new minor, program development) **4**

J. Describe any innovative classroom methods or course design or redesign (e.g., large lecture technology; leadership in reader development) in which you have engaged **4**

H. Describe any unusual advising you have done (e.g., honors advising; student organizations; informal advising of students from other departments/programs; students from underrepresented populations, etc.) **4**

III. SERVICE: 20%

- A. List Departmental committees on which you have served. Indicate any that you have chaired (Chair of Grad Studies **10**; Chair of UG Studies/P&T **8**; Chair of minor committee **6**; member of committee **4**)
- B. List College committees on which you have served. Indicate any that you have chaired (Chair of major committee **8**; chair of minor committee **4**; member of committee **4**)
- C. List University committees on which you have served. Indicate any that you have chaired and whether these were major or minor committees (Chair of major committee **8**; Chair of minor committee **4**; member of committee **4**)
- D. List all non-committee Department, College, or University service work you have performed **4**
- E. List all professional organization committees on which you have served. Indicate any offices held on committees or in professional organizations. To receive full credit for service, describe the nature of your contribution to those committees and/or organizations (committee service and offices held **2-6**; head of major professional organization **8**)
- F. Editorial functions: list service as a journal editorship **8**, series editorship **8**, book review editor **6**, and guest editor of a special issue of a journal **6**
- G. List all editorial boards on which you have served during this review period. Indicate any offices held on those boards. Describe the nature of the work you performed for the boards **6**
- H. List each of the following forms of professional service you have rendered. Provide numbers and dates:
 - 1. manuscript reviews for journals or publishers (for books, indicate if prospectus or full ms. review) (prospectus **4**; full manuscript **6**)
 - 2. organizing national or regional conferences or exhibits **6**
 - 3. external tenure reviews **6**
 - 4. external department/program/grant panel reviews **6**
 - 5. community/OSU presentations **2-4**
- I. List community/outreach service related to scholarly, instructional, or other academic goals **4**

**** Points for each section are added and then multiplied by the percentage of each section. For example, faculty member A obtains 60 points for Research, 78 for Teaching, and 90 for Service. A's total: $60 \times .45 + 78 \times .35 + 90 \times .20 = 27 + 27 + 18 = 72$**

APPENDIX B

Department of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Activity Report Format January 1 to December 31

I. RESEARCH: 45%

A. Publications: List your publications

1. Single-authored books (credit for 3 years starting with book in production; indicate which year you are claiming for this period)
2. Co-authored books (counted for 3 years; indicate which year you are claiming)
3. Edited or co-edited books (one year counted)
4. Textbooks (one year counted)
5. Translated editions: your book translated into another language (one year counted)
6. Revised editions (one year counted)
7. List books in progress (you may list these for two years only; indicate whether this is first or second year of the project and provide a short description of what you have accomplished this year)
8. Academic articles and book chapters (published during the year under review)
9. Academic articles or book chapters in press (may be listed in this form only once)
10. Articles published online (non-peer reviewed for a general audience)
11. Book reviews
12. Encyclopedia entries
13. Creative activities (multimedia work or film/video; digital narrative, etc.); indicate if in preparation, underway, or completed

B. Grants

1. List your successful external grants and amounts, as well as applications pending
2. List your successful internal grants and amounts, as well as applications pending

C. Awards for scholarly work (clearly explain each)

1. List national awards (book awards, fellowships, etc.)
2. List regional/state or press awards
3. List departmental or OSU awards

D. Professional presentations (conferences, university seminars)

1. List invited presentations.
2. List papers presented at professional meetings.
3. List service as chair, commentator, or panelist at professional meetings and local events. Describe nature of your contribution

II. TEACHING: 35%

- A. Please list all courses taught. Indicate semester and enrollment. Mark those that are new courses in the curriculum with a plus (+), and existing courses that you taught for the first time with an asterisk (*). For any new course, indicate whether you developed it yourself. Finally, indicate if you supervised GTAs
- B. Teaching evaluations
1. Attach SEIs for the courses you taught during the review period. As soon as your SEIs for Autumn come in, get a copy to the chair. Note: Indicate if SEIs are missing because of low response on SEI summary (you can check with Office of the University Registrar regarding missing SEI reports)
 2. Attach summaries of discursive evaluations prepared by your peer observer; if summaries are not available, attach copies of the discursive evaluations or a typed list of comments
- C. List any teaching honors or awards you received this year
- D. Ph.D. student service for the year under review
4. List dissertations you are chairing or co-chairing, or for which you are a committee member. If completed, list date of graduation.
 5. List Ph.D. exam committees you have chaired or for which you were a committee member; if not WGSS, indicate student's major
 6. List Ph.D. students not listed above whom you advised or for whom you supervised dissertation hours
- E. List M.A. students you advised and/or exam or thesis committees you have chaired or for which you were a reader; if not WGSS, indicate student's major
- F. List all honors theses of UG majors that you directed during the year under review Indicate expected graduation date for each student
- G. List independent studies you have offered for undergraduate majors and graduate students. Indicate UG/G rank and number of hours for each offering
- H. Describe any curriculum development activities in which you have engaged. Please be specific
- J. Describe any innovative classroom methods or course design or redesign (e.g., large lecture technology; leadership in reader development) in which you have engaged
- H. Describe any unusual advising you have done (e.g., honors advising; student organizations; informal advising of students from other departments/programs; students from underrepresented populations, etc.)

III. SERVICE: 20%

- A. List Departmental committees on which you have served. Indicate any that you have chaired
- B. List College committees on which you have served. Indicate any that you have chaired
- C. List University committees on which you have served. Indicate any that you have chaired and whether these were major or minor committees
- D. List all non-committee Department, College, or University service work you have performed
- E. List all professional organization committees on which you have served. Indicate any offices held on committees or in professional organizations. To receive full credit for service, describe the nature of your contribution to those committees and/or organizations
- F. Editorial functions: list service as a journal editorship, series editorship, book review editor, and guest editor of a special issue of a journal
- G. List all editorial boards on which you have served during this review period. Indicate any offices held on those boards. Describe the nature of the work you performed for the boards
- H. List each of the following forms of professional service you have rendered. Provide numbers and dates:
 - 1. manuscript reviews for journals or publishers (for books, indicate if prospectus or full ms. review)
 - 2. organizing national or regional conferences or exhibits
 - 3. external tenure reviews
 - 4. external department/program/grant panel reviews
 - 5. community/OSU presentations
- II. List community/outreach service related to scholarly, instructional, or other academic goal

Revised 10/30/01
Revised 12/04/01
Revised 02/16/04
Revised 05/25/07
Revised 11/28/07
Revised 01/03/08
Revised 05/31/13
Revised 11/12/13
Revised 08/03/17