

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

The Ohio State University
College of Social Work

January 9, 2017

Table of Contents

I	Preamble	4
II	College Mission	5
III	Definitions	5
	A Committee of Eligible Faculty	6
	1 Tenure-track Faculty Defined	
	2 Conflict of Interest Defined	
	3 Minimum Composition Defined	
	B Promotion & Tenure Committee	6
	C Quorum	6
	D Votes Regarding Recommendations from the Eligible Faculty	7
	E Votes Regarding Changes or Modifications to Procedures (201)	7
IV	Appointments	8
	A Criteria for Appointment (by appointment type)	8
	1 Tenure-track Faculty Appointment Criteria	
	2 Associated Faculty Appointment Criteria	
	3 Courtesy Faculty Appointment Criteria	
	4 Emeritus Faculty Appointment Criteria	
	B Procedures for Appointment (by appointment type)	10
	1 Tenure-track Faculty Appointment Procedures	
	a Search Committee Procedures	
	2 Transfer from the Tenure Track	
	3 Associated Faculty Appointment Procedures	
	4 Courtesy Faculty Appointment Procedures	
	5 Emeritus Appointment Procedures	
V	Annual Reviews	14
	A Procedures for Annual Review (by appointment type)	14
	1 Annual Review of Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	
	2 Annual Review of Tenured Faculty	
	3 Fourth-Year Review of Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	
	4 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	
VI	Merit Salary Increases & Other Rewards	17
	A General Criteria for Merit Salary Increases	17
	B Procedures for Merit Salary Increases	18
	C Documentation for Merit Salary Increases	18
	D Specific Merit Review Criteria	19
	1 Teaching Merit Criteria	
	2 Scholarship Merit Criteria	
	3 Service Merit Criteria	
VII	Promotion & Tenure Review	23
	A Criteria for Promotion & Tenure (by appointment type)	24
	1 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	
	2 Teaching Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	
	3 Research and Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	
	4 Service Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	
	5 Promotion to Professor	
	6 Teaching Criteria for Promotion to Professor	

	7	Research and Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to Professor	
	8	Service Criteria for Promotion to Professor	
B		Procedures for Fourth-Year, Promotion & Tenure Review	39
	1	Candidate Responsibilities	
	2	Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities	
	3	Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	
	4	Dean Responsibilities	
	5	External Evaluations	
C		Documentation for Fourth-Year, Promotion & Tenure Review	48
	1	Teaching Documentation (for College Review)	
	2	Scholarship Documentation (for College Review)	
	3	Service Documentation (for College Review)	
VIII		Appeals	49
IX		Seventh-Year Review	49
X		Procedures for Student & Peer Evaluation of Teaching	50
	A	Student Evaluation of Teaching	50
	B	Peer Review of Teaching	50
	C	Self-Evaluation of Teaching	51
XI		Appendices	52
		Appendix A Promotion & Tenure Subcommittee Schedule	
		Appendix B Sample Agenda for Review Meeting of the Eligible Faculty	

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to: Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure review in volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the college will follow the university's new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the university-level changes. In addition, this APT document must be reviewed and either reaffirmed or revised at least every five (5) years on the appointment or reappointment of the college dean.

As the need arises, procedures and policies described in this document can be modified by faculty vote (see [page 7](#) of this document). This document and substantive changes must be approved by the dean of the College of Social Work and by the Provost of the University before implementation.

It will be the responsibility of the Dean's office to ensure that (a) this document is updated within 30 days of approved changes, (b) the revised document is distributed to all faculty members electronically, and (c) the revised document is made available to faculty on the College of Social Work and Office of Academic Affairs websites.

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 college mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, 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 college and delegate to the college responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to the college and university missions and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules>) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility

- (a) to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes;
- (b) to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules>) and other standards specific to this college; and,
- (c) to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service are defined to include not only the criteria outlined below, but also professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>). In addition, the College of Social Work is committed to professional ethical conduct specified in the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics (see <https://www.socialworkers.org/pubs/code/default.asp>).

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal opportunity (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>)

II College of Social Work Mission

The College of Social Work, through excellence in teaching, research, and service, prepares leaders and practitioners who enhance individual and community well-being, celebrate difference, and promote social and economic justice for vulnerable populations. The College of Social Work fosters social change through collaboration with individuals, families, communities, and other change agents to build strengths and resolve complex individual and social problems. As an internationally recognized college, we build and apply knowledge that positively impacts Ohio, the nation, and the world.

College Vision

Three principles guide the implementation of the College of Social Work mission:

Embrace Difference.
Seek Justice.
Be the Change.

In addition, the College of Social Work is committed to pursuing its mission within the values of the social work profession:

- The dignity and worth of all people
- The importance of human relationships
- Building knowledge through ethically conducted, open inquiry
- Competence in all aspects of professional practice
- The maintenance of integrity in professional interactions
- The pursuit of social justice
- A commitment to service

Readers are referred to the current strategic plan for the college which can be located through the College of Social Work web site (<http://csw.osu.edu/about/strategic-plan>)

University Mission and Values

As an integral part of the Ohio State University community, the College of Social Work embraces the mission and values attributed to the university.

III Definitions

The following definitions will be applied to policy and procedure outlined throughout this document.

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty Defined

1 Tenure-track Faculty Defined

The eligible faculty for promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal rank to or higher than the candidate whose tenure resides in the College of Social Work, excluding the dean, assistant deans, and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost of the university, and the president of the university.

2 Conflict of Interest Defined

Members of the eligible faculty with a conflict of interest must recuse themselves from the review process.

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member

- (a) is a family member, related to a candidate, or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship,
- (b) has substantive financial ties with the candidate,
- (c) is dependent in some way on the candidate's services,
- (d) has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible (specifically, collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since last promotion)
- (e) believes he or she is engaged in a relationship with the candidate characterized by significant conflict.

3 Minimum Composition Defined

In the event that the college does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a candidate's review, the dean will request the requisite number of faculty members from outside the college to serve on an ad hoc basis.

B Promotion and Tenure Committee Defined

The Promotion and Tenure Committee for the College of Social Work consists of all eligible faculty members. The College of Social Work has an appointed Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee that assists the Promotion and Tenure Committee of eligible faculty members in managing the workflow of promotion and tenure processes.

C Quorum Defined

Quorum reflects the required number of eligible members present at a meeting for official action on all personnel decisions to occur.

In the College of Social Work, the quorum required to discuss and vote on personnel decisions is two-thirds (67% or more) of the faculty members eligible to vote on a motion (i.e., eligible faculty members, present at the review discussion, documentation of having accessed the posted materials) and are not on approved Special Assignment (SA), Faculty Professional Leave (FPL), or leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for determining purposes of quorum only if the dean has approved an off-campus assignment.

The quorum required to discuss and vote on alterations, revisions, or amendments to the procedures described in this document is two-thirds (67% or more) of the eligible faculty members who are not on approved Special Assignment (SA), Faculty Professional Leave (FPL), or other approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for determining purposes of quorum only if the dean has approved an off-campus assignment.

The quorum required to discuss and vote on procedural modifications (e.g., changing a due date) is two-thirds (67% or more) of the relevant deliberating body (i.e., eligible faculty or full faculty, depending on the matters being addressed).

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

D Votes Regarding Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The ballot items shall be written with regard to voting to recommend the candidate for the requested appointment, reappointment (4th-year review), promotion, or tenure: yes or no. Promotion recommendations and tenure recommendations are two separate ballot items.

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only “yes” and “no” votes are counted.

Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

Conflict of interest is not managed with abstention votes; conflict of interest is managed by recusing oneself from the voting process altogether.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

A positive recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when (at least) two-thirds (67%) of votes cast are positive.

E Votes Regarding Changes or Modifications to Procedures in the APT Document

In all votes taken on matters related to APT document changes or procedural modifications only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Conflict of interest is managed by recusing oneself from the voting process, not by an abstention.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

A positive recommendation for changes to the APT document is secured when (at least) two-thirds (67%) of votes cast are positive.

A positive recommendation for modification to a procedure specified in the APT document (e.g., changing a due date) is secured by a simple majority: when at least 50% of votes cast are positive. Note that this is distinct from modifications to the APT document itself.

IV Appointments

A Criteria for Appointment

Appointment decisions for tenure-track faculty positions, as defined in rule 3335-5 of the Rules of the University Faculty, must be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. The College of Social Work is committed to appointing to the faculty only individuals who will or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the College and advance its mission. Criteria for appointment shall follow Faculty Rule 3335-6.

Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, scholarship, and service; potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and, potential for interacting with colleagues and students in ways that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the College of Social Work/The Ohio State University.

No offer will be extended in the event that the approved search process does not yield one or more candidate who would enhance the quality of the college. The search is either cancelled or continued, as the Dean deems appropriate to the circumstances.

See Faculty Recruitment and Selection 3.0

<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyrecruitment.pdf>

1 Tenure-track Faculty Appointment Criteria

Instructor Appointment Criteria. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but the candidate has not completed all requirements for the terminal degree at the time of appointment. The College of Social Work makes every effort to avoid such appointments, including but not limited to adjusting the start date of appointment.

Appointment at the instructor level is renewable at the Dean's discretion on an annual basis, but limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior credit for time served as an instructor. This request must be approved by the College of Social Work eligible faculty, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs; this is not automatically granted. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior credit is appropriate since prior 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.

Assistant Professor Appointment Criteria. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in social work or related fields.

Appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of credited service as an assistant professor. An assistant professor is informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. Probationary periods of appointment for tenure-

track faculty will be in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 Probationary service, duration of appointment for regular faculty <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>. A faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion review, with or without tenure, at any time; however, the college promotion and tenure committee of eligible faculty may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review (per rule 3335-6-04).

The granting of credit for prior time served as an instructor, which requires approval from the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period but cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor Appointment Criteria. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the college's teaching, scholarship, and service criteria for promotion to these ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in social work or related fields. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the Provost following review by the eligible faculty and dean.

Appointment to associate professor or professor normally entails granting of tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs by petition from the college; review for tenure must occur no later than the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional terminal year of employment is offered. Probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate. But, the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

2 Associated Faculty Appointment Criteria

Associated faculty appointments may be for a period less than a semester (e.g., to assist with a focused project), a semester (e.g., to teach one or more courses), or for up to three years when this longer-term contract is useful for long-term planning and retention purposes. With the exception of visiting faculty, associated faculty may be reappointed.

Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor Appointment Criteria. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who provide academic service to the college, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

Lecturer Appointment Criteria. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. 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, but this type of appointment is renewable.

Senior Lecturer Appointment Criteria. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year, but this type of appointment is renewable.

Associated Assistant Professor, Associated Associate Professor, Associated Professor Appointment Criteria. Associated appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1 – 49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE. They may not hold a concurrent active appointment at another institution above a level where the total FTE exceeds 100%.

4 Courtesy Faculty Appointment Criteria

The active academic involvement in this college by a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another college at The Ohio State University warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in the College of Social Work. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State University rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

5 Emeritus Faculty Appointment Criteria

Rules concerning the appointment of emeritus faculty are specified by OAA (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>).

B Procedures for Appointment

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](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html) (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) 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

At the time of appointment, faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents pertaining to College of Social Work and Ohio State University promotion, tenure, and performance review criteria and procedures. These documents must include, at a minimum, the Office of Academic Affairs dossier guidelines and outline (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>). Faculty members shall be provided with copies of any revised documents, as well, should these documents be revised during the probationary period.

1 Tenure-track Faculty Appointment Procedures

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 Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university hiring policies. The search will be conducted in a manner consistent with training and practices recommended by the University's Office of Diversity and Inclusion

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

Search Committee Appointment: The dean of the college provides approves a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise. The dean appoints a search committee consisting of five or more faculty members in the College of Social Work; if the position is significantly interdisciplinary in nature, the dean, in consultation with CAC, may appoint additional members from other relevant colleges in the university. The dean appoints one of the search committee members to serve as chair.

Search Committee Approval: The College Advisory Council must ratify the search committee membership and the charge given to the search committee (The CAC consists of elected faculty representatives and college administrative staff.)

Search Committee Activities: In fulfilling its charge from the college Dean and as approved by the CAC, the search committee will:

- Engage in training through the OSU Office of Diversity and Inclusion (all members) to ensure the ability to provide leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made first to engage with a diverse pool of qualified applicants, and subsequently to retain the interest of potential candidates in joining the faculty.
- Develop a recruitment announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the dean'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, etc. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as

a preferred date or a date when application review will begin, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- Develop and implement a plan for external advertising and directed solicitation of diverse nominations and applications. The plan will, ideally, include posting with major social work professional/research organizations, as well as including mechanisms with the potential for enhancing diversity of nominations and applications. Note: 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 professional journal.
- Screen applications and letters of recommendation and make a recommendation to the dean regarding the appropriate candidates to invite for campus interviews (usually two to three for a position). The committee will engage in pre-screening brief interviews by telephone or in person (e.g., at professional meetings). Campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the dean's office.
- Maintain complete, detailed records of the manner in which the search is conducted, of all contacts with prospective candidates, and the means utilized in making screening, invitation, or recommendation decisions. The criteria used in evaluating candidates will be documented; the selection of candidates will be based on academic experience/achievement and goodness-of-fit with the publicized recruitment criteria.
- Engage with potential candidates in a manner that reflects awareness and appreciation of the recruitment nature of the activities and that all interactions reflect on the quality and nature of the college. The committee will, as appropriate, remind the entire faculty and staff about this spirit of recruitment interest.

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with individually and/or position relevant faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; and, the dean or designee. In addition, candidates are expected to deliver a presentation to the faculty, graduate students and the college/university/community related to their scholarship; this might include placing their work in the broader context of academia and the position for which the individual is being considered, perhaps including how their scholarship, teaching, and/or community work relates to issues of diversity. All candidate interviews for a particular position must follow the same interview format; however, within this structured format, specific meetings might be individualized/tailored to capitalize on each candidate's unique interests and potential contributions.

After each campus interview, the Search Committee will solicit written feedback and recommendations from faculty, staff, students, and others who have met with the candidate, participated in the candidate's formal presentation, and/or examined the candidate's application file. Based on the solicited feedback, as well as on their own independent evaluations of the candidate, the search committee will forward to the Dean a recommendation regarding each candidate as being acceptable or not to the faculty. Each recommendation should summarize the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, as well as a summarize feedback from the faculty/campus community. The recommendation concludes with a statement as to whether or not the candidate would be an acceptable hire for the College of Social Work. If more than one

candidate is interviewed, the reports are not comparative of candidates. The final decisions belong solely to the dean of the college.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves a level of support required to extend an offer, the dean decides which candidate(s) to approach and in what order to do so. Details of the offer(s), including compensation, are determined by the dean.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. These procedures are detailed in the section concerning how the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee functions. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the dean. Offers at the rank of associate professor or professor, with or without tenure, and offers involving the acceptance of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs (OIA). The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The College of Social Work Human Resource professional will facilitate communication between the OIA, the candidate, and OSU's Legal Affairs team to ensure that proper processing takes place within the appropriate timeframe for hire.

2 Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a clinical or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed.

Transfers from a clinical appointment and from a research appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Clinical faculty members and research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

3 Associated Faculty Appointment Procedures

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

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 college'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 university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

5 Courtesy Faculty Appointment Procedures

Any college faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State University college. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the College of Social Work, justifying the appointment, is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the dean may extend an offer of appointment. The dean reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

6 Emeritus Appointment Procedures

Rules concerning the appointment of emeritus faculty are specified by OAA (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>). A faculty member who is retiring has the opportunity to request emeritus status. That request is made in writing to the dean of the college. A copy of the retiring member's curriculum vitae must accompany the request. When the dean concurs with the request, the dean completes OAA Form 207 (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/Form207.pdf>) and submits the request, form, and a signed letter of retirement to OAA for approval. OAA will not accept such requests unless the retirement letter is included. The dean must notify the faculty member in writing if declining to make a request to OAA on behalf of the faculty member.

V Annual Reviews

A Procedures for Annual Review

The College of Social Work follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

Annual review of every faculty member is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the college Patterns of Administration (POA) guidelines concerning faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation to be submitted for the annual performance review of every faculty member follows the university's dossier/CV reporting guidelines per the Office of Academic Affairs (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/CoreDossier.pdf>). The dean may include a request for additional information that is systematic, meaning that the same type of information is requested of all faculty members. The specific elements documented for annual performance review purposes are described under section VI concerning Merit Salary Increases below (beginning on [page 17](#)). Regular annual review materials must be submitted to the dean no later than the last weekday of the Spring semester; the dean may choose to establish an earlier Spring semester deadline.

It is the aim of the college that annual performance reviews are constructive and candid, and we are committed to using the annual review process as a means to clearly communicate aspects

of performance the need improvement, as well as communicating and recognizing strengths. The review process is designed to assist faculty members in remaining productive and includes planning for the future.

The dean is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-3-administration.html>) to include a reminder in the annual review statement that all faculty members have the right to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

1 Annual Review of Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the dean, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and career development goals. The probationary faculty member may elect to invite one faculty member colleague to be present at the scheduled conference with the dean, serving in the capacity of observer.

First, the dean prepares and delivers a merit summary letter that specifies the point breakdown in the respective merit categories and how the points translate into salary changes for the individual faculty member (see section VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards, beginning on [page](#) 17 below).

In addition, for probationary faculty members, the dean prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The letter will include feedback to assist the candidate in remaining on track toward the goal of promotion and tenure. Both the Dean and the faculty member sign and date the written evaluation statement. The faculty member's signature indicates that the statement has been received and read; signing does not indicate agreement with the contents. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review within ten days. The dean's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) becomes part of the cumulative dossier for purposes of promotion and tenure, and of the faculty member's personnel record.

The dean may invite program directors (BSSW, MSW, and PhD programs) to provide written input regarding their observations concerning a probationary faculty member's performance in relation to the programs which they direct. External letters evaluating the faculty member's work may be obtained for any annual review if judged necessary and appropriate by the dean (Rule 3335-6-03). These additional pieces of information become part of the written record to which the faculty member has access and the right to provide written comments for the record.

If the dean recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The dean's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals.

If the dean recommends nonrenewal, the 4th-year review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is invoked. The College is committed to nonrenewal of a probationary appointment where any annual performance review indicates that a candidate's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor. In a case where nonrenewal is recommended, the dean will notify the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee of the necessity for conducting the 4th-year review process. Following completion of the aforementioned 4th-year review comments process, the candidate's complete dossier is forwarded to the Provost for review who makes the final

decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Appeals on a non-renewal decision follow specific guidelines in the Faculty Rule 3335-5-05

(<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-5-faculty-governance-and-committees.html>)

2 Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

Utilizing the same procedures outlined for probationary faculty members, associate professors and professors are reviewed annually by the dean.

The dean meets individually with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goal. The faculty member may elect to invite one faculty member colleague to be present at the scheduled conference with the dean, to serve in the capacity of observer.

The dean prepares a written evaluation on these topics, including comments on progress toward promotion for associate professors. Both the Dean and the faculty member sign and date the written evaluation statement. The faculty member's signature indicates that the statement has been received and read; signing does not indicate agreement with the contents. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review within ten days. The dean's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) becomes part of the cumulative dossier for purposes of promotion and tenure, and of the faculty member's personnel record.

3 Fourth-Year Review of Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional. The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations may be solicited only when either the dean or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the 4th-year review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without external input.

The eligible faculty conducts a thorough review of the candidate's dossier and supporting materials. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by confidential electronic ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the dean. The dean conducts an independent assessment of the candidate's performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the college review, the formal comments process is followed (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>).

The 4th-year review documentation and recommendation is forwarded to the Provost for a final decision on reappointment for the fifth year. The documentation follows the format required by the Office of Academic Affairs (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>)

4 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may elect to exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>).

VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A General Criteria for Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

Except when the university dictates any type of across the board salary increase (e.g., cost of living adjustments), all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable. The dean is charged with conducting an annual review of overall salary equity within the college and to factor results of this review into salary considerations.

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

The merit system is based on principles of management which suggest that criteria for performance evaluation and rewards should (a) be as specific as possible, (b) be applied fairly across comparable faculty positions, (c) be known well in advance of a decision affecting employment status or salary, and (d) offer a menu of equivalents for achieving baseline while respecting faculty diversity in interests and talents. The criteria for merit are operationalized in Section D below (beginning [page](#) 19 below).

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with similar criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Faculty members holding significant administrative roles and duties have a fourth category of criteria related to the goals and objectives associated with those duties. The time frame for assessing teaching and service will be the previous academic year (summer through spring). However, we recognize that productivity in the scholarship domain often fluctuates according to natural funding, conference, and publication cycles such that scholarly activities might not yield immediate outcomes falling within a single academic year. Thus, a faculty member may elect to have scholarship productivity evaluated either on the basis of the past academic year (12 months) or on a three-year rolling average basis. Calculation of annual merit for scholarship helps address long review cycles and multi-year projects. As a working example, a faculty member with a total of six accepted articles during the three-year period would be eligible for merit on the basis of having an average of two publications in each year. An average may be computed on fewer than three years if a faculty member was appointed fewer than three years ago. The three-year rolling average computation applies only to the scholarship domain.

Faculty performance will be evaluated in light of individual contributions to advancing the college mission. The specific roles, responsibilities, and assigned duties of individual faculty members

vary with regard to components of the college mission, and appointment variability will be taken into consideration in the awarding of merit. Faculty members demonstrating high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor (scholarship, teaching, and service) and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases. Faculty members 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.

B Procedures for Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

The dean recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the dean divides faculty performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service into four categories: extra merit (3 points), merit (2 points), partial merit (1 point), no merit (0 points); see tables below for criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service. The dean additionally considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The dean then computes the dollar value attributable to each point value from the merit review process.

Unless otherwise negotiated with the dean, beginning with the annual review of academic year 2016-2017 activities, the default ratio at which a final merit dollar value is computed will be 40% teaching, 40% research and scholarship, 20% service. Faculty members are advised to discuss alternative ratios for the upcoming year during their annual performance review meeting with the dean. However, we recognize that unanticipated opportunities may arise during the course of the year, and faculty members are encouraged to renegotiate the ratio with the dean on an as needed basis. It would be a truly unusual circumstance where the ratio places service at greater than 33.3%, or when the ratio for teaching and scholarship would become unequally balanced with each other.

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

C Documentation for Merit Review

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below be submitted electronically to the dean according to the posted deadline. Documents to be submitted include:

- An updated CV or dossier (following the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) Note that Faculty CVs/dossiers will be made publicly accessible on the college website.
- A completed merit review form distributed electronically to all faculty members by the dean's office during the Spring semester.

- The dean's office will assume responsibility for accessing the relevant Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports for every course taught during the year under review.
- Peer evaluation of teaching statements produced during the review period should be appended to the electronically submitted merit review form.
- Published scholarly materials presented for consideration should be made available in their published form—as an electronic link to a pdf or on-line version—or an electronic copy of the final acceptance letter indicating that it is in press should be presented. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
- Faculty members actively participating in interdisciplinary centers and institutes, or with joint appointments, should include their previously developed agreements about how rewards will be distributed for specific activities.

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.

Faculty members who are on approved leave for any reason are responsible for scheduling an opportunity for an annual review to occur within the established time frames. The dean is responsible for communicating timelines for completion of these reviews. When an in-person review is not possible, the faculty member may arrange in advance for a review conducted via distance technology (telephone, video-conferencing, etc.). If an annual review is not conducted by the established deadline, the faculty member is not eligible for any merit review increase that might have been available that year.

D Specific Merit Review Criteria

1 Teaching Merit Criteria

Ensuring program excellence is a major objective for the College of Social Work, and teaching activities are highly valued. Merit review in the teaching category is based on three types of information about teaching activities: evaluations of teaching (student and peer evaluation reports), effort/amount of involvement in teaching-related activities, and engaging in teaching improvement/development activities. A 4-point scale is utilized to quantify teaching-related merit:

- 0=no merit
- 1=partial/minimum merit
- 2=merit
- 3=extra merit

Teaching-related and teaching improvement/development activities that may qualify for merit consideration include those identified in the Promotion and Tenure teaching criteria (section beginning [page 24](#) of this document). Merit or extra merit is awarded only when a faculty member's performance in the teaching category exceeds the core teaching expectations.

Core expectations related to merit in the teaching category include:

- Student evaluation of instruction that reflect an acceptable level of competence in teaching for all or a significant majority of assigned course load. On a 5-point scale, this

means scores of 3.5 or better. (Note that this is not dependent on number of courses to which a faculty member is assigned.)

- Adhering to university guidelines for recording semester grades and providing feedback to students.
- Engaging in telephone/in-person/virtual contacts with assigned field instructors each semester (for individuals with liaison duties as part of assigned load).
- Serving responsively as faculty advisor to assigned students in the BSSW and/or MSW program(s). This means promptly returning telephone calls or responding to email requests.

Merit or extra merit in teaching is awarded for activities that exceed these core expectations for teaching merit, in terms of quantity, frequency, and/or impact. Activities beyond the core teaching expectations are described in the Teaching Criteria area for the Promotion and Tenure sections of this document (beginning [page 24](#)). For example, to earn merit or extra merit an individual might engage in a large number of the listed activities, frequently engage in a single category (such as supervision of theses), engage in a category with exceptionally high commitment and impact (such as writing a textbook published by a nationally recognized publisher, developing new courses, secure funding for a training grant related to teaching/curriculum development), or be recognized for exceptional teaching (e.g., a teaching award).

2 Scholarship Merit Criteria

Productivity in research and scholarship is highly valued in the College of Social Work and at The Ohio State University. We recognize and value that scholarship activities take many forms, especially when scholars are engaged at the cutting edge of scholarship. As befitting a discipline engaged with many others, and a college located in a university committed to interdisciplinary endeavors, we value scholarship activities in social work specifically and related discipline, scholarship that employ diverse methodologies, and scholarly dissemination products in varied media and formats.

A 4-point scale is utilized to quantify scholarship-related merit:

- 0=no merit
- 1=partial/minimum merit
- 2=merit
- 3=extra merit

Scholarship-related activities that **may** qualify for the Dean's merit consideration include those identified in the Promotion and Tenure criteria (beginning [page 30](#) of this document). The following chart indicates how commonly reported scholarship activities **could** be translated into these four levels of merit—merit decisions remain at the discretion of the Dean. (Note: individual cells apply; it is not necessary to complete an entire row of activities for the level of merit to apply).

	# of accepted or published article/book chapter manuscripts	book contract	book published	grant submission	grant funded	conference presentations accepted/ presented
0-no merit	---	---	---	---	---	---
1-partial merit	1	---	---	---	---	1
2-merit	2	1	---	1	---	2
3-extra merit	3+	---	1	--	1	3+

Note the following:

- Conference presentations are refereed or invited papers and posters. These are typically international or national professional conferences; other types of conferences may contribute to the case for scholarly impact, or may be more appropriately placed in the service category. The dean may require submission of a product (e.g., paper or PowerPoint file) at the time of annual review.
- Papers submitted for merit consideration that are 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.
- Scholarly works, with the exception of approved grant proposals, will be considered for merit when submitted, only when either accepted or actually disseminated (not both). In other words, 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 period may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.
- Consistent with the College of Social Work's strategic emphasis on increasing grant funding, a faculty member may earn merit when submitting a grant proposal that has been approved by the college administration prior to submission. This is the only scholarly activity for which merit may be earned by submission only. Extra merit can be earned only by obtaining funding. Seed grants awarded by the College of Social Work are not included in the determination of merit. Grants related to teaching (e.g., training grants) earn merit under the teaching category, not under scholarship.
- Faculty members will earn extra-merit for each funded year of their awarded grants.

3 Service Merit Criteria

Three major forms of service are valued in the College of Social Work. One facilitates the ability of the college and university to fulfill their missions, the second is related to achieving the college Community Engagement goals and objectives, and third is service to the profession and related disciplines.

A 4-point scale is utilized to quantify service-related merit:

- 0=no merit
- 1=partial merit
- 2=merit
- 3=extra merit

Service-related activities that may qualify for merit consideration include those identified in the Promotion and Tenure service criteria (beginning [page 35](#) of this document). Merit or extra merit is awarded only when a faculty member's performance in the service category exceeds the core services expectations.

It is expected that the volume of service provided by untenured faculty members to the college and university will be less than that provided by tenured faculty members.

Core expectations in the service category, applied to all faculty members, include:

- Regular attendance in scheduled faculty meetings; anticipated recurrent absences may be excused by the dean based on unavoidable scheduling conflicts with high priority activities (e.g., teaching schedule conflict, significant community engagement responsibility, team/collaborative research activity)
- Regular attendance and timely participation in meetings and activities of committees for which merit performance is being evaluated
- Participation in a significant number of college hosted events (e.g., new student orientation, Evening of Recognition, O'Leary lecture, doctoral symposium, scholarship luncheon, field recognition event, etc.)

VII Promotion and Tenure Review

A Criteria for Promotion and Tenure Review

The contents of the most current Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) Policies and Procedures Handbook (volume 3) apply <https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/policies-procedures-handbook/3HBPT.pdf>.

The criteria applied in decisions concerning reappointment, contract renewal, promotion and tenure are informed by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, (bylaws, codes and rules area) which provides the following statement regarding the context for such 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.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University, per Faculty Rule 3335-6-02. Furthermore, an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study is a minimum requirement for promotion to assistant professor or a higher rank.

According to the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (volume 3) as of March 2015:

Candidates undergoing 4th-year review and promotion/tenure review will be reviewed using the College of Social Work's most current APT Document approved and posted on the OAA website. Faculty members may choose to be reviewed under the document that was in effect when they signed their letter of offer or on the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent. A faculty member choosing to use an earlier APT document will notify the Dean of this intent and submit the APT document that was in effect at the relevant point in time. This notification will occur when the candidate submits his/her dossier and other materials for review, meeting the College's regular deadline for receiving the dossier and other materials for the review in question.

1 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-02.html>):

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

The College of Social Work has established and exercises very high standards for the awarding of tenure since a positive tenure decision has a powerful impact on the quality and future of the college. Although criteria will vary according to an evolving college mission and the particular responsibilities assigned to each individual faculty member, every candidate is held to a standard of excellence in all performance areas. Above all, candidates are held to a high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. A mediocre performance in one central area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another area. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

While the criteria are divided into three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service), we recognize that many academic activities span these domains. Faculty members will need to make a determination as to which area a specific activity best fits for purposes of evaluation; a specific activity should not be reported and evaluated in more than one area. If a project results in distinct products that fit different categories, it would be appropriate to list those products in the proper places. For example, if a funded research project might result in scholarly presentations and manuscripts appropriate for reporting in the scholarship area, involve significant community or professional outreach and engagement suitable for reporting as service, and supervision or mentorship of students that would be appropriate for reporting as teaching. While the project appears in multiple areas, the distinct products are reported only once each.

2 Teaching Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Teaching is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include didactic classroom, non-classroom and distance instruction, continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars.

Teaching is one of the primary functions of the College of Social Work and the university. When effectively accomplished, teaching makes contributions to and is served by scholarship and service. Accordingly, the demonstration of consistently effective teaching is a necessary condition for promotion and tenure in the college. Furthermore, the College of Social Work embraces the view that responsible faculty members engage in ongoing efforts to improve as educators, improve their courses and other teaching activities for which they have direct responsibility, contribute to the ongoing development of curriculum, explore and adopt appropriate innovations in teaching methods, and contribute to the development of a strong, diverse student body. Faculty members in the College of Social Work engage in activities related to both the explicit and implicit curriculum in social work education, as well as activities relevant to interdisciplinary education. While we recognize that innovation involves a certain degree of risk-taking and occasional missteps requiring corrections, it is expected that an individual faculty member's overall record will include no more than a small percentage of relatively unsuccessful efforts and be characterized by an overall consistent record of effective teaching.

Core expectations for promotion to associate professor are specified in the first four of the five teaching domains below: A. Teaching in the Explicit Curriculum, B. Continuing Development as an Educator, C. Engagement in the Implicit Curriculum, D. Program and Curriculum Contributions, and E. Contributions to Education in the Profession of Social Work or Related Disciplines. **Core expectations are required (Tables 1, 3, 5, and 7) but are not sufficient to meet the criteria for promotion; to support the College's high standards in teaching, additional teaching activities are also expected (Tables 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9).**

Potential sources of evidence for these activities, as well as for teaching activities over and above the minimum expectation, are described in the following tables. The sources of evidence listed here are not exhaustive, nor is it necessary to have all of them present for any particular activity.

A Teaching in the Explicit Curriculum. The teaching criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure include the faculty member having accumulated a consistent record of excellence in executing his or her teaching assignments (i.e., teaching in the context of assigned courses and field liaison assignments).

Table 1. The core expectations for category A, teaching in the explicit curriculum, include all of the following activities:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Provided current and accurate content, at the appropriate level and suited to the curricular objectives, in each assigned instructional situation (e.g., assigned courses, field liaison, supervision of students' independent studies, and other advising and mentoring capacities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Syllabus review of contents, student learning activities, and assignments as being appropriate to course objectives and student level• Peer review of teaching recognizes this• Documented updating of existing course

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaged in continuing education on topic or focus area
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student evaluation of instruction that reflect an acceptable level of competence in teaching for all or a significant majority of assigned course load. On a 5-point scale, this means overall scores of 3.5 or better [required evidence]. Where greater than one-third of courses in the dossier fail to meet this criterion point, evidence of concrete efforts to improve teaching and improved teaching outcomes are required. Peer review of teaching
Demonstrated teaching strategies and learning activities that create an optimal learning experience and environment, and that engage students actively in the learning process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multimodal approaches to delivering content discussed in teaching narrative University standard student evaluation of instruction Peer review of teaching
Ensuring course content delivered fits the program-defined curriculum goals and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syllabus materials Student and peer evaluation feedback
Provided appropriate, timely, and informative feedback to students throughout the instructional process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University standard student evaluation of instruction Adhering to university guidelines for recording semester grades and providing feedback to students (required evidence).
Treated students with respect and courtesy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University standard student evaluation of instruction Absence of significant substantiated "lack of respect" complaints to the program chair/academic dean
Demonstrated awareness of diversity (race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, age, disability, and religion) and promoted the importance of knowing the ways in which ascribed and/or achieved differences among consumers/clients may impact experiences of oppression, responses to service, interventions or approaches to evaluating practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syllabus and assignment review contains evidence recognizing social and economic disparities Peer evaluation of teaching Teaching practices that facilitate and acknowledge diversity
Inclusive practices and cultural humility demonstrated in the classroom or other teaching environments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing needs of students with special needs and different learning abilities Syllabus review Assignments Teaching practices that facilitate and acknowledge diversity dialogues

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer evaluation of teaching
For field liaison duties as part of assigned load: Engaging in telephone/in-person/virtual contacts with assigned field instructors each semester (required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of field activities

Table 2. Additional activities related to category A, teaching in the explicit curriculum, may include, but are not limited to the following:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Provided instruction or mentorship as instructor of record on students' graded (for academic credit) independent study coursework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contents of learning agreement with student are appropriate to the student's interests/goals, student level, and credits earned for the independent study
Provided instruction or mentorship as committee member on a student graded (for academic credit) project, including undergraduate honors thesis, graduate candidacy exam committee, or graduate thesis, where good progress is made.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee chair indicates contributions of value to the student's progress were made
Exceptionally high quality of instruction delivered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student evaluation of instruction that reflects an exceptional level of competence in teaching for all or a significant majority of assigned course load. On a 5-point scale, this means scores of 4.5 or better. • Teaching award(s)
Introducing innovation in instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum or external expert review of syllabus contents indicates introduction of teaching innovations to course(s) that are appropriate to the course objectives and the student level • Teaching portfolio

B Continued Professional Development as an Educator. Because of the high priority the college places on teaching, and because the profession of social work is dynamic, it is incumbent on all faculty members to engage in continuous development efforts related to their teaching and the relevance of the content that they teach. An individual's efforts at continued development in this arena are an important component of the evaluation process.

Table 3. The core expectations for category B, continued professional development as an educator, include all of the following activities:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Engage in self-review of teaching on a regular basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection on how to continue to improve as an instructor, based on peer reviewer (as scheduled) and student evaluation of instruction feedback, is included in annual review (merit) report • Teaching portfolio

<p>Demonstrated continued growth in subject matter (knowledge/skills)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented continuing education efforts in subject area (e.g., conference sessions attended, CEU credits earned, maintaining professional licensure/credentials, earning next level professional credentials, new literature review in scholarly work addresses the subject matter, published book review of item in the subject area) • Teaching portfolio
<p>Engaged in training aimed at strengthening cultural competence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College, University, external training opportunities, webinars, conference sessions attended, mentoring conversations (documented as reflections statement), self-study

Table 4. Additional activities in category B, continued professional development as an educator, may include, but are not limited to:

<p>Activity</p>	<p>Possible Evidence Examples</p>
<p>Engaging in consultation from teaching improvement services/specialists in the college, the university, or external to the university</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report, confirming letter/email or other documentation of the consultation occurring • Teaching portfolio documents engagement in these activities
<p>Participating in college, university, or externally offered training or professional conference sessions specifically targeted at teaching improvement, developing new teaching competencies, or otherwise developing as an educator</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the activity attended (minimally, description from published program or participant invitation) • Teaching portfolio
<p>Developed new content knowledge as the field continues to develop; content is relevant to present or proposed courses taught</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented continuing education efforts in a new or extension subject area (e.g., conference sessions attended, CEU credits earned, new literature review in scholarly work addresses the subject matter) • Teaching portfolio

C Engagement in the Implicit Curriculum. Faculty members engage in an array of activities that contribute to learning outside of the formal, structured curriculum—especially in a professional college and in doctoral education.

Table 5. The core expectations for category C, engaging in the implicit curriculum, include all of the following activities:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Served appropriately, responsibly, and responsively in the role of academic advisor for assigned students in the BSSW, MSW, and PhD programs (required where applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All e-forms completed in timely fashion, participation in performance review process (where applicable), timely email or telephone responses to student advising inquiries, absence of substantiated complaints about advising/inaccessibility as an advisor, referrals made when appropriate
Completion of BSSW, MSW, and PhD program admission review responsibilities in a timely fashion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews completed by deadline provided by each program when assignments are made
Providing appropriate letters of recommendation for students applying to programs or for scholarships/awards (when requested)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of letters submitted
Modeling for students behavior that reflects the standards and ethics of our profession	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining proper boundaries with students • Respect for diversity

Table 6. Additional activities for category C, engagement in the implicit curriculum, may include, but are not limited to the following:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Providing mentorship for a student developing research or academic skills outside of academic credit (e.g., assisted student in publication of a paper, presenting work at an academic/professional conference in addition to what was expected as part of assigned work in a course for academic credit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student learning agreement • Publication/presentation product
Responsibility for administering a certificate program (specialized advising)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement with associate dean/dean
Conducting training/discussion session related to students career development, job/academic skills necessary for success (other than what is covered in a course for credit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitation or advertising about the hosted event(s) • Presentation materials for the event(s)
Hosting a “journal club” or other peer learning session on a specific topic outside of a classes taken/taught for course credit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitation or advertising about the hosted event(s) • Presentation materials for the event(s)

D Program and Curriculum Contributions. The criteria for teaching excellence includes participation in and meaningful contributions to one or more of the programs delivered through the College of Social Work (BSSW, MSW, PhD; field; and, interdisciplinary minors, majors, certificates, or programs).

Table 7. The core expectations for category D, program and curriculum contributions, include all of the following activities:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Contributed to the ongoing process of course review and improvement in courses for which responsible as direct instructor or lead instructor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllabus and learning activities updated • Significant revisions brought to appropriate curriculum group(s) • Participation in ad hoc curriculum task subcommittees on as needed basis
Providing materials in a timely manner to staff requesting them for reporting to college accrediting/review bodies (e.g., syllabi, CV, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information provided as requested to the program directors/associate dean/dean or advising office for university and CSWE reports

Table 8. Additional activities for category D, program and curriculum contributions, may include, but are not limited to the following:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Leadership or membership on voluntary or elected curriculum committees and/or Educational Policy Committee (unless counted in service)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee list maintained by the college
Developing a new course or significantly revising an existing course in accordance with the college procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New/significantly revised course syllabus, approved by appropriate curriculum groups
Assisting in the development of a new major/minor or certificate program that includes social work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New major/minor or certificate program proposed and approved at the university level

E Contributions to Education in the Profession of Social Work or Related Disciplines. As social work educators, faculty members may engage in activities that enhance the delivery of social work education beyond the boundaries of the College of Social Work at The Ohio State University. There are no core expectations in this category.

Table 9. Activities and evidence for category E, Contributions to Education in the Profession of Social Work or Related Disciplines, might include, but are not limited to, having engaged in the following:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Published or contributed to development of instructional materials for which the intended use is educational/professional development (e.g., textbook, textbook chapter, textbook study guide, curriculum materials, learning exercises, other published instructional materials not otherwise counted in scholarship)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manuscript or digital resource “published” or accepted for publication—may be invited or peer-reviewed • Dissemination/impact data • Conducted book or other learning materials review for an author/publisher

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Disseminated intellectual contributions about social work education or education in related disciplines as pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, journal articles related to teaching (that are not otherwise counted in scholarship)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manuscript or digital resource “published” or accepted for publication—may be invited or peer-reviewed • Dissemination/impact data
Developed unpublished curricular or training materials for social work education or related disciplines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation by end users of their incorporation into courses, curriculum, or other dissemination venues • Dissemination/impact data
Significant participation in a discussion board or other social media system for exploring education in social work or related disciplines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of postings and responses to them, or other summary of the interactions and their impact
A professional conference presentation specifically about education in social work or related disciplines (that are not otherwise counted in scholarship)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program listing • Presentation materials • Evaluation of session
Conducted a continuing education workshop or Grand Rounds (not otherwise counted in service)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of invitation to participants • Evaluation of session
Guest lecturing about social work in other departments, programs colleges at OSU or other institutions (not otherwise counted in service)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgment/invitation identifying topic and audience

3 Research and Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Research is broadly defined in the Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and the scholarship of pedagogy.

Research and scholarship activities are central to the College of Social Work mission. A wide array of scholarly pursuits and products are valued in the college, as are the various methodologies employed in the knowledge building enterprise. Furthermore, the college places a high value on works that enhance knowledge dissemination and utilization in efforts to make positive changes and/or prevent problems in the lives of individuals, families, neighborhoods, communities, organizations, and institutions, locally, regionally, nationally, and globally. Valued are works at all points in the translational science cycle, including basic science, theory development and testing, intervention design, efficacy and effectiveness studies, implementation science, science that promotes new/better approaches to research, and the scholarship of pedagogy. In addition, a high priority is placed on inter-, multi-, and transdisciplinary scholarship.

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have established an independent line of research/scholarship, demonstrated an ability to ethically conduct high quality, impactful scholarship, and begun to establish a national reputation in the field of study/scholarship. Manuscripts considered in the candidate’s body of work are those with (1) an acceptance date subsequent to the candidate’s date of hire, or (2) a stated affiliation as being The Ohio State University. The window of materials to be included in the review

process may need to be adjusted according to the candidate’s “tenure clock” assigned at the time of hire.

Note that publications in languages other than English are not accepted as evidence of scholarship unless professionally translated into English. This is to ensure adequate review by faculty, external reviewers, and the dean.

Table 10. Activities and evidence that may be relevant for consideration include, but are not limited to the following:

Activity/Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Possible Evidence Examples
Productivity as a scholar *A successful candidate typically has an average of 2-3 peer-reviewed articles per year of review, a minimum of 5 of which are first authored.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Peer-reviewed articles ● Other areas of scholarship
Demonstrated thematically focused* scholarship that contributes to knowledge in area(s) of expertise in relationship to a scholarly agenda, college mission, profession/associated disciplines, and societal needs: publication record *Note: “Thematic focus” is indicated by the candidate. If a candidate’s area of inquiry or the central theme of the work includes sub-themes, these should be discussed along with how they connect to the main theme. If more than one main theme is relevant, the candidate should clearly identify how they are interconnected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Body of work in peer-reviewed journals, clearly demonstrating establishment of an independent program of research/scholarship over time, and contributes substantively to knowledge in the scholar’s area(s) of study. ● Publications should be thematically focused (note: methodology is a theme). ● There should be evidence of growing influence on the work of others, which could include an increasing role in the success of collaborations; impact evidence <u>may</u> include, but is not limited to, the impact of dissemination outlets. ● Publication rate should be relatively consistent or increasing in magnitude over time—a successful candidate may have a slower rate of publication at career outset or initiation of a new project, but there should be clear evidence of productivity over time and clear evidence indicative of continued scholarship beyond promotion. ● Evaluation of a scholar’s impact should take into consideration the innovative nature of the work represented—in newly emerging and/or heavily interdisciplinary areas, publication metrics might not be equivalent to those available in more established or singular areas.
Demonstrated thematically focused scholarship that contributes to knowledge in area(s) of expertise in relationship to a scholarly agenda, college mission,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence in addition to peer-reviewed journal papers includes refereed professional/scientific conference presentations (papers, symposia,

<p>profession/associated disciplines, and societal needs: presentation record and scholarship in other formats</p>	<p>posters). To have a significant impact on the candidate's case, the conferences involved should be widely recognized as being highly selective/competitive and of high quality; visibility of the conference as a focal point for research in the area must be clearly established.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited presentations may also demonstrate an emerging reputation; their quality and impact must be more clearly established • Evaluation of a scholar's impact through presentations should take into consideration the emerging and/or interdisciplinary nature of the scholar's area of study • Scholarly products may take other forms, depending on their purpose and intended audiences. Creative works representing a candidate's area of study <u>may</u> be appropriate as evidence of scholarship (e.g., computer programs/apps, websites, presentations grounded in the arts, multimedia presentations/performances).
<p>Demonstrated thematically focused scholarship that contributes to knowledge in area(s) of expertise in relationship to a scholarly agenda, college mission, profession/associated disciplines, and societal needs: grantsmanship</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence <u>may</u> include successful efforts to solicit/secure funding through grants and contracts from foundations, federal/state/county governmental agencies, industry, or the private sector; funding is a means that facilitates scholarship, it is not a requirement. • An independent researcher will have served in the capacity of primary/principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or co-investigator, or having otherwise documentable evidence of a significant leadership role in one or more research collaborations or teams. • Grant funding is a means-to-an-end: publications/presentations following from funded work should be part of the focused record of scholarship.
<p>Demonstrated impact of the work and influence on the work of others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning to be cited by other scholars • "White Papers" that can be shown to have influenced policy or practice • Invitations to present the work, conduct 'webinars' or other media presentations of the work, visiting scholars coming to learn about the work

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indices of others' use of candidate's work (e.g., ResearchGate, GoogleScholar) • Students/post-doctoral graduates continue to extend candidate's scholarly impact in their own work post-graduation • Competitive peer-reviewed funding is awarded to support the work • Grants/contracts awarded to support outreach and engagement activities related to the body of work • Recruited to provide consultation to others around the body of work
<p>Demonstrated independence as a scholar</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While it is typical that a candidate will include publications co-authored with their own advisors/mentors, a significant portion of the record should be authored/directed by the candidate with others (e.g., their own students or peers) as co-authors or collaborators. Collaborative research efforts that strengthen a program of research are encouraged, as they may lead to greater progress than would be possible from an independent scholar; however, the candidate should be increasingly assuming leadership in the work/collaborations. The candidate's contributions to collaborative projects and products of these partnerships must be clearly documented and verifiable through the collaborators, and must be recognizable as a unique, critical, creative contribution to the overall body of work produced by the collaboration/team. • Solo-authored work may be appropriate, but is not required • Recruited to provide consultation to others around the body of work
<p>Demonstrated high quality scholarship outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal ranking, citation index, H-index, or other indices of impact on field • Research or scholarship award/honors • External review of scholarly work • Peer review of publication (e.g., a published review of candidate's book)
<p>Pattern of ongoing research/scholarly productivity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productivity continues over time (e.g., • External reviewer feedback concerning how productivity relates to norms in the field • Evaluating patterns of productivity should take into consideration variations in

	<p>candidate's assigned workload distribution, as well as the time and effort necessitated by developing new collaborative partnerships and/or new project start-up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued competitive and/or peer-reviewed funding of the work
<p>Demonstrated unique contributions to a line of inquiry and/or work is innovative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External reviewer feedback that candidate has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession Narrative concerning the rationale for the research/scholarly activities presents convincing argument that the line of inquiry is unique and important Other indicators that the work is innovative in terms of methodology, perspective, and/or is an emerging area of scholarship/inquiry
<p>Emerging reputation as a scholar in the field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition by professional organizations and/or statement by external reviewers that the candidate is beginning to become recognized by others for scientific or scholarly contributions Invitations to present at recognized forums Invitations to review abstract submissions, manuscripts, or grant proposals in the field Beginning trend of positive citations in others' published work Graduate student/postdoctoral fellowship applicants selecting the program at OSU because candidate will serve as a mentor
<p>Research and scholarly activities conducted ethically and with integrity</p>	<p>Conduct of research and scholarly activities, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research conducted ethical treatment of all collaborators (e.g., students, postdoc fellows, junior faculty, community partners) adherence to ethical and integrity principles for publication, presentation, and other forms of dissemination

4 Service Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Service is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include providing administrative service to the university, professional service to a faculty member’s discipline, and disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university. As such, service activities that are not germane to a faculty member’s expertise and not furthering the mission of the college or university would not be relevant in faculty review. A faculty member should make the case for how service activities have contributed to and enhanced their work, the college, the university, the profession, and/or the larger community.

The College of Social Work defines three general domains of service: (a) contributing to the operations and mission of the college or university; (b) outreach and engagement with community-based partners in the local, regional, national, or global communities; and, (c) contributions to the profession or discipline. While service reflecting good citizenship of the college and university are important, of high priority are service activities that contribute to the candidate’s teaching and research/scholarship, the candidate’s and college’s national/international reputation, and realizing the college and university missions.

Membership on committees or other service groups is not in itself evidence of a contribution. The test of service effectiveness is evidence of productivity, creativity, leadership, and/or impact and this should be explained in the narrative statement. Core expectations are required (Table 11); additional service activities are desirable but not required (Table 12).

Table 11. The core expectations for service include all of the following activities:

Activity/Criteria	Possible Evidence Examples
Contributing to the operations and mission of the college or university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in regularly scheduled meetings of the faculty in the college [required criterion; anticipated recurrent absences may be excused by the dean based on unavoidable scheduling conflicts with high priority activities, e.g., teaching schedule conflict, significant community engagement responsibility, team/collaborative research activity] • Regular attendance and timely participation in meetings and activities of committees for which performance is being evaluated [required criterion]
Completing all college/university required training or other actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely and accurate completion of Conflict of Interest forms • Maintaining CITI certificate for the Office of Responsible Research Practices (IRB) • Timely completion of mandatory training (identified by the dean or the university as being required)
Outreach and engagement with community-based partners in the local, regional, national, or global communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations to community agencies or other community groups (other than

	scholarship presentations to professional conferences) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service activity that benefits community-based programs • Representing the college at community-sponsored events
Contributions to the profession or discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of abstracts, manuscripts, or grant proposals

5 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to professor:

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching, has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

In the College of Social Work, promotion to Professor occurs only if the candidate can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

6 Teaching Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The teaching criteria for promotion to Professor include all of the activities listed as the core expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (beginning [page 24](#) above), and that these be consistently demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of Associate Professor. Additionally, it is expected at a minimum that the successful candidate will have assumed leadership roles in at least some of the categories of activity described in each of three teaching areas: A. Explicit Curriculum (Table 2), B. Continued Development as an Educator (Table 4), C. Implicit Curriculum (Table 6), and D. Program and Curriculum Contributions (Table 8).

Table 12. Additional teaching-related activities for promotion to Professor may include, but are not limited to, the following important contributions not generally expected of junior faculty members:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Chairing successfully completed doctoral student candidacy and dissertation committee(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate school documentation
Conducting peer reviews of teaching for colleagues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review of teaching report submitted to Dean's office
Leadership of a teaching team (i.e., all instructors of multiple sections in a course or course sequence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgment by the associate dean
Chair/co-chair of standing curriculum committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee list maintained by Dean's office

Significant role in college reaccreditation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgment by the dean or associate dean
Delivering skill-building workshop/training related to teaching effectiveness, curriculum development, or content areas taught in courses (in the college, on the campus, or in the professional community)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertising announcements • Session evaluations

7 Research and Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The research and scholarship criteria for promotion to Professor include all of the minimum research and scholarship expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (beginning [page 30](#) above), and that these be consistently demonstrated during the period since last promotion (or hire at the rank of Associate Professor).

Table 13. Additionally, it is expected at a minimum that the successful candidate will have engaged in all of the following research/scholarship activities not generally expected of junior faculty members.

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Productivity as a scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to peer-reviewed articles since promotion, evidence may include production of a book (solo authored, co-authored, edited) published by a scholarly press
Demonstrated an ability to mentor future scholars in research/scholarship in their area(s) of study and/or methodologies employed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advising students, postdoctoral fellows, and/or peers/colleagues in research or scholarship endeavors (beyond what is taught in the explicit curriculum)
Assumed a leadership role in research collaboration(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role as the primary/principal or co-principal investigator in solo or collaborative projects
Developed a clear national or international reputation as a scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition by professional organizations and/or statement by external reviewers that the candidate is clearly recognized by others for scientific or scholarly contributions and/or a national or international reputation has been established • Invitations to present at recognized national/international forums • Invitations to review abstract submissions, manuscripts, or grant proposals in the field • Established trend of positive citations in others' published work • Graduate student/postdoctoral fellowship applicants selecting the program at OSU because candidate will serve as a mentor

Engaged in activities to generate extramural funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of requests/proposals for extramural funding research, training, or other activities within the mission of the College, University, and/or appropriate to the candidate's career trajectory
--	--

8 Service Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The service criteria for promotion to Professor include all of the activities listed as the core service expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (beginning [page 35](#) above), and that these be consistently demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of Associate Professor.

Table 14. Additionally, it is expected at a minimum that the successful candidate will have engaged in the following service-related activities not generally expected of junior faculty members.

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Contributing to the operations and mission of the college or university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumed leadership in committee work of the college • Membership in university governance system or committee serving units outside of the College of Social Work • Acting as a graduate school appointed external reviewer for doctoral candidacy exam or thesis defense (Grad Rep)
Outreach and engagement with community-based partners in the local, regional, national, or global communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing assistance or leadership in capacity building activities for community agencies • Collaboration in research, grant seeking, board development, strategic planning, staff development, etc. with community partners
Contributions to the profession or discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership in relevant professional or discipline organization(s) • Reviewing for professional journal or professional organization

Table 15. Additional service activities of note may include, but are not limited to:

Activity	Possible Evidence Examples
Contributing to the operations and mission of the college or university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in university governance • Award, honors, recognition of college or university service • Strong mentorship of junior/new faculty members • Leadership or other engagement with student organizations in the college or university

<p>Outreach and engagement with community-based partners in the local, regional, national, or global communities</p> <p>(specific applied research activities may count toward EITHER service OR scholarship)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board membership or leadership in agencies or institutions outside of the university • Membership, leadership, providing testimony, or other significant contributions to policy decision-making team(s) or governmental entities • Award, honors, recognition for community service • Review of service grant proposals for funders • Engage in community development activities • Provide consultation to public or private sector social/community agencies
<p>Contributions to the profession or discipline</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership role in professional or discipline organization(s) • Editorial team for professional or discipline journal • Review of research grant proposals • Award, honors, recognition for service to the profession or discipline • Leadership or other significant engagement with students organizations at the state, national, or international level
<p>Recognition for impactful service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards or honors received

B Procedures for Fourth-Year, Promotion, and Tenure Review

The award of tenure is a long-term employment commitment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the college's and university's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university. Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance; accepting weaknesses in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision impedes the college's ability to perform and to progress academically.

Each candidate is reviewed independently, on the basis of the merits of his or her own case. Candidates are not reviewed comparatively.

The College of Social Work's procedures for promotion and tenure and for promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 and the Office of Academic Affairs' (OAA) annually updated procedural guidelines (see Volume 3 of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook, <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). Multiple parties are involved in review of a candidate for either 4th-year review or for promotion and tenure: the candidate, Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, eligible faculty, dean, and the university level.

The following sections state responsibilities of the candidate, Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, eligible faculty, and dean in the review process. These responsibilities apply to all faculty members in the college.

1 Candidate Responsibilities in Fourth-Year, Promotion, and Tenure Review Processes

The responsibilities of the candidate for 4th-year, promotion, and tenure review are as follows:

- Timely submission of a complete, accurate, up-to-date dossier (and any required supporting documentation) that is 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.
- Submitting to the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee chair a list of preferences for person to serve as liaison identified from among the subcommittee members—neither the chair nor POD may serve as a liaison. The chair preserves confidentiality of the preferences submitted by candidate(s).
- Submitting a copy of the college's APT document in effect if he or she elects to be reviewed under those criteria rather than the criteria in the college's most recent APT document (note: this is either the APT document in effect at the time of the candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the college.
- Candidates will not be present at the review meeting of eligible faculty where their case is being discussed.
- Candidates MAY, but are not required to, submit a list of dossier updates that occur between the time the dossier was submitted for review and the point at which the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee report to the eligible faculty is completed and posted for eligible faculty review. This will include only changes in status for items already included in the dossier. The POD will verify facts in the updates; the liaison will circulate the updates at the P&T Committee meeting where candidates are discussed. The information circulated will be described in the candidate summary statement from the P&T Committee in the section where the discussion is outlined. Editing the dossier materials after the initial submission deadline, other than what the POD requests for purposes of accuracy, is not permitted.
- Submitting any dossier comments, appeals, or amendments in accordance with policy-dictated timelines and procedures.
- Candidates for Promotion (and Tenure): Reviewing the list of potential external reviewers presented by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee with the primary purpose of identifying anyone with a potential conflict of interest. The candidate's request for removal of any names requires a written statement of the reason for the request for removal. The Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will determine whether the removal is justified.
- Candidates for Promotion (and Tenure): Reviewing the list of potential external reviewers presented by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee with the secondary purpose of suggesting additional names. The candidate may present the subcommittee with the names, contact information, and a brief statement (based on the person's biography) as to why this individual's input would be helpful in fully evaluating the candidate's work. The candidate may suggest up to three additional names; the final set of obtained reviews may include up to but not more than 50% of candidate-recommended reviewers.

- Candidates for Promotion (and Tenure): Refrain from engaging with any of the potential external reviewers with regard to their being reviewed. Under no circumstances should the candidate discuss their case with a potential external reviewer. If contacted by a (potential) external reviewer, the candidate should refer the (potential) reviewer to the dean or chair of the P&T Subcommittee.
- Candidates for Promotion (and Tenure): Only the candidate may stop the review process once external letters of evaluation have been solicited. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Dean in writing. The Dean shall inform the Provost of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.

2 Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities and Procedures

In the College of Social Work, the membership of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee is composed of members of the eligible faculty. The Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee is comprised of five members in total: the chair and four members appointed by the dean.

Chair of the General Promotion and Tenure Committee. The chair of the College of Social Work Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed by the dean of the college based on election by the entire body of tenure-track faculty members whose tenure home is in the college. The chair is elected for a single two-year term; future re-election is permissible, but not in consecutive terms. In order to be eligible for election, the chair must

- (a) be an eligible voting member of the faculty (i.e., hold a tenured position at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor)
- (b) have served on the College of Social Work Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee within the past three years.

The chair nomination and election process is directed by the College Advisory Committee (CAC) in collaboration with the dean's office, and should be concluded by the end of the first week of February during an election year.

Should the chair become unable to complete the full two-year term, an election will be conducted to complete the interrupted term. This replacement term does not disqualify the individual from being elected to a subsequent full two-year term, however the individual does not automatically return to the position (i.e., must be re-elected to a subsequent term).

At the conclusion of the two-year term, the chair will facilitate the transition to a new chair and provide advice to the incoming chair/committee on an as-needed basis. The elected individual is strongly encouraged to attend an annual P&T Chair training sponsored by the OAA.

The Remaining General Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Members. Each of the remaining four members of the subcommittee is appointed by the dean for a one-year term. Appointment as a subcommittee member is based on an alphabetical (last name) rotation. Individuals whose term is missed due to leave or other reasons will be replaced in the rotation as soon as they become available. The dean may negotiate in confidence a deferral of duty with an eligible individual where unusual anticipated factors may significantly affect ability to perform the duties involved.

The entire Subcommittee will be established before the end of February each year.

The Procedural Oversight Designee (POD). The P&T Subcommittee will elect from within its membership an individual to serve in the role of Procedures Oversight Designee (POD). The chair may not also serve as the POD. The elected individual is strongly encouraged to attend an annual POD training sponsored by the OAA.

The POD's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines, and include: (a) ensuring accuracy of the candidate's dossier contents and conformity to OAA-required format, verifying accuracy of all publications and creative works listed in the dossier, working with the P&T Subcommittee chair to resolve any conflicts of interest, assuring that proper criteria are applied when candidates come up for early review or have an extension of the tenure clock, assuring that the P&T Subcommittee and the eligible faculty follow procedures governing faculty reviews that are written in the APT and OAA documents, monitoring proceedings to assure they are carried out in a highly professional manner, monitoring the review process in regard to equitable treatment and fair, unbiased review for all candidates (including, but not limited to, assuring that proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions based on gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, or other aspects of diversity), and signing off on the college level dossier checklist (Form 105).

If the POD has concerns about process in a review, these concerns should first be brought to the attention of the individual or review body generating the concerns. If appropriate procedures are not being followed, either by staff or faculty (including the candidate), those individuals should be promptly informed of the problem.

If concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they should be brought to the dean's attention; if the concerns involve the dean, they should be brought to the Provost.

Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Membership in Review for Promotion to Professor. In the review of candidates for promotion to (or initial appointment as) Professor, the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee is comprised of all eligible voting members (i.e., all faculty members in the College of Social Work tenured at the rank of Professor). The chair shall be elected by a simple majority of the subcommittee membership.

Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. The Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Subcommittee is responsible for two general areas of activity: (1) ensuring that the APT document contents related to faculty review policy and procedures are annually reviewed and revised as needed, and (2) managing the processes involved in faculty mandatory 4th-year review, mandatory promotion and tenure review, non-mandatory review, and making a recommendation to the dean regarding faculty members' requests for FPL.

Review of APT document contents related to faculty review will be conducted in the spring semester each year, prior to the subcommittee membership transition. Substantive changes recommended by the subcommittee will be brought by the chair to the first possible regularly scheduled full faculty meeting, following established rules.

With regard to 4th-year review and promotion/tenure review, the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee is to respect the timetable identified in the most current version of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (volume 3): *The College is encouraged to deliver materials to OAA as soon as the college-level review is complete, regardless of due date.* As of March 2015, the College of Social Work has as its deadline for submission to OAA the **second Friday in January**. Thus, the timeline for all P&T Subcommittee activities related to 4th-year and promotion/tenure review, including the comments and response processes, should be

constructed in such a manner that the Dean's office can meet this deadline. A list of the subcommittee's responsibilities and a recommended schedule of activities is presented in Appendix A of this document.

Procedures of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee in Fourth Year and Promotion/Tenure Review.

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows (also see Appendix A for timeline of activities):

- To review this APT document annually and recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To maintain confidentiality concerning all matters discussed in regards to candidate review, other than what is required to be placed in reports from the committee.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to determine whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. [A subcommittee of the entire body of full professors must be convened to review such a request for promotion to full professor.] A two-thirds majority of those Subcommittee members eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the non-mandatory review to proceed.
 - The Subcommittee bases its decision on assessment of the candidate's record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (i.e., student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review request.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal non-mandatory promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 dean that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (i.e., 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 the college.
 - A decision by the Subcommittee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the dean, or any other party to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, to facilitate the 4th-year, promotion and tenure review process as described below (see Appendix A, calendar of activities for precise deadlines).
 - Spring: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee.
 - Spring: Provide the dean with a list of potential external evaluators for each candidate for promotion.
 - Spring: Make a determination as to appropriateness of any faculty member requests for non-mandatory review.

- Spring: Identify the liaison assigned to each candidate's case from among the subcommittee membership. The chair will solicit from each candidate a rank-ordered preference list for the pairings, keeping it confidential, and will make the assignments.
- Late Summer/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.
- Late Summer/Early Autumn: Schedule and announce the autumn mandatory meeting(s) of eligible faculty for conducting all mandatory and non-mandatory reviews.
- Meet as necessary with each candidate for clarification and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on/revise his or her dossier. These meetings are not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Conduct an analysis, documented in a written "summary statement," of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service, and to provide this summary statement to the full eligible faculty along with the dossier; seeking to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The Subcommittee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- The Chair of the P&T Subcommittee (or Subcommittee member designee, if necessary) chairs the meeting of the eligible faculty discussing each case for 4th-year review or Promotion/Tenure. The POD maintains a record of the procedures followed in this meeting. The Chair is assisted by subcommittee members in recording notes about the eligible faculty members' perspectives discussion. The liaisons (or Subcommittee member designee, if necessary) are responsible for initiating the discussion of each candidate. (See Appendix B for a suggested meeting agenda.)
- Revise the summary statement analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include (a) the faculty vote and (b) a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and, to forward the completed written summary evaluation and recommendation to the dean.
- 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 dean in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is in another college. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the eligible faculty begins meeting on our own cases.

3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities in Fourth Year and Promotion and Tenure Review

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

- To independently review, thoroughly and objectively, each candidate's dossier and supporting materials in advance of the meeting at which each candidate's case will be discussed; accessing the materials is a requirement of being allowed to cast a vote for that candidate.
- To attend all meetings of the eligible faculty except when unusual circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; if arranged at least 24 hours prior to the meeting start, a faculty member may participate remotely via technology (less than 24-hour notice does not preclude remote participation, but there is no assurance that suitable arrangements can be made).
- To participate in the group's discussion of every case (i.e., must be present for the entire time that any case is being discussed in order to vote on that case)

- To vote.
- To maintain confidentiality concerning what was discussed and by whom in meetings of the eligible faculty where a candidate's case was reviewed.

4 Dean Responsibilities in Fourth Year and Promotion and Tenure Review Process

The Dean is responsible for the following activities with regard to the faculty review process (see Appendix A for a schedule):

- Reviewing the APT document and revisions recommended by the faculty.
- Providing all faculty members, regardless of rank, with annual review feedback that is formative in nature, helping them to gauge their strengths and limitations in each area of review; the Dean's summative evaluation conclusions are not binding on the review conducted by the eligible faculty, but it may be informative.
- Oversight of the Dean's office activities/responsibilities related to faculty review (e.g., ensuring all faculty have access to the APT document and are notified of all updates/revisions, managing the alphabetical rotation for P&T Subcommittee membership, communications with external reviewers, posting/circulation materials for eligible faculty review, managing voting procedures, completing forms for OAA—see Appendix A).
- Appointing the members and chair of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee (following faculty election).
- Identifying those faculty members who are due for mandatory review in the spring of the year before the review is to be conducted.
- Verifying a prospective candidate's residency status, as 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.
- Inviting faculty members to submit proposals for FPL (sabbatical leave), as well as requests for non-mandatory review.
- Soliciting recommendations from the P&T Subcommittee about submitted FPL proposals.
- Attending, as an observer, the candidate review meeting of eligible faculty members. The dean may respond to questions asked of him or her during the meeting.
- Removing 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.
- Notifying each candidate of the voting outcome from the eligible faculty concerning their case. While a courtesy telephone call may be made, a formal written letter will be provided.
- Conducting an independent, thorough review of each candidate for 4th-year review, promotion and tenure. The Dean's report includes a recommendation to the Provost regarding the candidate's reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, as well as a report of the results from voting by the eligible faculty members.
- Sharing the Dean's report with the candidate; the candidate has 10 days to submit an addendum to the report to accompany the dossier sent to OAA.
- Providing a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To explain to eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to their recommendation and vote.
- Ensuring appointment of supplemental (external) members of P&T Subcommittee for review in promotion to full professor, if needed.
- Ensuring dean from outside of college conducts final review for promotion to full professor, if needed.

- Ensuring that all materials are delivered to OAA at earliest possible time, but no later than the college's assigned due date.

5 External Evaluations in Promotion Review Process

External evaluations of a candidate's scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed (i.e., mandatory or non-mandatory tenure-track promotion, with or without tenure). While external evaluations are very helpful in reviewing a candidate's research/scholarship, they are not a substitute for eligible faculty members conducting a thorough evaluation of a candidate's body of work.

A minimum of five (5) credible and useful written 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 can give an "arms' length" evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research/scholarship collaborator, or former academic advisor/mentor of the candidate.

Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The College of Social Work seeks to solicit evaluations from The Ohio State University's peer institutions, but we recognize that in certain areas some of the most qualified reviewers may be at other institutions.

External evaluations will be sought only from individuals holding a rank equivalent to the rank for which the candidate is seeking appointment or promotion: for candidates seeking promotion to associate professor, external evaluations may be requested from associate or full professors, while external evaluations will be sought only from full professors in cases where the promotion or appointment request is for full professorship.

A minority of external evaluations obtained may include individuals situated in academic institutions outside of the United States system of higher education; emeritus faculty may be acceptable evaluators.

External evaluations are deemed useful if they provide sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to inform the review process (i.e., is analytical as opposed to perfunctory). Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case. A "non-useful" letter is still presented with the dossier.

Since the college cannot control who completes the requested review or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required. Letters are initially solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year, allowing additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

While external evaluators are provided with a deadline for submitting their reviews, there are times when the letters arrive later than expected. Letters will be included as long as they are received up to the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee completing its final version of the summary statement to be shared with eligible faculty, prior to the meeting where a candidate is reviewed. Letters will not be discussed if they have not been reviewed by the subcommittee in preparation of the summary statement and will not be circulated to the eligible faculty; they will not be entered into the materials for review.

The procedures for creating the list of potential external evaluators are derived from the OAA handbook. The list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee and the candidate. The Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee members will each independently generate a list of potential external evaluators, including contact information and a brief biographical statement reflecting the goodness-of-fit with the candidate's CV. The subcommittee members will meet to discuss the list, identifying the first five to be invited, and rank ordering at least four to six more names to invite should sufficient numbers fail to be generated from the initial group. Should the entire list be invited without achieving the necessary minimum number of letters, the subcommittee will reconvene to identify and invite an additional group of external reviewers. All invitations are documented per OAA procedures.

The subcommittee-generated list is shared with the candidate to ensure no conflicts of interest exist; if a conflict of interest is identified by the candidate, the list is shortened by the deletion of the individual(s). The candidate may, at that time, add up to five names to the "possible invitation" list, rank-ordered by preference (with contact information and a brief biographical statement reflecting goodness-of-fit with their case). The additions will be discussed and evaluated among the subcommittee members for goodness-of-fit. Among evaluators suggested by the candidate and meeting the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons but no more than 50% of the final set of letters obtained (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 40). In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write a letter, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this college requires that the dossier contain any letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. The candidate is not required to submit any names of potential external reviewers.

The college follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html>, for letters requesting external evaluations. The Ohio Public Records Act applies to external evaluation letters.

The dean's office solicits the letters of external evaluation. When a request is accepted by an external reviewer, the candidate's current CV, statements regarding research/scholarship, and representative examples of the candidate's scholarly work are submitted for review, along with a letter detailing what the review should address. When multiple-authored items are submitted to external reviewers, the candidate's record must contain a statement clearly describing the nature and extent of his or her contributions to the work; estimates of a percent contribution are necessary but not sufficient to satisfy this requirement. Single-authored works assist in more directly reflecting the candidate's effort, abilities, and potential impact; however, these are not essential to the review process.

External reviewers are NOT asked to share an opinion about whether the individual's record merits promotion or tenure at OSU or a comparable institution; however, should this be included in the review letter, this opinion should not be considered by eligible voting faculty members in their own evaluation of the candidate's record.

External evaluation generally applies only to the record of research/scholarship. However, in some circumstances, it may be helpful to request evaluation of other aspects of a candidate's dossier. Should this be requested, sufficient information must be provided to the external reviewer to allow for a useful evaluation.

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 dean, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (such as 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. Under no circumstances should candidates solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review!

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 Documentation in Fourth-Year, Promotion, and Tenure Review

As noted above (Candidate Responsibilities), every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) guidelines and dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure Sub-Committee assists by making 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 college-provided contents, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the college. The documentation of scholarship, teaching, and service noted below is for use during the college review only, unless reviewers at the university level specifically request it.

Candidate statements regarding teaching, research/scholarship, and service are embedded in the dossier per the format adopted by OAA.

1 Teaching Documentation (for college review)

The time period for teaching-related material included in the college-reviewed dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to the present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to the present.

Examples of documentation include:

- Cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the college's program for peer evaluation of teaching (see section X regarding Peer Review of Teaching, beginning on [page 50](#) below).
- 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 with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of teaching activities listed in the core dossier, such as those listed in the Tables 1-9 ([page 24](#) above) in this document.

2 Scholarship Documentation (for college review)

The time period for scholarship-related material included in the dossier for probationary faculty members is the date of hire to the present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty members it is the date of last promotion to present.

Examples of documentation include:

- Copies of, or direct hyperlinks for, all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Items accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- Documentation of scholarship activities listed in the core dossier including documentation of activities as listed in the core dossier, such as those listed in the tables beginning on [page 31](#) above in this document.

3 Service Documentation (for college review)

The time period for service-related material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty members it is the date of last promotion to present.

Examples of documentation include:

- Documentation of service activities listed in the core dossier such as those listed in the tables beginning on [page 35](#) above in this document.
- Any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

VIII Appeals

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).

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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 Review of Teaching¹

All faculty members are expected to engage in regular, ongoing review of their teaching effectiveness throughout the course of their careers. Two major structures (A and B below) reflect a common base by which to facilitate the review process; additional measures may also be relevant and applicable. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness includes assessment both by students and other faculty members, as well as the candidate's own self-evaluation.

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Student evaluations of individual courses are required and must be made available for every regular classroom course taught at The Ohio State University (in the College of Social Work or in other programs). OAA policy requires that faculty use one consistent instrument across comparable classroom settings. In the College of Social Work, the normal mechanism across classroom-based courses is the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). Faculty members are expected to use supplementary instruments and procedures for obtaining performance feedback as needed to monitor and improve their classroom performance, which may include instruments developed by the instructor to evaluate the effectiveness of new teaching methods or delivery of specific content (for example, content on diversity).

Efforts should be made to obtain evaluations from the largest possible number of enrolled students. When there is a large discrepancy between the number of students enrolled and the number providing evaluations, the evaluations cannot be assumed to represent student opinion accurately. Because student evaluations are useful only when viewed in significant numbers, student evaluations must be obtained for every course (with the exception of courses in which the instructor has primarily an organizational role, e.g., graduate seminar courses), except in rare circumstances.

A portfolio of student evaluations, each of which is well above College norms for courses with similar characteristics, is strong evidence of outstanding classroom performance. At the same time, a portfolio in which the evaluations are consistently at the bottom of results for the College is cause for concern. The College expectation is that most portfolios will contain a balance of some relatively high and some relatively low results. Because many factors outside the instructor's control, such as class size and grades anticipated by students, can have a systematic and significant effect on student evaluation ratings, responsible interpretation must consider these factors.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer review and feedback about teaching effectiveness is a critical element throughout a faculty member's career. The contribution of peer review is greatest when peer observations are done systematically and are conducted with the goal of offering constructive suggestions. The Office of Academic Affairs requires that dossiers of faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion contain documentation of peer reviews of teaching.

Untenured faculty members will have $n-1$ peer review reports where n =the number of years of service at The Ohio State University. Faculty with tenure will receive a peer review of teaching report at least every 3 years. A minimum of 2 peer review of teaching reports is required as part of any promotion or tenure review. Any faculty member may request a non-mandatory peer review be conducted at any time.

The peer review cycle is monitored by the Dean's office.

All tenured faculty members are eligible to serve as peer reviewers. No faculty member is obligated to conduct a requested review. Peer reviewers must be at or above the same rank as the faculty member under review. Faculty members serving as current promotion and tenure liaisons are not eligible to conduct peer reviews of teaching for persons for whom they serve as liaison. Conducting peer reviews counts as service to the College of Social Work during annual merit reviews.

During its initial meeting, the P&T subcommittee will establish a timeline to determine peer reviewers for all peer reviews of teaching during the year, and notify faculty members in writing of this timeline. Each faculty member to be reviewed will provide the P&T subcommittee chair with a confidentially treated list of 3 potential reviewers (excluding their P&T liaison) by a deadline established by the P&T subcommittee. The P&T subcommittee chair will determine the reviewer for each candidate and communicate that decision to the candidate and reviewer.

Once the reviewer is determined it is the responsibility of the candidate and assigned reviewer to schedule the pre-observation conference and class "visit." The faculty members receiving and conducting the review will meet to agree on a schedule for the peer review process. During this meeting, the faculty member receiving the review will identify a course and session/module for the class visit. Selection criteria should emphasize courses and session that the faculty member being reviewed believes will allow the best opportunity for providing an accurate representation of their teaching. It is generally not recommended that classroom observation occur for courses a faculty member is teaching for the first time.

The peer review activity consists of 4 components: (1) a pre-observation conference, (2) a class "visit," (3) a post-observation conference, and (4) a written summary to the P&T committee, dean's office, and candidate within two weeks of completing the class "visit." Specific procedures for class "visits" are described in the Peer Review of Classroom Instruction policy adopted by College of Social Work faculty in May of 2005.

¹ Note that this section will be revised in the near future with new procedures and standards.

C Self-Evaluation of Teaching

Self-evaluation of teaching is critical to any future improvement. Faculty members should spend time evaluating the successes and failures of their courses, as well as the feedback provided by the student evaluations. The candidate's evaluation of his or her teaching must include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching; self-assessment; and description of specific strategies for the candidate's further development as a teacher. A suggested model for the reports includes the faculty member's summary of his or her efforts in improvement, innovation, updating, along with an evaluation of what was effective, and how the course could be improved in the future. These reports should be included as part of the material available to peer evaluation of teaching as well as in the promotion packet, should promotion eventually be recommended by the College. The candidate's efforts with respect to graduate student advising should be described and discussed.

Appendices

Appendix A.

The Ohio State University
 College of Social Work
 Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Subcommittee Calendar of Activities

Re: 4th year Review
 Promotion to Associate & Tenure
 Promotion to Full
 FPL Requests
 Peer Review of Teaching¹

DEADLINE	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PERSONS
4 th week January	Dean invites faculty to submit proposals for FPL (sabbatical leave)	Dean
1 st week February	Election for chair of P&T Subcommittee (alternate years) for 2-year term	CAC/Dean
Mid- February	Dean appoints new P&T Subcommittee members (by 5 th week of Spring semester per OAA)	Dean
Mid- February	Proposals for FPL (sabbatical leave) are due to the Dean's office	Relevant faculty members, Dean
1 st week March	"Old" Subcommittee chair solicits a list of faculty members to be reviewed during the year (provided by the Dean)	"Old" chair, Dean, faculty members to be reviewed next
1 st week March	Dean solicits a list of faculty members requesting non-mandatory review (i.e., "early" reappointment or promotion review)	Dean
1 st week March	"Old" Subcommittee chair ensures that individuals to be reviewed in the upcoming year are provided with all policies, procedures, and timelines relevant to their review	"Old" chair
Mid-March	"Old" Subcommittee makes recommendations to the Dean about the FPL proposals that were submitted	"Old" subcommittee members, Dean
Mid-March	New P&T Subcommittee meets with "old" chair to become informed about procedural concerns, new info affecting P&T process (from OAA, etc.) <i>NOTE: PROMOTION TO FULL is a separate subcommittee but procedures are the same as described for P&T committee with regard to PROMOTION candidates</i>	"Old" chair, new subcommittee members
3rd week of March	New P&T Subcommittee chair solicits subcommittee member liaison preferences from each individual candidate to be reviewed in upcoming year (4 th YEAR and PROMOTION candidates)	Chair, candidates for 4 th YEAR REVIEW or PROMOTION
End of March	New P&T committee solicits CV and brief statement of substantive scholarship content area	Chair, candidates for PROMOTION

	from each <i>PROMOTION</i> candidate to help inform identification of potential external reviewers	
1 st week of April	Liaison assignments made by P&T committee and confirmed in writing by the committee chair with each candidate and liaison person	P&T subcommittee, chair, candidates for 4 th YEAR REVIEW or PROMOTION, liaisons
3 rd week of April	PROMOTION candidate submits names of 3-4 potential external reviewers and brief statement of reason for selecting each—submits in sealed envelope to the Dean's office	PROMOTION candidate, Dean's office
3 rd week of April	Each P&T subcommittee member generates 2-5 potential external reviewers for each PROMOTION candidate and a brief statement of reason for selecting each—submits to the P&T committee chair	P&T subcommittee members
3 rd week of April	Faculty member requesting non-mandatory review submits CV and available supporting materials (i.e., teaching evaluations) to the P&T Subcommittee Chair for Subcommittee evaluation as to whether the case will be reviewed in the coming year	Non-mandatory review candidate, P&T Subcommittee
4 th week of April	P&T subcommittee meets to select external reviewers for each PROMOTION candidate (more than 50% must be selected by committee; need enough to end up with minimum of 5 letters of evaluation in the end) using their own list and sealed list provided by candidate via Dean's office	P&T subcommittee, Dean's office
4 th week of April	P&T subcommittee chair consults with PROMOTION candidate to ensure that list includes no one with potential conflict of interest	P&T Subcommittee Chair, PROMOTION candidate
4 th week of April	P&T Subcommittee chair produces letter for Dean's office to send for external reviewer requests	P&T Subcommittee Chair, Dean's office
4 th week of April	P&T Subcommittee meets to determine whether a request for non-mandatory review will be approved for the coming year	P&T Subcommittee
4 th week of April	P&T Subcommittee chair notifies faculty member requesting non-mandatory review of the Subcommittee decision regarding whether the request to be reviewed has been approved	P&T Subcommittee Chair
1 st week of May	Dean's office initiates contact with potential external reviewers for each PROMOTION candidate, to determine willingness/availability to conduct a review—using "form" letter/email	Dean's office
April-May	Dean shares P&T calendar with any faculty expressing interest in promotion during Merit Review process and those for whom review is mandatory	Dean; individual faculty members

1 st week in May	Candidate for PROMOTION turn in all materials for external reviewers to Dean's office—no further updates will be sent to external reviewers NOTE: Candidate is responsible for accuracy and quality of all materials submitted for external review! Errors may be a source of concern in faculty review process, and may negatively bias external reviewers, as well	Candidate for PROMOTION, Dean's office
2 nd week in May	Dean's office sends official letter of request and review materials in preferred format (hard copy, electronic version) to each external reviewer for PROMOTION candidates	P&T Committee chair, Dean's office
2 nd week in May	Liaisons affirm that each candidate for 4 th YEAR review and PROMOTION is completing dossiers, using the University's reporting system	Liaisons and candidates for 4 th YEAR review or PROMOTION
2 nd week in May	Liaisons affirm that each candidate for 4 th YEAR review and PROMOTION is aware of and understands the College and University P&T policies and procedures, and the timeline for activities/responsibilities	Liaisons and candidates for 4 th YEAR review or PROMOTION
2 nd week in July	Reminders sent to external reviewers who have not yet returned their reviews	Dean's office
1 st week in August	External reviews for PROMOTION candidates are due back to the Dean's office	External reviewers, Dean's office
1 st & 2 nd week in August	P&T subcommittee chair works with Dean's office to obtain any outstanding external reviews for PROMOTION candidates	External reviewers, chair of P&T subcommittee, Dean's office
by 1 st day of autumn semester (about 3 rd week of August)	Candidates for 4 th YEAR REVIEW and PROMOTION finalize dossiers and personal statement, submit all supporting documents electronically to Dean's office, including APT document version at time of hire or last promotion unless current version is to be applied NOTE: Candidate is responsible for accuracy and quality of all materials submitted for review. Errors may negatively bias reviewers.	Candidates for 4 th YEAR REVIEW or PROMOTION, Dean's office
1st week of autumn semester	Candidate materials delivered to POD who works to confirm accuracy of all claims in document	POD, candidate for 4 th YEAR REVIEW or PROMOTION, Dean's office
1 st week in September	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ works with dean's office to generate list of needed peer reviews of teaching; notifies individual faculty members needing review and provides information about the process; solicits names of 3 potential reviewers from each	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ , Dean's office; faculty members needing peer review of teaching
Start of 2 nd week in September	POD communicates to candidate all changes required for accuracy; subcommittee chair is cc'd with all communications between POD and candidate about this topic	POD, candidate for 4 th YEAR REVIEW or PROMOTION

3 rd week in September	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ notifies peer reviewers and those to be reviewed of the pairing; pairs identify schedule by which the review will occur	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ , faculty members needing peer review of teaching, peer reviewers
3 rd week in September	Deadline for submission of all changes required by POD; candidate submits materials with these changes, and only these changes, to Dean's office	candidate for 4 th YEAR REVIEW or PROMOTION, Dean's office
3 rd week in September	POD confirms to chair, Dean's office, and candidate that all required changes are satisfactory	POD
3 rd week in September	Candidate materials delivered to liaison to begin draft of P&T subcommittee summary statement	Dean's office and liaisons assigned to candidates for 4 th YEAR REVIEW or PROMOTION
4 th week in September	Liaison completes a draft summary of dossier for each 4 th YEAR REVIEW and of dossier plus and external reviews for each PROMOTION candidate; this version is for circulation to P&T subcommittee members	liaison, P&T subcommittee chair and members
1 st week in October	P&T subcommittee meets to review each 4 th YEAR REVIEW and PROMOTION candidate's materials and liaison's draft summary; subcommittee prepares summary for circulation to eligible voting faculty	P&T subcommittee members
2 nd week in October	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ sends reminder to peer review of teaching pairs	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ , peer reviewer pairs
2 nd week in October	P&T subcommittee chair fact-checks summary report with candidate; required changes (for purposes of fact accuracy only) are shared/discussed with other subcommittee members	P&T subcommittee chair, candidate
2 nd week in October	Candidate materials and subcommittee summary statement are circulated to all eligible faculty	Dean's office
Remaining month of October	P&T subcommittee chair reminds eligible faculty to review materials, and that their voting eligibility is contingent on (1) review of materials and (2) attendance at faculty review meeting	P&T subcommittee chair, eligible faculty
November's 1 st non-holiday Monday	Mandatory meeting of all eligible voting faculty members, hosted by P&T committee, chaired by P&T committee chair (attended by Dean as non-participant observer); liaisons introduce summary for each candidate; P&T chair coordinates creation of final sections of P&T summary report that provides context around faculty vote (this is a brief overview of the discussion and is written/revised by the P&T committee following this meeting, based on discussion points during this meeting; substantive discussion on points	All eligible voting faculty, Dean's office, P&T subcommittee chair, P&T subcommittee liaisons, P&T subcommittee members, Dean

	where multiple members have differing positions are noted); Dean's office support person confirms attendance requirements met before voting opens—to be eligible tenured faculty member must be in attendance for <u>all</u> discussion of candidate and summary report, as well as have previously reviewed candidate materials.	
November (24 hours later)	Eligible voting faculty members submit votes by deadline (electronic voting system managed by Dean's office with college tech team support as needed); at voting deadline, Chair of P&T subcommittee counts votes with Dean's office, informs Dean in writing of voting results	All eligible voting faculty, Dean's office
Immediately or as soon after as possible	Dean notifies each candidate of voting results; P&T subcommittee chair performs final edits on the summary statement (inserts context discussion notes and voting results) and submits it to the Dean; Dean acknowledges its receipt	Dean, Chair of P&T committee
Immediately or as soon after as possible	Dean shares the summary statement with candidate—see next entry about 10 day time limit	Dean, candidate
3 rd week of November	Candidate has 10 days to submit an addendum statement to clarify any perceived errors in the discussion points and complete form about accompanying statement OR candidate completes form stating no addendum statement to accompany summary report. Note: addendum is NOT an appeal of the decision	Dean's office, candidate
3 rd week of November	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ sends reminder to complete peer review of teaching for autumn reviews	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ , peer review of teaching pairs
1 st week of December	Candidates with positive vote ensure all materials for transmittal to OAA are properly submitted to Dean's office	Candidate, Dean's office
1 st week of December	For 4th-year review or promotion to Associate Professor/Tenure review, submission of Dean's letter to OAA; For promotion to Professor, outside Dean letter for OAA (if needed) or compose Dean's letter for OAA (if meeting criteria)	Dean's office
Before 2 nd Friday in January	All materials delivered to OAA per deadline set for the College of Social Work	Dean's office
1 st week of January	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ sends reminder to complete peer review of teaching for outstanding autumn or spring review	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ , peer review of teaching pairs
(specific deadlines)	Appeals process detailed in the University documentation	

(specific deadlines)	Special actions/time table may be related to determining rank and/or tenure in new faculty hiring processes	
January-February	P&T subcommittee reviews and develops recommendations for revisions to APT/POA documents related to the P&T process	P&T subcommittee
1 st week of February	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ sends reminder to complete peer review of teaching for spring review	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ , peer review of teaching pairs
March-May	Substantive recommended revisions to APT/POA documents are brought to the faculty or other relevant groups for approval	P&T subcommittee chair, Dean, faculty, CAC
March	P&T subcommittee chair calls the transition meeting with new committee	P&T subcommittee chair, new P&T subcommittee members
1 st week of March	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ sends reminder to complete peer review of teaching for spring review	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ , peer review of teaching pairs
1 st week of May	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ sends reminder to complete peer review of teaching for spring review or for any scheduled during summer term	P&T subcommittee chair ¹ , peer review of teaching pairs

¹ These duties will be reassigned to the Associate Dean and academic committee for teaching and learning when new teaching evaluation procedures and standards are developed for the college.

Appendix B.

P&T MEETING OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY (date)

Sample Agenda (Times to be adjusted according to number of reviews and scheduled time of meeting's start, such that sufficient time is dedicated to the review of each candidate; minimum 20 minutes scheduled for 4th Year Review but full allotment not required if discussion completed earlier; minimum 30 minutes for tenure/promotion scheduled but full allotment not required if discussion completed earlier):

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1:00-1:05 | Attendance recorded (dean's office) to allow voting and orientation to agenda (chair) |
| 1:05-1:30 | Discussion of candidate 1 materials (4 th year review)—introduced by liaison |
| 1:30-1:35 | Summary of discussion reviewed for P&T summary letter to OAA |
| 1:35-2:00 | Discussion of candidate 2 materials (4 th year review) —introduced by liaison |
| 2:00-2:05 | Summary of discussion reviewed for P&T summary letter to OAA |
| 2:05–2:40 | Discussion of candidate 3 materials (tenure & promotion review)—introduced by liaison |
| 2:40-2:50 | Summary of discussion reviewed for P&T summary letter to OAA |
| 2:50-3:00 | Reminder of voting process and brief discussion of procedures/policies to address in APT revisions |
| 3:00-5:00 | Voting opens, recorded in electronic voting system (managed by dean's office and technology support team per POA) |
- Within 24 hours, voting closes (managed by dean's office, P&T subcommittee chair in attendance)
At close of voting, P&T subcommittee chair reports voting outcome to Dean
On receipt of voting outcome report, Dean notifies candidates of results.

Notes: The dean, in attendance at the P&T Committee review meeting as an observer, may answer specific questions from the eligible faculty if necessary;
Candidate is not present;
Proceedings are confidential;
POD includes the meeting processes in report