

School of Educational Policy and Leadership

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

**Criteria and Procedures for the
School of Educational Policy and Leadership**

**Approved by the School Faculty
May 6, 2008**

Table of Contents

1 PREAMBLE	3
2 SCHOOL MISSION	4
3 FACULTY APPOINTMENTS	4
3.1 Criteria	4
3.1.1 Tenure Track Faculty	4
3.1.2 Auxiliary Faculty	4
3.1.3 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	5
3.2 Faculty Appointment Procedures	5
3.2.1 Tenure Track Faculty	5
3.2.2 Auxiliary Faculty	6
3.2.3 Courtesy Appointments	7
4 ANNUAL REVIEWS	7
4.1 Annual Review Procedures: Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	7
4.1.1 Fourth-Year Review	8
4.1.2 Exclusion of Time From The Probationary Period	8
4.2 Annual Review Procedures: Tenured Faculty	9
4. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS FOR TENURED AND UNTENURED FACULTY	9
5.1 Criteria	10
5.2 Procedures	10
5.3 Documentation	10
6 PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	11
6.1 Criteria	11
6.1A Scholarship	11
6.1A.1 Components of Scholarship	11
6.1A.2 Evaluation of Scholarship	11
6.1B Teaching	12
6.1B.1 Components of Teaching	13
6.1B.2 Evaluation of Teaching	13
6.1C Internal and External Service Activities	15
6.1C.1 Components of Service	15
6.1C.2 Evaluation of Service	15
6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	15
6.1.2 Promotion to Professor	16
6.2 Procedures	16
6.2.1 Candidate Responsibilities	17
6.2.2 Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities	17
6.2.3 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	17
6.2.4 School Director Responsibilities	18
6.2.6 External Evaluations	19
6.3 Documentation	19
6.3.1 Teaching	19
6.3.2 Research	20
6.3.3 Service	21
7 APPEALS	21
7.1 Seventh year reviews	21

School of Educational Policy and Leadership

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Criteria and Procedures for the School of Educational Policy and Leadership

**Approved by the School Faculty
May 6, 2008**

1 PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Tenure track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure (www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php); the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 7 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the school and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the School shall follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the School Director.

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Provost of the University before it may be implemented. The document sets forth the school's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the School and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and candidates for positions in relation to the School's mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) of the Administrative Code regarding peer review and equality of opportunity. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) and other standards specific to this school and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

2 SCHOOL MISSION

The School of Educational Policy and Leadership defines its mission as the advancement of scholarship, instruction and service in scholarly disciplines in education that contribute to the formation of sound policy and effective leadership at educational institutions in all settings and levels.

The School is collectively committed to a balance of scholarship and teaching which lead to dissemination of the knowledge for which the faculty are responsible. This School of Educational Policy and Leadership is concerned with both theoretical and practical objects of inquiry and draws upon social-scientific and humanistic knowledge to elucidate educational contexts and their relevance to educational policy.

The School shares the mission and vision encompassed in the core values of the College of Education and Human Ecology: research, educating professionals, diversity and equity, collaboration, professional development, policy formation, technology, and land-grant mission. Although some of these values are more integral to the school's scholarship and teaching, all pertain to a proper definition of professional service in the University, the state and nation, and the world community.

In pursuit of these ends and values, the School strives to adhere to principles of equity and governance.

3 - FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

3.1 Criteria

The criteria here are wholly consistent with Chapter 6 of the University Faculty Rules 3335-6-02, Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion and Tenure.

3.1.1 Tenure Track Faculty

The school is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the school. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the school. No offer will be extended in the event that a search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the school. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

3.1.2 Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary faculty include temporary part-time lecturers or senior lecturers, who may be appointed by the Director in consultation with program faculty in cases of instructional

need, usually to cover the absence of permanent faculty. Auxiliary faculty also include visiting faculty (at the rank of instructor, assistant, associate, or full professor), who are appointed by the Director in consultation with program faculty and approval of the Dean. These full-time, compensated appointments are renewable up to three years. Auxiliary faculty also include adjunct faculty, who may be appointed by the Director in consultation with program faculty and approval of the Dean. Adjunct faculty are expected to teach or co-teach one course per year and are not paid. These appointments may be renewed annually.

3.1.3 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Courtesy appointments may be made by the Director on recommendation of program faculty and approval of the Dean and are not paid and may be renewed annually.

3.2 Faculty Appointment Procedures

The procedures here are wholly consistent with Chapter 6 of the University Faculty Rules 3335-6-02 Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion and Tenure. All procedures are followed consistently with the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php)

3.2.1 Tenure Track Faculty

Rationales for new faculty appointments should be developed to enhance the missions of both the School of Educational Policy and Leadership and the College of Education and Human Ecology. The School Director in consultation with the Dean appoints search committees for these positions; the search committees serve for the duration of each individual search. Each member of the search committee should be provided copies of the mission statements of both the School and College to assist in the development of position descriptions and candidate interview protocols.

Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of A Guide to Effective Searches (www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf).

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

The dean of the college provides approval for the School to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The School Director appoints a search committee consisting of faculty of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the school.

The search committee:

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

- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the School Director'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.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. The search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation, and presents to the School Director a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the Director agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the school office. If there is no agreement, the Director in consultation with the faculty, determines the appropriate next steps

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the School Director; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research. The search committee gathers feedback from all faculty and students attending sessions with a candidate.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the search committee meets to review feedback forms and to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to determine a recommendation to be submitted to the School Director.

The School Director decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the School Director. Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. Because the university cannot legally grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The School will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

3.2.2 Auxiliary Faculty

Position descriptions for auxiliary faculty with modified faculty titles (such as adjunct and visiting) should be clearly defined and consistent with the missions of the School of Educational Policy and Leadership and the College of Education and Human Ecology. The section in which the appointment will reside, in consultation with the Director, should develop the auxiliary faculty position descriptions in response to particular current needs of the section and School. These position descriptions are to be approved by a majority of the faculty in the section where the appointment will reside. In keeping with University Rule 3335-6-03, auxiliary faculty members are appointed by the Director and approved by the Dean for one-year terms. Auxiliary faculty may be reappointed if the

Director in consultation with the section and the Dean, determines that the appointment continues to be necessary and appropriate. The possibility of promotion exists for auxiliary faculty with ranked faculty titles, but this is the exception and not the typical auxiliary appointment.

3.2.3 Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments will require a letter of request (solicited or unsolicited) from faculty desiring the appointment. The School Director will present the request to the appropriate section for approval or denial, based on majority vote. Such appointments shall be consistent with the needs of the section. Continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing contributions of the courtesy appointment faculty member.

4. ANNUAL REVIEWS

The Director of the School shall conduct annual reviews of the professional activities of all faculty members. As part of this task, he/she will convene an annual review/salary committee to assist in this effort. Consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (as well as with Office of Academic Affairs policies described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook) all faculty in the School of Educational Policy and Leadership will have annual reviews, and all probationary faculty will have an annual meeting to review and discuss progress toward tenure.

4.1 Annual Review Procedures: Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

In light of Rule 3335-6-03, the annual review process for untenured faculty will include the following:

- 1) Each untenured faculty member will prepare an annual report.
- 2) For the first two years of the probationary period, the peer evaluation of teaching will be accomplished by the agreed-upon mentor and the focus of the evaluation will be formative/developmental. Written reports of the evaluation included in the annual report will indicate only how and by whom the evaluation was conducted – constructive criticisms will be given privately to the candidate. Beyond the second year, the yearly peer evaluation of teaching will be arranged by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the written reports will be summative and reflect the evaluator's judgments about the candidate's teaching. See section 6.42 for elaboration of peer evaluation of teaching.
- 3) The School Promotion & Tenure Committee will conduct a review process of the annual reports and peer evaluation of teaching and, by consensus, will generate an assessment of the candidate with respect to progress toward promotion and tenure.

- 4) The list of recommendations will be forwarded to the Director, who will write the annual letter of review.

At the completion of the review, the Director shall provide the faculty member and the Dean with all written assessments of the faculty member's performance and professional development and an indication as to whether the faculty member will be reappointed for an additional year. The Director's letter shall include a reminder that according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, any faculty member may review her or his personnel file and may place in that file a written response to any evaluation, comment, or other material contained in the file. The Director may respond in writing to the faculty's comments. All responses shall also become part of the core dossier for subsequent annual reviews, including the sixth year review, during the probationary period. A meeting of the Director and the faculty member to discuss the report and evaluation is required.

The annual review process for probationary faculty in years other than year 4 will be completed early in spring quarter. If the judgment is that the candidate's likelihood of meeting the School's expectations for promotion and tenure is poor, the School will not recommend renewal of the probationary appointment.

A recommendation by the Director to deny reappointment must be sent in writing to the Dean of the College. Prior to making the recommendation, the Director must include a presentation of the case to the School Faculty and must include a report of the faculty discussion and vote in the written recommendation. All tenured faculty members of the School are eligible to vote. A simple majority (i.e., more than 50% of the eligible, voting faculty members) shall be required for a positive recommendation.

4.1.1 Fourth-Year Review

The fourth year review shall be the same as for tenure and promotion in the School except that external letters are not required and review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be optional in all cases where both the tenure initiating unit and the Dean approve the renewal of the appointment. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the College. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the tenure initiating unit recommendation, the Dean must consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

If the Director recommends nonrenewal, the comments procedure of the fourth year review process must be invoked and the case must be sent to the Dean for College Promotion and Tenure Committee and decanal review and decision.

4.1.2 EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the

Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook
(http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php).

Faculty members will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period unless the faculty's absence from campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical.

4.2 Annual Review Procedures: Tenured Faculty

The professional activities of all tenured faculty members will be reviewed annually according to the established process within the School of Educational Policy and Leadership. Tenured faculty will provide the Director a completed activities report, including data about teaching, research and service, which will be used for the purpose of evaluating the work of the faculty member as it contributes to the mission of the School (see above). As required by the Office of Academic Affairs and by policies described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, the School Director will produce a written annual review for each tenured faculty member. A meeting of the Director and a tenured faculty member is required if requested by either. Regardless of whether the meeting occurs, the faculty member will receive a copy of the Director's written review. The Director's statement shall include a reminder that according to Faculty Rule 3334-5-04, the faculty member may review his or her personnel file and place in that file a written response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file. The Director may respond in writing to the faculty member's comments.

The School will support the progress of associate professors toward the rank of full professor. Annual review processes will include methods for re-engaging faculty who have become disengaged or stalled in progress toward full professor. These methods might include, but are not limited to, a mutually agreed upon mentor, co-teaching opportunities, provision of a research quarter (i.e. SRA), or co-writing opportunities.

Annual reviews for all professors will focus on continuous enhancement of competence and productivity in ways consistent with the missions of the School, College, University, and profession. The same evaluation criteria for research, teaching, and service used for promotion decisions will provide a general framework for annual reviews, with an understanding that faculty priorities may vary across years

5. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS FOR TENURED AND UNTENURED FACULTY

In accordance with the concept of shared-governance, the School of Educational Policy and Leadership will use a committee structure working in concert with the School Director to make recommendations for faculty salary increases. The Patterns of Administration of the School provides detail related to salary decisions.

5.1 Criteria

Except when the university dictates any type of across the board salary increase, 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. 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.

Multiple criteria, consistent with the promotion and tenure criteria will be employed in determining salary increases. It is essential that these criteria are clearly stated and consistent with both the School's mission and with an individual's actual practice. The diverse nature and quality of teaching, scholarship, and service will be taken into account in assessing performance for purposes of merit salary increases. Merit increases will be based on performance in research, teaching and service, with emphasis on a balance of activities taking into account faculty members' shifting emphases. Salary decisions need to be based on professional judgment.

Salary increases will be distributed among faculty in a manner that acknowledges merit in terms of recent performance, reflects performance in light of previous evaluations, and addresses issues of equity across faculty. Achievement of the latter goal necessarily means that the previous year's performance cannot be the sole determinant of salary increases. It could also mean, on occasion, that total dollar increases and resulting salary levels as well as percentage increases are taken into account. In short while merit evaluations will emphasize the previous year's performance, the Director may also consider the past several year's performance and/or the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall record in making annual salary adjustment recommendations.

5.2 Procedures

As part of the annual review process, each faculty member shall provide evidence of research, teaching, and service accomplishments on a standard form that allows explanations of the significance of each contribution. The completed form shall be reviewed by the Director and a faculty committee that serves as advisory to the Director, in accordance with the Patterns of Administration of the School. Final determination of salary is the responsibility of Director, after the Director and salary committee have jointly discussed and ranked the annual review forms.

5.3 Documentation

Both probationary and tenured faculty must document their performance for annual reviews and for salary determination. Probationary faculty must follow the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs to record their performance for annual review and for salary determination. The Director will determine a format for the School activities report to document the accomplishments of all faculty

that meets university guidelines. It is essential that the School require adequate documentation of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service.

6 PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

The School of Educational Policy and Leadership has as its mission the advancement of excellence in education through the pursuit and dissemination of new knowledge, the advancement of enlightened educational policy, and the preparation of educational scholars and leaders in accordance with these activities.

The Ohio State University is the primary research institution in the state of Ohio and one of the leading research universities in the world. The College of Education and Human Ecology is a leader in scholarly contributions to the education profession, and the centrality of this role leads to the centrality of scholarship in the criteria for promotion and tenure.

6.1 Criteria

The faculty of the School also is committed to a balance and integration of scholarly activity, teaching and advising, and service to a variety of local, state, national, and international constituents. High quality scholarship, however, is at the center of the School's activities and undergirds teaching and service to others.

6.1A Scholarship

6.1A.1 Components of Scholarship

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(a), for purposes of faculty performance reviews under these rules, "scholarship" is broadly defined to include "research, scholarly, and creative work." As suggested by its mission statement, the School encompasses and encourages a variety of scholarly paradigms and forms of inquiry. Likewise, the School's faculty members disseminate the results of their scholarship in a variety of formats. The components of scholarship reflect this variety, while recognizing the centrality of some formats in scholarly discourse. That is, the scholarly interactions that promote understanding tend to take place in certain arenas, especially peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, and scholarly books, and our criteria for judging scholarship recognize the primary preeminence of these arenas. Other publications are valuable as well, and form additional contributions to scholarship. Further contributions to scholarship include: presentations at national meetings of professional societies, invited addresses, and more innovative and specialized contributions. Altogether then, the components are intended to encompass a broad view of the range of scholarship, while recognizing the primacy of traditional forms of publication.

6.1A.2 Evaluation of Scholarship

In an applied field such as education, high quality scholarship is pursued in forms other than the academy. The School recognizes the importance of these activities but also

understands that, in order to advance the field as a whole, scholars have an obligation to disseminate their work beyond the local with whom they consult and form other affiliations. Such dissemination should be reflected in publication within peer-reviewed journals in the field, yearbooks of professional bodies, and related documents; scholarly books; presentations at conferences with refereed programs; and other methods that are appropriate to the type of materials produced. In these cases, the value of the product to the field may also be documented through reviews in scholarly journals, citation indices, and other means.

When products other than refereed journal articles and books form a substantial portion of a faculty member's work, the scholar's work will be judged on the appropriateness of the balance between materials production and dissemination and evidence from external sources that speaks to the quality and impact of that work.

With the growth of electronic journals, interdisciplinary collaborations that use forums other than those traditional to education, and other new means of conducting and disseminating research findings, there are instances in which the established norms for judging scholarly value cannot be applied. In such cases, it is incumbent that the candidates provide evidence supporting the importance of their contributions to the field.

It is essential that the faculty member seeking promotion demonstrate a focus in his or her scholarship and, in the case of promotion to Full Professor, a sustained focus or line of inquiry. It is also essential that a significant portion of this scholarly inquiry be published in peer-reviewed journals or presented in papers in scholarly forums that have a peer review process for acceptance of those papers.

Evidence for scholarship includes self-evaluation of scholarship (with a plan for future work), evidence about the importance of the journals in which the candidate has published, as well as evidence about the rigor of the journals. Fewer publications in highly regarded journals (with further evidence of impact as documented through the number of citations or validation of the quality of the work assessed by eminent scholars in the field) are important considerations in promotion decisions and are weighed against more publications in less recognized publication outlets. Additionally, the range of scholarly activity itself is a consideration, including the ability to obtain research grants, present research in a variety of forums, and serve in editorial capacities of scholarly publications.

6.1B Teaching

The quality of teaching in a College of Education and Human Ecology is of particular importance. Teaching and learning often are the object of scholarly inquiry in this academic unit; inquiry into one's own teaching and impact on learning is especially valued. As with scholarship, the general University standards as these pertain to teaching are supported by the School of Educational Policy and Leadership.

The School of Educational Policy and Leadership expects that all faculty will engage in a continuous process of self-examination and improvement in teaching. We encourage

faculty to seek appropriate feedback from students and colleagues and to develop their teaching through interactions with colleagues (both within and outside the School), professional organizations, and the Office of Faculty and TA Development.

6.1B.1 Components of Teaching

Faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor are called upon to provide "evidence of high quality instruction including but not limited to systematic student and peer review of classroom teaching" and "sufficient record of successful Masters' student advising and service on doctoral committees." Faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor are called upon to provide "evidence of high quality instruction and curriculum development including but not limited to systematic student and peer review of classroom teaching," "excellence in graduate advising," and "sufficient record of successful Ph.D. student advising." Thus the components of teaching to be considered in promotion decisions may include, but are not limited to:

- Teaching of university courses and supervision of internships and practica—both credit and noncredit-- on or off campus or via electronic technologies;
- Supervising, advising, and mentoring of students, including their research and teaching;
- Developing courses, curricula, or programs as well as instructional materials and strategies;
- Producing scholarly textbooks, chapters in books used as texts, reviews and other publications used primarily for instructional settings;
- Generating external funds to support students and/or teaching.

6.1B.2 Evaluation of Teaching.

The evaluation of teaching quality requires a comprehensive review of accomplishments in the components outlined in Section 6.2B.1. To be evaluated favorably, candidates must contribute to the accomplishment of the mission of the School in several components of teaching and provide evidence for the quality, relevance, and impact of their teaching. Candidates also should make clear in their dossiers the relationships among their scholarship, teaching, and service. A candidate will be judged unsatisfactory in teaching if the candidate fails to provide evidence of teaching competence in the dossier.

As much as possible, the School Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will interact with the candidate to develop a diverse profile of evidence of teaching quality, including as many of the components of teaching below as are appropriate.

Teaching of university courses and supervision of internships and practica—both credit and noncredit-- on or off campus or via electronic technologies.

Evaluation of Teaching: Evidence may include self-evaluations; other formal and informal evaluations of teaching; statements of the candidate's specific involvement in each course; videotapes of the candidate's teaching performance;

course syllabi and other teaching materials used, especially those created by the candidate; examples of course assignments and students' work; sample tests and other assessment procedures; examples of written feedback to students; teaching awards. Candidates are encouraged to summarize their efforts to inquire into the complex nature of teaching and learning in their courses, or any other efforts to document and improve teaching that they have pursued.

Measurement of Student Satisfaction: All candidates for promotion must provide results of the OSU student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for each class taught. An absence of evaluations for any classroom course requires explanation. This does not preclude the inclusion of other types of student evaluation. The SEI shall be administered according to institutional procedures to protect the integrity of the process and to insure the validity of the responses. The Director or Director's designee will summarize students' narrative comments from formal course evaluations. Five years of student evaluations are required unless the candidate has been at the Ohio State University for fewer than five years. Trends and/or patterns of responses in formal evaluations are considered to be as important or potentially more important than scores for any particular course or year.

Evidence may include self-evaluations; descriptions of work with student organizations; lists of advisees with descriptive information such as students' levels, admission and graduation dates, and the advising role of the candidate (program advisor, member or chair of Master's committee, member or chair of candidacy examination committee, etc.); lists of doctoral students with dissertation titles, completion dates, resulting publications, awards; letters of evaluation describing mentoring from a sample of advisees as solicited by the Promotion and Tenure Committee; candidate's written mentoring policies; written evidence of placing graduates in appropriate employment; and admission of advisees to programs of graduate or postdoctoral study. Other examples could include such activities as grant proposal development with students, shared authorship and paper presentations, and general facilitation of students' professional development and advancement. In addition, the candidates may choose to provide other evidence that illustrates mentoring and advising.

Masters and doctoral students require close and high levels of individualized advising. Given the importance of advising, multiple indicators of quality of should be incorporated in promotion and tenure decisions.

- Developing courses, curricula, or programs as well as instructional materials and strategies, either alone or in collaborations with colleagues.

Evidence may include self-evaluations, syllabi, proposals, outlines, teaching materials, case studies, simulations, software, and other instructional technologies and media.

- Producing scholarly textbooks, chapters in books used as texts, reviews and other publications used primarily for instructional settings.

Evidence may include self-evaluations; samples of work; written reviews of work; and indications of the use of the materials locally, nationally, or internationally.

- Generating external funds to support students and/or teaching.

Evidence may include self-evaluations as well as descriptions of grants that provide support for students (including title, dates, sponsoring agency, award, number of students supported and level or support) plus substantiating documentation such as letters from funding agencies, university offices, and student participants.

6.1C Internal and External Service Activities

6.1C.1 Components of Service

"Service" is defined as in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(a), "to include administrative service to the University, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the University...." Involvement in service should develop gradually from a modest level at the beginning of the career to more substantial engagement at advanced points. For example, faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor should provide evidence of sustained recognized professional service in state, regional, national, and/or international arenas and commitment to program area, School, College, and University leadership in the College and University.

6.1C.2 Evaluation of Service

The promotion and tenure committee will inquire about the scope and quality of internal service by such methods as soliciting the perceptions of the chairs of the committee on which individuals serve during the time in which they are formally seeking promotion. Positive contributions to the level of community and collegiality in the School will be recognized.

A critical issue in the evaluation of external service, whether at the local, state or national level, is the impact of the service. The candidate will be asked to provide some form of documentation for these activities (letter of appointment, recognition of service, etc.) by a second party and any available evidence of impact. The Promotion and Tenure Committee may undertake further inquiries.

6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure: "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." Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the school's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

6.1.2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of 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. For promotion to professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these required responsibilities. The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and international reputation in the field.

6.2 Procedures

The school's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php).

Voting Eligibility and Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee

For the School of Educational Policy and Leadership faculty vote, only tenured full professors may vote for candidates seeking promotion to full professorship; only tenured associate and full professors may vote for candidates seeking promotion to associate professorship. The Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of the Eligible Voting Faculty. The Director, the Dean, and Assistant and Associate Deans are not eligible to vote. Only those eligible faculty who attend the meeting at which a candidate is discussed can vote on that candidate.

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(b), each tenure initiating unit shall establish a mechanism such as a Promotion and Tenure -Subcommittee, for presenting the case of a candidate for promotion and tenure to the eligible faculty for consideration and for preparing a report for the School Director providing the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee's assessment of quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service.

6.2.1 Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. If external evaluations are required, candidates will review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the School Director and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The School Director decides whether removal is justified.

6.2.2 Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities

The Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee of the School shall present the case of a candidate for promotion and tenure to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for consideration. The Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee also is responsible for preparing a report for the Director providing the Promotion and Tenure Committee's assessment of the candidate's quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service. (See section 3335-6-04 b1)

After sufficient review and deliberation of the candidate's dossier and other information developed during the review process, the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee shall draft a detailed written assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. This report shall include a statement that a committee member has verified the accuracy of the candidate's citations of published work. The draft report will serve as the focus of the discussion of the candidate's case before the School of Educational Policy and Leadership faculty.

The chairperson of the School of Educational Policy and Leadership Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee shall call a meeting of the faculty members eligible to vote on the candidate. The Director may attend as a non-contributing participant. The chairperson of the subcommittee shall read, and the committee members shall discuss with the faculty, the previously prepared initial evaluation report. Changes in the draft report may be recommended by the faculty at this meeting.

Based on the faculty discussion and the faculty vote, the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee shall revise its initial draft report, including the numerical vote of the faculty, and submit the report to the Director.

6.2.3 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

Faculty Review of Candidates.

The candidate's dossier shall be made available for review by the School of Educational Policy and Leadership faculty members eligible to vote for the candidate. The dossiers will be located in an administrative office as determined by the Director. The dossiers shall be available for review for a minimum of seven days prior to a meeting of the eligible faculty members. Each person who reviews a candidate's dossier will sign a form indicating that he or she has done so.

School of Educational Policy and Leadership Faculty Vote.

A secret ballot will be prepared and distributed to all faculty members eligible to vote on a particular case and present at the meeting. Ballots shall be returned by a date deemed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee to provide sufficient time for deliberation and to meet previously established deadlines. The Promotion and Tenure committee will count and report on the votes. A two-thirds affirmative vote by the eligible voting faculty will constitute a favorable vote for the action under consideration. A vote to abstain should not be used to determine the base for the two-thirds rule.

Conflict of Interest.

A faculty member should not participate in the review of a particular candidate when he or she has a conflict of interest. Such a conflict may exist when there is a familial or comparable relationship with the candidate or a close professional relationship such that the faculty member stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review of a candidate. When there is a question about potential conflicts, open discussion and professional judgment are required in determining whether it is appropriate for the faculty member to remove him or herself from a particular review. If there is any question the P & T Subcommittee will make the final decision.

6.2.4 School Director Responsibilities

Disposition of the School of Educational Policy and Leadership Faculty Report and Letter of Evaluation By the Director

The Director shall subsequently and in a timely manner shall write a letter of evaluation and transmit copies of both the Director's letter of evaluation and the written report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Dean and to the candidate. The letter from the P & T Committee must include an assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service regarding both strengths and weaknesses and a report of the discussion of the faculty as a deliberative body, including the numerical vote.

Review of Decision with the Candidate

The Director and the chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall meet with the candidate to review the evaluation. Ordinarily, this meeting should occur within seven days of the candidate's receipt of the evaluation report from the Director.

6.2.6 External Evaluations

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. External evaluators cannot have a familial or other personal relationship with the candidate. Advisors, mentors, or close collaborators of the candidate cannot be external evaluators.

The Director is responsible for obtaining letters from internal and external evaluators. The Director will notify external reviewers of the expectations against which candidates are being assessed for promotion. Some external evaluators should be suggested by the candidate, some by the Director, and some by the Promotion and Tenure committee. The Director will determine the final list of evaluators, with concurrence of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. All solicited letters that are received will be included in the dossier; there must be at least five letters included. No more than half of the letters of evaluation included in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate. The letters of evaluation will meet requirements specified in the most recent "Guidelines and Procedures for the Promotion and Tenure of Regular Faculty and for the Promotion of Regular Clinical and Auxiliary Faculty," issued by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The steps of the specific procedure for soliciting external reviewers are as follows: The P & T Subcommittee and the Director generate a list of external reviewers; The Director invites the candidate to review these for conflict of interest and to add names to the list; The Director and the P & T Subcommittee make up the final list; There must be an adequate number of requests to ensure a minimum of five letters.

6.3 Documentation

The School will follow the description of documentation contained in the guidelines by the Office of Academic Affairs (see OAA's "Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure of Regular Faculty and for the Promotion of Clinical and Auxiliary Faculty"). The Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline serves as the standard for documentation. Candidates for fourth year review, tenure or promotion in the School of Educational Policy and Leadership shall submit for faculty review the Core Dossier as delineated by OAA, copies of all SEIs, and copies of all refereed articles, books, and book chapters (including copies of any that have been accepted but have not yet appeared). It is the candidate's responsibility to provide a carefully and thoroughly prepared dossier according to the University requirements.

As the faculty of the School is committed to a balance and integration of scholarly activity; teaching and advising; and service to a variety of local, state, national, and international constituents, documentation should emphasize how these are related.

6.3.1 Teaching

The following information is in addition to “Components of Teaching” and “Evidence for Evaluation of Teaching” in Sections 6.1B.1 and 6.1B.2 above.

Student and peer evaluations of teaching are mandatory.

Reports of Student Evaluation of Instruction should indicate both the number of evaluations submitted and the final enrollment of the class in question. As noted in Section 6.1B.2, absence of evaluations for any classroom course requires explanation. Five years of student evaluations are required, unless the candidate has been at the Ohio State University for fewer than five years.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will arrange for each candidate an annual peer evaluation of classroom teaching, which may include review of syllabi, assignments, examinations, instructional materials, texts and readings, student work, student interviews, and classroom observation. The designated peer evaluator(s) will submit to the Director a signed report of the evaluation.

Candidates may be requested to provide the following evidence by the committee.

- Copies of course syllabi
- Complete SEI reports for all classes taught
- Verification of teaching awards (if any)
- Verification of accomplishments of students (if any)

6.3.2 Research

Multiple approaches will be used to assess the candidate’s research and scholarly work. Documentation includes:

- Indicators of the quality and impact of the candidate’s publication outlets. This information may include journal circulation, names of current editors, and journal acceptance rates
- Verification of publications (reprints, journal or book table of contents, title pages of books or monographs)

Candidates may be requested to provide the following evidence by the committee.

- Copies of correspondence from publishers, documenting manuscripts accepted for publication
- Copies of correspondence from publishers, documenting manuscripts are in revision
- Copies of awards letters from granting agencies
- Verification of research awards

External evaluations of scholarship are required for all promotion and tenure considerations.

Each committee member will review copies of supporting evidence as part of the dossier.

For each candidate, one committee member will be appointed to verify all citations for publications.

Candidates must indicate their contributions to multiple-authored publications.

Candidates may be asked to provide specific information to assist in the assessment of the quality, relevance, and impact of their publications.

6.3.3 Service

The following information is in addition to “Components of Service” and “Evaluation of Service” in Sections 6.1C.1 and 6.1C.2 above.

It is the candidate’s responsibility to be able to document internal and external service such as participation on various committees, sub-committees, and task forces as well as offices and other responsibilities in professional organizations.

The School Promotion & Tenure Committee will attempt to identify indicators of the quality as well as the quantity of the candidate’s service. Candidates may be requested to provide the following evidence by the committee.

- Letters from committee chairpersons or professional organizations detailing the candidate’s specific and substantive contributions.
- Awards for service.
- Evidence of service organizing panels, symposia, or sessions at professional meetings.
- Evidence of serving as a mentor for faculty members.
- Evidence of Coordinating sections, programs, or courses.

7 APPEALS

The School will follow Faculty Rule 3335-6-05(a), which sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05. This rule requires candidates who believe that they have been improperly evaluated to seek to resolve the matter informally before filing a formal appeal under that rule.

7.1 Seventh Year Reviews

The School will follow Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (b), which sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh-year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year review.