

The College of Education and Human Ecology

Department of Consumer Sciences

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

Criteria and Procedures



June 2008

Revised June 2009

Revised July 2011, approved by OAA September 2011

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures
Department of Consumer Sciences**

Table of Contents

I Preamble	4
II Department Mission	4
III Definitions.....	5
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty	5
2 Conflict of Interest	5
3 Minimum Composition.....	5
B Promotion and Tenure Committee	6
C Quorum.....	6
D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
1 Appointment	6
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	6
IV Appointments.....	6
A Criteria	6
1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty	7
2 Auxiliary Faculty (Adjunct, Lecturer, Visiting Faculty)	8
3 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	8
B Procedures	9
1 Tenure Track Faculty	9
2 Auxiliary Faculty (Adjunct, Lecturer, Visiting Faculty)	11
3 Courtesy Appointments For Regular Faculty	11
V Annual Review Procedures.....	11
A Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	12
1 Fourth-year Review	13
2 Exclusion of Time From the Probationary Period	13

B Tenured Faculty.....	13
VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	13
A Criteria	13
B Procedures	14
C Documentation	15
1 Teaching.....	15
2 Research.....	16
3 Service.....	16
VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	16
A Criteria	16
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	17
2 Promotion to Professor	20
B Procedures	20
1 Candidate Responsibilities.....	21
2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	21
3 Department Chair Responsibilities	23
4 External Evaluations	24
C Documentation	26
1 Teaching.....	26
2 Research.....	27
3 Service.....	27
VIII Appeals.....	28
IX Seventh-year Reviews	28
X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	28
A Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	28
B Procedure for Peer Evaluation of Teaching	29
C Peer Evaluation of Resident Teaching	31
D Peer Evaluation of Extension Teaching.....	31

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews 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 department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department of Consumer Sciences will 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 department chair.

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

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

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

II Department Mission

The mission of the Department of Consumer Sciences is to provide excellence in research and educational programming about the consumer/industry interface in the fields of Consumer and Family Financial Services, Hospitality Management, and Fashion and Retail Studies.

The department is a multidisciplinary academic unit. Through its teaching, research and service activities, the department addresses issues related to meeting consumer needs through customer service, and the acquisition and provision of products and service products in the marketplace—food, clothing, textiles, shelter and financial services.

III Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty

In the Department of Consumer Sciences, the Committee of Eligible Faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors holding a regular appointment in the department who are not administrators.

The eligible faculty for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of regular tenure track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

2 Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

3 Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will develop a list of eligible faculty consisting of three times as many names as positions available from outside the department. This list will be forwarded to the department chair, who will convene a faculty meeting for the purpose of selecting nominees from the list to fill vacant positions. All regular voting faculty in the department are eligible to vote for outside members of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee. The nominee(s) receiving a majority of votes will be deemed acceptable. The department chair may ask any of these acceptable nominees to serve as outside members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Outside member(s) will discuss and vote only on promotion/tenure cases for which they are needed to meet the minimum of three voting members

B Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee in the Department of Consumer Sciences shall consist of all tenured associate professors and professors holding a regular appointment in the department who are not administrators. Only faculty members who have attained the rank to which a candidate seeks promotion may participate in discussion regarding, and vote on, that candidate.

C Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive

IV Appointments

A Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. 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

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

1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the doctoral degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning 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 service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A 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 probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

2 Auxiliary Faculty (Adjunct, Lecturer, Visiting Faculty)

Auxiliary appointments are made for no more than one year at a time.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are never compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty. In the event that the department wishes to compensate an adjunct faculty member for work other than the voluntary service for which the adjunct title is provided, a concurrent appointment of limited duration (lecturer, workshop leader) may be added for that purpose.

Lecturer. 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 or promotion.

Senior Lecturer. 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.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. Appointment at regular titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of auxiliary faculty with regular titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Auxiliary faculty members with regular titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular 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 a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non regular faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular 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.

3 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a regular faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. 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 rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B Procedures

See Volume 1 in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) on the following topics:

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

1 Tenure Track Faculty

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 dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. 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 department 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 department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department.

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 (formerly known as the "green sheet") through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to

rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, 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. 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 circulated print journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the department chair a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the department chair agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the department chair does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty search committee determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research, and teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Following the completion of on-campus interviews, all department faculty members will have the opportunity to complete a candidate comment sheet, indicating their perceptions and vote on the suitability of the candidate for the position. The comments and vote will be summarized by the search committee and presented to the department chair.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible voting faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit.

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

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of

permanent residency status. The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

2 Auxiliary Faculty (Adjunct, Lecturer, Visiting Faculty)

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated auxiliary faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with the department Faculty Advisory Board.

Appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal is considered at a regular faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer.

Auxiliary appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All auxiliary appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on quarter-by-quarter (semester-by-semester) basis.

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

3 Courtesy Appointments For Regular Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a regular faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments annually to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V Annual Review Procedures

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policy on Faculty Annual Review](http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf) (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities;

on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. A face to face meeting between the faculty member and the department chair is a required part of the annual review for every faculty member in the department.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. The Part 1 section of the department's Review and Counseling documentation must be submitted to the department chair no later than a date in spring designated by the chair.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually in autumn by the eligible faculty of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and, as appropriate, future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>)) is invoked. This process is also described in the Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures section of this document. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1 Fourth-year Review

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 and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Since this department follows fourth-year review procedures for all annual reviews of probationary tenure track faculty, no modifications are required for the fourth-year.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty of the P&T Committee determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's research is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the research without outside input.

At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

2 Exclusion of Time From the Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) 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/handbook.html>).

B Tenured Faculty

The department chair will review all associate professors and professors annually. This will include a written review of performance completed by the faculty member (Part 1 section of the department's Review and Counseling document) and an independent assessment by the department chair. A formal face to face meeting between the chair and the faculty member will take place in which the performance, future plans and goals are discussed. A written evaluation is completed by the chair to which the faculty member may respond.

VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A 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.

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Overall expectations of each of the faculty are in accordance with Boyer's categories of "scholarship".

"The scholarship of discovery involves disciplined, investigative patterns of research for the purpose of the generation or discovery of new knowledge. The scholarship of integration involves work that interprets, draws together, and brings new insights to bear on original research as well as the interpretations, fitting of one's own research – or the research of others—into larger intellectual patterns. This form of scholarship might include interdisciplinary, collaborative and integrative studies. The scholarship of application involves the application of research –based knowledge to critical and consequential problems in education and related fields in ways response to social issues and concerns. The scholarship of teaching involves not only sharing knowledge but transforming, extending and generating it as well."

Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

B Procedures

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. 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 department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

C Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that the Department's current Part 1 Review and Counseling document be submitted to the department chair no later than a date in spring designated by the chair.

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

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

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 12 months.

1 Teaching

Documentation of teaching may include both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the dissemination of knowledge including the following:

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required annually for probationary tenure track faculty and as elected by a faculty member considering promotion at some time in the future. (details provided in Section X of this document).
- Pedagogical papers, books, digital programs or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.
- Evidence of efforts to improve the quality of teaching, for example through University Center for the Advancement of Teaching workshops and services.
- Impact of teaching materials developed through their use by other institutions
- Impact of pedagogical papers, books, digital programs and other publications.
- Contributions to new course development or major course revision
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the college, across the university or at other institutions in the development and implementation of teaching materials and methods.
- Development and use of new technologies in teaching, including digital technologies.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching and impact of teaching as appropriate.

2 Research

Documentation of research may include both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the development of knowledge including:

- Scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Impact of scholarly publications.
- 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).
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the department, college or across the university and at other institutions in the development of knowledge.

3 Service

Documentation of service may include both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the service to institutional development and development of the profession including:

- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.
- Recognition or awards by professional organizations for service
- Service on advisory boards and committees for professional organizations
- Service on review panels for journals or granting agencies
- Service on advisory boards and committees for public organizations such as industry or community boards
- Service on department, college and university committees
- Service as a mentor for faculty members
- Service as advisor to student organizations or other efforts contributing to student welfare.

VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A Criteria

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and

responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) 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 department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Excellence in teaching, research, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics (www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm).

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, research, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member's record may include demonstration of:

- up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- active engagement of students in the learning process and encouragement of independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- provision of appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- respectful and courteous treatment of students
- service as advisor to graduate students, as feasible within the department, given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- service as advisor to honors students and as director of undergraduate research as appropriate
- engagement in documentable efforts to improve teaching

In addition, the faculty member's record may also include demonstration of:

- curriculum improvement through revision or development of courses and/or academic programs including cross university interdisciplinary programs and multi-university programs
- published pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, digital programs
- development of teaching materials which have been adopted by other institutions

Research

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member's record may include demonstration of:

- Publication of a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - quality, impact, quantity
 - contribution to a line of inquiry that entails scholarship in any of the four categories outlined in section VI A of this document.
 - Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues.
 - Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
 - While collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described.
- An ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review.
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.
- A high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member's record may include demonstration of:

- contributions to the orderly functioning of the department
- contributions to the profession

2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) 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 faculty, for students, and for the profession. As specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in once area against lighter ones in another.

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 scope of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of an established national and international reputation in the field.

Moreover, it is recognized that faculty “contribute to institutional development in a variety of ways which are consistent with the creation and dissemination of knowledge and contribution of service” (Alutto, 2010). Faculty contributions to the university evolve with their own evolving interest and skills in instruction and research; their interests and skills also evolve in response to the needs of the department, college, and university’s instruction and research missions. These contributions are recognized.

In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

B Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty tracks in the department.

1 Candidate Responsibilities

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

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

2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
- To review this document annually and to make revisions as needed.
- To consider annually, in the spring, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A quorum of two-thirds of the eligible faculty is required to discuss and vote. Only yes and no votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. A recommendation to proceed is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.
 - The P&T Committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

- A tenured faculty member who requests and is denied a formal promotion review must be granted the review in the following year per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>). 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 who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The P&T Committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- A decision by the P&T Committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee process will proceed as described below:

- **Spring:** The Promotion and Tenure Committee will elect a chairperson from its membership each Spring. The term of office shall run from Autumn through Summer. Typically, no individual shall serve as chair for more than two consecutive year-long terms. The chair is responsible for calling committee meetings, leading candidate reviews, drafting and forwarding the committee's letters of candidate evaluations, working with the department chair to ensure a fair and efficient review process, and leading activities to develop and review departmental promotion and tenure procedures and policies. In addition, it is the responsibility of the chair to ensure a dossier is correctly prepared and does not include extraneous or inaccurate information before it is reviewed by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- The Promotion and Tenure Committee will elect a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) from its membership each Spring. The term of office shall run from Autumn through Summer. Typically, no individual shall serve as POD for more than two consecutive year-long terms. It is the responsibility of the POD to assure that the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee follows written procedures governing its reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of under-represented groups that could bias their review. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review are brought to the attention of the Committee. If difficulties or concerns are not resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee, they are brought to the attention of the department chair. The department chair must investigate

the matter and provide a response to the designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is not warranted.

- **Late Spring:** The P&T Committee suggests names of external evaluators to the department chair for upcoming candidates.
- **Early Autumn:** The P&T committee chair will 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.
- The P&T chair will meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- The P&T chair appoints an individual from the P&T Committee to draft a summary analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to present to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the time of the meeting in which the candidate's dossier will be reviewed. This summary serves to focus discussion at the meeting, and in no way relieves the other P&T committee members from their obligation to review the entire dossier of the candidate. The individual takes no position in presenting the analysis of the record.
- The P&T Committee provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The P&T Committee does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- **Mid autumn:** The eligible members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews each candidate's dossier thoroughly and objectively in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- At the meeting in which the candidate's case is discussed, the P&T chair's appointee who has prepared an analysis of the dossier presents a summary of that analysis.
- The eligible members of the P&T participate in the discussion and vote. A quorum of two-thirds of the eligible members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee not on an approved leave of absence must be present at the meeting to discuss and vote. Only "yes" or "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. A positive recommendation is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

3 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure may not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Late Spring:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the chair and the candidate.
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- **Mid-Autumn:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and department chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of auxiliary faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.

4 External Evaluations

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

External evaluations are optional in other reviews and will be obtained as needed. When obtained, they should meet the criteria described below. For special cases, in fourth year review, external evaluations may be solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the review. This may occur when the candidate's research is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the research without outside input.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter 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.

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

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

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

Under no circumstances should candidates contact prospective or actual external evaluators regarding their case at any stage of the review process, nor should they discuss their case with any evaluator or provide additional materials to any evaluator even if the evaluator initiates the contact. Such contact compromises the integrity of the review process. Soliciting external

evaluators and providing materials to them is solely the responsibility of the Department chair (TIU head) and the P&T committee chair.

All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier unless OAA approves their removal from the review process. 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

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

The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of research and service noted below is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

- Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

1 Teaching

For the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, documentation of teaching may include both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the dissemination of knowledge including the following:

- Cumulative SEI reports (e-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 annually for probationary tenure track faculty and if as elected by a faculty member considering promotion at some time in the future (details provided in the Appendix to this document)
- Pedagogical papers, books, digital programs, or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including

- involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
- mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
- extension and continuing education instruction
- involvement in curriculum development
- awards and formal recognition of teaching
- presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
- adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- Evidence of efforts to improve the quality of teaching, for example through University Center for the Advancement of Teaching workshops and services.
- Impact of teaching materials developed through their use by other institutions
- Impact of pedagogical papers, books, digital programs and other publications..
- Contributions to new course development or major course revision
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the college, across the university or at other institutions in the development and implementation of teaching materials and methods.
- Development and use of new technologies in teaching, including digital technologies.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching and impact of teaching as appropriate.

2 Research

For the time period since the last promotion, documentation of research may include both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the development of knowledge including:

- Scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Impact of scholarly publications.
- Grants and contracts received
- Research activities as listed in the core dossier
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the department, college or across the university and at other institutions in the development of knowledge.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publication where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)

3 Service

For the time period since the last promotion documentation of service may include both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the service to institutional development and development of the profession including:

- Documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier
- Involvement with professional journals and professional societies
- Recognition or awards by professional organizations for service
- Recognition or awards for service to the university, college or department
- Service on advisory boards and committees for professional organizations
- Service on review panels for journals or granting agencies
- Service on advisory boards and committees for public organizations such as industry or community boards
- Service on department, college and university committees
- Service as a mentor for faculty members
- Service as advisor to student organizations or other efforts contributing to student welfare.

VIII Appeals

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05(<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) 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/rules/university-rules.html>).

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/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Student Evaluation of Instruction (e-SEI) is required for every department course except independent studies, thesis research, dissertation research and similar types of courses. The eSEI is administered through the Registrar's Office. During week 8 of the quarter, students enrolled in a class receive an e-mail message from the SEI Administrator asking them to complete the

eSEI during weeks 9 and 10. Students not responding by early week 10 are sent a reminder e-mail. During weeks 8 or 9 of the quarter, faculty should inform students of the importance of completing the eSEI. Faculty members may also consider sending an e-mail message to all students enrolled in the class encouraging them to complete the eSEI.

B Procedure for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Each year the department chair will assess the need for peer review of teaching, considering the needs of the untenured faculty and the requests from tenured faculty who are considering promotion. The chair will assign peer reviewers for these needs. While peer teaching reviewers are asked to serve as needed for a one-year term, it is possible that continued service may be required; however, a reasonable effort will be made to distribute service among the tenured faculty. It may be necessary to request service from tenured faculty members from outside the department as ad hoc reviewers for peer evaluation of teaching. These individuals must have the requisite subject matter expertise. While it is desirable for a peer reviewer to be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, this is not required.

The responsibilities of the Peer Reviewer are:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure track faculty at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year.
- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors as elected by the faculty member with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review. In preparation for promotion to full professor, the reviews need to include summative assessment of teaching achievements throughout the faculty member's career.
- The peer evaluation of teaching is a narrative report in the form of a letter to the department chair. The letter by the evaluator should be sent to the department chair within three weeks after the observation or by the end of the term in the case of summative teaching reviews. The department chair will share the letter with the reviewed faculty member.

The areas to be addressed in the letter to the department chair should include the following six general areas. The bulleted areas are illustrative.

1. Curriculum Choice and Development
 - Appropriateness for audience
 - Specific course/workshop objectives
 - Supporting materials, current and well chosen
 - Rigorous
2. How Faculty Member Promotes Learning
 - Learning objectives clearly stated and developed

- Teaching materials useful to learners in their own situations
- Provides class members with opportunities for participating
- Summarizes/clearly identifies key points
- Personal Characteristics: enthusiasm: genuine interest in student success; self confidence; ethical behavior
- Task oriented and/or businesslike behavior
- Answers questions clearly
- Approachable and accessible to participants

3. Faculty Member Preparedness

- Significant disciplinary knowledge; technically accurate
- Logical organization of class time and presentation
- Mastery of a variety of teaching methods
- Accommodates differences among learners
- Keeps the class members focused on the objectives

4. Strategies for Instruction

- Effective use of a variety of methods and materials
- Appropriate instructional materials selected for topic(s)
- Uses questioning to enable critical thinking by learners
- Quality of session materials such as handouts, audio-visual aids and web sites
- Uses class time effectively

5. Evaluation of Learning

- Evaluation materials appropriate to the objectives
- Appropriate and timely feedback on how activities/projects/assignments contribute to learning
- Documentation of learning outcomes by participants

6. Summary Comments

- General comments
- Strengths/things that worked
- Areas for improvement. Include a specific list of suggestions for addressing problems observed
- Comparison to last review by this observer (if appropriate)

A faculty member may provide written comments on these reports and the reviewer may respond in writing to the comments. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in a faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests that all comments be excluded.

Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative (they provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews, and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching).

C Peer Evaluation of Resident Teaching

Peer review focuses on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as curricular choices given the goals of the course, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, appropriateness relative to current discipline knowledge, etc. These reviews should provide not only an assessment of the faculty member's teaching but also advice to improve a faculty member's teaching.

The peer review includes classroom visitation as well as reviews of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and examinations. The review will consist of a class visit with visits being unannounced. No more than one reviewer will attend a single class period. At the beginning of the quarter, the peer reviewer will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because of examinations, guest speakers, or other atypical activities.

It is important for the peer evaluation of resident teaching to reflect the various types of courses a faculty member teaches. That is, it should reflect lower-division and upper-division undergraduate courses, graduate courses, survey courses, major courses, etc. depending on a given faculty member's teaching responsibilities. However, at the same time it is important to recognize that all courses are not conducive to peer evaluation. For example, independent/individual study courses, "experimental" courses, etc. should typically not be peer reviewed.

D Peer Evaluation of Extension Teaching

Peer evaluation of extension teaching is intended to identify teaching quality characteristics that cannot be obtained from students/participants. These reviews should provide not only an assessment of the faculty member's teaching but also advice to improve a faculty member's teaching.

The peer review includes on-site visitation as well as reviews of course materials (syllabi, teaching outlines, handouts, projects, audio/visuals, web sites, outcome evaluations, etc.). On-site visits are unannounced. No more than one reviewer will make an on-site visitation for a given teaching event. At the beginning of the review period, the peer reviewer will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be appropriate.

It is important for the peer evaluation of extension teaching to reflect the various types of extension teaching. That is, it should reflect the various audience types (e.g. community leaders, community members, extension professionals, etc.) a faculty member teaches in a given year.