

**The Department of Educational Studies**  
**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document**

**Provisionally Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: December 5, 2025**

## Table of Contents

1	PREAMBLE .....	4
2	DEPARTMENT MISSION .....	4
3	DEFINITIONS .....	5
3.1.1	Tenure-Track Faculty .....	5
3.1.2	Clinical Faculty .....	6
3.1.3	Associated Faculty .....	6
3.1.4	Conflict of Interest .....	7
3.1.5	Minimum Composition .....	7
3.2	Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee .....	8
3.3	Quorum .....	8
3.4	Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty .....	8
3.4.1	Appointment .....	9
3.4.2	Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal .....	9
4	APPOINTMENTS .....	9
4.1	Criteria .....	9
4.1.1	Tenure-Track Faculty .....	9
4.1.2	Clinical Faculty .....	10
4.1.3	Associated Faculty .....	12
4.1.4	Regional Campus Faculty .....	13
4.1.5	Emeritus Faculty .....	13
4.1.6	Joint Appointments .....	13
4.1.7	Courtesy Appointments .....	14
4.2	Procedures .....	14
4.2.1	Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	14
4.2.2	Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	16
4.2.3	Transfer from the Tenure Track .....	16
4.2.4	TIU Transfer .....	16
4.2.5	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Camps .....	16
4.2.6	Regional Campus Faculty .....	17
4.2.7	Joint Appointments .....	17
4.2.8	Courtesy Appointments .....	18
5	ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES .....	18
5.1	Documentation .....	19
5.2	Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty .....	19
5.2.1	Fourth-Year Review .....	20
5.2.2	Extension of the Tenure Clock .....	20
5.3	Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	21
5.4	Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	21
5.5	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	22
5.6	Regional Campus Faculty .....	22
5.7	Salary Recommendations .....	22
6	PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS .....	24

6.1	Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion .....	24
6.1.1	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure .....	24
6.1.2	Promotion to Professor .....	27
6.1.3	Clinical Faculty .....	28
6.1.4	Associated Faculty .....	28
6.1.5	Regional Campus Faculty .....	29
6.2	Procedures .....	29
6.2.1	Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	29
6.2.1.1	Candidate Responsibilities .....	29
6.2.1.1.1	Dossier .....	29
6.2.1.1.2	Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document .....	31
6.2.1.1.3	External Evaluations .....	32
6.2.2	Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities .....	32
6.2.3	Eligible Faculty Responsibilities .....	33
6.2.4	Department Chair Responsibilities .....	33
6.3	Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	34
6.4	Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty .....	34
6.5	External Evaluations .....	35
7	PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS .....	37
8	SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS .....	38
9	PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING .....	38
9.1	Student Evaluation of Teaching .....	38
9.2	Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....	38
	Appendix A: Evaluation Rubric for Faculty Duties .....	40
	Appendix B: Additional Guidance on the Peer Review of Teaching .....	50
	Appendix C: Criteria and Types of Evidence: P&T .....	52

## 1 PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); 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 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 or 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](#) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty experience.

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

## 2 DEPARTMENT MISSION

### **Mission**

Across our unique tapestry of academic specializations, we prepare knowledgeable and ethical leaders, scholars, practitioners and global citizens and produce innovative research to transform schools, colleges and universities, non-profits, community agencies, and policy entities to effectively address the challenges of rapidly changing societies.

### **Vision**

We work to serve local, national, and international communities, promoting sound research, dialogue, reciprocity, ethics, and strategic partnerships. Collectively, we endeavor to make a positive impact on the growth, vitality and wellness of children, adults, families, communities, and the workforce in Ohio and beyond through the application of our teaching, research and service.

### **Values**

Guided by the College of Education and Human Ecology Core Values: Excellence, Justice, Innovation, and Internationalization, we approach our work:

- Through modeling, mentoring, and student-centered instruction
- Through rigorous professional preparation
- By enacting meaningful engagement and service to urban, suburban and rural communities
- By promoting research engagement among our students and excellence in research methodology in all its forms
- Through technological innovation to improve learning and development
- With collaboration and respectful dialogue about social issues
- By engaging in transdisciplinary and transformative scholarship
- Through promoting critical engagement with pedagogical and epistemological issues to ensure that false narratives are countered in favor of research-based teaching, scholarship, and service.
- By teaching and promoting wellness across the lifespan
- Through connecting and partnering with federal/state/local/global communities, as well as scholarly and professional communities
- Through continuous self-reflection and accountability in our recruitment and retention of students and faculty with different perspectives, so that we are transformed into a more ethical, respectful, and rigorous community of inquiry.
- Through training leaders and practicing leadership to address systemic problems in education.

### 3 DEFINITIONS

#### 3.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the department.

The department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

##### 3.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty

###### Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** No vote of the eligible faculty is needed for the initial appointment of a tenure-track assistant professor.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank at associate professor or professor level must then be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

###### Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the promotion reviews of associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

### **3.1.2 Clinical Faculty**

#### **Appointment Reviews**

- **Initial Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an associate clinical professor or a clinical professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all clinical faculty in the department of equal or higher rank.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank in the case of associate professor or full professor must then be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

#### **Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all non-probationary associate clinical professors and clinical professors.
- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate clinical professors, and the reappointment reviews of clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors, and all nonprobationary clinical professors.

### **3.1.3 Associated Faculty**

#### **Initial Appointment and Reappointment**

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair based on search committee recommendations.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all nonprobationary clinical faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.
- Reappointments are decided by the Department Chair, in consultation with the EHE Office of Faculty Affairs.

#### **Promotion Reviews**

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track or clinical faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1 or 2 above.

For the promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer the eligible faculty shall of all tenure-track and nonprobationary clinical faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

### **3.1.4 Conflict of Interest**

- Search Committee Conflict of Interest**

A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process if the member:

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- 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 (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

- Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest**

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when he/she/they are or have been to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

Such faculty members will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

If an eligible faculty member refuses to recuse himself or herself but the Department Chair determines that the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest due to one or more reasons described above, the Chair has the authority to remove the person from the pool of eligible voters.

A faculty member who recuses her/himself or is removed by the department chair cannot observe, participate, or vote in the deliberation process.

### **3.1.5 Minimum Composition**

If the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

### **3.2 Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee**

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The P&T Subcommittee consists of at least five (5) tenured faculty members elected for staggered three-year terms from May 1 of one calendar year to April 30 three years later. A majority of the subcommittee members must be professors and at least one member must be an associate professor. Subcommittee members are elected by nominations from the faculty at large, consistent with university and college rules. A professor alternate and an associate professor alternate shall also be elected. A chair will be elected by subcommittee members annually; the chair must be a professor. On an annual basis, the subcommittee also will elect one or more Procedures Oversight Designees (PODs) after discussing and reaching agreement on distributing POD duties within the subcommittee. If a single POD is chosen, the faculty member must be a professor unless there are no candidates being reviewed for professor. If PODs are assigned to individual cases, an associate professor can serve as POD for candidates being reviewed for promotion to associate professor and for fourth-year review cases. The term of service on the subcommittee is three years on a rotating basis. Subcommittee members can be reappointed after two years. The alternates serve a one-year term and can be reappointed via faculty vote annually up to a total of three years. After this timeframe, alternates can be reappointed after two years.

When considering cases involving clinical faculty, the Promotion and Tenure Committee subcommittee may be augmented by two nonprobationary clinical faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

### **3.3 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. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. 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 a quorum.

### **3.4 Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” or “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not allowed. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

If the faculty member participates in the entire discussion, but leaves prior to voting for a reason beyond their control, they should provide their vote to the POD prior to leaving. An eligible faculty member who leaves the meeting after the discussion but before the vote must notify the POD before departing that he or she must

depart for a reason outside the person's control. The POD reserves the right to determine if the reason is justified.

### **3.4.1 Appointment**

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

- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint appointment TIU prior to his or her appointment.

### **3.4.2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Promotion, and Contract Renewal**

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast by faculty eligible to vote are positive.

- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint appointment TIU prior to his or her reappointment or promotion and/or tenure.

## **4 APPOINTMENTS**

### **4.1 Criteria**

The department seeks international distinction in education, scholarship, and public service. Consequently, the department shall make every effort to employ faculty members who can help meet this standard.

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 in teaching, scholarship 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 appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment.

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

#### **4.1.1 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 terminal 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. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the 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, because 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 terminal degree 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. The granting of prior service credit requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, and cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

**Associate Professor and Professor.** Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor 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. Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible.

All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the executive vice president and provost.

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

#### **4.1.2 Clinical Faculty**

Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. Clinical faculty can be appointed at the Instructor, Assistant, Associate, or Professor level. Appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval by the college dean and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other clinical faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract at all ranks is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate clinical professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) or financial exigency (see Faculty Rule [3335-5-02.1](#)). If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member

is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period (see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#)). By the end of that year, the clinical faculty member shall be notified whether a new contract will be offered.

In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that a new contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

**Instructor.** Appointment is normally made at the rank of Instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree or has not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment.

The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three- year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed the requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant clinical professor by the beginning of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

**Assistant Clinical Professor.** A terminal degree and/or appropriate credentials demonstrating relevant expertise in the field of study, and extensive experience in the workplace are the minimum requirements for the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor. Evidence of potential for high quality teaching and high-quality service to the profession is highly desirable.

Criteria for appointment as an Assistant Clinical Professor:

- A terminal degree and/or appropriate credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study.
- Evidence of current clinical experience appropriate to the teaching and service role expected within the unit of hire (minimum of five years).
- Evidence of current knowledge of research impacting practice within the field of study.

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

Criteria for appointment as, or promotion to, Associate Clinical Professor:

- A terminal degree and/or appropriate credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study.
- Current professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study.
- Evidence of current knowledge of research impacting practice within the field of study.
- Evidence of sustained high-quality teaching.
- Evidence of high-quality and impactful service both within and outside of the university.
- Although scholarship is not required, the faculty can document evidence of scholarship as it pertains to the scholarship of teaching, and this scholarship can be used as evidence for excellence in teaching.

**Clinical Professor.** The awarding of the rank of Clinical Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the clinical faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching and has demonstrated leadership in service at both the local and national level.

Criteria for appointment as, or promotion to, Clinical Professor:

- An earned doctoral degree in relevant field of study.
- Current professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study.
- Evidence of current knowledge of research impacting practice with the field of study.
- Evidence of ongoing engagement with practitioners in relevant context.
- Evidence of sustained high-quality teaching.
- Evidence of high-quality and impactful service both within and outside of the university.
- Evidence of high-quality and impactful service at a local, state, and/or national level.
- Although scholarship is not required, the faculty can document evidence of scholarship as it pertains to the scholarship of teaching, and this scholarship can be used as evidence for excellence in teaching.

#### **4.1.3 Associated Faculty**

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple of weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

**Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.** Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track or clinical faculty of equivalent rank. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or clinical faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments are rarely compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who provide academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track or clinical faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

**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, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

**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 a record of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.

**Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.** Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1–49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

**Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor.** Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of

tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may be reappointed annually for only three consecutive years.

#### **4.1.4 Regional Campus Faculty**

The mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction; therefore, teaching experience and the quality of instruction are given greater emphasis than for Columbus campus appointments at the tenure-track ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Given this greater emphasis on undergraduate teaching, regional campus faculty are not expected to produce the same quantity of research as Columbus campus faculty; however, all research should be of comparable quality.

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of clinical faculty and associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus faculty in each of these categories.

#### **4.1.5 Emeritus Faculty**

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-36](#). Full-time tenure track, clinical, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured and nonprobationary associate clinical professors and clinical professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair, who will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

#### **4.1.6 Joint Appointments**

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a [memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

#### **4.1.7 Courtesy Appointments**

Courtesy appointments (0% FTE) may be made by the chair from the recommendation of program faculty. Appointments of a tenure-track or clinical faculty member from another department at Ohio State may be renewed periodically by the chair. Appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

### **4.2 Procedures**

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

#### **4.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

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 as well as other fields within the department.
- Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system..

The [SHIFT](#) Framework serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and

staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

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

Following completion of virtual/on-campus interviews, the search committee meets to discuss perceptions and preferences and to indicate if each candidate is acceptable. The search committee reports its recommendation on each candidate to the department chair. If more than one candidate is supported by the committee and the chair, the department chair discusses with the dean which candidate to approach first and the details of the offer, including compensation, service credit, and rank.

The department will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An MOU must

be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

#### **4.2.2 Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Searches for clinical faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on clinical/professional practice rather than scholarship.

#### **4.2.3 Transfer from the Tenure-Track**

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a clinical appointment if appropriate circumstances exist.

The department will abide by the following:

- The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed;
- When a tenured faculty member transfers to the clinical faculty, tenure is lost; and
- All transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

Per Faculty Rule [3335-7-10](#), transfers from a clinical appointment to the tenure-track position are not permitted. Clinical faculty may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

#### **4.2.4 TIU Transfer**

Following consultation with the TIU heads and college dean(s), a tenure-track faculty member may voluntarily move from one TIU to another upon approval of a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

The Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

#### **4.2.5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The appointment of all compensated associated faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The

appointment is then decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the appropriate program chair.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the relevant program area faculty.

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

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

#### **4.2.6    Regional Campus Faculty**

The appointment of all compensated regional campus faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) and candidate interviews.

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the dean/director or their designees consults with the department chair to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the Columbus campus.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, the Columbus campus department chair, and either the regional campus search committee or a broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A hiring decision requires agreement by the Columbus campus department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by both the Columbus campus department chair and the regional campus dean.

Searches for regional campus clinical and associated faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

#### **4.2.7    Joint Appointments**

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section 4.1.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An [MOU](#) signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint

appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

#### **4.2.8 Courtesy Appointments**

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or clinical faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is provided to the department chair, who extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments at least once every three years in consultation with the program faculty.

### **5 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES**

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment Policy](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

The Department Chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the Department Chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's "Evaluation Rubric For Faculty Duties" (see appendix A). The evaluation will consider the faculty member's responsibilities and workload, as well as any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual and on his/her/their progress toward promotion, if relevant. The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

In the Department of Educational Studies, each faculty member's annual review materials will be reviewed by the Chair, Associate Chair, the faculty member's Program Chair, and at least one outside program chair. Each Program Chair will offer an independent rating of the faculty member's materials based on the Evaluation

Rubric Relating to Faculty Duties, and the results will be discussed in a meeting of the Executive Committee. A draft annual performance letter will be provided to each faculty member prior to finalization. The Department Chair will make the final judgment about performance, taking into account the Program Chair ratings, the comments at the Executive Committee meeting, and the feedback from the faculty member on the draft letter. In all cases, accountability for the annual review process resides with the department chair.

It is expected that Executive Committee members involved with a review who have a conflict of interest will recuse themselves. See the Pattern of Administration for specific requirements and procedures. The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

While ideally there will be alignment between the annual evaluation reviews and the reviews conducted for fourth-year or promotion and/or tenure cases, the process is different for the two types of review, and conclusions reached through one process may not necessarily match the conclusions reached in the other.

It is expected that the information in the annual reviews will be used to inform, in part, the fourth-year or promotion and/or tenure cases of tenure-track faculty.

## 5.1 Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair at a set date in late January:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty and associate professors*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- a summary of the past year's activities and goals for the upcoming year (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section 6 of this document.

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

## 5.2 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair, with written input from the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee and in consultation with the Executive Committee. The department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee chair meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee each prepare an independent written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The P&T subcommittee letter will focus on year in review as well as within the context of the cumulative work in rank.

If the chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final, pending review by the dean. The 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 Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee's letter and the chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if submitted) are forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letters become part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if submitted).

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

### **5.2.1 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.

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate, and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will write a review letter. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by anonymous, written ballot.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee letter to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

If either the department chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

### **5.2.2 Extension of the Tenure Clock**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (E) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time

extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review [.](#)

### **5.3 Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who conducts an independent assessment alongside consultation from the Executive Committee; may meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who conducts an independent assessment alongside consultation from the Executive Committee. Leadership may meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance in light of these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

### **5.4 Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The annual performance and merit review process for clinical probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively, except that non-probationary clinical faculty may participate in the review of clinical faculty of lower rank. In general, there should be no expectation of an alignment between an annual evaluation and reviews conducted for clinical faculty and the evaluation during the penultimate contract year. It is expected that the information in the annual reviews will be used to inform, in part, the evaluation of the penultimate contract year.

In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, the dean, in consultation with the department chair and associate dean of faculty affairs, determines whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited.

To secure a renewal of contract, there needs to be convincing evidence that the clinical faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching and has demonstrated leadership in service at both the local and national level. The record shall indicate a positive trajectory toward the next rank of promotion, if applicable. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

## **5.5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

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

## **5.6 Regional Campus Faculty**

The annual performance and merit review of a regional campus probationary tenure-track or tenured faculty member is conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period.. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and feedback. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

The annual performance and merit review of a regional campus clinical faculty member is conducted on the regional campus. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a clinical faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted entirely on the regional campus.

## **5.7 Salary Recommendations**

In accordance with the concept of shared governance, the Department of Educational Studies will use a committee structure working in concert with the department chair to make recommendations for faculty salary increases. Specifically, the Executive Committee will advise the chair on salary matters. The committee's primary role is to assess the summary of the past year's activities (see Documentation above) submitted by individual faculty. The Committee also may provide advice on procedural questions, as allowable under college and university procedural rules for the period of review.

Annual evaluation occurs during the spring semester, and the chair sends evaluation letters in May. Salary determinations are made after the dean announces the pool that will be available for annual raises. Salary increases for the subsequent fiscal year will go into effect as of September 1<sup>st</sup>, unless otherwise designated by the university. Salary decisions for faculty on regional campuses are made by the campus dean/director.

The Department aims to distribute available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. Salary decision will be made based on ratings produced by the annual review and will consider market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it.

Recommendations for salary increases are made by the Chair to the Dean, who may modify them. The achievement of excellence in teaching, research, and service with impact is the primary measure of success in the compensation strategy of the college. Principles for faculty and staff compensation are also contained in annual statements issued by the college. In the case of family medical leaves, annual evaluations will conform to university guidelines concerning salary increases. The time frame for assessing performance will be primarily the past year, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity over the last three years.

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 and rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Specifically, an assistant professor is expected to meet criteria that are consistent with eventual advancement to the rank of associate professor. An associate professor is expected to meet criteria that are consistent with eventual advancement to the rank of professor. And, professors are expected to sustain the record that resulted in promotion. Associate professors and professors are expected to contribute equitably in department, college, and university service. These performance criteria are captured in the department's "Evaluation Rubric for Faculty Duties" (see Appendix A).

Merit increases will be commensurate with performance in teaching, research, and service. Evaluation of teaching depends on reports of student evaluations, indicators of academic quality of the teaching, and generation of credit hours. The department has a separate "Additional Guidance on Conducting the Peer Review of Teaching" document (see Appendix B) that will serve as a basis for providing additional information about the evaluation of teaching.

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.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section 5.1 above) for an annual performance and merit 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.

## **6 PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS**

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

*In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.*

### **6.1 Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion**

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations.

#### **6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) 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 an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. 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 high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Poor performance in one area cannot be counterbalanced by excellent performance in another area.

All judgments will be made within the context of the candidate's assigned responsibilities and consistent with the conditions of the appointment throughout the review period (see Faculty Rule [3335-6](#)).

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, 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.

#### *6.1.1.1 Teaching*

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have high quality teaching. This may be evidenced by the faculty member having:

- Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.
- Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively.
- Demonstrated competence in the use of various modes of instruction (e.g., lecture, discussion, lab; in-person, distance learning, hybrid).
- Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process.
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process.
- Treated students with respect and courtesy.
- Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs.
- Served as advisor or co-advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student to faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise. (See also the department POA for information on mentoring junior faculty.) Graduate advising is not an expectation for regional campus faculty.
- Served as advisor to undergraduate or licensure students, if appropriate.
- Served as a mentor to undergraduate and/or graduate students, when appropriate.
- Achieved "P" graduate faculty status, unless at a regional campus.
- Documented efforts to improve teaching.
- Engaged in the scholarship of teaching. This can be defined as inquiry into teaching or learning that advances classroom practice in higher education by making research findings public. Scholarship in this area can be used as evidence for excellence in either teaching or research, but not both.

Types of evidence that can be presented to support these aspects of teaching can be found in Appendix C.

### *6.1.1.2 Scholarship*

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have published a body of work in high-quality venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be cited or otherwise shows evidence of influence on the work of others.

Peer reviewed journals and books are primary, and other scholarly works can contribute to the portfolio. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:

- Quality, impact, quantity. The candidate is strongly encouraged to consult with faculty in the program area and the department chair regarding measurements for these constructs.
- Original and independent contribution to a line of inquiry. The candidate should provide evidence of sole or lead authorship.
- Although 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 to permit accurate assessment of individual contribution.
- Evidence of quality of the candidate's scholarship, based on discipline specific indicators (e.g., journal impact factors, h index, citation rate, publication reputation). Archival journal publications, books, and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, original works more than edited works, and refereed publications more than non-refereed publications.
- Empirical (i.e., based on data), theoretical, methodological, and/or conceptual work are all considered part of the candidate's profile and should demonstrate the ability to conduct such work and to mentor future scholars. In all instances, superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion.
- The development of coherence and a clear scholarly identity in the research program over time.

In addition, candidates are strongly encouraged to demonstrate attempts to obtain research program funding.

- Evidence of the candidate's contribution to grant proposals and, if funded, contribution to conducting grant-related activities, based on discipline specific indicators, should be documented.
- Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, as it serves as a quality indicator of research programs.
- Grants that support or enhance the candidate's scholarly development are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate activities that do not enhance the development of the candidate's scholarship (e.g., training grants).
- Grant activities that result in publication are especially encouraged.

All candidates are expected to document the following:

- A developing national 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 citations in other researchers' publications.
- Articulation of how the candidate's scholarship demonstrates its relevance and alignment with the discipline, impact on the field, and potential for continued productivity.
- 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 students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Types of evidence that can be presented to support these aspects of teaching can be found in Appendix C.

#### *6.1.1.3 Service*

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have made appropriate contributions to:

- The department (the contributions of regional campus faculty may be limited to their campuses);
- The profession, the university, and the community.

As part of service, faculty may also contribute to public scholarship or a “scholarship of leadership.” This is research intended to help leaders guide their institutions and make evidence-informed decisions, and it is research that is made available to the public. Examples include research which helps leaders (e.g., policymakers, elected officials, organizational leaders) make decisions to address challenges like economic, social, political, health, or educational inequality. Public scholarship, or scholarship of leadership can count towards excellence in either service or scholarship, but not both, and if considered as scholarship, must result in publications or other scholarly products as described in Section 6.2.1.1.1.

### **6.1.2 Promotion to Professor**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) 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.*

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, 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 quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and international reputation in the field. The time frame of review shall begin from the date of the last promotion. A “significant body of scholarship” in this department will generally include at least twelve high-quality, peer-reviewed publications produced since last promotion, with the caveats described in section 6.1.1.2.

For promotion to Professor, it is generally expected that senior faculty have effectively mentored doctoral students through the dissertation phase; have effectively served in department-, college- and university-level service and/or leadership roles; and taken steps to continually improve as a teacher. While not all faculty members can contribute excellence in all evaluation dimensions, given different assignments and opportunities, promotion to Professor in the Department of Educational Studies requires evidence of sustained excellence in research.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional

responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university. Issues related to differential workload are addressed in the Pattern of Administration.

### **6.1.3 Clinical Faculty**

**Promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor.** For promotion to assistant clinical professor, a faculty member must complete his/her/their doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in his/her/their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

**Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor.** For promotion to associate clinical professor, a clinical faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service, must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice, and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate clinical professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Scholarship activity is not expected; however, faculty can document evidence of scholarship as it pertains to scholarship of teaching and this can be used as evidence for teaching. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

**Promotion to Clinical Professor.** For promotion to clinical professor , a clinical faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice and leadership in service to the department and to the profession. Scholarship activity is not expected; however, faculty can document evidence of scholarship as it pertains to scholarship of teaching and be used as evidence for teaching. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

### **6.1.4 Associated Faculty**

**Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor.** The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track or clinical faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above.

**Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50%.** The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer.** Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section 4.1.3.

**Promotion of Visiting Faculty.** Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

### **6.1.5 Regional Campus Faculty**

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. Recognizing that the character and quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

In evaluating regional campus clinical faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of clinical faculty above. Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. The decision of the regional campus dean is final.

## **6.2 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](#) for tenure-track faculty, 3335-7-05 for clinical faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). In all cases, the review procedure follows the university's and college's calendar and deadlines.

### **6.2.1 Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Promotion reviews of Clinical Faculty are nonmandatory reviews. The initial review is conducted by the Promotion & Tenure subcommittee. A positive decision by the subcommittee permits the review to proceed to a deliberation and vote by the full eligible faculty. If the request for a non-mandatory promotion review occurs during the first [i.e., probationary] contract, there is no limit to the number of times that a candidate can be denied a formal non-mandatory review. If the request for a non-mandatory promotion review occurs during non-probationary contracts, the candidate can only be denied a formal full review one time.

#### **6.2.1.1 Candidate Responsibilities**

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

##### **6.2.1.1.1 Dossier**

By August 1 every candidate must submit to the department chair a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#). 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.

While the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee 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 him or her. Occasionally it may be appropriate to amend the record when significant new information about items in the dossier becomes available; examples include acceptances of publications of works listed in progress; funding of grants listed as submitted; or contracts or patents that have received a license or other commercial activity. An amended record must be reviewed by all parties to the review process.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion or reappointment may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of teaching is forwarded along with the dossier. The documentation of scholarship and service is for use during the departmental review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

### **Teaching Materials Submitted Should Include:**

- Class specific and cumulative SSLE reports (Survey of Student Learning Experiences computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class for which they are available.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program. If a candidate's case is to be evaluated in the fall semester of a given calendar year, she or he will need the required number of peer evaluations completed by the end of the prior academic year. See Section 9, Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier may include:
  - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, dissertations, and undergraduate research,
  - mentoring of students

- 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,
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

### **Scholarship Materials Submitted Should Include:**

- Citations for all books, articles, and 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.
- Citations of grants and contracts submitted.
- Lists of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus such as artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites.
- Lists of inventions, patents, disclosures, options, and commercial licenses.
- Lists of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.
- The same materials sent to the external reviewers shall be made available to the eligible faculty.
- Other published works should be available upon request.

### **Service Materials Should List:**

- Involvement with professional journals, professional societies, and funding agencies.
- Consultation activity with industry, education, or government.
- Uncompensated clinical services.
- Uncompensated community service
- Administrative service to department.
- Administrative service to college.
- Administrative service to university and student life.
- Mentoring colleagues.
- Advising to student groups and organizations.
- Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department.
- Documentation (e.g., letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

#### **6.2.1.1.2 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document**

Candidates must indicate the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed using the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of clinical faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved

version available [here](#), a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

#### **6.2.1.1.3 External Evaluations** (see also External Evaluations below)

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair 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. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. No more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier.

### **6.2.2 Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend revisions to the faculty, if warranted.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to provide written feedback as to whether such a review should take place. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed. Faculty seeking a non-mandatory review should inform the department chair and the chair of the promotion and tenure subcommittee by March 1st.
- Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. The subcommittee bases its feedback 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, including student and peer evaluations of teaching. Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for non-probationary clinical faculty. 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.
- This one-time denial rule does not apply to untenured tenure-track faculty or probationary clinical faculty (see Section 6.2.1.).
- The feedback from the subcommittee in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
- **Late Spring Semester:** Selects from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the subcommittee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).
- **Late Spring Semester:** Suggests names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

- **Early Autumn Semester:** Reviews candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements and works with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
  - Meets with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier.
  - This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
  - Drafts an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier and seeks to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The subcommittee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
  - Revises the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting and forwards the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
  - Provides a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
  - Provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is in another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases as the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on department cases.

### **6.2.3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities**

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

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

### **6.2.4 Department Chair Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations, below.)

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted upon.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process of the:
  - recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair,
  - availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair,
  - 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 warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

### 6.3 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the procedures detailed in Section 6.2 above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases).

### 6.4 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

The responsibilities of regional campus candidates are the same as those of a Columbus campus candidate as described above.

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus

review focuses on teaching and service. The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean/director and the department chair.

Regional campus clinical faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. Following the review, the dean/director consults with the faculty member's department chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

Associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The decision of the regional campus dean/director is final.

## **6.5      External Evaluations**

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs:

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Indiana University Bloomington

University of Iowa

University of Maryland, College Park

University of Michigan

Michigan State University

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

University of Nebraska–Lincoln

Northwestern University

University of Oregon

Pennsylvania State University

Purdue University

Rutgers University

University of California, Los Angeles

University of Southern California

University of Washington

University of Wisconsin–Madison

Vanderbilt University

Stanford University

Harvard University

University of California, Berkley

University of Arizona

Arizona State University

University of Utah

University of Colorado, Boulder

New York University

University of Texas, Austin

University of North Carolina  
North Carolina State University  
Columbia University (Teachers College)  
University of Florida  
University of Kansas  
University of Virginia  
Florida State University  
Boston College  
Virginia Commonwealth University

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical or associated faculty members unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a clinical or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee.

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer's objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

Materials sent to the external reviewers must include, at a minimum, a curriculum vitae, five publications, and a research statement. Materials should be submitted from the start date or last promotion, whichever is most recent; however, it is acceptable to use an earlier date if it is germane to the evaluation. Candidates should consult the department chair and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee to make this determination.

A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. No more than half can be recommended by the candidate. A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) and who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged based on the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The department will solicit evaluations from tenured faculty with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, the chair shall make every

effort to ensure that the majority of the evaluations come from professors. In the case of an associate professor seeking promotion to professor, evaluations must come from professors.

- 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.

Because the department cannot control who agrees to write 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 end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested, should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the chair with input from the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the department chair, and the candidate. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. If the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write a letter, 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 for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for clinical faculty can be found [here](#).

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

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

## 7 PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of clinical research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

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

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

## **8 SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

## **9 PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

### **9.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Use of the Survey of Student Learning Experiences (SSLE) form is required in every course offered in the department. Faculty should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be considered in future teaching.

### **9.2 Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

Periodic peer evaluation of teaching is required for faculty at all ranks

Peer review of instruction is the responsibility of the faculty of the department, not the individual faculty member being reviewed. A peer review of teaching includes class observation and the review of course materials. Peer reviews should aim for clear and productive feedback on the course that has been reviewed, its design and organization, student assignments, and feedback to and engagement with students. The faculty member may select courses for review and recommend the schedule for review. They may nominate reviewers and may request assistance and input from the Department Chair or Associate Chair to help select appropriate peer reviewers from within the Educational Studies faculty.

It is an expectation that all non-probationary faculty (clinical and tenure track) will serve as peer reviewers. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible. Each year, the associate chair will contact probationary faculty to coordinate the assignment of a peer reviewer. Non- probationary faculty who would like to have a peer review conducted should contact the associate chair.

The responsibilities of the tenured departmental faculty are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty at least once per year during the probationary period.
- To review the teaching of all associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once per year.

- To review the teaching of associate professors at least twice by the time they seek promotion to professor.
- To review the teaching of non-probationary assistant clinical professors and non-probationary associate clinical at least once every other year, with the goal of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- To review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary clinical professors as requested by the department chair.
- To review the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon the department chair's request. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for aiding in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Assistant professors may conduct these reviews. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the associate chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester. A candidate for promotion may nominate a faculty member from elsewhere in the university to serve as the peer reviewer, subject to approval by the Educational Studies Promotion and Tenure subcommittee.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report, and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

More specific information about the Peer Evaluation of Teaching can be found in Appendix B.

**APPENDIX A**

**Evaluation Rubric for Faculty Duties**

## **EVALUATION RUBRIC OF FACULTY DUTIES**

### **Please read these instructions carefully.**

The purpose of this rubric is to guide the evaluation process for each faculty member as they progress toward promotion or tenure, and is designed to mirror the **current APT**. It is intended to offer context and detail across the job activities of teaching, research, and service. Use the Notes column (right column) to document any questions, concerns, or observations that emerge during the review process. Note any overall comments for each activity (teaching, research, and service) at the end of that activity.

In each activity (teaching, research, and service) there are multiple criteria for evaluation taken from the APT. Each criterion has been enumerated and identified in red font for each row (for example, “Teaching 1: Evaluation of Quality of Instruction”). There should be one score for **each criterion** on the rubric. Within that criterion, there may be multiple options for faculty to document accomplishment in that enumerated activity (for example, in “Teaching 1: Evaluation of Quality of Instruction” there are four optional blocks of descriptors that can be used to determine performance in that criterion that are consistent across the page). *Not every item for that criterion must be met to evaluate that criterion.* If the faculty has met various descriptors in that criterion, you can average the row or assign the highest value for that row. For example, if a faculty person has met one optional descriptor at the “4” rating and several at the “3” column, you can arrive at a 3, 3.5 or 4 rating for that criterion using your best professional judgment. To determine the score for the entire activity (teaching, research, or service), you will add the scores for each criterion, then average the criterion scores in that activity to arrive at one rating for the activity.

### **Please keep the following in mind and use your best judgment:**

- To be given a **score of 1, Does Not Meet Expectations**, the work in that area does not meet expectations relative to the workload allocations in the area.
- To be given a **score of 2, Meets Expectations**, the work in that area meets the basic expectations relative to the workload allocation of that area.
- To be given a **score of 3, Exceeds Expectations**, the work in that area consistently exceeds the basic expectations relative to the workload allocation in the area.
- To be given a **score of 4, Outstanding**, the work in the area goes uniquely, significantly, and consistently beyond the basic expectations relative to the workload allocation in the area across its multiple dimensions, or that provides an extremely valuable service to the mission of the department in a way that transcends regular assigned duties.

**These scores should fall on a normal distribution, with most people earning 2's and 3's, and very few people earning 1's and 4's. In other words, to earn a 1 or a 4, someone has to be truly remarkable, and you have to defend your stance.**

Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_

## TEACHING

**Timeframe of review: 1 calendar year**

	<b>4=Outstanding</b>	<b>3=Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>2= Meets Expectations/Emerging</b>	<b>1=Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
<b>Teaching Criterion 1: SSLE VARIOUS DESCRIPTORS</b>	SSLE scores cluster around “strongly agree”	SSLE scores cluster around “agree”	SSLE scores cluster around “neutral” or display a wide variance	SSLE ratings cluster around “disagree and strongly disagree”	SCORE for criterion:  MULTIPLY BY 2:	30%
<b>Teaching Criterion 2: EVIDENCE OF TEACHING SUCCESS</b>	<p>Evidence of student comments, alternative evaluation, or other mechanism to support <b>excellent</b> teaching</p> <p>Evidence of peer-review to indicate excellent teaching</p> <p>Evidence of international or national teaching awards or recognition</p>	<p>Evidence of student comments, alternative evaluation, or other mechanism to support <b>above average</b> teaching</p> <p>Evidence of peer-review to indicate above average teaching</p> <p>Evidence of state or university teaching awards or recognition</p>	<p>Evidence of student comments, alternative evaluation, or other mechanism to support <b>satisfactory</b> teaching</p> <p>Evidence of peer-review to indicate average teaching</p> <p>Evidence of local teaching awards or recognition</p>	<p><b>No evidence</b> (e.g. no report of student comments, alternative evaluation, or other mechanism) to support average or above teaching</p> <p>No evidence of peer-review</p> <p>No evidence of teaching awards or other recognition of teaching</p>	SCORE for criterion:	15%
<b>Teaching Criterion 3: Documented efforts to</b>	Evidence that faculty use SEIs to improve teaching	Evidence that indicates how faculty use SEIs to improve teaching	Evidence that indicates how faculty use SEIs to improve teaching	No evidence that indicates how faculty use SEIs to improve teaching	SCORE for criterion:	15%

<b>improve teaching and develop courses</b>  <b>VARIOUS DESCRIPTORS</b>	Evidence of critical reflection on and evaluation of teaching to improve instruction  Evidence of participating in multiple opportunities to improve one's teaching	Evidence of critical reflection on and evaluation of teaching to improve instruction  Evidence of participating in several opportunities to improve one's teaching	Some evidence of critical reflection on and evaluation of teaching to improve instruction  Evidence of minimal activity to enhance teaching	No evidence of critical reflection on and evaluation of teaching to improve instruction  No evidence of efforts to develop as a teacher		
<b>Teaching Criterion 4: Student Advising and mentoring</b>	Evidence of engaging many students in research, advising masters students, and serving on doctoral dissertation committees, both within and beyond one's own discipline  Evidence of clearly documented and contextualized advising and mentoring load  Evidence of scholarly work associated with mentoring and advising, such as peer-reviewed presentations or publications	Evidence of engaging a moderate number of students in research, advising masters students, and serving on doctoral dissertation committees within one's own discipline  Evidence of clearly documented and contextualized advising and mentoring load  Evidence of robust mentoring directly with students and student groups	Evidence of advising masters students and serving on few doctoral dissertation committees  Minimal reflection on advising or mentoring  Minimal mentoring	No evidence of engaging students in research, advising masters students, or serving on doctoral dissertation committees  No reflection on advising or mentoring  No evidence of impact of mentoring	<b>SCORE for criterion:</b>	15%
<b>Teaching Criterion 5:</b>	Evidence of leadership in new course development, significant course revision (e.g. use of technology; service learning), new program	Evidence of new course development, significant course revision (e.g. use of technology; service learning), new program	Evidence of efforts toward new course development or significant course revision, new program	No evidence of efforts toward new course development, significant course revision, or other instructional contribution	<b>SCORE for criterion:</b>	15%

<b>Documented efforts to develop courses and programs</b>	technology; service learning), new program development, or other instructional contribution coupled with evidence of effectiveness	development, or other instructional contribution	development, or other instructional contribution			
<b>VARIOUS DESCRIPTORS</b>						

**TOTAL :** \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL / 5:** \_\_\_\_\_

Bonus 0.5 for consistently teaching large courses: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMENTS:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## RESEARCH

**Timeframe of review: 3 calendar years**

	<b>4=Outstanding</b>	<b>3=Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>2=Meets Expectations</b>	<b>1=Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
<b>Scholarship and Research Criterion 1: Peer-reviewed articles and books: Quantity</b>  <b>VARIOUS DESCRIPTORS</b>	Over the past 3 years, evidence of (on average) three or more paper-length scholarly or research publications <b>per year</b> in high quality* venues as determined by the field (9+ total), or equivalent work in scholarly books	Over the past 3 years, evidence of (on average) two scholarly or creative publication <b>per year</b> in a high quality venue as determined by the field (6 total); or equivalent work in scholarly books	Over the past 3 years, evidence of (on average) one scholarly or creative publication per year, <b>plus</b> consistent attempts to complete scholarly or research publications in high quality venue as determined by the field (attempts are defined as article in progress, under review; steady progress toward completion of book) (2-3 total)	No evidence of progress toward publication of scholarship in high quality venues as determined by the field or 0-1 article over the past 3 years	SCORE for criterion:  Multiply by 2:	40%
<b>Scholarship and Research Criterion 2: Non-peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, technical reports, creative works (i.e., podcasts)</b>  <b>VARIOUS DESCRIPTORS</b>	Evidence of two or more scholarly publications per year (non-peer reviewed)  Evidence of serving as lead and or sole author or creator	Evidence of at least one scholarly publication per year  Evidence of serving as lead and or sole editor or creator	Evidence of attempts to complete scholarly publications that demonstrate promise  Evidence of a submitted prospectus (authored and/or edited)	No evidence of progress toward scholarly publications  No evidence of this work	SCORE for criterion:	20%
<b>Scholarship and Research Criterion 3: Conference Presentations</b>	Evidence of international or national invitations to present at prestigious forums	Evidence of national, state, or local invitations to present at relevant forums	No invited presentations at relevant forums  Evidence of occasional presentations or other	No evidence of presentations	SCORE for criterion:	20%

<b>VARIOUS DESCRIPTORS</b>	Evidence of at least two peer-reviewed conference presentations per year (6+ total)	Evidence of at least one peer-reviewed conference presentation per year (3-5 total)	scholarly activity, non-peer-reviewed; evidence of attempts to submit conference proposals (2 total)	No evidence of presentations		
	Evidence of serving as lead and or sole presenter for most of the peer-reviewed conference presentations	Evidence of serving as lead or sole presenter for some of the peer-reviewed conference presentations	Evidence of participation with presentations	No evidence of presentations		
<b>Scholarship and Research Criterion 4: Grants</b>	Evidence of securing a prestigious competitive externally funded grant requiring intellectual creativity	Evidence of securing internally and/or externally funded grant, or consistent proposal submissions	Evidence of attempts to seek small seed grants, which demonstrate promise	No evidence of attempts to seek grant support	SCORE for criterion:	20%
<b>VARIOUS DESCRIPTORS</b>	Evidence of serving as PI, Co-PI, Co-I, or lead proposal writer  Invitations to review prestigious grant proposals	Evidence of serving as PI, Co-PI, Co-I or lead proposal writer  Invitations to review grant proposals	Evidence of being written into a grant for a specific role other than leadership (e.g. consultant)  No invitations to review	No evidence of attempts to seek grant support  No invitations		

TOTAL : \_\_\_\_\_

AVERAGE TOTAL / 4: \_\_\_\_\_

Bonus 0.5 for a national award or recognition:  
\_\_\_\_\_

\*Note, high quality does not always mean high impact factor. For example, for fields that have a significant practitioner base, scholarship that speak to these audiences might be more likely read in journals that offer more applied research, rather than those more academically driven. Please keep this and other caveats in mind.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

## SERVICE

**Timeframe for review: 1 calendar year (2020)**

	<b>4=Outstanding</b>	<b>3=Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>2=Meets Expectations</b>	<b>1=Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
<b>Service Criterion 1: Editorial Service</b>	Evidence of service as an editor or co-editor of a recognized discipline-related journal	Evidence of consistently serving as a reviewer for discipline-relevant journals or conference proposals	Evidence of periodically serving as a reviewer for discipline-related journals or conference proposals	No evidence as a reviewer for journals or conference proposals	SCORE for criterion:	20%
<b>Service Criterion 2: Professional Service</b>	Elected or appointed to leadership roles of committees or boards in national/international field-related organizations	Elected or appointed to membership roles of committees or boards in national or state field-related organizations	Participation on committees or boards in international, national, or state field-related organizations	No evidence of participation in field-related national/international organizations	SCORE for criterion:	20%
<b>Service Criterion 3: Service within the University</b>  <b>VARIOUS DESCRIPTORS</b>	Evidence of leadership on faculty governance committees across the department, college and/or university	Evidence of service on more than 1 faculty governance committee across the department, college and/or university	Evidence of service on at least one faculty governance committee in the department, college and/or university	No evidence of service on committees at the Department, College or University level	SCORE for criterion:	20%
<b>Service Criterion 4</b>  <b>Service to Academic program</b>	Evidence of extraordinary <i>leadership</i> of academic programs, particularly outside of normal functions (e.g., leading accreditation efforts, teaching extra courses, etc.)	Evidence of substantial contributions to academic programs, particularly outside of normal functions (e.g., participating in accreditation efforts)	Evidence of participation in normal functions of the academic program	No evidence contribution to academic program	SCORE for criterion:	20%

TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_

AVERAGE = TOTAL / 4: \_\_\_\_\_

Bonus for national service award 0.5: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B

### Additional Guidance on Conducting the Peer Review of Teaching

The peer review of teaching includes class observation and the review of course materials. Peer reviews should aim for clear and productive feedback on the course that has been reviewed, its design and organization, student assignments, and feedback to and engagement with students. The faculty member may select courses for review and recommend the schedule for review. They may nominate reviewers and may request assistance and input from the Department Chair or Associate Chair to help select appropriate peer reviewers from within the Educational Studies faculty. In general, peer reviews are conducted by tenured faculty within the department. Faculty are strongly encouraged to seek a variety of reviewers from outside their home program.

#### Initial Meeting

At the first meeting between the faculty member and the peer reviewer, the focus of peer review that is the most relevant and appropriate to the course and instructional goals of the faculty member are determined. The faculty member should be prepared to:

- give the reviewer a copy of the syllabus;
- describe the aims of the course and its place within the degree program or the program(s) it serves;
- describe the goals, purposes, and organization of the class session to be observed;
- describe the areas on which the faculty member would like to review to focus; and
- give any other relevant course materials to the reviewer (e.g., the faculty member may grant guest access to the course's Carmen site). If the course is an online course, the reviewer should be given the same level of access to Carmen as the students.

#### Reviewer Preparation

Prior to the class session, the reviewer should read the syllabus and review any other materials provided by the faculty member. The reviewer should also begin the review letter by filling in pertinent class information and summarizing the pre-observation meeting.

#### Class Observation(s)

The peer review of teaching includes at least one class observation (two observations are preferred). Class observations, however, can occur in the classroom, be an observation of an electronic class, or be an observation of a course that has been recorded. Wherever possible, student feedback (outside of the faculty member's presence) should be sought (e.g., classroom discussion, Qualtrics survey).

#### Post-Observation Letter Preparation

Following the class observation, the reviewer should complete the review letter. In addition to the observational information (e.g., what happened in the class), the reviewer should provide an evaluation of the faculty member's instruction including recommendations for changes. The evaluation should include highlights of the faculty members' strengths and suggestions for improvement.

#### Post-observation meeting

After the class, the faculty member and the reviewer should meet to discuss the experience, to review the written review, and to address any questions that either party may have. Following this meeting, the reviewer will submit their review to the Associate Department Chair, copied to the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member is entitled to respond to the review in writing to the Associate Department Chair. The faculty member should include the review (and the response, if applicable) as part of the annual review and with any promotion materials.

## Peer Review of Teaching Template

Date:

Faculty Observed:

Peer Observer:

Date/Time of Observation:

Class Title & Number:

Credits:

Number of Students:

Level of Instruction:

Mode of Instruction (in person, synchronous, asynchronous):

### Description of Pre-Meeting

### Evaluation of Instruction

**Strengths** (can be worked into the Evaluation of Instruction or kept separate)

**Suggestions for Improvement** (can be worked into the Evaluation of Instruction or kept separate)

### Summary

Signature

## APPENDIX C

### Criteria and Types of Evidence: P&T

The charts below list the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure and, on the other, the evidence that the criteria have been met.

#### Teaching

Criteria	Types of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.</li><li>Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively.</li><li>Demonstrated competence in the use of various modes of instruction (e.g., lecture, discussion, lab; in-person, distance learning, hybrid).</li><li>Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process.</li><li>Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process.</li><li>Treated students with respect and courtesy.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Student comments and SSLE data</li><li>Peer evaluation of classroom reports</li><li>Peer evaluations of course materials (syllabus, assignments, examinations, sample class information).</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Description of changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, case studies, field trip agenda, problem sets, computer software demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Documented efforts to improve teaching.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Attendance at continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class</li><li>Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning</li><li>Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning</li><li>Awarding of “Endorsement” from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Served as advisor or co-advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department’s graduate student to faculty ratio and the faculty member’s area(s) of expertise.</li><li>Served as advisor to undergraduate or licensure students, if appropriate.</li><li>Served as a mentor to undergraduate and/or graduate students, when appropriate.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Complete and detailed list of advising activities including advising and committee work at graduate and undergraduate levels.</li></ul>

#### Research and Scholarship

Criteria	Types of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated thematically focused body of research and scholarship/creative outcomes contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be cited or otherwise shows evidence of influence on the work of others</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publications in peer reviewed journals, and/or scholarly books, consistent with the standards of the appropriate program, and/or conferences of high quality that clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research/scholarship program over time, and contributes substantively to knowledge/outcomes in the area of focus.</li> <li>• Data relating to the quality of the candidate's scholarship, based on discipline specific indicators (e.g., journal impact factors, h index, citation rate, publication reputation).</li> <li>• Publications that demonstrate intellectual leadership by showing first or sole authorship.</li> <li>• Complete publication record including archival journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures.</li> <li>• Sustained grants and contracts, when appropriate for the field, including foundations, federal agencies, major industry, or private sector – may be as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator with documented focused contribution on multiple grants or projects</li> <li>• White papers that can be shown to have influenced policy or practice</li> <li>• Research awards (internal and external)</li> <li>• Keynote presentations at international conferences</li> <li>• Invited talks at symposia, conferences, other field specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the thought leadership of the candidate.</li> <li>• Data relating to a growing reputation as evidenced by external evaluations.</li> </ul>

### Service

Criteria	Types of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated excellence in service to the Department</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions</li> <li>• Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to Department</li> <li>• Annual evaluations document excellent service to Department</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated high quality administration to the university at any level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions including positive change</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated service to the profession</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions to academic publishing</li> <li>• Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions to professional organizations</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated community-engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities / quality indicators within the Community Setting</li> </ul>