THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University College of Social Work

Approved by the Faculty: May 13, 2025

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: November 10, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. 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 Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Procedures and Guidelines Handbook; and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the college and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the college 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 five years on the appointment or reappointment of the Dean.

This document and substantive changes must be approved by the Dean of the College of Social Work and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the college's mission and, in the context of that mission and the mission of the university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Office of Academic Affairs accepts the mission and criteria of the college and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to college mission and criteria. As the need arises, procedures and policies described in this document can be modified by faculty vote (see section III.C. Quorum).

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

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 college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service are defined to include not only the criteria outlined below, but also professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics. In addition, the College of Social Work is committed to professional ethical conduct specified in the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics.

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

II. COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK MISSION

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

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of Eligible Faculty within the College of Social Work

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

Per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (B), 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. Only those eligible to vote and the Dean (as an observer) participate in any meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty in review of appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure. If the Dean is unable to attend as an observer, they may send a designate. At the request of the eligible faculty, the Dean will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** The final decision for an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor belongs solely to the Dean with recommendation from the Faculty Search Committee.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed senior rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested. More information can be found in section IV.B.3 Process for the Review of Appointments at a Senior Rank.

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.

2. Clinical Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** The final decision for an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, or clinical professor belongs solely to the Dean with recommendation from the Faculty Search Committee.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed senior rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested. More information can be found in section IV.B.3 Process for the Review of Appointments at a Senior Rank.
- The initial appointment of all clinical faculty is probationary regardless of rank at hire. The duration of the initial appointment defines the length of the probationary period.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment of probationary clinical faculty 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 promotion reviews of associate clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary clinical professors.
- Reappointment of non-probationary clinical faculty is at the discretion of the Dean. If the Dean recommends nonrenewal, the fourth-year process is invoked, and the eligible faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank and all non-probationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank.

3. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%

- The final decision for an appointment (hiring) review of a faculty member at less than 50% appointment belongs solely to the Dean with recommendation from the Faculty Search Committee.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary clinical faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval from the Dean.
- The reappointment of faculty at less than 50% appointment is decided by the Dean.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

- The final decision for an appointment at lecturer or senior lecturer belongs solely to the Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs with recommendation from the Associated Faculty Search Committee. The initial contract for lecturers and senior lecturers cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts cannot exceed three years.
- The reappointment of all lecturers and senior lecturers is decided by the Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs or designee.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

- 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.

Promotion Reviews

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%

- Faculty at less than 50% appointment are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have tenure-track titles.
- For the promotion reviews of faculty at less than 50% appointment with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described above.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer occurs automatically when the lecturer has completed 20 semesters of instruction. Lecturers are not eligible to earn tenure.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

- Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

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

5. **Minimum Composition**
   In the event the College of Social Work does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Dean will appoint a faculty member from another college.

B. Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

The college has a P&T Committee that reviews the promotion, tenure, and reappointment or renewal of college faculty and provides an evaluative written assessment to the Dean. The Committee's assessment is advisory to the Dean. The college committee provides a vote regarding promotion and/or tenure and consensus that all earlier review processes met written university, college, and tenure initiating units' procedures. The committee's membership is described in the college's POA document.

C. Quorum

The quorum required for the college to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds (67% or more) of the eligible faculty. The eligible faculty includes those not on an approved leave of absence. Approved leaves of absence include special assignments (SA) and faculty professional leave (FPL). 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 SA may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Dean has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who withdraw or recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest do not participate in any aspect of candidate review, do not attend meetings discussing the candidate, and are not counted when determining quorum. Voter eligibility is determined as being an eligible faculty member, documented by the Dean's office as having accessed the required review materials and the appropriate promotion criteria for all candidates by the stated deadline, present at the stated meeting start time (no one will be allowed to enter the room late), and attending the entire review discussion.

The quorum required to discuss and vote on alterations, revisions, or amendments to the procedures described in this APT document is two-thirds (67% or more) of the faculty body (i.e., tenure-track and clinical faculty members). Faculty on approved professional leave are not required to participate but remain eligible to participate if they fulfill all required obligations for faculty participation; such members may be excluded from the count for determining quorum only if the Dean has approved their off-campus assignment or professional leave. The quorum required to discuss and vote on procedural modifications (e.g., changing a due date) is two-thirds (67% or more) of the relevant deliberating body depending on the matters being addressed.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes.

Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

Voting takes place via confidential electronic ballot. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1. **Appointment**
   Appointment decisions, other than lecturer appointments, belong solely to the Dean with recommendation from the Faculty Search Committee, who will have solicited written feedback and recommendations from faculty, staff, students, and others who have met with the candidate, participated in the candidate's formal presentation, and/or examined the candidate's application file. Lecturer appointments are decided by the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs or designee.

   In the case of a joint appointment, the Dean will seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to their appointment.

2. **Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion**
   For tenure-track faculty, a positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds (67% or more) of votes cast are positive.

   For clinical faculty, a positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for reappointment and promotion is secured when two-thirds (67% or more) of votes cast are positive.

   In the case of a joint appointment, the college will seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to their reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

3. **Changes or Modifications to Procedures in the APT Document**
   A positive recommendation for changes to the *substantive content* of the APT document is secured when two-thirds (67% or more) of votes cast are positive. A recommendation for modification to a *procedure* specified in the APT document (e.g., changing a due date, updating appendix) is secured by a simple majority (at least 50%) of votes cast are positive.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

The college is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the faculty. Important considerations include an individual's record to date 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 college. No offer will be extended in the event the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance faculty quality. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

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, as stipulated in section IV. B. Appointment Procedures below.

All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are 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.

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. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for assistant professor. The College of Social Work 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. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the College of Social Work's eligible tenure-track faculty, the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor

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

Appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of credited service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment.

The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period. Newly hired faculty are encouraged to take the full clock with an option to come up early with recognition of earlier work.

Shortening the Probationary Period: At the time of initial appointment, the Dean, with the approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, has authority to credit 1, 2, or 3 years towards a tenure decision to incoming faculty with previous tenure-track faculty experience of a comparable nature at another institution. Granting years of credit towards tenure must be defined in the letter of offer. Work completed in the credited years will be recognized and counted toward the candidate's promotion dossier submission. Assistant professors should be conservative in requesting or accepting credit towards tenure, as the decision to shorten one's probationary period becomes a binding decision on the part of both the university and the faculty member except

through an approved request to exclude time from the probation period.

Associate Professor and Professor
See section IV.B.3. Process for the Review of Appointments at a Senior Rank below for information on the role of the P&T committee and committee of eligible faculty in appointing tenure-track faculty at a senior rank.

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the college's teaching, scholarship, and service criteria for promotion to these ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in social work or related fields. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor or professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor 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 should not occur.

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

2. Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty will be recruited with consideration of strong, positive teaching experience. The initial contract for clinical faculty must be for a period of five years. The initial contract 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. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

Assistant Clinical Professor
The criteria for appointment to assistant clinical professor are: (1) an earned MSW or PhD degree from a CSWE-accredited institution, or equivalent educational background in a discipline relevant to the position for which they are recruited; (2) significant previous instructional experience with positive evaluations of instruction; (3) extensive practice experience (minimum of five years); and (4) demonstration of a strong potential to attain reappointment and advance through the clinical faculty ranks. Clinical faculty will hold a social work degree, with case-by-case exceptions depending on the teaching needs of the college, keeping in line with the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) accreditation standards. For candidates accruing significant years of practice experience while earning their degree, the record is reviewed to determine if there exists a commensurate level of practice experience. Professional licensure, credentialing, or certification in one or more areas of practice is desirable, but not required. Evidence of ability to contribute to the social work programs and provide excellent curricular support is highly desirable.

Associate Clinical Professor and Clinical Professor

See section IV.B.3. Process for the Review of Appointments at a Senior Rank below for information on the role of the P&T committee and committee of eligible faculty in appointing clinical faculty at a senior rank.

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual meet the criteria for assistant clinical professor above and, at a minimum, meet the college's teaching and service criteria for promotion to these ranks. In addition, clinical professors must demonstrate teaching and curriculum development leadership and will have gained recognition for their work. They will be required to demonstrate pedagogical leadership, which may be demonstrated by developing and/or testing teaching modalities and learning tools, scholarship, or by integrating learning tools and teaching modalities in the classroom.

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few 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.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%

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

Lecturer and Senior 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. This type of appointment is renewable.

Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with demonstrated sustained excellence and breadth in teaching as evidenced by student evaluations of instruction, the peer evaluation of teaching process, and engagement in instructional development trainings. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure. This type of appointment is renewable.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. 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. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years. Guidelines for hosting visiting scholars can be found on the CSW Shared Drive.

4. 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 60 or older with 10

or more years of service or at any age with 25 or more years of service.

Faculty will send a written request for emeritus faculty status to the Dean outlining academic performance and citizenship. A copy of the retiring faculty member's CV must accompany the request. When the dean concurs with the request, the dean completes OAA Form 207 and submits the request, form, and a signed letter of retirement to OAA for approval. OAA will not accept such requests unless the retirement letter is included. The dean must notify the faculty member in writing if declining to make a request to OAA on behalf of the faculty member. 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.

See the OAA Procedures and Guidelines Handbook Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available.

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

5. 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.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B. Appointment 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. Formal interviews are 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.

Information on faculty search committees can be found in the college's POA document. Search

procedures must be consistent with university hiring policies. 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.

At the time of appointment, faculty members shall be provided with all relevant documents pertaining to College of Social Work and The Ohio State University promotion, tenure, merit review, and performance review criteria and procedures. These documents must include, at a minimum, the Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment University Policy, the college's POA and APT documents, and dossier preparation guidelines. Faculty members shall be provided with copies of any revised documents, as well, should these documents be revised during the probationary period.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure- track positions. Limited exceptions to this policy can be found in OAA Procedures and Guidelines Handbook (Vol. 1, Chap. 4, section 5.0) and must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and follow the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment.

Based on the solicited feedback, as well as on their own independent evaluations of the candidate, the search committee will forward to the Dean a recommendation regarding each candidate as being acceptable or not to the faculty. Each recommendation should summarize the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, as well as summarize feedback from the faculty/campus community. The recommendation concludes with a statement as to whether the candidate would be an acceptable hire for the College of Social Work. If more than one candidate is interviewed, the reports are not comparative of candidates.

The final decisions belong solely to the Dean. If more than one candidate achieves a level of support required to extend an offer, the Dean decides which candidate(s) to approach and in what order to do so. Details of the offer(s), including compensation, are determined by the Dean.

If the offer involves senior rank with tenure, the eligible faculty members vote on recommending the proposed rank. These procedures are detailed in section IV.B.3. Process for the Review of Appointments at a Senior Rank concerning how the P&T committee functions. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor or professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The College of Social Work will consult with the Office of International Affairs to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status. An MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2. Clinical Faculty

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 teaching rather than scholarship.

3. **Process for the Review of Appointments at a Senior Rank**
This section is applicable to both tenure-track and clinical appointments at a senior rank. Before an offer is extended, a candidate whose initial appointment to the faculty would be at the rank of associate professor (with or without tenure) or professor must have a recommendation put forward on their behalf by the Dean to the P&T committee. The P&T committee will convene to conduct a non-binding review of the candidate and report their findings to the Dean. If an offer were to be made, the offer letter language would state that the rank of the appointment is subject to a positive review through the college and university P&T process and approval by the Board of Trustees. The college review will take place within two months of the offer letter being signed, except if that corresponds with off-duty time for faculty in which case the review takes place within two months of their return.

4. **Transfer from the Tenure Track**
Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a clinical appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

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

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

A tenure-track faculty member placed on a terminal contract after an unsuccessful attempt to earn tenure has the right to apply and compete for a posted clinical faculty position. However, the clinical faculty position search will follow the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment.

5. **TIU Transfer**
Following consultation with the Dean of the College of Social Work and with the relevant TIU head and college dean, 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. 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.

6. **Associated Faculty**
All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%
The appointment of compensated faculty member at less than 50% appointment is made by the

dean with recommendation from the Faculty Search Committee. Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. The reappointment compensated faculty member at less than 50% appointment belongs solely to the Dean.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

A search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all lecturer positions. The appointment of lecturers is made by the Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs based on recommendations from a faculty search committee. The reappointment of all lecturers is decided by the Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs or designee. The initial contract for lecturers and senior lecturers cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts cannot exceed three years. Lecturers may not be reappointed if there are significant concerns with their performance or SEIs.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the college and are decided by the Dean in consultation with college leadership. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years.

7. **Joint Appointments**

A TIU may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.5. 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.

8. **Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

Any faculty member within the College of Social Work may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another college at The Ohio State University. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the College of Social Work, justifying the appointment, is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by a majority of all tenure-track and clinical faculty, the Dean may extend an offer of appointment.

The Dean reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES

The dean may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate college administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written

assessment to the dean. However, the dean 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 dean or the dean's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty. In all cases, however, accountability for the annual performance and merit review process in the College of Social Work resides with the dean. **For specific merit review criteria, see Appendix A.**

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the college's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.
- The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments may 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.
- Annual performance and merit reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment.
- Per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, the Dean is required to include a reminder in annual review letters that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

The College of Social Work follows the requirements for annual performance and merit reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment. It is the expectation of the college that annual performance and merit reviews will also be consistent with our APT document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the college, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

It is the aim of the college that annual performance reviews are constructive and candid, and the college is committed to using the annual review process as a means of clearly communicating aspects of performance needing improvement, as well as communicating and recognizing strengths. The review process is designed to assist faculty members in remaining productive and includes planning for the future.

A. Documentation

The Dean is responsible for communicating timelines for completion of reviews and will send an email in Spring with posted deadlines for the year. Annual review meetings are usually completed by June 30.

Documents include:

- An updated CV. Note that all faculty CVs will be made publicly available on the college website.
- A completed merit review form distributed electronically to all faculty members by the Dean's office during the Spring semester.
    - Published scholarly materials presented for consideration should be made available in their published form—as an electronic link to a PDF or online version—or an electronic copy of the final acceptance letter indicating that it is in press. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
    - Professional and conference presentations listed for consideration should include a link to or copy of where the presentation is listed in the conference or event program.

- Probationary faculty and associate professors must submit an updated dossier following the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline.
- The Dean's office will assume responsibility for accessing the relevant Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports for every course assignment during the year under review.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports produced during the review period should be appended to the electronically submitted merit review form.
- Faculty members actively participating in interdisciplinary centers and institutes, or with joint appointments, should include their previously developed agreements about how rewards will be distributed for specific activities.

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

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

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Dean, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The probationary faculty member may elect to invite one faculty member colleague to be present at the scheduled conference with the Dean, serving in the capacity of observer.

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

If the Dean recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Dean's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review within 10 days. The Dean's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure, and of the faculty member's personnel record.

If the Dean recommends nonrenewal, the fourth-year review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) is invoked. The college is committed to nonrenewal of a probationary appointment where any annual performance review indicates that a candidate's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor. In a case where nonrenewal is recommended, the Dean will notify the P&T committee of the necessity for conducting the fourth-year review process. Following completion of the fourth-year review comments process, the candidate's complete dossier is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost who makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Appeals on a non-renewal decision follow specific guidelines in the Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

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 exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the Executive Vice President and Provost makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Official fourth-year reviews are not completed earlier, except when the candidate has also decided to go up for promotion at the same time.

   External evaluations may be solicited only when either the Dean or the P&T committee, on behalf of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, 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 external input.

   The Committee of Eligible Faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty vote by confidential electronic ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The P&T committee, on behalf of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the Dean, who 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 college review, the formal comments process is followed (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04). The fourth-year review documentation and recommendation are forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost for a final decision on reappointment for the fifth year, regardless of whether the Dean recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

2. **Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period**
   Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Procedures and Guidelines Handbook.

C. Tenured Faculty

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

The Dean or designee may meet individually with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The faculty member may elect to invite one faculty member colleague to be present at the scheduled conference with the Dean or designee, to serve in the capacity of observer.

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 college, 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 college, 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 dean or designee prepares a written evaluation on these topics, including comments on progress toward promotion for associate professors. Both the Dean (or designee) and the faculty member sign and date the written evaluation statement. The faculty member's signature indicates that the statement has been received and read; signing does not indicate agreement with the contents. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review within 10 days. The Dean's (or designee's) letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) becomes part of the cumulative dossier for purposes of promotion and tenure, and of the faculty member's personnel record.

D. Clinical Faculty

Every clinical faculty member is reviewed annually by the Dean utilizing the same procedures outlined for tenure-track faculty.

1. Penultimate Year Review for Probationary Clinical Faculty

During a clinical faculty member's penultimate year of an initial appointment term, a formal performance review is conducted by the Committee of Eligible Faculty 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. The P&T committee, on behalf of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the Dean, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the contract. All appointment decisions are at the discretion of the college Dean.

At the conclusion of the college review, the formal comments process is followed (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04). This same process is also invoked if the Dean recommends nonrenewal *before* the penultimate year of a probationary clinical faculty member's contract.

Positive decisions to reappoint will be approved by OAA without review and forwarded to the Board of Trustees (BOT) for final approval. Upon approval by the BOT, the clinical faculty member is no longer probationary (per the Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment University Policy).

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.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

2. Penultimate Year Review for Non-probationary Clinical Faculty

The annual review process for clinical faculty in their second and subsequent terms of appointment is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in instruction and engagement with the curriculum relevant to the mission of the college; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors.

Penultimate year reviews of any second and subsequent contract for non-probationary clinical faculty are at the discretion of the Dean. If the Dean recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. Positive decisions to reappoint will be approved by OAA without

review and forwarded to the Board of Trustees (BOT) for final approval.

If the Dean recommends nonrenewal, a formal performance review will be conducted by the Committee of Eligible Faculty. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. The P&T committee, on behalf of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the Dean, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the contract. All appointment decisions are at the discretion of the college Dean. At the conclusion of the college review, the formal comments process is followed (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04).

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.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members—excluding lecturers—must be reviewed annually. The Dean or designee prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the Dean will decide whether or not to reappoint. The Dean's decision on reappointment is final.

For lecturers and senior lecturers, the Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs or designee reviews SEIs at the end of each semester and will discuss any concerns with instructors whose SEIs suggest a need for additional training and mentoring. Lecturers may not be reappointed if there are significant concerns. Lecturers and senior lecturers are not reviewed for merit.

F. Salary Recommendations

The Dean makes annual salary recommendations based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months. Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase (e.g., cost of living adjustments), all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable. The Dean is charged with conducting an annual review of overall salary equity within the college and to factor results of this review into salary considerations.

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

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see section V.A. Documentation 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.

1. **Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards**
   As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Dean divides tenure-track faculty performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service into four

categories: extra merit (3 points), merit (2 points), partial merit (1 point), no merit (0 points). The Dean additionally considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The Dean then computes the dollar value attributable to each point value from the merit review process.

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

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

2. **Procedures for Clinical Faculty Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards**
As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Dean divides clinical faculty performance in each of the two areas of teaching and service into four categories: extra merit (3 points), merit (2 points), partial merit (1 point), no merit (0 points). The Dean additionally considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The Dean then computes the dollar value attributable to each point value from the merit review process. Note that dollar values for tenure-track and clinical merit may or may not be equivalent.

   Unless otherwise negotiated, the default ratio at which a final merit dollar value for clinical faculty is computed will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Clinical faculty are advised to discuss alternative ratios for the upcoming year during their annual performance review meeting. Recognizing that unanticipated opportunities may arise during the year, clinical faculty are encouraged to renegotiate their ratio on an as needed basis. It would be a truly unusual circumstance where the ratio places teaching at less than 70% for clinical faculty.

   Clinical faculty who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the Dean should be prepared to explain how their salary overall (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since merit increases are one means to the end of an optimal salary distribution.

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

The contents of the most current Office of Academic Affairs Procedures and Guidelines Handbook apply.

The criteria applied in decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure for tenure-track faculty are informed by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 which provides the following statement regarding the context for such reviews:

> *In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new*

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

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

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty

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.*

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 college and university's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university. Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance; accepting weaknesses in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision impedes the college's ability to perform and to progress academically. Although criteria will vary according to an evolving college mission and the responsibilities assigned to each individual faculty member, every candidate is held to a standard of excellence in all performance areas. A mediocre performance in one central area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another area. For example, a high rate of publication would not compensate for a mediocre record of teaching. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

While the criteria are divided into three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service), we recognize that many academic activities span these domains. Faculty members will need to decide which area a specific activity best fits for purposes of evaluation; a specific activity should not be reported and evaluated in more than one area (with the exception of papers co-authored with students [See OAA Procedures and Guidelines Handbook Volume 3, Chapter 6.1.2.4]). The criteria and examples provided below should be used as a guide to inform the decision for reporting activities within specific areas. The P&T chair and candidate's liaison can provide additional guidance to ensure activities are not miscategorized.

1.1. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

Specific indicators of teaching excellence are listed below for these categories of teaching:

- Engagement in teaching
- High-quality instruction
- Equity and inclusion
- Other teaching and mentoring activities
- Mentoring of doctoral students
- Curriculum development
- Continued professional development as an educator
- *Exceptional* teaching performance

Potential sources of evidence for these categories are described below. Examples of evidence and sources of evidence are not exhaustive. Candidates may report additional evidence.

Table 1. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Teaching accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

In all domains below, fourth-year candidates should demonstrate they are on a trajectory to meet criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Because external letters are not required for fourth-year review, external reviews will not be a source of evidence.

Engagement in Teaching
All faculty are required to teach one course per academic year, regardless of the amount of external funding available, with exception to those serving in some administrative positions. Faculty are not evaluated in terms of the number of courses they have taught if they have met the one-per-year minimum.

Source of Evidence

- Dossier

Table 1. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Teaching accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

High-Quality Instruction

CSW faculty are expected to have high performance appraisals and/or offer convincing evidence of a trajectory toward excellence in teaching in online and/or in-person courses.

- Candidate's instruction includes the use of multiple teaching methods, effective engagement in grading/assessment, timely communication with students, and efforts to stay current with new knowledge in course content area.
- Multiple performance indicators of high-quality instruction or a trajectory toward excellence are evident in the dossier.

Sources of Evidence

Evidence of high-quality instruction may be based on at least two of the following:

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- Student evaluations of instruction (SEIs), quantitative and narrative
- Peer evaluation of teaching (candidates are required to have *n - 1* peer reviews where *n* is the number of years they have taught)
- External observations (e.g., Drake Institute for Teaching & Learning)

Note: CSW acknowledges that SEI data cannot be assumed to represent student opinion accurately when response rates are low, as is common at the college. It also acknowledges that many factors outside the instructor's control, such as class size, can have a systematic effect on student evaluations. In addition, research indicates that the race, ethnicity, and gender of instructors systematically affects student evaluations, to the disadvantage of women and faculty of color. Therefore, ***SEI data should be interpreted with caution in some cases.***

Equity and Inclusion

Inclusive excellence practices and cultural humility are demonstrated in the classroom or other teaching environments. Examples may include one or more of the following or other indicators:

- Candidate addresses issues of equity in their instruction as relevant to the course curriculum.
- Candidate holds high standards equitably for all students.
- Candidate supports students with special needs, different learning styles, and different levels of academic preparation.
- Candidate creates a positive learning environment for all students.
- Candidate makes efforts to strengthen their cultural responsiveness in instruction.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- SEIs on related items

Other Teaching and Mentoring Activities

Candidate engages in one or more instructional activities outside the regular classroom, such as:

- Mentoring MSW and undergraduate students.
- Faculty advisor to student group.

Table 1. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Teaching accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

- Responsibility for administering a certificate program (specialized advising)
- Independent studies and honors theses for undergraduate and MSW students; STEP program supervision.
- Teaching Bridge courses, mini courses at CSW, university short courses, and providing guest lectures.
- Other examples of teaching activities outside the classroom are contributions to the social work profession or broader public, such as: writing educational materials for NASW or CSWE, developing a course for Coursera, LinkedIn, or other online platforms.
- Providing formal continuous education, workshops, or professional development to practitioners and the broader community.

Sources of Evidence
- Dossier

Mentoring of Doctoral Students
- Candidate *may* have supervised and/or mentored one or more doctoral students as graduate research assistants.
- Candidate *may* have served as a member on a doctoral candidacy and/or dissertation committee, which may include committees for students in other departments at the university, or other universities in the US or abroad.
- Candidate *may* have conducted a training, guest lecture, or workshop for doctoral students.
- Candidate *may* have served as advisor or PI on a proposal for funding for a student-led project (*could also be considered under Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure*).

Sources of Evidence
- Dossier

Curriculum Development
The criteria for teaching excellence includes participation in and meaningful contributions to one or more of the programs delivered through the College of Social Work (BSSW, MSW, PhD).

Candidate has engaged in at least one of the following:
- Candidate has taken part in developing or substantially revising one or more in-person and/or online courses.
- Candidate has led or contributed to other curricular or program initiatives, such as, developing an interdisciplinary minor or certificate program or developing online content for certificate programs.
- Assisted academic Program Directors/Associate Dean of Academic Affairs in developing new projects or reaffirmation materials (unless counted in service)
- Candidate has served on a committee focused on curriculum and/or teaching.

Source of Evidence
- Dossier

Table 1. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Teaching accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

Continued Professional Development as an Educator

Candidate has done at least two of the following:

- Sought opportunities to improve and expand their knowledge in the content areas of their courses (e.g., through university trainings, professional development, literature review).
- Sought opportunities to improve and expand their teaching methods (e.g., through university trainings, professional development, or seeking feedback from students).
- Introduced innovation to their instruction.

Source of Evidence

- Dossier

***Exceptional* Teaching Performance**

The candidate *may* have demonstrated exceptional teaching performance as evidenced by two or more of the following (or similar activities):

- One or more teaching awards.
- Providing professional development or conference trainings on pedagogy.
- Providing consultation to other faculty on instructional methods.
- Candidate may have developed published or unpublished social work texts or pedagogical materials for the profession, including online formats.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier
- SEIs

1.2. Research and Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

Research and scholarship activities are central to the College of Social Work mission. A wide array of scholarly pursuits and products are valued in the college, as are the various areas of scholarship and methodologies employed in the knowledge building enterprise. Furthermore, the college places a high value on works that enhance knowledge dissemination and utilization in efforts to make positive changes and/or prevent problems in the lives of individuals, families, neighborhoods, communities, organizations, and institutions, locally, regionally, nationally, and globally.

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have a record of rigorous and excellent scholarship in one area or across multiple areas of inquiry. This may include the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and practice, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or the scholarship of engagement. Rigorous and excellent scholarship is demonstrated by a coherent body of work in which the candidate clearly makes substantive contributions to knowledge in their area of inquiry, theory, and/or methods. A candidate's scholarship demonstrates relevance

(meaningfulness and utility) and quality (distinctive theoretical contribution and/or method-specific measures of credibility and rigor).

Evaluation of candidates for promotion should be based on the ***entirety*** of their scholarly contributions in the time frame of their review and the ***context*** of their research areas.

Scholarly products considered in the candidate's body of work to be reviewed are those with (1) an acceptance date after the candidate's date of hire and work that was included if previous service was granted in the offer letter, or (2) a stated affiliation as being The Ohio State University. The last date for revising status updates on grants, publications, awards, etc., in the dossier is when materials are posted for eligible faculty to review. If there are status updates on existing accomplishments in the candidate's dossier between the time of posting the candidate's materials for faculty review and the discussion and vote of the eligible faculty, the liaison includes them orally when presenting the summary letter at the discussion meeting and they can be included in the summary of the discussion.

NOTE: Publications in languages other than English are not accepted as evidence of scholarship unless professionally translated into English. This is to ensure adequate review by faculty, external reviewers, and the Dean.

Specific indicators of excellence in scholarship are divided into the following categories:

- Quality and rigor of scholarship
- Promising trajectory of productivity as a scholar
- Independent research/independent contributions to collaborations
- Funding
- Coherent and relevant body of research
- Research that promotes social justice values and inclusive excellence
- Emerging and realized impact and influence of scholarship on area of research and public impact
- Creativity and innovation
- Research and scholarly activities conducted ethically and with integrity

Detail on these categories is presented below. Examples of evidence and sources of evidence are not exhaustive. Candidates may report additional evidence.

Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload
In all domains below, 4th year candidates should demonstrate they are on a trajectory to meet criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Because external letters are not required for 4th year review, external reviews will not be a source of evidence.

Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

Quality and Rigor of Scholarship

Research quality and rigor are demonstrated by the methodological thoroughness, precision, and trustworthiness of research results of the candidate's body of work.[1-2] The candidate's scholarship demonstrates relevance (meaningfulness and utility).

Candidates must meet the first three criteria below for scholarship. Scholarship includes publications based on qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research, as well as theory, conceptual, and policy-oriented work (e.g., not research studies).

- Rigorous research methods (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods, or emerging innovative methodologies) are evident in scholarly products, including theoretical, conceptual, and policy-oriented scholarship.
- Methods used in the candidate's work are appropriate for their data and research questions.
- Candidate publishes in journals that are respected and influential in their topic area, in addition to other journals.
- Candidate's work *may* make contributions to the understanding and use of rigorous qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods in research in social work and other disciplines.

Sources of Evidence

- External reviewers
- Publication record, authorship order, descriptions of effort
- Manuscripts submitted with dossier
- Dossier

Promising Trajectory of Productivity as a Scholar

- A successful candidate will minimally have 14 articles by the time they go up for associate professor. The numbers should be considered in the context of the nature and topic area of the candidate's research, as well as with consideration of other major contributions, such as books and edited books.
- Candidates should have a minimum of 5 first-author or solo author publications. If authorship norms in a candidate's area of study differ from social work in relation to where lead authors are placed in author lists, the candidate can describe their leadership on a publication on which they are not listed as first author but are still the author who contributed the most to the publication.
- These numbers are not necessary or sufficient for promotion in the absence of rigor, independence, and impact.
- Book chapters, book reviews, editorials, and other examples of scholarship that the candidate deems relevant are further indicators of scholarly productivity and a candidate's trajectory.

[1] Gill, T. G., & Gill, T. R. (2020). What Is Research Rigor? Lessons for a Transdiscipline. *Informing Science*, *23*, 47–76. https://doi- org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/10.28945/4528

[2] Warren, M. R., Calderón, J., Kupscznk, L. A., Squires, G., & Su, C. (2018). Is Collaborative, Community-Engaged Scholarship More Rigorous Than Traditional Scholarship? On Advocacy, Bias, and Social Science Research. Urban Education, 53(4), 445–472. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918763511

Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

- Candidate has a consistent record of giving peer-reviewed presentations and/or invited presentations at national and/or international conferences as well as at local conferences or settings if applicable.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- External reviewers
- Publication record, authorship order, descriptions of effort

Independent Research/Independent Contributions to Collaborations

The college values multiple models of research engagement, including but not limited to, small collaborations led by the candidate, continued collaborations with mentors or other senior scholars, and large transdisciplinary team-based collaborations. Candidates must demonstrate that they have an established or emerging independent research program OR that they are making unique intellectual contributions to an established collaboration with senior scholars.

- A candidate may demonstrate independence as a researcher by establishing and leading a unique program of research/scholarship in an area they define. The candidate typically involves students, peers, and/or community members in the research, and clearly has primary responsibility for defining the research agenda, activities, and scholarship.
- Candidate's continuing to work with mentors or other senior scholars (e.g., faculty from their doctoral program), may demonstrate their unique intellectual contributions through leadership on publications, a trajectory of increasing responsibility within the team; initiating research on a distinct subtopic; or making other substantive contributions to the overall body of work produced by the collaboration.
- Candidates engaged in transdisciplinary team-based science or other large collaborations may demonstrate their independent contributions through leadership on publications and/or funding efforts; a trajectory of increasing responsibility within the team; initiating research on a distinct subtopic; or by making other substantive contributions to the overall body of work produced by the team.
- The order of authorship for papers with multiple authors will be considered in the review process. Dossiers should make clear the authorship traditions of the candidate's field (e.g., typical placement of lead author, corresponding author, etc.). In general, order of authorship reflects the relative contribution to the research and/or the writing of the paper. It is essential for the candidate to describe their contribution to a publication with multiple authors.
- When applicable, a growing number of publications with peer collaborators, the candidate's students, or community members; and/or a growing number of publications without senior scholars is also evidence of independent scholarship.
- The candidate provides evidence of increasingly assuming leadership in their collaborations and their unique, critical, creative contributions to the overall body of the work of the collaboration/team.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- External reviewers
- Publication record, authorship order, descriptions of effort

Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

- Manuscripts submitted with dossier

Funding

Funding is a means that facilitates scholarship; **it is not a requirement for promotion to associate professor.** Receipt of competitive funding is one way candidates *may* demonstrate their developing research trajectories and recognition of their work. However, *efforts* to obtain funding (submitting proposals) is expected.

- Candidate demonstrates a pattern of effort (e.g., two or more proposals submitted in the review period) to seek funding intramurally and/or outside the college and university (e.g., from community, industry, state, foundation, and/or federal sources) serving in a leadership role (e.g., PI, Co-PI, core director, evaluator, etc.).
- Evaluation of the candidate's funding status takes into account how access to and norms of funding differ across substantive areas.
- The candidate *may* have obtained funding from one or more intramural or external funding sources.
- Securing funding is not sufficient for promotion and tenure, and not obtaining funding does not preclude promotion.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- External reviewers
- Proposal submission and award record as confirmed by the CSW Research Office (please provide the CSW Research Office 3-weeks for review)

Coherent and Relevant Body of Research

The candidate must describe a cohesive research agenda and accomplishments. (This criterion takes into account the understanding that some of the candidate's work is likely to be on topics outside their main body of research.)

- The majority of the candidate's research during the pre-tenure period represents a cohesive body of work demonstrated by a thematic focus or multiple themes that form a cohesive and logical whole.
- The candidate describes how their scholarship has relevance (meaningfulness and utility),[1-2] for example:
    - The research addresses an important knowledge gap in their area of research
    - The research *may* further the mission of the college to promote social change, enhance individual and community well-being, and/or further social and economic justice for vulnerable populations (also see "Emerging and Realized Impact and Influence of Scholarship on Area of Research and Public Impact" in Table 2)

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- External reviewers
- Publication record, authorship order, descriptions of effort
- Manuscripts submitted with dossier

Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

Research that Promotes Social Justice Values and Inclusive Excellence

Candidates for promotion *may* demonstrate how their scholarship enhances individual and community well-being, and promotes social and economic justice for vulnerable populations.

- Candidates for promotion *may* demonstrate how their scholarship directly advances social justice, anti-racism, and/or anti-oppression by addressing issues of inclusion, diversity, equity, systemic racism, and/or accessibility.
- As appropriate, the *process* of research used by the candidate *may* include anti-racist, anti-oppression approaches and methodologies.
- Community-engaged research using quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods is also highly valued by the college as an anti-oppressive research approach. As appropriate, candidates *may* conduct research that includes—from design to dissemination—community members and organizations; Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC); and marginalized, underrepresented, understudied populations.[3]
- When applicable, candidates describe the impact of their research on policies and practices in communities.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- External reviewers
- Publication record
- Manuscripts submitted with dossier

Emerging and Realized Impact and Influence of Scholarship on Area of Research and Public Impact

Scholarly impact and recognition are central criteria for promotion. These criteria represent a shift from "counting quantity" to "assessing impact" (p. 615).[3] The first two criteria below must be met.

- Candidate describes the contribution of their research to knowledge, theory, policy, practice, and/or research methods in their study area.
- External reviewers note the impact of the candidate's work. There is evidence that the candidate has an emerging national and/or international reputation.

Other possible indicators of impact:

- Candidate has received awards or recognition for their scholarship.
- Candidate has received and accepted invitations to make scholarly contributions, give presentations, serve as abstract or proposal reviewers, or serve on other scholars' research projects.
- Candidate has assumed leadership roles in professional organizations (e.g., guest editor, editorial board, etc.)
- H indices, JCR impact factors, or other quantitative metrics if accompanied by credible guidelines for interpreting their magnitude in the candidate's field of study. No cutoffs for

[3] McBride, A. M., Abrams, L. S., Dettlaff, A., Gregoire, T., Jenkins, D., & Uehara, E. (2019). Advancing the public impact of social work scholarship: Perspectives of deans and directors. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, *10*(4), 611-621–621. https://doi- org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/10.1086/706154

Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

these metrics are provided because no universal benchmarks exist that can validly be applied to all fields of study.

- Candidate *may* be doing public impact scholarship, which is defined as "intentional efforts to create social change through the translation and dissemination of research to nonacademic audiences" (para. 7).[4] Public impact scholarship may be dissemination of findings from qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods research, using a variety of strategies making research findings more accessible to community or broader audiences (e.g., briefs, testimony, community meetings, digital platforms, social media).

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- External reviewers
- Manuscripts submitted with dossier
- Google scholar, citation indices, H index, Journal Citation Reports

Creativity and Innovation

The candidate's research methods, products, and dissemination strategies *may* demonstrate creativity and innovation, for example:

- New implementation science methods, research designs, novel qualitative or quantitative analysis approaches.
- New apps, measures, interventions, trainings, legislation, policy.
- Novel use of technology, social media, websites, or community-based dissemination methods.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- External reviewers
- Publication record, authorship order, descriptions of effort
- Manuscripts submitted with dossier

Research and Scholarly Activities Conducted Ethically and with Integrity

The university and college have high expectations for ethical research.

- Adherence to IRB regulations.
- Ethical *process* of research from design and data collection to analysis and publication.
- Ethical treatment of graduate students, community collaborators, and faculty collaborators on research projects. Ethical treatment of research participants.
- Fair and accurate attribution of authorship,[5] for example:
    - Assigning authorship order based on size of contributions to publications.
    - Assigning authorship to everyone who helps write publications.
    - Not assigning authorship to individuals who made no contributions to the text of a publication.

[4] Sliva, S. M., Greenfield, J. C., Bender, K., & Freedenthal, S. (2019). Introduction to the Special Section on Public Impact Scholarship in Social Work: A Conceptual Review and Call to Action. *Journal of the Society for Social Work & Research*, *10*(4), 529–544. https://doi- org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/10.1086/706112

[5] International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2023). *Defining the Role of Authors and Contributors*.

Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

See also: American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s)
- Annual review letters

1.3. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Service is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include providing administrative service to the university, professional service to a faculty member's discipline, and disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university. While service reflecting good citizenship of the college and university are important, of high priority are service activities that contribute to the candidate's teaching and research/scholarship, the candidate and college's national/international reputation, and realizing the college and university missions. The purpose of service is to show evidence of productivity, creativity, leadership, and/or impact.

The College of Social Work defines three general domains of service. Candidates should articulate how they have contributed to each expected domain of service:

- Contributions to the operations and mission of the college or university
- Outreach and engagement with community-based partners in local, regional, national, or global communities
- Contributions to the profession or discipline

Detail on the three categories is presented below. Examples of evidence and sources of evidence are not exhaustive. Candidates may report additional evidence.

Table 3. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Service accounts for 20% of tenure-track faculty workload

In all domains below, 4th year candidates should demonstrate they are on a trajectory to meet criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Because external letters are not required for 4th year review, external reviews will not be a source of evidence.

Contributions to the Operations and Mission of the College or University
Candidates are expected to contribute to the operation of the college and university, including but not limited to at least two of the following:

- Participation in regularly scheduled meetings (unless excused by the Dean).
- Participation in additional college committees, task forces, and ad hoc committees.
- Participation in student organizations and events (e.g., orientation and commencement).
- May participate in university committees.
- May provide other types of service, such as consultation to peers, assistance with college events, etc.

Table 3. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Service accounts for 20% of tenure-track faculty workload

Outreach and Engagement with Community-Based Partners in Local, Regional, National, or Global Communities

Candidates *may* engage in community outreach that involves fulfilling a role in the wider community and/or representing the college at the local, state, national, and global levels. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Civic board memberships where such membership specifically represents university participation in the organization.
- Service to governmental agencies at the federal, state, and local levels.
- Making research understandable and usable in practice and policy settings.
- Contributing to non-academic media, e.g., creating content or being interviewed for newsletters, radio, television, and magazines.
- Giving presentations or performances for the public.
- Presentations to community agencies or other community groups (other than scholarship presentations to professional conferences).
- Service activity that benefits community-based programs.
- Representing the college at community-sponsored events.

Contributions to the Profession or Discipline

Candidates for promotion to associate professor are expected to be making contributions to the profession in more than one way. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Review of scholarly materials, such as conference abstracts, manuscripts, grant proposals.
- Chairing a professional conference.
- Serving on or leading a special interest group or topical cluster for a national conference.
- Serving as an organizer or leader of professional workshops, panels, or meetings.
- Contributing time and expertise to a professional society or organization.
- Refereeing or reviewing disciplinary/professional grant proposals for funding agencies.
- Holding official leadership roles in professional or scholarly organizations.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier

2. Promotion to Professor

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

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

The college recognizes that some seeking the rank of professor have spent time in outstanding academic leadership positions like Dean, Associate Dean, Director, and other university-wide positions. Outstanding academic leadership is evidenced by a visible and demonstratable impact on the mission of the college and university (or for incoming faculty, the mission of their previous college or university). The recognition of these multiple models of faculty success aims to recognize the broader range of faculty contributions that bolster the academic

culture. Therefore, in accordance with the principle specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, any assessment should be performed "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," with an understanding that no area of responsibility (teaching, research, service) should be below the minimum expectation level identified for promotion, nor outstanding performance in one dimension be used to overcome deficiencies in another dimension.

2.1. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Professor

Teaching criteria for promotion to professor include that the candidate has met all criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and that these have been demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of associate professor, or the last 5 years, whichever is more recent.

Additionally, it is expected *at a minimum* that a successful candidate will have assumed leadership roles in *two or more of the categories* of activity listed in the teaching criteria for promotion to associate professor (see Table 1. Teaching Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure), as well as mentoring of faculty. Candidates may provide evidence of leadership in other categories of Teaching.

- Leadership in equity and inclusion
- Other teaching and mentoring activities
- Mentoring of doctoral students
- Leadership in curriculum development

Table 4. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Professor
Teaching accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

Examples of leadership roles in teaching include, but are not limited to:

Leadership in Equity and Inclusion

- Demonstrating leadership (at the college, university, or professional level) in developing or disseminating strategies for culturally responsive and inclusive instruction.
- The candidate may also demonstrate how their work impacts students, faculty, and community members in areas such as retention of under-represented students and faculty, mentoring of under-represented groups and individuals, and promotion of community work and collaborative projects that further the causes of equity and inclusion.

Other Teaching and Mentoring Activities

- Developing or leading the development of educational materials and platforms related to social work practice, policy, and pedagogy (see examples in Other Teaching and Mentoring Activities and Exceptional Teaching Performance boxes of Associate Professor section.)
- Promoting the social work profession to broader audiences.
- Mentoring other faculty

Mentoring of Doctoral Students

- Serving on multiple doctoral candidacy and dissertation committees as member or chair.

Table 4. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Professor
Teaching accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

Leadership in Curriculum Development

- Leading one or more efforts to develop or revise courses and/or other curricular tasks, such as accreditation, degree requirements, certificate programs, or teaching team leader at the BSSW, MSW, or PhD levels.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier

2.2. Research and Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Professor

The research and scholarship criteria for promotion to professor include all the research and scholarship expectations for promotion to associate professor with tenure (see Table 2. Research & Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure), and that these have been demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of associate professor. OAA recommends using a full history of publications and creative work because it provides context to the more recent and relevant research and creative activity record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. *However, it is the performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluation*.

Additionally, it is expected *at a minimum* that a successful candidate will meet the criteria listed below in the following areas:

- Productivity as a scholar
- Independent research
- Funding
- Realized impact of scholarship in area of research

Table 5. Research and Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Professor
Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

In addition to the criteria for associate professor, candidates for professor should meet all the criteria in each of the following areas of research and scholarship, unless otherwise noted:

Productivity as a Scholar

- Since their last promotion, a successful candidate will minimally have 14 articles by the time they go up for professor. The numbers should be considered in the context of the nature and topic area of the candidate's research, as well as with consideration of other major contributions, such as books and edited books. Of these articles, candidates should have a minimum of 5 first-author or solo author publications.
- The candidate has contributed to the productivity of other scholars through mentoring, training, and/or opportunities for collaboration.
- Associate professors are expected to demonstrate mentoring of PhD students, including publishing with students. If the effort of serving as second author behind a PhD student first author is a significant contribution, the CSW values such publications as first-authored publications.
- The candidate *may* have published a book or edited book with a major publisher.

Table 5. Research and Scholarship Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Professor
Research and scholarship accounts for 40% of tenure-track faculty workload

Independent Research

- The candidate has a clearly defined and well-established program of research that is recognized by other scholars in their field of study.
- The candidate has a leadership role in collaborative research projects, publications, and funding as indicated by first-author publications and PI status on funded projects.

Funding

- Candidate has obtained external funding from community, state, foundation, and/or federal sources appropriate for their program of research.
- Grant funding contributes to the candidate's focused record of scholarship with dissemination through peer-reviewed publications and presentations.
- For candidates with administrative positions, funding may include grants to fund, for example, scholarships, recruitment and retention of students and faculty.

Realized Impact of Research on Scholarship in Area of Research

- The candidate's research has influenced knowledge, theory, and/or research methods in their area of scholarship.
- The candidate has a national and/or international reputation in their scholarship area as evidenced by invited presentations, invitations to review grant proposals, editorial positions, and/or citations, etc.
- Candidate is recognized as an expert by professional organizations, journals, and/or funders as indicated by honors, awards, and/or invitations to review abstract submissions, manuscripts, or grant proposals in their field.
- Candidate is cited by other scholars in their field.

Sources of Evidence

- External reviewers
- Publication record
- Dossier
- Manuscripts/scholarly products submitted with dossier

2.3. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Professor

Service criteria for promotion to professor include that the candidate has met all criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and that these have been demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of associate professor, or the last 5 years, whichever is more recent.

Additionally, it is expected *at a minimum* that the successful candidate will have assumed leadership roles in all three of the categories of service listed in the criteria for associate professor (see Table 3. Service Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure):

- Contributing to the operations and mission of the college and/or university
- Outreach and engagement with community-based partners in local, regional, national, or global communities
- Contributions to the profession or discipline

Detail on the three categories is presented below. Examples of evidence and sources of

evidence are not exhaustive. Candidates may report additional evidence.

Table 6. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Professor
Service accounts for 20% of faculty workload

In addition to the service criteria for promotion to associate professor, candidates for professor should provide evidence of at least one contribution in each of the areas below. Examples include, but are not limited to:

Contributing to the Operations and Mission of the College and/or University

- Serving in an administrative role at the college or university.
- Leadership in committee work of the college.
- Membership in university governance system or a committee serving units outside of the College of Social Work.
- Leadership in university governance.
- Providing career, promotion, research, and/or teaching mentorship to other faculty, especially assistant and associate professors and new faculty of any rank.
- Candidate *may* have received one or more awards, honors, or other recognition from the college or university.

Outreach and Engagement with Community-Based Partners in Local, Regional, National, or Global Communities

- Providing consultation, assistance, or leadership to community agencies or institutions outside of the university, including serving on community boards or collaborating on grant-seeking and research.
- Membership, leadership, providing testimony, or other significant contributions to policy decision-making team(s) or governmental entities.
- Community development activities.
- Candidate *may* have received one or more awards, honors, or other recognition from the local, regional, national, or international entities.

Contributions to the Profession or Discipline

- Leadership in one or more professional organizations.
- Serving as editor, associate editor, or on the editorial board of one or more professional journals.
- Candidate *may* have received one or more awards, honors, or other recognition from professional organizations.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier

B. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion for Clinical Faculty

NOTE: The university does not require clinical faculty to seek promotion. They may elect to remain at their entry rank indefinitely.

1. Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor

1.1. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor

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

Specific indicators of teaching excellence are listed below for these categories of teaching:

- High-quality instruction
- Equity and inclusion
- Other teaching and mentoring activities
- Mentoring of doctoral students
- Curriculum development
- Continued professional development as an educator
- *Exceptional* teaching performance

Potential sources of evidence for these categories are described below. Examples of evidence and sources of evidence are not exhaustive. Candidates may report additional evidence.

Table 7. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor
Teaching accounts for 80% of clinical faculty workload

High-Quality Instruction

CSW faculty are expected to have high performance appraisals and/or offer convincing evidence of a trajectory toward excellence in teaching in online and/or in-person courses.

- Candidate's instruction includes the use of multiple teaching methods, effective engagement in grading/assessment, timely communication with students, and efforts to stay current with new knowledge in course content area.
- Multiple performance indicators of high-quality instruction or a trajectory toward excellence are evident in the dossier.

Sources of Evidence

Evidence of high-quality instruction may be based on at least two of the following:

Table 7. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor
Teaching accounts for 80% of clinical faculty workload

- Dossier narrative statement(s) demonstrates that curricula, instructional practices, and/or learning environments are evidence informed, differentiated, culturally responsive, innovative and/or data driven or contain other evidence of high-quality instruction
- Student evaluations of instruction (SEIs), quantitative and narrative
- Peer evaluation of teaching (candidates are required to have *n - 1* peer reviews where *n* is the number of years they have taught)
- External observations (e.g., Drake Institute for Teaching & Learning)
- Teaching award(s)

Note: CSW acknowledges that SEI data cannot be assumed to represent student opinion accurately when response rates are low, as is common at the college. It also acknowledges that many factors outside the instructor's control, such as class size, can have a systematic effect on student evaluations. In addition, research indicates that the race, ethnicity, and gender of instructors systematically affects student evaluations, to the disadvantage of women and faculty of color. Therefore, ***SEI data should be interpreted with caution in some cases.***

Equity and Inclusion

Inclusive excellence practices and cultural humility are demonstrated in the classroom or other teaching environments. Examples may include two or more of the following or other indicators:

- Candidate addresses issues of equity in their instruction as relevant to the course curriculum.
- Candidate holds high standards equitably for all students.
- Candidate supports students with special needs, different learning styles, and different levels of academic preparation.
- Candidate creates a positive learning environment for all students.
- Candidate makes efforts to strengthen their cultural responsiveness in instruction.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier narrative statement(s) describes inclusive teaching principles related to instruction, curricula and/or learning environments
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- SEIs on related items
- Assignments and/or syllabi

Other Teaching and Mentoring Activities

Candidate engages in one or more instructional activities outside the regular classroom, such as:

- Mentoring MSW and/or undergraduate students.
- Providing instruction or mentorship as a committee member on a student graded (for academic credit) project, including undergraduate honors thesis, graduate candidacy exam committee, or graduate thesis.
- Providing instruction or mentorship as instructor of record on students graded (for academic credit) independent study coursework.
- Providing formal continuous education, workshops, or professional development to practitioners and the broader community.
- Teaching Bridge courses, mini courses at CSW, university short courses, and providing

Table 7. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor
Teaching accounts for 80% of clinical faculty workload

guest lectures.
- Faculty advisor to student group.
- Responsibility for administering a certificate program (specialized advising).
- Conducting training/discussion session related to students' career development, job/academic skills necessary for success (other than what is covered in a course for credit).
- Hosting a "journal club" or other peer learning session on a specific topic outside of classes taken/taught for course credit.
- Other examples of teaching activities outside the classroom are contributions to the social work profession or broader public, such as: writing educational materials for NASW or CSWE, developing a course for Coursera, LinkedIn, or other online platforms.

Sources of Evidence
- Dossier

Mentoring Doctoral Students
- Candidate *may* have supervised and/or mentored one or more doctoral students as graduate research and/or teaching assistants.
- Candidate *may* have served as a member on a doctoral candidacy and/or dissertation committee, which may include committees for students in other departments at the university, or other universities in the US or abroad.
- Candidate *may* have conducted a training, guest lecture, or workshop for doctoral students.
- Candidate *may* have served as consultant or PI on a proposal for funding for a student-led project.

Sources of Evidence
- Dossier

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

Candidate must have membership or leadership on voluntary, appointed, or elected curriculum committees and/or the Teaching & Learning Committee (unless counted in service). In addition, the candidate has engaged in at least one of the following:
- Supported development or substantial revision of one or more in-person and/or online courses.
- Assisted in the development of a new major/minor or certificate program that includes social work.
- Assisted academic Program Directors/Associate Dean of Academic Affairs in developing new projects or reaffirmation materials (unless counted in service).

Source of Evidence
- Dossier
- Updated syllabus and/or other course materials

Table 7. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor
Teaching accounts for 80% of clinical faculty workload

Continued Professional Development as an Educator

Candidates must have sought opportunities to improve and expand their teaching methods (e.g., university trainings, professional development, seeking feedback from different sources such as students, faculty, or external consultants) and their knowledge in the content areas of their courses (e.g., university trainings, professional development, literature review, community practice).

Candidate has done at least one of the following:

- Introduced innovation to their instruction.
- Engaged in consultation from teaching improvement services/specialists in the college, the university, or external to the university.
- Engaged in training aimed at strengthening instructional competence.
- Engaged in self-review of teaching on a regular basis.

Source of Evidence

- Dossier

***Exceptional* Teaching Performance**

The candidate *may* have demonstrated exceptional teaching performance as evidenced by two or more of the following (or similar activities):

- One or more teaching or mentoring awards.
- Providing professional development or trainings on pedagogy.
- Providing consultation to other faculty on instructional methods.
- Developed published or unpublished social work texts or pedagogical materials for the profession, including online formats.
- Significant participation in a discussion board or other social media system for exploring education in social work or related disciplines.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier
- SEIs
- Teaching or mentoring award(s)

1.2. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor

Service is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include providing administrative service to the university, professional service to a faculty member's discipline, and disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university. While service reflecting good citizenship of the college and university is important, of high priority are service activities that contribute to the candidate's teaching, the candidate's and college's national/international reputation, and realizing the college and university missions. The purpose of service is to show evidence of productivity, creativity, leadership, and/or impact.

The College of Social Work defines three general domains of service. Candidates should articulate

how they have contributed to each expected domain of service:

- Contributing to the operations and mission of the college or university
- Outreach and engagement with community-based partners in local, regional, national, or global communities
- Contributions to the profession or discipline

Detail on the three categories is presented below. Examples of evidence and sources of evidence are not exhaustive. Candidates may report additional evidence.

Table 8. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor
Service accounts for 20% of clinical faculty workload

Contributions to the Operations and Mission of the College or University

Candidates are expected to contribute to the operation of the college and university, including but not limited to at least two of the following:

- Participation in regularly scheduled meetings (unless excused by the Dean).
- Participation in college committees, task forces, ad hoc committees, and instructional/program development activities.
- Participation in student organizations and events (e.g., orientation and commencement).
- May participate in university committees.
- May provide other types of service, such as consultation to peers, assistance with college events, etc.

Outreach and Engagement with Community-Based Partners in the Local, Regional, National, or Global Communities

Candidates *may* engage in community outreach that involves fulfilling a role in the wider community and/or representing the college at the local, state, national, and global levels. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Civic board memberships where such membership specifically represents university participation in the organization.
- Service to governmental agencies at the federal, state, and local levels.
- Contributing to non-academic media, e.g., creating content or being interviewed for newsletters, radio, television, and magazines.
- Giving presentations or performances for the public.
- Presentations to community agencies or other community groups (other than scholarship presentations to professional conferences).
- Service activity that benefits community-based programs.
- Representing the college at community-sponsored events.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier

Contributions to the Profession or Discipline

Candidates for promotion to associate clinical professor are expected to make contributions to the profession in more than one way. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Review of scholarly materials, such as conference abstracts, manuscripts, grant proposals.
- Chairing a professional conference.

Table 8. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor Service accounts for 20% of clinical faculty workload
• Serving on or leading a special interest group or topical cluster for a national conference. • Serving as an organizer or leader of professional workshops, panels, or meetings. • Contributing time and expertise to a professional society or organization. • Holding official leadership roles in professional or scholarly organizations. • Active membership in professional or disciplinary organizations, task forces, workgroups • Publications or professional presentations related to the profession or discipline and/or disseminated to professional audiences.
Sources of Evidence • Dossier

2. Promotion to Clinical Professor

2.1. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Clinical Professor

Teaching criteria for promotion to clinical professor include that the candidate has met all criteria for promotion to associate clinical professor, and that these have been demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of associate clinical professor.

Additionally, it is expected *at a minimum* that the successful candidate will have assumed leadership roles in *two or more of the categories* of activity listed in the teaching criteria for promotion to associate clinical professor (see Table 7. Teaching Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor), as well as mentoring of faculty.

Candidates may provide evidence of leadership in other categories of Teaching.

- Leadership in equity and inclusion
- Other teaching and mentoring activities
- Leadership in curriculum development

Table 9. Teaching Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Clinical Professor Teaching accounts for 80% of clinical faculty workload
Examples of additional teaching-related activities and teaching-related leadership for promotion to clinical professor may include, but are not limited to: **Leadership in Equity & Inclusion** • Demonstrating leadership (at the college, university, or professional level) in developing or disseminating strategies for culturally responsive and inclusive instruction. • Demonstrating how their work impacts students, faculty, and community members in areas such as retention of under-represented students and faculty, mentoring of under-represented groups and individuals, and promotion of community work and collaborative projects that further the causes of equity and inclusion. • Delivering skill-building workshop/training related to teaching effectiveness, curriculum development, or content areas taught in courses (in the college, on the campus, or in the professional community).

Other Teaching and Mentoring Activities

- Conducting peer evaluations of teaching and/or advising colleagues on teaching-related activities.
- Leadership of a teaching team (i.e., all instructors of multiple sections in a course or course sequence).

Leadership in Curriculum Development

- Chair/co-chair of standing curriculum committee.
- Leading one or more efforts to develop or revise courses and/or other curricular tasks, such as, degree requirements or certificate programs.

Pedagogical Leadership

- Demonstrate facilitation or adoption of current, evidence-based teaching content or approaches within CSW, OSU and/or other universities.
- Leadership role in college reaccreditation process.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier

2.2. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Clinical Professor

Service criteria for promotion to clinical professor include that the candidate has met all criteria for promotion to associate clinical professor, and that these have been demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of associate clinical professor, or the last 5 years, whichever is more recent.

Additionally, it is expected at a minimum that the successful candidate will have assumed leadership roles in all three of the categories of service listed in the criteria for associate clinical professor (see Table 8. Service Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor):

- Contributions to the operations and mission of the college and/or university
- Outreach and engagement with community-based partners in local, regional, national, or global communities
- Contributions to the profession or discipline

Detail on the three categories is presented below. Examples of evidence and sources of evidence are not exhaustive. Candidates may report additional evidence.

Table 10. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Clinical Professor
Service accounts for 20% of faculty workload

In addition to the service criteria for promotion to associate clinical professor, candidates for clinical professor should provide evidence of at least one contribution in each of the areas below. Examples include, but are not limited to:

Contributions to the Operations and Mission of the College and/or University

- Serving in an administrative role at the college or university.
- Leadership in standing or ad hoc committee or task forces of the college.
- Membership in university governance system or a committee serving units outside of the

Table 10. Service Criteria/Evidence for Promotion to Clinical Professor
Service accounts for 20% of faculty workload

College of Social Work.

- Providing career, promotion, research, and/or teaching mentorship to other faculty, especially assistant and associate professors and new faculty of any rank.
- Leadership in university governance.
- Receiving awards, honors, or other recognition from the college or university.

Outreach and Engagement with Community-Based Partners in Local, Regional, National, or Global Communities

- Providing consultation, assistance, or leadership to community agencies or institutions outside of the university.
- Membership, leadership, providing testimony, or other significant contributions to policy decision-making team(s) or governmental entities.
- Community development activities.
- Receiving awards, honors, or other recognition from the local, regional, national, or international entities.

Contributions to the Profession or Discipline

- Leadership in one or more professional organizations.
- Serving as editor, associate editor, or on the editorial board of one or more professional journals.
- Receiving awards, honors, or other recognition from professional organizations.

Sources of Evidence

- Dossier

C. Promotion of Associated Faculty

The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer occurs automatically when the lecturer has completed 20 semesters of instruction.

D. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

The college's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules 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 Procedures and Guidelines Handbook.

Each candidate is reviewed independently, based on the merits of their own case. Candidates are not reviewed comparatively.

1. Procedures for Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty

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 document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the college'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 college guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

Dossier
Every candidate must submit 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 POD 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 them.

a. Teaching Documentation
The time frame for teaching-related material included in the college-reviewed dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to the present. For tenured faculty or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to the present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Required documentation includes:
- Documentation of teaching activities as listed and described in the core dossier.
- Cumulative SEI reports for every class taught, provided by the Dean's office.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports, provided by the Dean's office.
- Electronic or PDF copies of pedagogical papers, books, or other materials published or accepted for publication. PDF copies are not required if links to electronic versions are embedded in dossier citations (e.g., DOI).

b. Scholarship Documentation
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 (for tenured or non-probationary faculty) 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.

Required documentation includes:
- Documentation of scholarship activities as listed and described in the core dossier.
- Electronic or PDF copies of books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. PDF copies are not required if links to electronic versions are embedded in dossier citations (e.g., DOI). Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has

been unequivocally accepted with no further revisions needed.
- Impact factor/H scores can be embedded within the Research Impact Narrative Statement.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received, as confirmed by the CSW Research Office.
- Materials provided for external review: Candidates who will need an external review are responsible for preparing a research statement, separate from the dossier research narrative. The statement, along with five representative articles and the candidate's CV, are sent to reviewers. The recommended length of the statement is 5-10 pages. Within the statement, the candidate should describe the nature of their contribution in the five representative articles.

c. Service Documentation

The time frame for service-related material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty members 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 if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Examples of documentation include:
- Documentation of service activities as listed and described in the core dossier.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Office of Academic Affairs Procedures and Guidelines Handbook outlines candidates' options regarding the version of APT document applied to their review. Candidates undergoing fourth-year review and promotion/tenure review will be reviewed using the College of Social Work's most current APT document approved and posted on the OAA website unless they choose to be reviewed under the document that was in effect on their start date or on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of clinical faculty), whichever is 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. A faculty member choosing to use an earlier APT document will notify the Dean of this intent and submit the APT document that was in effect at the relevant point in time. This notification will occur when the candidate submits their dossier and other materials for review.

External Evaluations (see VI.D.4. External Evaluations)

As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to college guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Dean decides whether removal is justified.

1.2. College of Social Work P&T Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the P&T committee are as follows (see Appendix B for a recommended calendar of activities):
- Review this APT document annually and recommend proposed revisions following established rules.
- Manage the processes involved in tenure-track and clinical faculty reviews. This includes, as applicable, mandatory fourth-year review; mandatory promotion and tenure review;

and non-mandatory promotion review, with or without tenure.

Spring Semester:

- Decide the appropriateness of faculty requests for non-mandatory promotion review (see section VI.D.2. Procedures for Requesting a Non-Mandatory Promotion Review).
- Elect from within its membership one or more individuals to serve in the role of Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) and identify the liaison for each candidate. The committee roles are described in detail in the college's POA document.
- Provide the Dean's office with a list of potential external evaluators for each candidate for promotion.

Late Summer/Early Autumn:

- The POD will review candidates' dossiers to assure they are prepared correctly and to verify completeness and accuracy of all publications and creative works listed citations); and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- The liaison drafts a summary letter describing the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship (not applicable for clinical faculty), and service. It is due to the P&T committee by the first week in October for approval. The P&T committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record in the summary letter.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Dean in the case of joint appointees whose TIU is in another college. The Committee of Eligible Faculty do not vote on these cases since the recommendation must be provided to the other TIU substantially earlier than the eligible faculty begins meeting on our own cases.

Autumn Semester:

- The chair (or committee member designee, if necessary) leads the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty discussing each case for fourth-year review, promotion and tenure, or promotion. The POD maintains a record of the procedures followed in this meeting. Two committee members (not the POD or chair) take notes about the eligible faculty members' discussion. The liaisons (or committee member designees, if necessary) are responsible for initiating the discussion of each candidate (see Appendix C for a suggested meeting agenda).
- The chair, based on notes taken by two committee members during the meeting and with committee input, updates the summary letter to include (a) the faculty vote and (b) a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting. The chair then forwards the completed written summary letter and recommendation to the Dean.
- Maintain confidentiality concerning what was discussed and by whom, other than what is required to be placed in reports from the committee.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

1.3. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Committee of Eligible Faculty are as follows:

- Independently review, thoroughly and objectively, each candidate's dossier and supporting materials in advance of the meeting at which each candidate's case will be discussed; accessing the materials is a requirement of being allowed to cast a vote for that candidate.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control

prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
- Refer candidates' procedural questions to the P&T committee chair and/or POD.
- Maintain confidentiality concerning what was discussed and by whom.

1.4. Dean's Responsibilities

The Dean's general responsibilities as they relate to promotion and tenure are as follows:

- General oversight by the Dean's office of activities related to faculty review, including but not limited to: ensuring all faculty have access to the APT document and are notified of all updates/revisions; managing the alphabetical rotation for P&T committee membership; communications with external reviewers; posting/circulation materials for eligible faculty review; managing voting procedures; completing forms for OAA.
- Provide all faculty members, regardless of rank, with annual review feedback that is formative in nature, helping them to gauge their strengths and limitations in each area of review.
- Forward APT document revisions approved by the faculty, to the Office of Academic Affairs.

The responsibilities of the Dean or Dean's office during promotion and tenure or promotion reviews are as follows:

Early Spring Semester:

- Following faculty election of the chair-elect, appoint the remaining members P&T committee. The committee's membership is described in the college's POA document.
  - Ensuring appointment of supplemental members of the P&T committee for review in promotion to professor or clinical faculty promotions, if needed.
- Identify those faculty members who are due for mandatory review in the spring of the year before the review is to be conducted and inviting faculty members to submit requests for non-mandatory promotion review.
- 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. For tenure-track assistant professors, the Dean's office confirms 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:

- Solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the P&T committee and the candidate (see section VI.D.4. External Evaluations).

Late Summer/Early Autumn:

- Schedule and announce the autumn mandatory meeting(s) of the committee(s) of eligible faculty for conducting all mandatory and non-mandatory reviews. Per calendar, meetings will take place on November's 1st non-holiday Monday.

Mid-Autumn Semester:

- 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.
- Charge each member of the Committee of Eligible Faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- 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.

- Attend, as an observer, the meetings of the Committee of Eligible Faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions asked of them during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the Dean will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the summary letter prepared by the P&T committee, which is finalized by the P&T chair after the discussion and vote of the eligible faculty.
- Explain to eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- Inform each candidate within 24 hours of the outcome of the vote of the eligible faculty. A formal letter will also be provided to the candidate after completion of the review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and Dean;
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Dean; and
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the Dean, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Dean, indicating whether or not they will submit comments.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To ensure that all materials are delivered to OAA at earliest possible time, but no later than the college's assigned due date.

2. Procedures for Requesting a Non-Mandatory Promotion Review

A tenure-track or clinical faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion review at any time. The Dean will solicit a list of faculty interested in a non-mandatory promotion review in early Spring semester (see Appendix B for a recommended calendar of activities). In such cases, the college P&T committee will review the following materials submitted by candidates requesting non-mandatory promotion review:

- CV
- For tenure-track faculty, 2 pages (maximum) with a brief research statement and the following information for the time since appointment or last promotion (for professor candidates):
  - Count of in-press or published articles.
  - Statement of courses and classes taught, revised, and/or developed.
  - Average of overall SEIs.
  - Summary of service activities.
- For clinical faculty, 2 pages (maximum) with a statement about the candidate's growth and mastery of teaching and the following information for the time since appointment or last promotion (for clinical professor candidates):
  - Statement of courses and classes taught, revised, and/or developed.
  - Average of overall SEIs.
  - Summary of service activities.

The entire body of tenured professors must be convened to review a request for promotion to professor.

The P&T committee will make a recommendation to the Dean about whether to put forth a

faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion review. A two-thirds majority of those committee members eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the non-mandatory promotion review to proceed. The P&T committee bases its decision on assessment of the candidate's record as presented in the faculty member's CV and 2-page statement described above. The committee also determines if the candidate has all required documentation for a full review (e.g., at least 2 peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review request.

If the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review, however, the college P&T committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion review (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04). A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal non-mandatory 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.

A decision by the P&T committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Dean, or any other party to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

3. Procedures for Associated Faculty

Associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in section VI.D.1. Procedures for Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the Executive Vice President and Provost if the Dean's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the Dean is final in such cases). Positive recommendations, however, do proceed to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer occurs automatically when the lecturer has completed 20 semesters of instruction.

4. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. External evaluations are not obtained for clinical faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship, as determined by the Dean after consulting with the P&T committee chair. While external evaluations are very helpful in reviewing a candidate's research/scholarship, they are not a substitute for eligible faculty members conducting a thorough evaluation of a candidate's body of work.

A minimum of five (5) credible and useful written evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation.
- The College of Social Work seeks to solicit evaluations only from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State, but we recognize that in certain areas some of the most qualified reviewers may be at other institutions. A minority of external evaluations

may include individuals situated in academic institutions outside of the United States system of higher education. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. Emeritus faculty are acceptable evaluators.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

4.1. Procedures for Creating the List of Potential Evaluators

The list of potential evaluators is assembled by the P&T committee and the candidate. First, the P&T committee members will independently generate a list of potential external evaluators, including contact information and a brief biographical statement reflecting the goodness-of-fit with the candidate's CV. External evaluators should be sought from peer and aspirational peer institutions (for example, but not restricted to, the University of Michigan, University of Washington, University of California Los Angeles, University of Texas at Austin, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Washington University in St. Louis, Columbia University, and the University of Denver). The committee should identify 12 to 15 possible reviewers. Next, the committee-generated list is shared with the candidate to ensure no conflicts of interest exist. If a conflict of interest is identified by the candidate, the list is shortened by the deletion of the individual(s). The candidate may, at that time, add no more than 3 names to the possible invitation list, rank-ordered by preference (with the same information and in the same format used by committee members). The candidate is not required to submit any names of potential external reviewers.

The P&T committee then meets to discuss the committee-generated list and candidate additions, identifying the first five evaluators to be invited, and rank ordering the rest should sufficient numbers fail to be generated from the initial group. Among evaluators suggested by the candidate and meeting the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons but no more than 50% of the final set of letters obtained (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04). If the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write a letter, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this college requires that the dossier contain any letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. Should the entire list be invited without achieving the necessary minimum number of letters, the committee will reconvene to identify and invite an additional group of external reviewers. All invitations are documented per OAA procedures.

4.2. Procedures for Soliciting External Evaluations

- The college will follow the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track 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 Dean, 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 unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves exclusion. If concerns arise about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the college's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.
    - While external evaluators are provided with a deadline for submitting their reviews, there are times when the letters arrive later than expected. Letters will be included as long as they are received up to the P&T committee completing its final version of the summary letter to be shared with eligible faculty, prior to the meeting where a candidate is reviewed. Letters will not be discussed if they have not been reviewed by the committee in preparation of the summary letter and will not be circulated to the eligible faculty; they will not be entered into the materials for review.
- The Dean's office solicits the letters of external evaluation. When a request is accepted by an external reviewer, the candidate's current CV, statements regarding research/scholarship, and representative examples of the candidate's scholarly work are submitted for review, along with a letter detailing what the review should address.
    - Within the statement, the candidate should describe the nature of their contribution in the five representative articles.
    - External reviewers are NOT asked to share an opinion about whether the individual's record merits promotion or tenure at The Ohio State University or a comparable institution; however, should this be included in the review letter, this opinion should not be considered by eligible voting faculty members in their own evaluation of the candidate's record.
    - External evaluation generally applies only to the record of research/scholarship. However, in some circumstances, it may be helpful to request evaluation of other aspects of a candidate's dossier. Should this be requested, sufficient information must be provided to the external reviewer to allow for a useful evaluation.

VII. APPEALS

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

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

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

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.

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

All faculty members are expected to engage in regular, ongoing review of their teaching effectiveness throughout the course of their careers. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness includes assessment both by students and other faculty members, as well as the candidate's own self-evaluation.

A. Student Evaluation of Instruction

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

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

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

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer review and feedback about instructional effectiveness is a critical element throughout a faculty member's career. The contribution of peer review is greatest when peer observations are conducted systematically with the goal of offering constructive suggestions. The Office of Academic Affairs requires that dossiers of tenure-track faculty members seeking reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion contain documentation from peer evaluation of teaching. The college expectation is that dossiers of clinical faculty members seeking reappointment and/or promotion also include documentation from peer evaluation of teaching.

Both tenure-track and clinical faculty members at the assistant rank will have n-1 peer evaluation reports where n=*the number of years of instruction at The Ohio State University*. Faculty members (regardless of appointment type) at the associate or higher rank will engage in peer evaluation of their teaching at least every 3 years. A minimum of 2 peer evaluations of teaching reports is required as part of any reappointment, promotion, or tenure review. Any faculty member may request a non-mandatory peer evaluation of teaching be conducted at any time.

The peer evaluation of teaching procedures are as follows:

- The peer evaluation of teaching cycle is monitored by the Dean's office.
- All faculty members are eligible to serve as peer reviewers with either tenure-track or clinical faculty at any rank. No faculty member is obligated to conduct a requested review. Peer reviewers must be at the same or higher rank as the faculty member under review. Faculty members serving as current P&T liaisons are not eligible to conduct peer evaluations of teaching with persons for whom they serve as liaison. Conducting peer reviews counts as service to the College of Social Work during annual merit reviews.
- The Dean's office maintains a schedule of which faculty require peer evaluation of teaching each year. During the first week in September, the Dean's office will generate a list of needed peer evaluation of teaching and share it with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs as the chair of the Curriculum Oversight Group (COG). At their initial meeting, the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, in consultation with the COG, will establish a timeline to determine peer reviewers for all peer evaluations of teaching during the year, and the chair will notify in writing each faculty member to be reviewed of this timeline. Each faculty member to be reviewed will provide the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs with a confidentially treated list of 3 potential reviewers (excluding their P&T liaison, if applicable) by the established deadline. The COG, along with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, will determine one reviewer for each faculty member under review and communicate that decision to both the faculty member under review and the reviewer. It is expected that the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, in consultation with the COG, will coordinate their assignments to ensure that no individual faculty member is disproportionately assigned to conduct too many reviews.
- Once the reviewer is determined, it is the responsibility of the faculty member under review and the assigned reviewer to schedule the review process. The faculty members receiving and conducting the review will meet to agree on a schedule for the peer review process. During this meeting, the faculty member receiving the review will identify a course and session/module for the class observation. Selection criteria should emphasize courses and sessions that the faculty member being reviewed believes will allow the best opportunity for providing an accurate representation of their instruction. It is generally not recommended that observation occur for courses a faculty member is teaching for the first time.
- The peer review process consists of four components: (1) a pre-observation conference, (2) a class observation, (3) a post-observation conference, and (4) a written summary submitted to the Dean's office and candidate within two weeks of completing the post-observation conference. The T&L committee should also be notified that the written summary has been received by the Dean's office. Specific procedures for class observations are described in the Peer Evaluation of Teaching documents adopted by College of Social Work and available on the CSW Shared Drive.

C. Self-Evaluation of Teaching

Self-evaluation of teaching is critical to any future improvement. All instructors, including tenure-track and clinical faculty members, should consider the strengths and challenges of their courses, as well as the feedback provided by the student evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, and other instruction-improvement activities (e.g., conferences, workshops, consultation, course design services). The candidate's evaluation of their instruction in the dossier must include a statement of the candidate's instructional approach and goals; self-assessment; and description of specific strategies for the candidate's further development as an instructor.

X. APPENDICES

Appendix A. Specific Merit Review Criteria

The merit system is based on principles of management which suggest that criteria for performance evaluation and rewards should: (a) be as specific as possible; (b) be applied fairly across comparable faculty positions; (c) be known well in advance of a decision affecting employment status or salary; and (d) offer a menu of equivalents for achieving baseline while respecting faculty diversity in interests and talents. Merit review presumes demonstration of a baseline level of responsible execution of assigned duties. This includes faculty workload assignments, as well as a responsibility to complete all university-required training and to behave in a collegial and professional manner when representing the programs, college, and university.

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with similar criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Academic program directors, assistant and associate deans, and other leadership positions who are faculty will be reviewed for merit in an additional fourth category so that their performance in these administrative capacities is reflected in their annual merit review.

The time frame for assessing teaching and service will be the previous academic year (summer through spring). However, recognizing that productivity in the scholarship domain often fluctuates according to natural funding, conference, and publication cycles such that scholarly activities might not yield immediate outcomes falling within a single academic year, a faculty member may elect to have scholarship productivity evaluated either based on the past academic year (12 months) or on a three-year rolling average basis. Calculation of annual merit for scholarship helps address long review cycles and multi-year projects. As a working example, a faculty member with a total of six accepted articles during the three-year period would be eligible for merit based on having an average of two publications in each year. An average may be computed on fewer than three years if a faculty member was appointed fewer than three years ago. The three-year rolling average computation applies only to the scholarship domain.

Faculty performance will be evaluated considering individual contributions to advancing the college mission, goals, and objectives. The specific roles, responsibilities, and assigned duties of individual faculty members vary regarding components of the college mission, goals, and objectives, and appointment variability will be taken into consideration in the awarding of merit. Tenure-track faculty members demonstrating high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor (scholarship, teaching, and service) and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. This is true also of clinical faculty demonstrating high-quality performance in the areas of endeavor specified in their contract, but for teaching and service at a minimum. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no merit-based salary increases.

1. Teaching Merit Criteria

Ensuring program excellence is a major objective for the College of Social Work, and teaching activities are highly valued. Merit review in the teaching category is based on three types of information about teaching activities: (1) evaluations of teaching (student and peer evaluation of teaching reports), (2) effort/amount of involvement in teaching-related activities, and (3) engaging in teaching improvement/development activities.

A 4-point scale is utilized to quantify teaching-related merit: 0 = *no merit*; 1 = *partial merit*; 2 = *merit*; and 3 = *extra merit*. Teaching-related and teaching improvement/development activities that may qualify for merit consideration include those identified in section VI.A. Criteria and

Evidence that Support Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty (teaching criteria tables). Partial merit, merit, or extra merit is awarded only when a faculty member's performance in the teaching category exceeds expectations.

Expectations related to merit in the teaching category include:

- Evidence of teaching competence based on SEIs, peer evaluation of teaching (if applicable), and other evidence provided by the faculty member in their annual review report.
- Adhering to university guidelines for recording semester grades and providing feedback to students.
- Communicating with assigned field instructors each semester (for individuals with liaison duties as part of assigned load).
- Timely response to student requests.

Merit or extra merit in teaching is awarded for activities that exceed these expectations for teaching merit, in terms of quantity, frequency, and/or impact. Activities beyond these teaching expectations are described in section VI.A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty (teaching criteria tables). For example, to earn merit or extra merit an individual might engage in a large number of the listed activities, frequently engage in a single category (such as supervision of theses), engage in a category with exceptionally high commitment and impact (such as writing a textbook published by a nationally recognized publisher, developing new courses, securing funding for a training grant related to teaching/curriculum development), or be recognized for exceptional teaching (e.g., a teaching award).

2. Scholarship Merit Criteria

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

A 4-point scale is utilized to quantify scholarship-related merit: 0 = *no merit*; 1 = *partial merit*; 2 = *merit*; and 3 = *extra merit*. This scale applies to tenure-track faculty merit review. Scholarship activities engaged in by clinical faculty and approved by the Dean may be credited merit points in either the service or teaching category as determined by how the faculty member places their activities in their annual review report.

Scholarship-related activities that may qualify for the Dean's merit consideration include those identified in section VI.A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty (scholarship criteria tables). The following chart indicates how commonly reported scholarship activities could be translated into these four levels of merit—merit decisions remain at the discretion of the Dean. (Note: individual cells apply; it is not necessary to complete an entire row of activities for the level of merit to apply).

Table 11. Commonly Reported Scholarship Activities and Possible Translation to Merit

	# of accepted or published article/book chapter	Book contract	Book published	Grant submission	Grant funded	Conference presentations accepted/ presented
0 = no merit	—	—	—	—	—	—
1 = partial merit	1	—	—	—	—	1
2 = merit	2	1	—	1	—	2
3 = extra merit	3+	—	1	—	1	3+

Note the following:

- Conference presentations are refereed or invited papers and posters. These are typically international or national professional conferences; other types of conferences may contribute to the case for scholarly impact or may be more appropriately placed in the service category. The Dean may require submission of a product (e.g., paper or PowerPoint file) at the time of annual review.
- Papers submitted for merit consideration that are accepted for publication, but not yet published, must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Scholarly works, except for approved grant proposals, will be considered for merit when submitted, only when **either** accepted or actually disseminated (not both). In other words, an accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in an annual review period may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.
- Consistent with the College of Social Work's strategic emphasis on increasing grant funding, a faculty member may earn merit when submitting a grant proposal that has been approved by the college administration prior to submission. This is the only scholarly activity for which merit may be earned by submission only. Extra merit can be earned only by obtaining funding. Seed grants awarded by the College of Social Work are not included in the determination of merit. Grants related to teaching (e.g., training grants) earn merit under the teaching category, not under scholarship.
- Faculty members will earn extra-merit for each funded year of their awarded grants.

3. Service Merit Criteria

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

A 4-point scale is utilized to quantify service-related merit: 0 = *no merit*; 1 = *partial merit*; 2 = *merit*; and 3 = *extra merit*. Service-related activities that may qualify for merit consideration include those identified in section VI.A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty (service criteria tables). Merit or extra merit is awarded only when a faculty member's performance in the service category exceeds the service expectations.

It is expected that the volume of service provided by assistant-level faculty members to the college and university will be less than that provided by higher ranked faculty members.

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

- Regular attendance at scheduled faculty meetings; anticipated recurrent absences may be excused by the dean based on unavoidable scheduling conflicts with high priority activities (e.g., teaching schedule conflict, significant community engagement responsibility, team/collaborative research activity).
- Regular attendance and timely participation in meetings and activities of committees for which merit performance is being evaluated (including assigned curriculum and program committees).
- Participation in a significant number of college hosted events (e.g., student orientations, recognition events, symposiums, luncheons, field events, etc.).

4. Administrative Merit Criteria

Academic program directors, assistant and associate deans, and other leadership positions who are faculty will be reviewed for merit in an additional fourth category so that their performance in these administrative capacities is reflected in their annual merit review. A 4-point scale is utilized to quantify administrative merit: 0 = *no merit*; 1 = *partial merit*; 2 = *merit*; and 3 = *extra merit*.

Administrative merit or extra merit is awarded only when a faculty member's performance in the administrative category exceeds the Dean's expectations of the position.

Appendix B. Recommended P&T Committee Calendar of Activities

P&T committee members should follow all embedded links in the Calendar of Activities to review additional information. Templates are available through the P&T committee and the Office of Academic Affairs for different tasks (e.g., generating a list of potential external reviewers), sample documents (e.g., liaison summary letters), and other resources for committee members and candidates to facilitate and guide the promotion process.

P&T Committee and Dean's Tasks	Deadline	Candidate Tasks
	FEBRUARY	
CAC, **Dean**: Election for chair-elect of P&T committee for 2-year term.	1st week February	
Dean appoints new P&T committee members, whose term starts in mid-March.	Mid-February	
	MARCH	
Dean provides the list of faculty members going up for mandatory or non-mandatory promotion review to the **outgoing and incoming P&T Chair.** *(See VI.D.1. Procedures for Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty for information about mandatory reviews and VI.D.2. Procedures for Requesting a Non-Mandatory Promotion Review for information about non-mandatory review.)*	By March 1st	At the latest, **Faculty** going up for non-mandatory review inform the Dean by March 1st.
Chair and **chair-elect** meet with mandatory and non-mandatory promotion candidates to discuss promotion process and criteria. *(See VI.D.1.1. Candidate Responsibilities for information on choosing the APT document version the candidate will be reviewed under.)*	By the 1st week of March	**Mandatory promotion candidates** and **non-mandatory promotion candidates** meet with P&T committee chair and chair-elect.
	By the 2nd week of March	**Faculty** requesting a non-mandatory promotion review submit selected materials for the P&T committee to review. *(See VI.D.2. Procedures for Requesting a Non-Mandatory Promotion Review for information about non-mandatory review.)*
P&T committee (with new chair and new members) evaluates materials from non-mandatory promotion review candidates and makes a recommendation to **Dean** about whether each candidate's case should be reviewed.	By the 2nd - 3rd week of March	Decision will be communicated to the candidate no later than the 3rd week in March.

P&T Committee and Dean's Tasks	Deadline	Candidate Tasks
Once all mandatory and non-mandatory cases are determined for the year (especially promotion to professor or cases involving clinical faculty), the Dean may appoint additional members to the P&T committee to fulfill all committee roles.	By the 3rd week of March	
P&T committee (with new chair and new members) meets to discuss charge and plan activities of the committee.	Mid-March	
P&T chair requests from each **candidate** for review or promotion. • Three ranked liaison preferences. • Candidates for associate professor or professor provide their CV and brief statement of substantive research for use in identifying external reviewers.	3rd week of March	Candidate provides: • Three ranked liaison preferences. • Candidates for associate professor or professor provide their CV and brief statement of substantive research for use in identifying external reviewers.
	APRIL	
P&T committee assigns **liaisons** and notifies candidates. **POD**(s) are chosen and assigned to candidates. *(See the college's POA document VII.D.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee for information on roles of PODs and liaisons.)*	2nd week of April	
Liaisons and candidates meet to discuss tasks, roles, responsibilities, communication plans, and timelines; also review in detail dossier requirements.	2nd - 3rd week of April	Liaisons and candidates meet to discuss tasks, roles, responsibilities, communication plans, and timelines; also review in detail dossier requirements.
P&T committee generates list of 12-15 potential external reviewers for each candidate for promotion to associate or full. **Chair** provides candidates with template for their list. *(See VI.D.4. External Evaluations for requirements for reviewer choices.)*	2nd – 3rd week of April	Candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor may submit the names of 3 to 4 potential reviewers to the P&T committee. *(See VI.D.4. External Evaluations for requirements for reviewer choices.)*
P&T committee meets to select and rank external reviewers for each promotion candidate using their own list and list provided by candidate.	4th week of April – 1st week of May	

P&T Committee and Dean's Tasks	Deadline	Candidate Tasks
Liaisons and candidates communicate throughout the summer as needed as candidates prepare their dossiers. Timeline varies. Final dossiers are due the 3rd week of August. Candidates are strongly encouraged to share components of dossier with liaison as they are generated.	April-August	Liaisons and candidates communicate throughout the summer as needed as candidates prepare their dossiers. Timeline varies. Final dossiers are due the 3rd week of August. Candidates are strongly encouraged to share components of dossier with liaison before due date.
	MAY	
P&T chair consults with candidate to ensure potential reviewers do not have a conflict of interest.	1st week of May	Candidate reviews potential reviewer list for conflicts of interest.
P&T chair sends the Dean's office list of names of potential reviewer. **Dean's office** sends first round of emails requesting reviews and maintains record of replies.	1st week of May (3 months before Aug deadline for letters)	
Liaisons report to committee on candidate progress with dossiers, and that candidates for promotion to associate and full will have materials for external reviewers ready by the end of May. Liaison may begin work on the summary letter at any time, but it is due to the larger P&T committee by the 1st week of October.	At regular P&T meetings or by email in May - August	Candidates share progress with liaison. Prepares materials for external reviewers for deadline during the 4th week of May.
Dean's office sends email to individuals and materials (CV, research statement, and 5 sample publications) to external reviewers. Due date is in the second week of August. If fewer than 5 potential reviewers agreed to review, **Dean's office** sends out additional requests for review.	4th week of May	**Candidates** for promotion turn in materials for external reviewers to the **Dean's office.** No further updates will be sent to this round or subsequent rounds of potential external reviewers. Candidates are responsible for accuracy and quality of all materials submitted for external review. Errors that affect external reviews may be a negative consideration in faculty review process.
	JULY - AUGUST	
Dean's office sends reminders to external reviewers who have not yet returned their reviews.	Last week of July	
Dean helps to obtain any outstanding external reviews for candidates (e.g., by calling or emailing reviewers).	2nd week of August	
Dean's office and **Candidate** posts candidates' materials in Canvas and gives **P&T committee** access.	3rd week of August	**Candidates** finalize their dossiers and upload to Canvas or submit materials to the **Dean's office** for upload.

P&T Committee and Dean's Tasks	Deadline	Candidate Tasks
POD (or PODs) reviews dossier and confirms accuracy of scholarly and creative works listed. **POD** contacts the CSW Research Office to confirm listings in the dossier of grants and contracts under review, submitted but not funded, and funded.	3rd week of August	
	SEPTEMBER	
POD communicates to candidate all changes required for accuracy of their dossier; **Chair** and liaison are cc'd with all communications between **POD** and **candidate** about this topic.	2nd week of September	**Candidate** is informed of required changes for accuracy of the dossier.
POD confirms that all changes are satisfactory. Candidates can no longer make any changes to their documents posted in Carmen and candidate access will be removed by the **Dean's office**.	2nd - 3rd week of September	**Candidates** submit dossier with all changes required by **POD.**
POD confirms final updates. **Chair** sends documents to **Dean's office,** which posts revised materials.	3rd week in September	Final opportunity for **candidate** to update status of publications and funding proposals that were under review when materials were first submitted in.
	OCTOBER	
Liaison completes a draft summary letter of dossier for each 4th year review candidate, and of dossier and external reviews for each promotion candidate.	1st week in October	
P&T committee members review all candidate's dossiers and liaison summary letter. Committee meets to discuss materials and liaison's draft summary. **Chair** and **liaison** finalize summary letter based on discussion.	1st - 2nd week in October	
P&T Chair meets with candidate to fact-check committee's summary letter. Changes are only made for purposes of accuracy.	2nd week in October	**Candidate** meets with P&T chair to fact-check summary letter.
Candidate materials and committee summary letter are posted at the Canvas site by **Dean's office** and made available to all faculty.	Two weeks before mandatory meeting of eligible faculty	
Liaison can note updates reported by candidate for inclusion in oral summary of candidate's application at mandatory meeting.	Between posting of materials and mandatory meeting date	**Candidate** may inform liaison of updates in status of publications, grants, or awards (but cannot make changes to posted documents).

P&T Committee and Dean's Tasks	Deadline	Candidate Tasks
Dean's office reminds **eligible faculty** that voting eligibility is contingent on (a) review of materials and (b) attendance at entire faculty review meeting, and (c) review of promotion criteria applicable for each candidate. **Dean's office** monitors faculty access to Canvas materials to ensure eligibility. *(See VI.D.1.2. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities)*	Between posting of materials and mandatory meeting date	
	NOVEMBER	
Mandatory meeting of all **eligible voting faculty** members, chaired by **P&T committee chair.** *(See meeting procedures in Appendix C)*	November's first non-holiday Monday	
Dean's office determines eligible voting faculty and makes ballots available. **Eligible voting faculty members** submit votes within the meeting.	During the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty	
Dean notifies each candidate of voting results.	Within 24 hours of the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty	**Candidate** is informed of voting results.
P&T chair makes final edits to summary letter—including a summary of the discussion and—with input from committee members. *(See VI.D.1.3. College of Social Work P&T Committee Responsibilities for information on finalizing summary letter)*	Within week after vote	
Dean shares the P&T committee's summary letter and the Dean's summary letter with candidate.	Within three weeks after vote	**Candidate** has 10 days to submit an addendum statement to clarify any perceived errors in the discussion points and complete form about accompanying statement OR candidate completes form stating no addendum statement to accompany summary letter. *(See VI.D.1.1. Candidate Responsibilities and VII. Appeals)*

P&T Committee and Dean's Tasks	Deadline	Candidate Tasks
P&T chair, with input from **committee members**, responds to candidate rebuttal, if applicable. **Dean** responds to candidate rebuttal, if applicable. *(See VI.D.1.1. Candidate Responsibilities and VII. Appeals)*	10 days after Dean shares summary letter	**Candidate** receives a copy of the rebuttals.
	JANUARY	
All materials delivered by **Dean's office** to OAA by deadline set for the college of Social Work (before OAA deadline).	By 2nd Friday in January	
Special actions/timetable may be related to determining rank and/or tenure in new faculty hiring processes; e.g., expedited reviews.	(Variable deadlines)	
Return to top of document to restart the process	1st week of February	
P&T committee reviews and develops recommendations for revisions to APT/POA documents related to the P&T process.	January-March	
P&T chair provides **Dean** with recommended substantive revisions to APT/POA documents for review.	End of March	
Substantive recommended revisions to APT/POA documents are brought to the **faculty** or other relevant groups for approval.	1st – 2nd week of April	
P&T documents updated with recommendations from faculty.	2nd to 4th week of April	
Addition meeting of **faculty** to approve revisions.	1st week of May	
Substantive recommended revisions to APT/POA documents due to OAA; submitted by **Dean's office.**	Early June	

Appendix C. Sample P&T Meeting Agenda and Roles

P&T MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELIGIBLE FACULTY

Roles
The chair of the P&T committee (or committee member designee, if necessary) chairs the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The POD maintains a record of the procedures followed in this meeting. Two committee members (not the POD or chair) take notes during the eligible faculty members' discussion. The liaisons (or committee member designees, if necessary) are responsible for initiating the discussion of each candidate.

Sample Agenda
Forty-five (45) minutes should be scheduled for the discussion of each candidate, with time spent discussing one performance domain at a time—teaching, scholarship, and service. The full allotment of time for each candidate is not required if discussion is completed earlier.

1:00	Attendance recorded by the Dean's office for quorum and voting eligibility
1:00–1:05	Introduction and review of agenda, process for voting and discussion, and responsibilities of eligible faculty (Chair)
1:05–1:10	Reminder of criteria for fourth-year review (Co-Chair)
1:10–1:20	Review of summary letter on candidate #1 materials (Liaison)
1:20–1:50	Discussion of candidate #1 materials for fourth-year review
1:50–1:55	Brief summary of discussion of candidate #1 (Liaison) *Final drafting of summary letter for OAA by P & T committee takes place after the meeting.*
1:55–2:00	Confidential online votes for candidate #1. Faculty remain in meeting. Results are announced.
2:00–2:05	Reminder of criteria for promotion to associate with tenure (Co-Chair)
2:05–2:15	Review of summary letter on candidate #2 materials (Liaison)
2:15–2:45	Discussion of candidate #2 materials for promotion to associate with tenure
2:45–2:50	Brief summary of discussion of candidate #2 (Liaison)
2:50–2:55	Confidential online votes for candidate #2. Faculty remain in meeting. Results are announced.
2:55–3:05	Break and Associate Professors are dismissed. Only professors remain.
3:05–3:10	Reminder of criteria for promotion to professor (Co-Chair)

3:10–3:20	Review of summary letter on candidate #3 materials (Liaison)
3:20–3:50	Discussion of candidate #3 materials for promotion to professor
3:50–3:55	Brief summary of discussion of candidate #3 (Liaison)
3:55–4:00	Confidential online votes for candidate #3. Faculty remain in meeting. Results are announced.
4:00	Meeting adjourned

A confidential online vote occurs after the discussion of each candidate. All eligible faculty who attended the entire candidate discussion receive a vote. After votes are cast, the P&T committee chair and the Dean's office review the outcome. Results are immediately announced to eligible faculty in attendance. The announcement will be stated as follows: "XX eligible faculty members participated in the vote for (Candidate's Name). The results were XX of eligible faculty voting 'Yes' and XX 'No." The requisite two -thirds vote (67% or more) for a positive outcome was/was not reached." The meeting then moves to discussion of the next candidate or ends.

After the meeting concludes, the Dean will notify the candidates of the results via phone within 24 hours. No announcement of the results will be made to the larger college until the Board of Trustees decision (April/May).

Notes:

- The Dean (or a designate, if necessary) attends, as an observer, the meetings of the Committee of Eligible Faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions asked of them during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the Dean will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- Per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (B), 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. Only those eligible to vote and the Dean (as an observer) participate in any meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty in review of appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure. If the Dean is unable to attend as an observer, they may send a designate.
- The candidate is not present and all proceedings are confidential.
- Recommendations for online meeting procedures:
    - Waiting room is enabled to allow control over who enters the room.
    - OSU authentication is enabled so all attendees are properly identified.
    - Camera must be on for the entire duration of the meeting.
    - Chat function disabled.
    - Breakout room for the supporting admin (usually the executive assistant to the Dean) so they can't see/hear any of the conversation but will be available for tech support and Qualtrics voting once discussion has ended.