

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University**
Department of Human Sciences

Approved by the Faculty based on meetings: September 10, 2014; January 28, 2015; September 16, 2015; March 23, 2017; and October 31, 2018; December 8, 2021

Last approved by the Faculty: 12/8/2021

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 4/11/2022

Table of Contents

1. Preamble	5
2. Department Mission.....	5
3. Definitions.....	6
3.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
3.1.1 Initial Appointment Reviews Tenure-Track Faculty.....	6
3.1.2 Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews.....	6
3.1.3 Initial Appointment Reviews of Clinical Faculty	6
3.1.4 Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews of Clinical Faculty ..	6
3.1.5 Initial Appointment Reviews of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers	7
3.1.6 Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers	7
3.1.7 Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contrat Renewal of Other Associated Faculty	8
3.1.8 Promotoin Reviews of Other Associated Faculty	8
3.1.9 Conflict of Interest for Personnel Decisions	8
3.1.10 Definition of Conflict of Interest.....	8
3.1.11 Procedures for Handling Conflict of Interests in Personnel Decisions	8
3.1.12 Minimum Composition	9
3.1.13 Promotion and Tenure Committee	9
3.1.14 Quorum.....	9
3.1.15 Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	9
3.1.16 Appointment	10
3.1.17 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal	10
4. Appointments	10
4.1 Criteria	10
4.1.1 Tenure-Track Faculty	10
4.1.2 Clinical Faculty	11
4.1.3 Associated Faculty	12
4.1.4 Regional Campus Faculty.....	13
4.1.5 Emeritus Faculty.....	13
4.1.6 Courtesy Appointments	13
4.2 Search Procedures	14
4.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty	14
4.2.1.1 The Search Committee	14
4.2.1.2 Votes of Acceptability of Faculty Candidates.....	15
4.2.1.3 Votes of the Eligible Faculty Concerning Senior Faculty Rank	15
4.2.2 Clinical Faculty	16
4.2.3 Transfer from the Tenure-track	16

4.2.4	Associated Faculty	16
4.2.4.1	Appointment & Reappointment of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers	16
4.2.4.2	Regional Campus	16
4.2.5	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	17
5.	Annual Performance and Merit Review	18
5.1	Documentation.....	19
5.2	Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	20
5.3	Fourth-Year Review.....	21
5.4	Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	21
5.5	Tenured Faculty	21
5.6	Clinical Faculty	22
5.7	Lecturers and Senior Lectures and Other Associated Faculty	22
5.8	Regional Campus Faculty	22
5.9	Salary Recommendations.....	24
5.10	Criteria	24
5.11	Merit Increases for Lecturers/Sr. Lecturers	24
5.12	Procedures.....	24
6.	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	25
6.1	Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion	25
6.2	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	25
6.2.1	Teaching Criteria.....	26
6.2.2	Research Scholarship Criteria	27
6.2.3	Service Criteria.....	27
6.3	Promotion to Professor	28
6.4	Faculty with Joint Appointments in Extension	28
6.5	Clinical Faculty	30
6.6	Full-Time Lecturers - Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer.....	30
6.6.1	Promotion of Other Associated Faculty	31
6.7	Regional Campus Faculty	32
6.8	Procedures for Clinical and Tenure-Track Faculty	32
6.8.1	Candidate Responsibilities	32
6.8.2	Dossier.....	35
6.8.3	Teaching Documentation.....	35
6.8.4	Research Documentation.....	35
6.8.5	Service Documentation	35
6.8.6	Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document	35
6.8.7	External Evaluations.....	35
6.8.8	Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities.....	35

6.9 The Procedures for P&T Committee	32
6.10 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	38
6.11 Department Chair Responsibilities	38
6.12 Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer.....	39
6.12.1 Procedures for Other Associated Faculty	40
6.12.2 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	40
6.12.3 Faculty with Extension Joint Appointments.....	40
6.13 External Evaluations	41
7. Appeals	42
8. Seventh-Year Reviews	42
9. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	42
9.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	42
9.2 Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	42
9.3 Procedure for Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	43
9.3.1 The responsibilities of the Department Chair:.....	43
9.3.2 The role and responsibilities of the Peer Reviewer	43
9.4 Peer Evaluation of Extension Teaching.....	46
Appendix I: Mentoring	47

1. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

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

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

2. Department Mission

The Department of Human Sciences advances human health, wellbeing, development, and economic vitality across a diversity of contexts.

To achieve this mission, the Department engages world-class research, education, and service within consumer sciences, human development and family science, human nutrition and kinesiology. The diversity of our programs and personnel empowers us to engage in multidisciplinary collaboration among our program areas, OSU Extension, the broader OSU community and our academic disciplines.

The Department affirms and upholds a core set of values to include:

- diversity, equity, and inclusion in all of our pursuits;
- shared, consistent, fair, and transparent decision-making;
- collegiality, civility, respect, safety, honesty, and empathy in our working relationships; and
- a supportive, cohesive, and collaborative community spanning a diversity of partners.

These values guide our mission, strategies, goals, and daily work as we adhere to the democratic principles of equity and shared governance.

The Department actively aligns its mission with the vision, mission and core values of the College of Education and Human Ecology as our College evolves to meet the needs of our State, Nation, and global community.

3. Definitions

3.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, contract renewal, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the Department of Human Sciences.

The Department Chair, the Dean and Assistant and Associate Deans of the college, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

3.1.1 Initial Appointment Reviews Tenure-Track Faculty

For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the Department of Human Sciences.

For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate professor or professor). First, a vote of acceptability is undertaken where the eligible faculty consist of all tenure-track faculty in the Department of Human Sciences. Second, a Promotion and Tenure review is performed where the eligible faculty consist of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

3.1.2 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 and the tenure reviews of probationary professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

3.1.3 Initial Appointment Reviews of Clinical Faculty

For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a clinical assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all clinical faculty in the department.

For appointment (hiring) at senior rank (clinical associate professor or professor). First, a vote of acceptability is undertaken where the eligible faculty consist of all tenure-track faculty and all clinical faculty in the Department of Human Sciences. Second, a Promotion review is performed where the eligible faculty consist of all tenure-track faculty and all clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Votes of acceptability are not binding and advisory to the Department Chair and Dean.

3.1.4 Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews of Clinical Faculty

For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of clinical assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all nonprobationary

clinical/teaching/practice associate professors and professors.

For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of clinical associate professors, and the reappointment and contract renewal reviews of clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors, and all nonprobationary clinical/teaching/practice professors.

Votes of acceptability are not binding and advisory to the Department Chair and Dean.

3.1.5 Initial Appointment Reviews of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

Part-time and Full-time Lecturers – The initial appointment and hiring of part-time and full-time lecturers is at the discretion of the Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director in consultation with the Department Chair. The eligible faculty are not involved.

Senior Lecturers - The initial appointment and hiring of a Senior Lecturer is at the discretion of the Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director in consultation with the Department Chair or designee. The Program chair then presents the candidate case to the eligible faculty consisting of the program area tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, and senior lecturers who vote on the acceptability of this candidate to the program. The Program chair reports the vote to the Department Chair and a decision relative to appointment is made. Appointments are usually made on an annual basis.

3.1.6 Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

Contract renewal and reappointment of Part Time and Full time Lecturers – The reappointment and contract renewal of part-time and full-time Lecturers is at the discretion of the lecturer's Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director in consultation with the Department Chair.

Contract renewal and reappointment of Senior Lecturers – The reappointment and contract renewal of Senior Lecturers is at the discretion of the senior lecturer's Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director and Department Chair. For the contract renewal of Senior Lecturers, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, and Senior Lecturers in the Program area in which the lecturer resides. The eligible faculty vote and make a recommendation to the Department Chair who makes the final decision.

In order to be considered for contract renewal, the Senior Lecturer must complete the relevant parts of the Teaching section of the Core Dossier that is in line with their current contract including evidence of the following items:

- Courses taught, including classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus.
- Instruction offered by electronic technology including online programs or courses or other materials that are promulgated electronically through appropriate channels.
- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught or similar evaluation of extension instruction including student comments.
- Summary of student comments from the SEIs summarized by an individual other than the candidate.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports for the timeframe of the current contract.

In order to be considered for contract renewal, the Senior Lecturer may provide evidence from the relevant Research and Service parts of the Core Dossier in line with the current contract for the timeframe of the current contract.

Promotion reviews from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer – For the promotion reviews from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, and Senior Lecturers in the Program area in which the lecturer resides. The eligible faculty vote and make a recommendation to the Department Chair who makes the final decision.

3.1.7 Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal of Other Associated Faculty

Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), reappointment, and contract renewal of faculty with adjunct titles and tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below are decided by the department chair in consultation with the respective Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director.

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 of the college dean.

3.1.8 Promotion Reviews of Other Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and tenure-track faculty with service at 49% FTE or below are eligible for promotion but not tenure. For the promotion reviews of these faculty members, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section 3.1.2 above.

3.1.9 Conflict of Interest for Personnel Decisions

Personnel decisions include: initial appointments, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews.

3.1.10 Definition of Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member: a) is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, b) has substantive financial ties with the candidate; c) is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, d) has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisor), or e) 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 an appointment, reappointment, or promotion review of that candidate.

3.1.11 Procedures for Handling Conflict of Interests in Personnel Decisions

Below are expectations for how each conflict will be handled.

Personal Conflict of Interests - The onus is on an individual member of the eligible faculty to reflect on potential conflict of interests. If an eligible faculty member perceives (or even questions) if he/she has a conflict of interest, she/he should reach out to the chair of the committee and/or Department Chair to disclose and/or discuss the conflict of interest. Where relevant the individual should withdraw from the committee and/or eligible faculty vote. Individuals who withdraw from a vote due to a conflict of interest do not count for quorum.

Conflict of Interest Perceived in Others – There are times when it is perceived that an individual

has a conflict of interest and this individual does not self-identify. The process for handling a perceived conflict of interest in others is: 1) share with the individual your concern for the perceived conflict of interest articulating why you perceive this individual to have a conflict of interest, if the issue is not resolved, 2) share with the committee chair and/or Chair of the Department that you perceive an individual has a conflict of interest.

Department Chair Responsibilities - Ultimately it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to consider and act on all potential conflict of interests. When a conflict of interest arises the Department Chair may remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate who does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. All decisions by the Department Chair are final and there is no appeal.

3.1.12 Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, in consultation of the dean, will appoint a third member from another department in the College.

3.1.13 Promotion and Tenure Committee

The department has a Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of nine members: two faculty members, at least one of whom is a professor, elected by the faculty from each of Kinesiology, Human Development and Family Sciences, Consumer Sciences, and Human Nutrition plus a faculty member named by the chair. The P&T committee members will serve 3 year terms with reappointment possible. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be elected by the P&T committee members in spring semester, and serve a two-year term which is renewable.

When considering cases involving clinical faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by two nonprobationary clinical faculty members at a rank equivalent to rank being considered. These faculty would be non-voting members of P&T and serve in an advisory capacity.

3.1.14 Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is at least two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave of absence are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

3.1.15 Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed. Individuals who engage in the

discussions via remote two-way electronic connection are eligible to vote.

3.1.16 Appointment

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

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

3.1.17 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal

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

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

4. Appointments

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

4.1 Criteria

4.1.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

Instructor: Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked 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: An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching,

and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor: 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. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur.

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

4.1.2 Clinical Faculty

The Department of Human Sciences supports Clinical Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in the department or college. Clinical Faculty members are expected to contribute to the TIU's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Clinical Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

The initial contract for all clinical faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical assistant and associate 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. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period.

Clinical Instructor: Appointment is normally made at the rank of clinical instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree or has not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of clinical assistant professor by the beginning of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

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

Associate Clinical Professor: The awarding of the rank of Associate Clinical Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the clinical faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university. An earned terminal degree in relevant field of study; current professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study (if appropriate); evidence of current knowledge of research affecting practice with the field of study; evidence of ongoing engagement with practitioners in relevant context; evidence of sustained high-quality teaching; and evidence of high-quality and impactful service both within and outside of the university are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor of Human Sciences.

Clinical Professor: The awarding of the rank of Clinical Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the clinical faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching and has demonstrated leadership in service at the local and national level. An earned Doctoral degree in relevant field of study; current professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study (if appropriate); evidence of current knowledge of research affecting practice with the field of study; evidence of ongoing engagement with practitioners in relevant context; evidence of sustained high-quality teaching.; evidence of high-quality and impactful service both within and outside of the university; and evidence of high-quality and impactful service at a local, state, or national level are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of Clinical Professor of Human Sciences.

4.1.3 Associated Faculty

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

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

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

Lecturer: Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The

initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

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

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor: Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

4.1.4 Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

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

4.1.5 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured and nonprobationary clinical/teaching/practice associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-05-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

See the OAA *Policies and Procedures 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.

4.1.6 Courtesy Appointments

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

4.2 Search Procedures

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

4.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The Dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise. The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant), as well as other fields within the department.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college with resources from the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. Implicit bias training, such as that available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, is also required of all search committee members prior to any search.

4.2.1.1 The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants. All members of the committee should be sensitive to issues of diversity and recognize its importance as well as the range of the definitions of diversity.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the Office of Human Resources and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and identifies a list of candidates (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. The list of candidates to review is forwarded to the chair, who then requests the dean's approval of the candidates to interview. Online interviews may be used by the committee to prescreen candidates. On-campus interviews and where appropriate virtual interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office.
- On-campus/virtual interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee, and the Associate Deans for Research and Academic Affairs or their designees. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship, and may be required to teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

4.2.1.2 Votes of Acceptability of Faculty Candidates

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty (see section above) meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. As noted in Section 3.1.12, the quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is at least two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. The vote of acceptability is a personnel decision that provides the opportunity for the eligible faculty to have a broad discussion about the relative fit of the candidate to a specific program area and Human Sciences. This might include (but is not limited to): fits with the teaching, research and service needs of the program and Human Sciences, academic background aligns with the mission of the program area and Human Sciences, has a unique skill set that will advance the mission of the program area and Human Sciences, and contributes to the 5 EHE Pillars. The search committee will develop a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate and share this in writing with the faculty ahead of the meeting. At the vote of acceptability of the eligible faculty, the chair of the search committee will present each candidate case to the faculty and provide time for questions.

At the conclusion of the faculty discussion, an anonymous paper or electronic vote will be conducted. A vote of yes indicates that the faculty member would support hiring this candidate. A vote of No indicates that the faculty member does not support hiring this candidate. Abstentions do not count as votes. A two-thirds vote in favor of a candidate reflects the faculty's overall acceptance of the candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate to the department chair.

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

4.2.1.3 Votes of the Eligible Faculty Concerning Senior Faculty Rank

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank following department, college and university Promotion and Tenure Procedures. In such cases, all effort must be made to expedite the Promotion and Tenure review in order to insure the hiring of the best candidate for the position. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service

credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. The university will not grant tenure unless an individual is (1) a U.S. citizen or national; (2) a permanent resident (“green card” holder); (3) an asylee or refugee; or (4) an individual otherwise described as a “protected individual” pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b). The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in seeking residency status for the appointee promptly and diligently.

4.2.2 Clinical Faculty

Searches for clinical faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus/virtual interview is on clinical/professional practice rather than scholarship, and exceptions to a national search require approval by the college dean.

4.2.3 Transfer from the Tenure-track

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

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

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

4.2.4 Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the department chair in consultation with the respective Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director.

Appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal should include a copy of the individual's CV and a rationale as to why the appointment advances the mission of program area and Human Sciences. The proposal is considered at a faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty (a simple majority - show of hands), the department chair extends an offer.

Associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

4.2.4.1 Appointment & Reappointment of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

- **Part-time and Full-time Lecturers** – The Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director in conjunction with the Department Chair (or chair designee) appoints part-time and full-

time lecturers. Appointments are usually made on an annual basis. After the initial appointment of full-time lecturers, the lecturer supervisor, Program Chair, and Department Chair (or chair designee) evaluate the performance of the lecturer and determine if a new contract is warranted including (but not limited to) considerations of budget, curricular needs, and lecturer performance.

- **Full-time Senior Lecturers** – The Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director in conjunction with the Department Chair (or chair designee) identifies candidates for full-time senior lecturers. The Program chair presents the candidate case to the program area tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, and senior lecturers who vote on the acceptability of this candidate to the program. The Program chair reports the vote to the Department Chair and a decision relative to appointment is made. Appointments are usually made on an annual basis. After the initial appointment, the senior lecturer supervisor, Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director, and Department Chair (or chair designee) evaluate the performance of the senior lecturer and determine if a new contract is warranted including (but not limited to) considerations of budget, curricular needs, and lecturer performance. If a decision is made to renew the appointment, the Program chair presents the senior lecturer case to the program area tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, and senior lecturers who vote on approval to renew the contract. At this point (depending on department needs and budget) a three year appointment may be offered.

4.2.4.2 Regional Campus

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, department eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair (who shall consult with the dean of the college) and the regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

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

Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the dean/director, department chairs, program chairs, and other relevant faculty members.

4.2.5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or clinical faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty (via a simple majority positive vote – show of hands), the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for renewal or nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a meeting.

5. Annual Performance and Merit Review

Annual reviews of all probationary, tenured, clinical, and compensated associated faculty serve to monitor progress toward tenure, promotion, reappointment, and ongoing outcomes. Written performance reviews serve to assist faculty in improving professional productivity, establish goals against which faculty performance will be assessed, determine salary increases and other resource allocations, define progress toward reappointment and/or promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, establish and explain the need for remedial steps. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the written annual performance review evaluates faculty productivity and progress relative to the expectations of each TIU to which the faculty member is appointed.

An annual written performance review that examines performance over the prior calendar year and sets goals for future performance is mandated for all compensated faculty. These annual reviews must be conducted by the department chair or designee and include a written assessment, a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty or an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all tenured or other compensated faculty members at the request of either the department chair or the faculty member.

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment Policy.

The purpose of such a written performance review are as follows:

- To assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the development of professional development plans that meet the joint needs of the unit and the faculty member.
- To establish the goals against which faculty performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future.
- To document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.
- In addition, annual reviews of probationary faculty serve to monitor progress toward tenure and determine whether the probationary appointment will be continued for another year or terminated, subject to the relevant standards of notice per Faculty Rule 3335-6-08. In the case of tenure-track faculty, annual reviews (including Fourth- Year Review) serve to monitor progress toward tenure.

The annual reviews of every tenure track or tenured faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The annual reviews of clinical faculty and full time lecturers and senior lecturers are based on expected performance in teaching and where appropriate service and scholarship in line with the individual contractual duties.

The OAA requires compensated faculty at all levels to be reviewed annually by the department chair or designee. Faculty Annual Review procedures in the Department of Human Sciences involve a multi-step process in order to achieve a reliable, valid, and equitable annual evaluation of faculty performance. The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described below. A template is provided which outlines the required components and provides the format. This material must be submitted to the department chair no later than January 31st. The document for tenure track and tenured faculty reports teaching and service performance covering the

past calendar year through December 31 and for research the past three years of performance. The document for clinical faculty and lecturers and senior lecturers reports teaching performance (and where relevant service performance) covering the past calendar year through December 31 and where relevant research for the past three years of performance.

The specific steps of the Faculty Annual Review process are: 1) Submission of annual review materials by January 31; 2) Writing of a draft annual review letter by the program chair acting as department chair's designee; 3) Holding an annual review meeting that is required for all probationary faculty and offered to all other tenured and compensated faculty; and 4) Writing of the culminating annual review letter by the department chair in consultation with the appointed designee. Annual reviews for all faculty on 12/12 appointments will be completed by July 1. Annual reviews for all other faculty will be completed by May 15.

The department chair prepares a culminating letter, in consultation with the designees in situations in which the designee wrote the draft letter and conducts a face-to-face meeting, that must include a narrative evaluation addressing the purposes of the annual review described above. A perfunctory checklist lacking narrative or evaluative content does not meet this requirement. At a minimum the culminating letter or other written report must address the following (if applicable):

- Teaching and advising
- New course development
- Publications and presentations
- Research activities
- Funding and efforts to obtain funding
- Service to the university and profession and outreach activities
- Honors and awards

In addressing these activities, the letter should distill the major accomplishments in these areas, summarize goals and strategies, and provide focused action steps. There should be explicit agreement with each faculty member about the expected contribution focus or foci and the levels of achievement expected of him/her in a given year. The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

The letter from the Chair will also remind faculty that collegiality, civility, mutual support and respect for others are strongly held values in the Department of Human Sciences and the College of Education and Human Ecology. Diverse beliefs and free exchange of ideas are supported and the faculty, staff, and students are expected to promote these values and apply them in a professional manner in all academic endeavors.

5.1 Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, tenure-track faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than January 31:

- Relevant sections of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [*Policies and Procedures Handbook*](#), Volume 3
- Updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section 6 of this document. The annual performance review of all clinical faculty, full-time lecturer, and senior lecturer faculty members requires that all documentation described in Section 6 in the categories of teaching and service, as relevant to that faculty member's appointment, be submitted to the department chair no later than January 31st.

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

5.2 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance. Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The program chair, acting as department chair's designee, writes the draft annual review letter for probationary faculty. Consistent with the OAA Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment Policy all probationary faculty are required to have a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair or a designee (Program Chair and/or Vice Chair). The Department Chair writes the culminating annual review letter in consultation with the designees (program chair and/or vice chair) as needed. In the case of faculty that hold joint appointments with extension or other TIUs, the culminating annual review letter is written by the department chair/head and/or designee of the primary TIU in which the faculty is appointed. The culminating letter also includes evaluative content provided by the department chair/head and/or designee of the other units in faculty's joint and/or extension appointment. The culminating annual review letter evaluates faculty productivity and progress relative to the expectations of each TIU to which the faculty member is appointed as is signed by the department chair/head and/or designee of all TIUs/units in the joint and/or extension appointment.

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

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) is invoked. The Chair forwards this information to the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Fourth Year Review process is instituted. The Promotion and Tenure committee reviews the probationary tenure-track faculty member's dossier and other supporting materials. These materials are then summarized for the Eligible Faculty and the Eligible Faculty vote on whether to recommend reappointment of the faculty candidate is taken via secret ballot. This meeting and the Promotion and Tenure committee's deliberations are summarized in a letter that is forwarded to the chair, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Dean. The chair uses the content of this letter, as well as his/her own independent review of the probationary faculty member, to determine whether the faculty member will be reappointed. This process is also described in the Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures section of this document. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review

and the Dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

5.3 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Therefore, for annual review during the fourth year of the probationary period, faculty are required to submit the core dossier consisting of all research, teaching, and service activities since date of hire and/or initial appointment into a tenure track position.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the Committee of Eligible Faculty (referred to as the Eligible Faculty below) or the Promotion and Tenure Committee determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. Since the solicitation and receipt of external review letters require a significant amount of time, it is wise for the Promotion and Tenure Committee to anticipate the need for the request for such letters in a year prior to the Fourth-Year Review. The Fourth-Year Review process, then, would commence in the summer with the solicitation and receipt of external letters of review. For Fourth-Year reviews, only three external evaluations are required.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the Eligible Faculty votes by written or electronic ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards a record of the vote of the eligible faculty and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335- 6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

All materials in the dossier are then forwarded to the dean for the dean's review, according to the timeline announced at the beginning of each academic year.

5.4 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

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

5.5 Tenured Faculty

The department chair or designee (program chair and/or vice chair) will review all associate professors and professors annually. This will include a submission of a written review of performance completed by the faculty member (as outlined in Appendix I) and an independent assessment by the department chair or designee. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting will be provided for all tenured and other compensated faculty members at the request of either the department chair or the faculty member. All formal face-to-face meeting between the chair or designee and the faculty member will take place in which his or her performance and future

plans and goals are discussed. A culminating written evaluation is completed by the chair in consultation the designee program chair and/or vice chair which distills the major accomplishments in these areas, summarizes goals and strategies, and provides focused action steps. There should be explicit agreement with each faculty member about the expected contribution focus or foci and the levels of achievement expected of him/her in a given year. In the review process for associate professors, the department chair (or designee) conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. In the review process for professors, the evaluation is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The tenured faculty member may provide written comments on the review. All documents are included in the faculty member's permanent record.

5.6 Clinical Faculty

The annual review process for clinical probationary (defined as clinical faculty serving in their first contract term) and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively.

Annual evaluations will take place at the same time as those for tenure-track faculty and clinical faculty will be offered the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair (or designee of program chair and/or vice chair) wherein future plans and goals are discussed. A written annual evaluation is completed by the chair (or chair designee) which distills the major accomplishments, summarizes goals and strategies, and provides focused action steps. There should be explicit agreement with each clinical faculty member about the expected contribution focus or foci and the levels of achievement expected of him/her in a given year. The clinical faculty member may provide written comments on the review. All documents are included in the clinical faculty member's permanent record.

In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

5.7 Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and Other Associated Faculty

Only full time lecturers will be required to undertake an annual review process. An annual review of full time lecturers and senior lecturers will be conducted each year by the appropriate

Program Chair. In the case of lecturers/senior lecturers in the Sport Fitness and Health Program, the annual review will be conducted by the SFHP Program Director in consultation with the Program Chair. Annual reviews for lecturers/senior lecturers should be conducted in alignment with the respective responsibilities of the position (e.g. 95% teaching, 5% service, 0% research). The Department Chair in consultation with the Program Chair and/or SFHP Program Director will determine each faculty member's respective load in teaching and service (and where appropriate research). Documentation of the review should be forwarded to the Department Chair and in the case of SFHP lecturers/senior lecturers, the Kinesiology Program Chair.

Per the university's [Faculty Appointments policy](#), Full Time Lecturers and Sr. Lecturers are not required to complete service. Program Area Chairs have the flexibility in collaboration with lecturers to modify course load to allow for service on an annual basis, barring the financial ability within the Department of Human Sciences. If lecturer course load is adjusted by one three-credit hour course, this equates to 25% FTE. If lecturer course load is adjusted by one one-hour course, this equates to 8% FTE. If course load is not adjusted, service will be on a voluntary basis.

All compensated full-time lecturers and senior lecturers in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and offers the opportunity to meet with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment for senior lecturers. Lecturers have annual contracts only.

Annual evaluations for all full-time lecturers and senior lecturers will take place at the same time as those conducted for tenure-track and clinical faculty. All full-time lecturers and senior lecturers will be offered the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair (or chair's designee of program chair and/or vice chair and/or SFHP Program Director) wherein future plans and goals are discussed. Compensated senior lecturers on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee, who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than April 1 of the final year of the appointment, the department chair (in consultation with the appropriate Program Chair (and if applicable SFHP Director)) will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

Other compensated associated faculty members (adjunct faculty and tenure-track faculty with service at 49% FTE or below) in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated adjunct faculty and tenure-track faculty with service at 49% FTE or below on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee, who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the department chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's decision on reappointment is final.

5.8 Regional Campus Faculty

The annual performance and merit review of a probationary tenure-track or tenured faculty

member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above for probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty, respectively. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

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

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

5.9 Salary Recommendations

5.10 Criteria

Except when the university dictates any type of across the board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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

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

5.11 Merit Increases for Lecturers/Sr. Lecturers

Full time lecturers with at least one year as a full time lecturer and senior lecturers are eligible for consideration for annual merit increases. Full time lecturers and senior lecturers with at least one year high-quality performance in all assigned duties (e.g., teaching, service, etc.) and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Full time lecturers and senior lecturers whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases. Part time/community lecturers are not eligible for merit increases.

5.12 Procedures

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating

salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

The annual performance review of every tenure-track faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the department chair no later than January 31st. The annual performance review of all clinical faculty, full-time lecturer, and senior lecturer faculty members requires that all documentation described below in the categories of teaching and service, as relevant to that faculty member's appointment, be submitted to the department chair no later than January 31st. The document reports information covering the past calendar year through December 31 for teaching and service and the past three years for research. The review process including a meeting with the chair and/or chair's designee for all probationary faculty, opportunity for a meeting with the chair and/or chair's designee for all tenured faculty, receipt of the chair's letter, and receipt of response from faculty member will be completed by May 15 each year.

- Updated CV, which will then be made available to all faculty in an accessible place
- Documentation for annual review

Any published materials cited in the annual review document should be held by the faculty member in an accessible form which can be made available on request from the chair, or the P&T Committee. Reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication would be included in this file as well as digital links to published materials. A faculty member's manuscript does not document publication.

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.

6. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

6.1 Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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

6.2 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

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

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

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

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

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

6.2.1 Teaching Criteria

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member's record may include but is not limited to demonstration of any of the following:

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

mission

- engagement in documentable efforts to improve teaching, including but not limited to attendance at and participation in university, college, or department teaching workshops
- curriculum improvement through revision of courses or development of new courses and/or academic programs including cross-university interdisciplinary programs and multi-university programs
- published pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, digital programs and documentation of the extent to which these products have been adopted by other faculty at Ohio State and at other institutions
- the extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State in professional societies and at other institutions.

6.2.2 Research Scholarship Criteria

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

Publication of a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and/or is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise shows evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:

- quality, impact, quantity
- unique contribution to a line of inquiry
- rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues as appropriate within the field. Archival journal publications and monographs, including digital outlets, are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and original works more than edited works.
- empirical work broadly defined
- candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described.
- a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

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

- Obtaining and demonstrated potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done.
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and/or a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.

6.2.3 Service Criteria

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

- orderly functioning of the department, college, and university
- profession
- community at large

6.3 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

For promotion to professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for faculty, for students, and for the profession. As specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another.

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national or international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship. Faculty contributions to the university evolve with their own evolving interest and skills in instruction and research; their interests and skills also evolve in response to the needs of the department, college, and university's instruction and research missions. These contributions are recognized.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another.

Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

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

6.4 Faculty with Joint Appointments in Extension

Faculty with joint minority (less than 50%) appointments in Extension engage in activities that enhance the mission of Extension which is:

“We create opportunities for people to explore how science-based knowledge can improve social, economic and environmental conditions.”

In Extension the following values are highlighted: 1) Teamwork and partnerships; 2) Integration of science and local knowledge; 3) Respectful community engagement; 4) Credibility, honesty and integrity; 5) Innovation, flexibility and adaptability; 6) Relevance and responsiveness; 7) Leveraging resources; 8) Lifelong learning; 9) Diversity in all of its forms, and 10) The contributions of all people toward achieving organizational and societal goals

When reviewing the candidate's performance with respect to their faculty appointment in Extension it is important that this evaluation should reflect the alignment of the candidate's Extension responsibilities and activities with the mission and core values of Extension. Flexibility in evaluation is paramount as Extension duties take many different forms.

Specifically Extension holds a broader view of the definition of scholarship and indicators should include:

- A substantial body of focused, high quality research/scholarly/creative work that is disseminated appropriately and judged to have had impact on the field by internal and external evaluators
- A body of work that demonstrates quality, impact, and quantity
- Contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work
- Demonstration of the rigor of the peer review process and degree of dissemination of publication and/or presentation venues (archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarly works more than unpublished, and original works more than edited works. Internally peer-reviewed OSU Extension publications for non-campus-based faculty are recognized venues of scholarly contribution)
- Collaborative work is not required but encouraged, and is considered essential to Extension's mission. The candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain program funding from grants and contracts (competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types since it serves as a quality indicator, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done). Funding is a means to an end and may not be necessary for all Extension faculty to conduct their work.
- A developing national reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized academic forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other's publications.
- Demonstrated high degree of ethics in the conduct of applied research, including but not limited to full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the program, and ethical treatment of collaborators.

Recognizing that the nature of scholarship by Extension faculty may differ from that of traditional faculty, the department nevertheless expects Extension faculty to establish a program of high- quality scholarly activity.

Teaching is broadly defined and encompasses both on campus teaching and workshops and other programming provided to the community and Extension staff. If a candidate's primary role is, and will continue to be, community-based teaching of noncredit courses and workshops, then excellence in teaching and program development and implementation is required. Indicators should include:

- Consistently excellent teaching as assessed by both learners and peers or steadily improving teaching so that excellence is attained by the time of the review.
- Up-to-date content at an appropriate level in each situation and demonstrate continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.
- A systematic pattern of evaluation of teaching, using the standardized EEET (Evaluation of Effective Extension Teaching) forms.
- A systematic pattern of peer evaluation of teaching and curriculum development using the Extension peer appraisal tools provided by OSU Extension.
- Impact assessment of the outcomes of the learning process document level of change in knowledge, skills, behaviors, attitudes or practice of individuals or document social or economic impact.

- Demonstrated creativity and innovation in use of various modes of instruction, technology and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment.

Service encompasses both service to the university and profession but also service to the community through Extension activities. Indicators should include:

- Substantive contributions to the department, college or university (in line with load allocation to Extension) and related professional organizations.
- Demonstrated potential for useful contributions to the profession.
- Demonstrated success in administrative leadership roles if these are a part of the assignment. Attributes considered: results of peer and faculty assessments, significant impacts on organization policies and procedures, contributions to achieving the mission and vision of the department, development and implementation of improved practices in dealing with: legislative matters, personnel issues, fiscal management, staff development, communication, leadership development or other areas.

6.5 Clinical Faculty

Evaluation of clinical faculty is based on the quality of performance in the following:

- oversight of practicum experiences;
- teaching (classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus as applicable);
- advising and service to the department, university, and /or community; and
- knowledge of research impacting practice within the field of study.

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor: For promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to clinical associate professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Scholarship activity is not expected.

Promotion to Clinical Professor: For promotion to clinical professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

6.6 Full-Time Lecturers - Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Only full time lecturers can be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer. For promotion to Senior Lecturer a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher. Where appropriate to appointment responsibilities, candidates could also provide effective service. All candidates must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching (and where appropriate service) relevant to the mission of this department. It would be typical for a lecturer to have at least three years of experience teaching in the department prior to consideration for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure.

Senior lecturers who are promoted into the position will be moved to a three year contract with the

potential for renewal.

In order to be considered for Senior Lecturer, the candidate must provide evidence of:

- Courses taught, including classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus.
- Instruction offered by electronic technology including online programs or courses or other materials that are promulgated electronically through appropriate channels.
- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught or similar evaluation of extension instruction including student comments.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required annually for probationary tenure track faculty and as elected by a faculty member considering promotion at some time in the future. (Details of teaching reviews are provided in Section 9).
- Evidence of efforts to improve the quality of teaching, for example through the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning workshops and services.
- Developing instructional materials, courses and curricula for use in university and non-university settings

In order to be considered for Senior Lecturer, the candidate may provide evidence of:

- Awards and formal recognition of teaching
- Other relevant documentation of teaching accomplishments, efforts to improve teaching, and of impact of teaching as appropriate.

Producing scholarly publications designed primarily for classroom and other instructional settings (where applicable):

- Pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, digital programs or other materials published, or accepted for publication.
- Presentations on pedagogy and teaching delivered at local, national and international conferences.
- The extent to which pedagogical materials, books, digital programs and other publications developed by the candidate have been adopted by other faculty at Ohio State and at other institutions.

Advising and mentoring students:

- Advising or mentoring undergraduate or graduate students in professional activities in line with the area of expertise
- Involving undergraduate students in research opportunities.
- Service learning efforts with students and community groups
- Contributions to new course development or major course revision.
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the college, across the university or at other institutions in the development and implementation of teaching materials and methods. Evidence of interdisciplinary work.
- Development and use of new technologies in teaching, including digital technologies, e-learning and distance learning.
- The extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State, in professional societies, or at other institutions.

6.6.1 Promotion of Other Associated Faculty

Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor. The relevant criteria for the

promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

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

6.7 Regional Campus Faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. While consideration of the quantity of research productivity of Tenure track Faculty at Regional campuses may be appropriately adjusted given the emphasis at Regional campuses on teaching, the quality of research should meet the same criteria as that expected of faculty on the Columbus campus.

Recognizing that the quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high- quality scholarly activity.

In evaluating regional campus clinical/teaching/practice faculty, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of clinical/teaching/practice faculty.

6.8 Procedures for Clinical and Tenure-Track Faculty

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the department.

6.8.1 Candidate Responsibilities

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

6.8.2 Dossier

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

While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last

five years, whichever is less, to present.

The time period for scholarship documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence over time. There should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present.

Any published materials cited should be held by the faculty member in an accessible form which can be made available on request from the chair, or the P&T Committee. Reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication would be included in this file as well as digital links to published materials. A faculty member's manuscript does not document publication.

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

6.8.3 Teaching Documentation

“Teaching” is broadly defined to include didactic classroom, non-classroom and distance instruction, extension and continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars. (Revised Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(A)).

Documentation of teaching may include, but is not limited to, both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the dissemination of knowledge including the following:

- Courses taught, including classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus. Instruction offered by electronic technology including online programs or courses or other materials that are promulgated electronically through appropriate channels.
- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught or similar evaluation of extension instruction including student comments from SEIs.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required annually for probationary tenure track faculty and as elected by a faculty member considering promotion at some time in the future. (Details of teaching reviews are provided in Section 9).
- Evidence of efforts to improve the quality of teaching, for example through the University Institute for Teaching and Learning and the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching workshops and services.
- Awards and formal recognition of teaching.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching accomplishments, efforts to improve teaching, and of impact of teaching as appropriate.

Producing scholarly publications designed primarily for classroom and other instructional settings.

- Pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, digital programs or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Presentations on pedagogy and teaching delivered at national and international conferences.
- The extent to which pedagogical materials, books, digital programs and other publications developed by the candidate have been adopted by other faculty at Ohio State and at other

institutions.

Advising and mentoring students

- Advising or mentoring undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral students.
 - Advising or mentoring honors students.
 - Involving undergraduate students in research opportunities.
 - Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations.
 - Service learning efforts with students and community groups.
 - Assessment of the success of current and former graduate students.
- Generating external funding
 - External grants such as training grants and other resources to support students and instruction.
 - Developing instructional materials, courses and curricula for use in university and non-university settings
 - Contributions to new course development or major course revision. Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the college, across the university or at other institutions in the development and implementation of teaching materials and methods. Evidence of interdisciplinary work.
 - Development and use of new technologies in teaching, including digital technologies, e-learning and distance learning.
 - The extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State, in professional societies, or at other institutions.

6.8.4 Research Documentation

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

Documentation of research may include, but is not limited to, both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the development of knowledge including:

- Scholarly peer reviewed papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Impact of scholarly publications.
- Grants and contracts applied for; grants and contracts received.
- Creative endeavors including, but not limited to, commercialization activities such as inventions, disclosures, patents, options and licensing agreements or creative works pertinent to the candidate’s professional focus.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (e.g. published reviews including publications where one’s work is favorably cited, news reports citing research).
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the department, college or across the university and at other institutions in the development of knowledge.
- Prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.
- Evidence of other scholarly and creative endeavors that achieve the strategic goals of the university.
- Developmental efforts in incubation of research advancement.

6.8.5 Service Documentation

“Service” is broadly defined to include providing administrative service to the university, professional service to the faculty member’s discipline, and disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university. (Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(A))

Documentation of service may include, but is not limited to, both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the service to institutional development and development of the profession including:

- Service on department, college and university committees including ad hoc committees.
- Service as a mentor for faculty members.
- Service as advisor to student groups and organizations or other efforts contributing to student welfare.
- Service on review panels for journals or granting agencies.
- Recognition or awards by professional organizations for service.
- Service and consultation on advisory boards and committees for public organizations such as industry or community boards or governmental boards.
- Developmental efforts in advancement of outreach.
- Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department.
- Contributions to departmental goodwill such as serving as a department leader on committees, mentoring junior faculty, regularly attending meetings and events.
- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

6.8.6 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must also submit a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, 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. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department. The Chair of P&T committee will inform the candidate of these rights.

6.8.7 External Evaluations

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

6.8.8 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the P&T committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of the P&T committee members who are eligible to vote on the request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (e.g.

student and peer evaluations of teaching, documentation of publications). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A decision by the P&T committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document other than the department's current APT document, the Promotion and Tenure Committee must inform the Human Sciences Committee of Eligible Faculty and make available to them a copy of the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document to be used in that case. Although there may be candidates within Human Sciences using different Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure documents, the Department of Human Sciences needs only one Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Committee of Eligible Faculty is the same as defined elsewhere in this document. The Committee of Eligible Faculty must include a statement making it clear to all subsequent levels of review which Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document was used (if other than the one currently in effect.)
- To provide feedback to candidates on dossier preparation. Comments made in no way commit the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to review the dossier to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- To consider annually, in Autumn semester, dossiers of probationary and tenured tenure-track faculty members as well as probationary and non-probationary clinical faculty as they seek promotion or promotion with tenure.

Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

- **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
- **Late Summer to Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- The P&T chair appoints an individual from the P&T Committee to draft a summary analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to present to the P&T Committee for discussion at the time of the meeting in which the candidate's dossier will be reviewed. This summary serves to focus discussion at the meeting, and in no way relieves the other P&T committee members from their obligation to review the entire dossier of the candidate. The individual takes no position in presenting the analysis of the record. From this review meeting, the P&T committee drafts an analysis of the candidate's

performance in teaching, scholarship and service to present to the Eligible Faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.

- The P&T Committee meets with the Committee of Eligible Faculty, and presents each case, providing the summary analysis prepared in their preliminary meeting. The eligible faculty participate in the discussion and an anonymous vote on each candidate occurs.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

6.9 The Procedures for P&T Committee

The P&T Committee chair is responsible for calling committee meetings, leading candidate reviews, drafting and forwarding the committee's letters of candidate evaluations, working with the department chair to ensure a fair and efficient review process, and leading activities to develop and review departmental promotion and tenure procedures and policies. In addition, it is the responsibility of the committee chair in partnership with the POD to ensure a dossier is correctly prepared and does not include extraneous or inaccurate information before it is reviewed by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The task of providing feedback to the candidate concerning the preparation of the dossier may be distributed among the 9 members of the P&T Committee, depending on the number that need this review each year.

The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines. The POD's duties include responsibility for verification of the items in the dossier. It is the responsibility of the POD to assure that the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee follows written procedures governing its reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of under-represented groups that could bias their review. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review are brought to the attention of the Committee. If difficulties or concerns are not resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee, they are brought to the attention of the department chair. The department chair must investigate the matter and provide a response to the designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is not warranted.

After discussion and faculty vote, the P&T committee members revise the analysis of each case to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting, as they craft a letter. The draft letter is labeled as draft including a watermark to that effect. The draft letter can be reviewed by the faculty electronically, or a copy may be housed in the chairperson's office, or a site on Carmen can be made available for use of the faculty. Input from the faculty will be solicited for revision of the letter. The completed written evaluation and recommendation of the faculty is signed by the P&T chair as representative of the entire committee of eligible faculty and is delivered to the department chair.

The P&T Committee alone provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The Eligible Faculty do not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

6.10 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

6.11 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.)
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment.
- To make each candidate's dossier available electronically 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.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the departmental review process:

- of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
 - To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the TIU head recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the TIU head is final in such cases.
 - To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

The Department Chair must maintain copies of all Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure documents for a minimum of ten years.

6.12 Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

The review period for promotion to senior lecturer will be since date of hire or the past five years, whichever is most recent.

The promotional process from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer is as follows:

- The Full-Time Lecturer seeks input from their direct supervisor and/or Program Chair, and may seek input from other Senior Lecturers regarding the promotion. These meetings are in an advisory nature only assisting the candidate in determining if they could demonstrate the criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer.
- The candidate informs the Program Chair (and SFHP Program Director where relevant) that they wish to be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer when the call for non-mandatory review comes out from the P&T Committee Chair.
- The candidate submits the following documentation to the Program Chair:
 - Cumulative Core Dossier. Completion of appropriate sections of the teaching section is required. The candidate may add information to the service and research sections if relevant to their responsibilities.
 - Curriculum Vitae
 - All student evaluation of instruction for the review period
 - Summary of student comments from SEIs for the review period (summarized by someone other than the candidate)
 - All peer reviews of instruction - at least one peer evaluation per year for the review period
 - All annual review letters for the review period.
- The Program Chair, and in the case of SFHP lecturers, the Program Chair and the Director of SFHP will draft the initial letter. This letter will provide an evaluative review of the candidate's

qualifications relative to the candidate's assignment.

- The Program Chair will present the case to the eligible faculty in which the candidate resides. Eligible faculty consist of all tenure track and clinical faculty and senior lecturers in that Program area. The eligible faculty then vote on the promotion and the vote is added to the faculty letter.
- The Program Chair sends the summary letter including the faculty's recommendation to the Department Chair who makes the final evaluation to support or not support the faculty's recommendation.
- The Department Chair sends the letter from the eligible faculty and his/her decision to the candidate. A 10 day comments process ensues where the candidate may respond to the faculty letter or choose not to respond. If the candidate chooses to respond to the letter both the eligible faculty and Department Chair may respond to those comments. The Department Chair makes the final determination of promotion and informs the candidate.

6.12.1 Procedures for Other Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section 6.8 above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

6.12.2 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

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

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

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

6.12.3 Faculty with Extension Joint Appointment

Faculty with Extension joint appointments where the primary TIU is in Human Sciences are first reviewed by the Chair of Extension. The Extension review focuses on those activities aligned with the candidates responsibilities associated with their Extension appointment.

The Extension Chair forwards the written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair

and Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, from which point the review follows the procedures described above. The Extension Chair letter becomes part of the candidate's Dossier.

6.13 External Evaluations

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

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a clinical faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

External evaluations should meet the criteria described below. For special cases, as in Fourth-Year Review, external evaluations may be solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the review. This may occur when the candidate's research is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the research without outside input. For Fourth-Year reviews, only three external evaluations are required.

For promotion and tenure, a minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained.

A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

7. 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.

8. Seventh-Year Reviews

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

9. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

9.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching

Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required for every department course except independent studies, thesis research, dissertation research and similar types of courses. The SEI is administered through the Registrar's Office. During week late in the semester, students enrolled in a class receive an e-mail message from the SEI Administrator asking them to complete the SEI during last two weeks. Students not responding by early in the last week of the semester are sent a reminder e-mail. Faculty should inform students of the importance of completing the SEI. Faculty members may also consider sending an e-mail message to all students enrolled in the class encouraging them to complete the SEI.

Extension courses are evaluated by course attendees using the EEET and these data are reported annually.

9.2 Peer Evaluation of Teaching

OAA describes Peer review of teaching in (2.8.2 Policies and Procedures Handbook, Volume 1, Chapter 1) as follows:

Peer evaluation of teaching aims to apply appropriate disciplinary (peer) standards to the teaching performance of faculty members. TIUs should provide opportunities for and mechanisms that support both formative and summative evaluation of teaching. The TIU must set forth detailed guidelines for peer evaluation of teaching to be used in faculty performance reviews that is appropriate for the unit's instructional situation(s).

Peer evaluation should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey, major required course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with current disciplinary knowledge. Assessment of these aspects can be made by peers within the unit or external reviewers as determined by procedures established by the TIU.

TIUs may select from among many modalities of peer review. See the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning for links to on-line resources at Ohio State and at other institutions, as well as published sources that offer principles and methods for the formative and summative evaluation of teaching. TIUs must not only establish rules governing evaluation of instruction but also abide by those rules, applying them evenly and without prejudice. For further discussion see Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 1.4.4 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

9.3 Procedure for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

9.3.1 The responsibilities of the Department Chair:

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

9.3.2 The role and responsibilities of the Peer Reviewer

The peer reviewer serves to validate the accomplishments of the faculty member being reviewed as well as contribute to the faculty's member's development. Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative (they provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews, and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching). The responsibilities of the reviewer are:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year. Peer review of instruction includes review of multiple components of the faculty member's teaching and is not limited to classroom observation alone but should include examination and evaluation of all documentation provided by the faculty member for the teaching portion of the annual review report to the department chair (as summarized in section [6.3.1](#) of this document)
- To review the teaching of probationary clinical faculty at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year. Peer review of instruction includes review of multiple components of the faculty member's teaching and is not limited to classroom observation alone but should include examination and evaluation of all documentation provided by the faculty member for the teaching portion of the annual review report to the department chair (as summarized in section [6.3.1](#) of this document)
- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary clinical faculty with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review. Peer review of instruction includes review of multiple components of the faculty members teaching and is not limited to classroom observation alone but should include examination and evaluation of documentation provided by the faculty member for the teaching portion of the annual review report to the department chair as summarized in section [6.3.1](#) of this document. In preparation for promotion to professor, the reviews need to include summative assessment of teaching achievements throughout the faculty

member's career.

- Tenured professors shall be reviewed upon request or at the discretion of the chair.
- The peer evaluation of teaching is a narrative report in the form of a letter to the department chair. The letter by the evaluator should be sent to the department chair within three weeks after the observation or by the end of the term in the case of summative teaching reviews. The department chair will share the letter with the reviewed faculty member.

In assessing classroom instruction, the areas to be addressed in the letter to the department chair should include the following six general areas. The bulleted areas are illustrative.

Curriculum Choice and Development

- Appropriateness for audience
- Specific course/workshop objectives
- Supporting materials, current and well chosen
- Rigor
- Assessment of syllabi, presentation, course packets and online media, tests, assignments should be included. For extension faculty, assessment of educational materials such as handouts or interactive digital programs should be included.

How the Faculty Member Promotes Learning

- Learning objectives clearly stated and developed
- Teaching materials useful to learners in their own situations
- Provides class members with opportunities for participating
- Summarizes/clearly identifies key points
- Personal Characteristics: enthusiasm: genuine interest in student success; self confidence; ethical behavior
- Task oriented and/or businesslike behavior
- Answers questions clearly
- Approachable and accessible to participants
- For extension faculty, the ability to communicate effectively with outreach students and an understanding of the needs of outreach students.
- Faculty Member Preparedness
- Significant disciplinary knowledge; technically accurate
- Logical organization of class time and presentation
- Mastery of a variety of teaching methods
- Accommodates differences among learners
- Keeps the class members focused on the objectives Strategies for Instruction
- Effective use of a variety of methods and materials
- Appropriate instructional materials selected for topic(s)
- Uses questioning to enable critical thinking by learners
- Quality of session materials such as handouts, audio-visual aids and web sites
- Uses class time effectively Evaluation of Learning
- Evaluation materials appropriate to the objectives
- Appropriate and timely feedback on how activities/projects/assignments contribute to learning
- Documentation of learning outcomes by participants Summary Comments
- General comments

- Strengths/things that were successful
- Areas for improvement, including a specific list of suggestions for addressing problems observed
- Comparison to last review by this observer (if appropriate)

In assessing other components of teaching the letter should include discussion of the effectiveness and impact of teaching reflected in the documentation provided. The bulleted areas are illustrative.

Teaching.

- Evidence of efforts to improve the quality of teaching, for example through University Center for the Advancement of Teaching workshops and services.
- Awards and formal recognition of teaching.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching accomplishments, efforts to improve teaching, and of impact of teaching as appropriate.

Producing scholarly publications designed primarily for classroom and other instructional settings.

- Quality and impact of pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, digital programs or other materials published, or accepted for publication.
- Quality and impact of presentations on pedagogy and teaching delivered at national and international conferences.
- The extent to which pedagogical materials, books, digital programs and other publications developed by the candidate have been adopted by other faculty at Ohio State and at other institutions.

Advising and mentoring students.

- Assessment of success of students who have been mentored.
- Assessment of the success of current and former graduate students. Generating external funding
- External grants such as training grants and other resources to support students and instruction.

Developing instructional materials, courses and curricula for use in university and non- university settings.

- Assessment of contributions to new course development or major course revision. Assessment of evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the college, across the university or at other institutions in the development and implementation of teaching materials and methods.
- Assessment of development and use of new technologies in teaching, including digital technologies, e-learning and distance learning.
- The extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State, in professional societies, or at other institutions

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

all comments be excluded

9.4 Peer Evaluation of Extension Teaching

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

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

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

Appendix I: Mentoring

The Department of Human Sciences employs a formalized mentoring system. Assembling a mentoring committee is recommended, but not required. If the faculty chooses to have a mentoring committee, the chair will work with the assistant professor to select at least two senior faculty members to serve as mentors for the probationary faculty member. The chair will then ask those senior faculty to serve in this capacity.

The mentoring committee's purpose is to act as a resource for questions concerning research, teaching or service pertinent to the duties of faculty in the Department. As a member of the tenured faculty, a mentor's first obligation is to the Department. During the review process, mentors sometimes provide clarifying information to the promotion and tenure committee when particular issues come up related to teaching, research, service, and extension responsibilities.

The Department recommends at least one meeting per semester between mentors and mentees to discuss progress and issues. The mentee should initiate these meetings. Faculty mentoring should cover the following areas:

1. Information about the system of governance (policies and procedures) within the unit and university.
2. Research: provide guidance on scholarly activities (reading manuscripts, suggesting publication outlets, providing feedback on grant proposals), advice on how to achieve short-term and long-term goals.
3. Teaching: reinforce the message that teaching is an important component of annual reviews and the promotion and tenure process, provide guidance on teaching issues.
4. Service: provide information about service expectations, and appropriate levels of commitment.
5. Extension: provide guidance related to extension teaching, community outreach, and research as appropriate.
6. Review of the dossier and its component parts.

Mentoring committee members may be adjusted as needed. Although mentors can provide an important role in reaching promotion, the junior faculty member has ultimate responsibility for compiling a record of scholarship, teaching and service that merits promotion and tenure. Mentees must take responsibility for their own growth and success, be proactive in seeking out information and guidance, and be open to constructive feedback. Ultimately, the mentoring committee is one set of faculty members among many. Any advice a mentor provides must be considered only within the context of the mentee's goals and capabilities.

The decisions and choices that untenured faculty make are ultimately their own. As part of the oversight process for tracking the mentee's progress and the mentoring committee activity, the mentee is required to generate a brief written summary of the content, action steps, and/or recommendations discussed at mentoring committee meetings to be shared with the members of the mentoring committee, Program Chair, and Department Chair.