

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SCHOOL OF EARTH SCIENCES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE.....	2
II. SCHOOL MISSION.....	2
III DEFINITIONS.....	3
IV. APPOINTMENTS.....	5
A CRITERIA.....	5
B PROCEDURES.....	8
V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	12
A PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK FACULTY.....	12
B TENURED FACULTY.....	13
C TENURED FACULTY—REGIONAL CAMPUS.....	14
D RESEARCH FACULTY.....	14
VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS.....	15
A CRITERIA.....	15
B PROCEDURES.....	15
C DOCUMENTATION.....	16
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	18
A CRITERIA.....	18
B PROCEDURES.....	23
C DOCUMENTATION.....	29
VIII. APPEALS.....	31
IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS.....	31
X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	32
A STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	32
B PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	32

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SCHOOL OF EARTH SCIENCES

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty <http://trustees.osu.edu/assets/files/RuleBook/UniversityFacultyRules.pdf>; the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/3HBP&T.pdf>; and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the school and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the school 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 school director.

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 school's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and 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 school and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to school 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 school and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

II. SCHOOL MISSION

The Mission of the School of Earth Sciences (SES) is education, research and service to understand earth, environment, and human systems and the complexities of their interactions. Our faculty members have recognized the importance of a portfolio of earth science specialties as a foundation for programs of distinction to link studies of earth processes with critical problems. SES will help to realize the tremendous research and educational opportunities of the coming decades. Detailed discussions of the mission and

focus of SES can be found in a recent self-study (2010) and strategic plan (2012) done for CAS and OAA.

Excellence in research involves advancing state-of-the-art knowledge in a variety of research disciplines within the School. It emphasizes the publication of research results in high quality peer-reviewed journals; the publication of other scholarly documents, book chapters, books, and monographs; and the securing of external funding to conduct research and support graduate students who will become the new leaders in the field. Mentoring of graduate students to completion of PhD degrees is a significant component of a faculty's research accomplishments.

Excellence in teaching involves (1) presenting the most complete and stimulating educational product possible in the SES undergraduate service courses, (2) introducing innovation in the courses designed primarily for our majors, (3) continuous updating of our upper level undergraduate and graduate courses to present state-of-the-art information to our students in the most exciting and stimulating ways possible, (4) mentoring of undergraduate research and (5) ongoing evaluation of teaching quality, both by peers and students, to improve our educational product to the highest possible level.

Excellence in service involves serving responsibly on committees within SES, the college, and the university. It also entails serving on professional committees at state, national, and international levels, providing service in the form of peer reviewing manuscripts, proposals, and other documents for journals and funding agencies, and evaluating colleagues at other universities involved in the promotion and tenure process. Finally, it requires sharing the fruits of our educational and research endeavors with the community outside of the university.

III. DEFINITIONS

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1 Tenure-track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the school. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the school excluding the school director, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

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

2 Research Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of research faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the school and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the school. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the school, and all nonprobationary research faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the school excluding the school director, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

3 Conflict of Interest

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

4 Minimum Composition

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

B Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. This includes faculty who are able to participate in faculty meeting discussion through teleconferencing and/or videoconferencing. 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.

C Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when 60% of the votes cast are positive.

2 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 60% of the votes cast are positive.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A CRITERIA

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

Tenure Track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the doctoral degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The school will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the Instructor level is limited to three years. When an Instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the School's eligible faculty, the Director, the Dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the Probationary Period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high quality teaching, and high quality service to the school and the profession is required. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of the eligible faculty 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 without a formal request for an extension of the Probationary Period.

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

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

Tenure Track Faculty – Regional Campus

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.

Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the School wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-7-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-clinical-faculty-appointment-reappointment-and-nonreappointment-and-promotion.html>.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high quality publications that strongly indicates the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program. This research program is expected to substantially fund the salary and benefits of the faculty member.

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the school's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

Expectations for publications and research funding are appropriately greater than outlined above for the Research Assistant Professor.

Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments are typically made for no more than one year at a time and in no case for more than three years at a time. Associated faculty are considered valuable members of SES. While individuals hold these appointments, they can identify their affiliation of the School through use of their proper titles, *Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor*. Adjunct appointments are compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give considerable academic service to the school, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty 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 professorial titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Associated faculty with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the School by a tenure-track or research faculty member from another academic unit at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this school. 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. These must be reappointed every year (usually in May for the coming academic year).

B PROCEDURES

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure track and research 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

The letter of offer should contain a clause that defines the duration that the offer is valid.

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

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The School Director appoints a search committee consisting of 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 school. An attempt should be made to have members from all divisions within the School.

The Search Committee Chair 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.

The Search Committee:

- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services and external advertising, subject to the school Director's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated print journal. Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the School's administration manager. If the faculty does not agree, the School Director, in consultation with the faculty, determines the appropriate next steps, e.g., to solicit new applications, to review other applications already received, or to cancel the search for the time being.

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the School Director; and the Dean or designee. In addition, all candidates must make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the Search Committee meets and determines which candidates are acceptable and which are not, the faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. Voting rules are delineated in Section III.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty also vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. (The results of the vote are provided to the Office of Academic Affairs, along with the other documentation required for offers at senior rank.) If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The faculty vote on all acceptable candidates and the one with the highest vote total is the first to be approached. If the first candidate does not accept the offer, the faculty can reconvene and revote. The Director of the School can veto any appointment but must do it in writing with clear justification. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Director of the School.

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The University does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The school will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

Tenure Track Faculty – Regional Campus

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, school director, school committee of the interested 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 school director and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the School Director and the regional campus Dean.

Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure track faculty.

Highly qualified research faculty candidates may occasionally be considered for appointment without a national search, only when there is a reasonable likelihood that a national search would not result in finding more highly qualified and/or more diverse candidates. The faculty must first approve the decision to interview a candidate without a national search. However, the Dean's approval is required to forego a national search for a research faculty position. From that point, the on-campus interview and decision making processes are identical to those following a national search. The school director determines the details of the offer, including the length of the initial contract.

Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the Chair, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, 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 research appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the School Director in consultation with the school Advisory Committee.

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

Associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. They may not be any longer than three years. 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 academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester basis.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see APPOINTMENT CRITERIA above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the school director's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the University level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty

Any School faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or research faculty member from another Ohio State school, department or college. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to SES justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the school Director extends an offer of appointment. The School Director reviews all courtesy appointments annually to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting. Appointments are for one year and must be renewed by faculty vote every year.

V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

The school follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>). The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the School's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under MERIT SALARY INCREASES below. This material must be submitted to the School Director by a date specified by the Director, usually mid Spring Semester.

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

A PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually by the committee of the eligible faculty. A formal vote after the third year (fourth-year review) is mandatory.

The committee of the eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote, if taken, and a written performance review to the School Director. The School Director conducts an independent assessment of performance; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and, as appropriate, future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the School Director recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The School Director'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 School Director's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the College. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the School Director recommends nonrenewal, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process,

the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

Probationary Tenure Track Faculty – Regional Campus

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the Columbus School and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the School, the School Director 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.

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 the Dean (not the School Director) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Since this School follows fourth-year review procedures for all annual reviews of probationary tenure track faculty, no modifications are required for the fourth-year. External letters are not solicited. However, at the conclusion of the school review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the school director recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

Exclusion of Time from the Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D), <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>, sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, <http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>.

B TENURED FACULTY

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the Full Professors, who submit a written performance review to the School Director along with comments on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The School Director 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. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the School Director. The review process includes a meeting. On completion of the review, the School Director prepares a written assessment on the faculty member's performance and future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

C TENURED FACULTY—REGIONAL CAMPUS

Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the Columbus School and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the School, the School Director 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.

D RESEARCH FACULTY

The annual review process for research probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, except that non-probationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank.

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the School Director must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it 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, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> 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 follows the review procedures for promotion of research faculty except that external review letters are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

F Associated Faculty

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

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written

evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A CRITERIA

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 24 month for research and the previous calendar year for service and teaching, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. 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. The most highly paid faculty will be held to a higher performance standard than others.

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

B PROCEDURES

The School Director recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the Dean, who may modify these recommendations. In formulating recommendations, the School Director consults with the school Evaluation Committee who provide an initial assessment of salary adjustments for the faculty. This Committee has a member from each of the School's four divisions. 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 School Director divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (as quartiles) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

Faculty members who are dissatisfied with their salary increase should meet with the School Director and explain their case.

C DOCUMENTATION

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the school director upon request.

- Updated *Curriculum Vitae*, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place.
- Annual Activity Report (AAR), detailing contributions to teaching, research and service. This detailed AAR can be supplemented by a one page summary of the faculty member's past year's accomplishments.

In all cases it is the responsibility of the faculty member to see that professional achievements are brought to the attention of the School. Faculty members may also, at any time, supply additional documentation of their activities to be included in their personnel file and to be available for evaluation in merit increase determinations.

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

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous calendar year.

Teaching

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught. SEI reports represent the single method chosen to solicit student opinions of instructors in all classes. Faculty members may supplement the SEIs with other methods if they wish.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the school's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in Section X of this document).
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.

- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

Research

- Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication, if requested. 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.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g. published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, or grants and contract proposals that have been submitted.

Service

- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier or activity report. This includes university as well as professional service.

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A CRITERIA

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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

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

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 School'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, research, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics, <http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>.

NOTE: The content of the following sections is obviously not appropriate for all disciplines, but is nevertheless provided in order to demonstrate the requisite level of specificity. The school should strive for an equivalent or greater level of detail in undertaking the review of any particular candidate.

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

Teaching

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.
- Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm.
- Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment.
- Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process.
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process.
- Treated students with respect and courtesy.

- Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs.
- Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the school's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise.
- Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.
- Dedication to class activities including such factors as meeting the class on time and being available for student questions and discussions, and effective supervision of students in independent studies and research.

Research

Every faculty member is generally expected to conduct original independent research on important scientific issues and to communicate the results to the scientific community. Faculty members are expected to achieve a position of national and eventually international prominence and be among the leaders within a given area of scientific inquiry. No person shall be recommended for promotion in rank or awarded tenure who does not satisfy this requirement.

More specifically, promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Published a body of work in high quality peer reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - Quality, impact, quantity.
 - Unique contribution to a line of inquiry.
 - A rigorous peer review process and affording a degree of dissemination. Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
 - Collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. For example, first authorship on published papers would indicate a leading role in the collaborative work.

- Generally, a rate of 2 or 3 published papers in peer-reviewed journals per year is a satisfactory research output for faculty members, and depends on their identified contributions. Papers published solely and primarily with their own graduate students are weighted more highly than with other collaborators. The rate of publication of scholarly work in whatever form should be more or less constant rather than episodic.
- It is recognized that research collaboration is an important means for attaining new knowledge, and is encouraged.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evinced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences. External evaluation of a faculty member by his/her peers at the time of consideration for promotion with tenure must show that the faculty member's research has made a positive impact in the area of his/her expertise and has the potential to continue to advance the body of knowledge significantly.
- Demonstrated 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.
- Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding, patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript, licensing activities that generate revenues should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards, and materials transfer activities should be considered evidence of national (or international) recognition and impact.

Service

Faculty members are encouraged to contribute professional expertise for the benefit of the profession, public, university community, and the School. The expectations for service vary in the following manner.

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Made substantive contributions to the governance of the School in a collegial manner that facilitates positive contributions by others.
- Demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession.

Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for junior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these responsibilities required. The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and/or international reputation in the field, as well as leadership in service. This includes membership on prestigious national and international scientific/ agency committees, editorships and associate editorships of international journals, and leadership roles within the School, College and University.

In the area of research, the faculty member being considered for promotion to professor must have demonstrated continued publication of peer-reviewed scholarly work at the same rate or greater than is expected of assistant professors. The external evaluations at the time of consideration for promotion must demonstrate that the faculty member has made a solid and significant positive impact in the area(s) of his/her expertise and that there is a continuing expectation of advancing the body of knowledge with national and/or international recognition. External research funding must be well established and have the potential to support a long-range research program. Under certain conditions, a faculty member could be considered for promotion with an exceptional teaching record combined with a less exceptional research record.

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.

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 School will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to research. Recognizing that the character and quantity of research 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 school nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high quality scholarly activity in the form of peer-reviewed publications or other evidence of scholarly contributions. Rather than also emphasizing quantity (as in the rate of publication), the school nevertheless expects the same quality of research productivity.

Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor

For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high quality peer reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required that is also capable of generating his/her salary and benefits, along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

Promotion to Research Professor

For promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation built on an extensive body of high quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required that is also capable of generating his/her salary and benefits, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

B PROCEDURES

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

Candidate Responsibilities

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

If external evaluations are required: to review, upon request by the school director, the list of potential external evaluators developed by the school director and the committee of the eligible faculty. The candidate may add additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The school director decides whether removal is justified. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.)

Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The TIU is the School of Earth Sciences. The School Director may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote. The P & T Chair is appointed by the Director with the advice of the Advisory Committee.

The responsibilities of the CEF 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. The CEF is constituted separately for each candidate under review. A 60% majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The Committee bases its decision on an 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). 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>) for 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.
 - Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for

nonmandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the School Director that an untenured faculty member seeking nonmandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (i.e. has a "green card"). Faculty lacking citizenship or permanent residency can be promoted but not awarded tenure until permanent residency is received.

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the CEF, the School Director, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late Spring through early Autumn Semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - Late Spring: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. 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 School Director.
 - 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.)
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to provide to the full CEF with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the School Director.
 - Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the School Director in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another school. The joint appointment reviews will also be done by the CEF.

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To appoint a devil's advocate whose function is to review a candidate's dossier from a critical, arm's-length viewpoint.
- To attend all CEF meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote. Voting rules are delineated in Section III.

School Director Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the School Director are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a nonmandatory review for tenure, and tenure may not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this School.
- Early Summer Semester: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the CEF, the Director and the candidate. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.)
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the CEF at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted. Electronic forms of the dossier can be made available to facilitate faculty participation from distant locations.
- To remove any member of the CEF from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. A conflict of interest exists when a CEF member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible.
- Mid Autumn Semester: To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the CEF's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the CEF to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the Committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the school review process:

- of the recommendations by the CEF and School Director.
- of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the CEF and School Director.
- of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the School Director, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the school director, 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 school director recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the school director is final in such cases.

To receive the CEF's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the school director's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other TIU by the date requested.

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 school director, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

External Evaluations

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

External evaluations are optional in other reviews and will be obtained as needed. When obtained, they should meet the criteria described below.

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

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the CEF, the School Director, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this School requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. The School follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html>, 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 School Director, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted, e.g., requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier. It is in the candidate's self-interest to ensure 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 school's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

C DOCUMENTATION

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

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

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

Teaching

For the time period since the last promotion (for associate professors, the time period is last promotion or last five years, whichever is less):

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the School's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in Section X of this document).
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

Research

For the time period since the last promotion:

- Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter

from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.

- Documentation of grants and contracts received.
- Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g. published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, or grants and contract proposals that have been submitted.

Service

For the time period since the last promotion:

- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

VIII. APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-5-faculty-governance-and-committees.html>. Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05, www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in this school. Faculty should continue to mention to their students that the SEI form should be filled out on-line or through the mobile application. The faculty member should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

B PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The School Director oversees the School's peer evaluation of teaching process, which is generally implemented through individual faculty Mentor Committees and in some cases, ad hoc Evaluation Committees.

Annually the Director appoints a two-person Mentor Committees for each of the Assistant and Associate Professors. The term of service is one year, with the same mentors commonly reappointed. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty. Mentors usually must be of higher rank (in most cases, Professors) than the faculty member being reviewed.

The responsibilities of the individual Mentor Committees are as follows:

- To review the teaching of main-campus assistant and associate professors normally once per year.
- To review the teaching of tenured Professors at least once every four years 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.

On occasion, it may be necessary for the Director to evaluate the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching. For this purpose, the Director will form an ad hoc committee to assist that faculty member. Reviews conducted upon the request of the School Director focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the director or faculty member.

Reviews can also occur at the request of faculty members. These are considered formative only. The School Director is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching, <http://ucat.osu.edu> .

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Classroom visitation is conducted by two or more committee members attending together and is unannounced. However, at the beginning of the semester, the Committee will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because exams are being given, guest speakers are scheduled, etc.

Mentor Committees will focus particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (e.g., survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. As part of its evaluation the Mentor Committee may discuss the faculty member's SEI summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the Committee attempts to ascertain the reasons. In so doing, members are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the semester, and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

At the conclusion of the review, the Mentor Committee submits a written report to the School Director, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the Committee may respond in writing to those comments if it wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier.

Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative, i.e. 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.