

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SCIENCE
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN ECOLOGY**

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty, Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6index.html>), the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/xi_ptannual.html), and any additional policies established by the College of Education and Human Ecology and the University.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department of Human Development and Family Science shall follow those 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 appointment or reappointment of the department chair.

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the provost of the University before it can 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 its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document the dean and provost accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01, General Considerations (<http://trustees.ohio-state.edu/rules6/ru6-01.html>).

1. MISSION and VISION

Mission: The Department of Human Development and Family Science engages in scholarship, teaching, outreach, and the preparation of scholars and professionals to enhance the lives of individuals and families.

Vision: The Department of Human Development and Family Science is composed of a community of scholars and educators who embrace intellectual passion. The department strives to enrich the lives of individuals and families through basic and applied research that has relevance for present and future generations. The department's approach to teaching, research, and outreach is collaborative, multi-disciplinary, and inclusive. The goal of the department's teaching, research, and service activities is to build a world in which children thrive in their families, adults thrive in their relationships, and families thrive in their communities.

Each member of the department faculty is expected to contribute to the mission of the department, the college, and the University through *excellence in teaching and research, and*

through effective service. Contributions will be evaluated based on quality, quantity and relevance to the mission and programs of the department, the college, and the University. A faculty member's work will be evaluated in comparison to his/her peers and in light of its value to the intended audience.

APPOINTMENTS

CRITERIA

TENURE TRACK FACULTY

This section establishes criteria for appointment to the assistant professor rank in the department. Criteria for appointment to higher ranks are to be consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks discussed later in this document (Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion Reviews) and the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, Appointments at Senior Rank or With Prior Service Credit (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/ii_seniorrank.html).

The department is bound by principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, Criteria for Appointment, Re-appointment, and Promotion and Tenure (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-02.html>). Consistent with this rule, the minimum requirement for appointment to the assistant professor or higher rank in the department is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a relevant field of study. Appointment at the instructor level will only be made when the offered appointment is "assistant professor," but the desired appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment.

The department is also bound by principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, Probationary Service, and Duration of Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html>). Appointment as professor or associate professor will normally be with tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be part of the appointment, as approved by the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment to assistant professor is always probationary. An assistant professor will be reviewed for promotion and tenure within the six year probationary period and informed by the end of the evaluation year whether or not promotion with tenure is granted at the beginning of the next academic year.

Appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. Instructors must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year.

AUXILIARY FACULTY

This section establishes criteria for appointment and reappointment of compensated and uncompensated auxiliary faculty. Definitions and policies related to auxiliary faculty are delineated in Section (C) of Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules5/ru5-19.html>).

Compensated auxiliary faculty members include regular titles (1-49% FTE), lecturers, senior lecturers, and visiting faculty. Appointments to regular titles (1-49% FTE) and visiting faculty may be at the assistant, associate or professor rank with criteria for appointment and performance the same as for appointment to a regular faculty title. The minimum requirement for appointment to the position of lecturer is an earned master's degree in a relevant field of study or equivalent experience in the field. Visiting faculty appointments are made on an annual basis not to exceed three (3) consecutive years.

Uncompensated auxiliary faculty members include adjunct faculty, appointments to regular titles (0% FTE) and visiting faculty. Independent or collaborative teaching, research and service that enhance departmental mission and productivity are expected of each uncompensated appointee. These appointments are to be consistent with the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, Uncompensated Auxiliary Appointments (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/ii_auxuncomp.html).

Auxiliary appointments may be made for no more than one year at a time and thus require formal annual review and renewal if they are to be continued. Auxiliary faculty may identify themselves as associated with The Ohio State University only in situations where this association is professionally relevant. For example, it is unacceptable for an auxiliary faculty member to identify with the University when the purpose is solely for financial gains accrued through the "good name" of the University. However, it is acceptable for an auxiliary faculty member to be identified with the University when involved in research activities leading to related publications and presentations.

COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR FACULTY

A courtesy no-salary joint appointment in the department is available to and reserved for regular faculty from other tenure initiating units at The Ohio State University. Faculty granted this appointment are expected to participate in the department's teaching, research and/or service program. This appointment does not require formal annual review. However, at the discretion of the department chair and no less than once each four years, appointments will be reviewed and continued only if it is determined that the appointee contributes to the mission of the department. Courtesy appointments are defined in the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, Definitions and Use of Faculty Titles (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/ii_factitle.html).

PROCEDURES

TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Upon receiving permission from the college to hire for a tenure track position, the department chair will appoint a search committee for the position. The committee will familiarize itself with and follow any college and university policies directing its activity. Particular attention will be paid to the most recent edition of *A Guide to Effective Searches* (<http://hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guide/wgmain2.htm>).

A national search is required unless an exception is requested from, and approved by, the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty will have opportunity to advise the search committee which

will solicit and receive nominations from faculty and other interested parties or organizations. The committee will review materials of applicants and develop a short list of candidates for departmental review and possible invitation for formal interviews.

Following each candidate interview the search committee chair will solicit comments and evaluations regarding the candidate from department faculty and other interested persons. Based upon the comments and evaluations, the search committee chair will determine whether or not a faculty meeting is necessary to further discuss the candidate. The search committee chair will then conduct a closed ballot on the candidate and report a recommendation to the department chair. The vote will be advisory to the chair. The chair will make a recommendation to the dean. The departmental chair will negotiate and make the formal offer to the selected candidate.

Offers at the associate professor or professor ranks, with or without tenure, and offers involving prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. This will be done in a way that is consistent with University policies and procedures as outlined in the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, Letters of Offer (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/ii_lettoffer.html) and Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, Appointments at Senior Rank or With Prior Service Credit, (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/ii_seniorrank.html).

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Education. These offers will be handled in a manner consistent with Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, Appointment of Foreign Nationals (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/ii_foreignnatl.html).

AUXILIARY FACULTY

After seeking input from appropriate faculty members, the department chair appoints lecturers. These appointments do not require a faculty vote.

Appointment of auxiliary faculty including adjunct faculty, regular titles (1-49% FTE), and visiting faculty, regardless of compensation, require the department chair to bring a recommendation to the faculty on a yearly basis. The chair, or designated faculty member, will prepare and present the case for appointment to department faculty for a vote. Salaried and adjunct appointments require the prior approval of college administrators and it is inappropriate for the department to extend an offer before receiving the approval.

COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR FACULTY

Courtesy appointments will require a letter or request (solicited or unsolicited) from faculty requesting the appointment. The department chair will present the request at a faculty meeting for discussion and approval or denial. Such appointments will be reviewed at least once each four years and the appointee will be informed of the continuation or termination of the appointment. Courtesy faculty may be listed as Human Development and Family Science faculty, but they do not hold voting rights in the Department.

ANNUAL REVIEWS

PROCEDURES

Every faculty member must have an annual performance review as specified in the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, Faculty Annual Reviews and Fourth Year Reviews, (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/x_annreview.html).

PROBATIONARY FACULTY

Annual reviews for probationary faculty are to be consistent with the policies set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, Probationary Service, and Duration of Appointments for Tenure-Track Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html>). In addition to the review process outlined in this section, probationary faculty are to be reviewed by the department chair using the same procedure as for the annual review of tenured faculty members since the latter review provides the basis for compensation decisions.

Probationary faculty are annually reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee which consists of all tenured faculty at or above the rank of associate professor. Nontenured faculty members submit a dossier in conformance with current Office of Academic Affairs guidelines and dossier outline (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/xi_ptannual.html), to the department chair by the second week of Autumn Quarter. The department chair alerts the chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee when the dossiers are available for review. The Committee evaluates each probationary faculty member with respect to performance in teaching, scholarship and service, and evidence of continuing development. The Committee votes on whether to recommend that the appointment should be renewed. A simple majority vote is needed to recommend renewal. The Committee provides the department chair a written evaluation of each probationary faculty member in as expeditious a manner as possible. In turn, the department chair provides the probationary faculty member with a written evaluation in a similar prompt manner.

A meeting with the department chair and at least one tenured faculty member is required each year for all untenured faculty members. The written documentation serves as the basis for a review conference. Following the review conference, each faculty member will receive written feedback from the chair regarding performance and future plans. Faculty members may submit a written response to the chair's written and/or oral feedback.

Probationary Faculty Annual Reviews are intended to help probationary faculty develop as faculty members. These reviews should be constructive and candid. The review process is a means to be supportive and helpful as well as a means to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance. In instances when the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department chair are in conflict with respect to the performance of a probationary faculty member, the chair and the Committee are to meet to resolve the differences. This is to insure that probationary faculty members do not receive conflicting messages related to their development as faculty.

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department chair should encourage eligible faculty to request an extension to the probationary period when the extension would be

beneficial to the faculty member. Time that can be excluded from the probationary period is associated with factors beyond a faculty member's control that significantly interfered with productivity: birth or adoption of a child, personal illness, care of sick or injured person, and so forth. Such extensions must be consistent with University and College policies. No probationary faculty member can be forced to take an extension.

Probationary faculty appointments should not be continued following any annual review in which it is apparent that the faculty member's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is unlikely. Renewal of faculty appointments is contingent upon fulfilling the responsibilities associated with an appointment, a continuing need for an individual's set of competencies, and the potential for adaptability to other essential roles in the department's program. Probationary appointments may be terminated during any probationary year because of inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a non renewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with fourth year review procedures. Notification of non-renewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08, Standards of Notice (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-07-08.html>). In addition, a recommendation for non-renewal must be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs in Winter Quarter on the same date when college Promotion and Tenure cases are due (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/xi_ptannual.html).

Probationary appointments may be terminated for fiscal or programmatic reasons (see *Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, Probationary Service, and Duration of Appointments for Tenure-Track Faculty* (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html>)). When non-renewal is based on fiscal or programmatic reasons, the faculty member should be advised that such non-renewal is a possibility and formal notice of non-renewal should be provided as soon as possible after the need for non-renewal is established. Non-renewal of a probationary appointment for fiscal or programmatic reasons does not entail a performance review and requires the prior approval of the executive vice president and provost. Because hiring decisions should be based on informed assumptions regarding the future availability of resources and of programmatic needs, approval of such non-renewals will be based on the extent to which convincing evidence is provided that the fiscal or programmatic reasons for the non-renewal could not be anticipated when the appointment was made and are expected to be long lasting.

Probationary faculty members also take part in performance reviews that serve as a basis for merit salary increases. The dossier submitted for the annual review may serve as the basis for the merit salary review. In addition, however, probationary faculty may provide the department chair with written information about any and all updates to their accomplishments in instruction (including new SEI evaluations), scholarship, and service. A second meeting with the department chair regarding the merit salary review (and any updated information) is required only upon request by the chair or the faculty member. Probationary faculty members will receive written notification from the chair regarding performance and merit salary increases. Faculty members may submit a written response to the chair's written and/or oral feedback.

PROBATIONARY FACULTY—FOURTH YEAR REVIEW

The fourth year review of probationary faculty follows the procedures for promotion to associate professor with tenure noted below; however, for the fourth year review, no outside letters of evaluation are requested and the dossier is not forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs by the college. In all circumstances, a fourth year review is to be consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, Probationary Service, and Duration of Appointments for Tenure-Track Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html>).

TENURED FACULTY

Annual performance reviews are an important part of the monitoring and mentoring processes needed for a productive tenured faculty. The review should assist faculty in the development and implementation of professional plans. It should bring attention to performance problems, when they exist. In addition, the review serves as a basis for merit salary increases.

Each faculty member annually will provide the department chair with written information in a format specified by the department chair on their accomplishments in instruction (including at least the SEI evaluations for all courses taught in a given year), scholarship, and service. A meeting with the department chair and at least one professor is required each year for all tenured faculty members at the rank of associate professor in the department. The written documentation serves as the basis for a review conference between the associate professor and the department chair and at least one professor. Following the review conference, each faculty member will receive written feedback from the chair regarding performance and future plans. Faculty members may submit a written response to the chair's written and/or oral feedback.

A meeting between the department chair and a faculty member at the rank of professor is optional, required only upon request by the chair or the faculty member. As above, the written documentation serves as the basis for a review conference between the professor and the department chair, and the faculty member will receive written feedback from the chair regarding performance and future plans. Faculty members at the rank of professor also may submit a written response to the chair's written and/or oral feedback.

Peer evaluation of teaching is required of all department faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion, and shall follow procedures outlined in the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/iv_instruction.html) section on Evaluation of Instruction. Initiation of this evaluation is the responsibility of the department chair and Promotion and Tenure committee, not the individual faculty under review. Tenured faculty instruction at the rank of associate professor should be peer reviewed at least every four (4) years (but the faculty can request peer evaluations more often). The review schedule for tenured faculty seeking promotion to the next level is noted below. The process for peer evaluation of teaching is noted below.

In those situations where review is non-mandatory, a faculty member will contact the department chair, **normally** no later than the first week of the Spring Quarter preceding the Autumn Quarter in which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. The candidate should discuss with the department chair the appropriateness of submitting credentials for review. If supportive, the department chair will ask the Promotion and Tenure Committee to conduct a preliminary review of a faculty member's **progress in teaching, research, and service**. The

chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will prepare a response to the submitted credentials, noting strengths and limitations (including identification of areas where no information was available to render a preliminary assessment).

Regardless of the decision to seek a preliminary review, candidates considered by the chair to be premature with respect to candidacy will not be formally reviewed. However, no tenured faculty member can be denied consideration for promotion more than three consecutive years.

MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

CRITERIA

The department's Patterns of Administration document gives the department chair responsibility for recommending merit salary increases. The department chair uses information provided in the faculty annual review as a starting point for evaluating faculty. Performance in teaching, research and service will be judged according to the department's mission, with consideration given to a faculty member's specific balance of responsibilities. Performance evaluation will emphasize the previous year's performance. However, the chair also may consider performance from several previous years and/or the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall records. The philosophy and principles outlined in the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, Compensation Philosophy & Principles (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/iii_compphilos.html) provide the foundation for faculty compensation decisions.

The compensation rate for individual positions is primarily established by relevant competitive markets, as well as the impact of individual positions on the unit's mission, as feasible within the unit's budget. Compensation rates for individuals should vary with the credentials and performance of individuals holding the positions. Compensation decision makers should monitor equity patterns across groups of similarly employed individuals and address observed inequities in a timely way.

Salary determinations for faculty who are on leave will be considered on an individual basis. In cases where the chair determines a faculty member has made little, no, or a negative contribution to the department mission (i.e., damaged the welfare of the department, has not made satisfactory progress toward agreed upon goals, or has submitted insufficient documentation to permit a well informed evaluation), the chair may recommend no merit salary increase.

PROCEDURES

Annual report documentation submitted by each faculty member will be evaluated by the department chair in light of agreed upon department goals prior to making a salary recommendation to the dean. Each faculty member will be informed in writing of a merit salary increase by either the chair or the dean.

DOCUMENTATION

The primary evidence for determining merit salary raises will be the updated curricular vita; a written report of accomplishments in instruction, creative scholarly activities, and service for the period of time under review; and copies of teaching evaluations (SEI) for the period of time under review—the documentation submitted as part of the annual review process. These documents reflect a faculty member's performance in teaching, research and service from the perspective of contribution to the stated mission of the department and the faculty member's goals.

PROMOTION & TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

CRITERIA

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-02.html>).

Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure are held to a high standard of excellence in their primary areas of responsibility. When evaluating a candidate, the focus of the evaluation is the candidate's primary areas of responsibility. A mediocre performance in an area of primary responsibility cannot be offset by excellent performance in a secondary area of responsibility.

A candidate must demonstrate growth and improvement over the probationary period. In addition, a candidate's pattern of performance over the probationary period should lead to a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

Teaching

Teaching excellence **in resident instruction and extension education** is reflected through command of the subject; ability to organize material and present it with logic and conviction; the capacity to awaken in the audience an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; the capability to bring an audience to a higher level of understanding; the creativity, spirit, and enthusiasm which vitalize learning; the skill of preparing materials for use by diverse audiences; the ability to arouse curiosity and stimulate advanced students to creative work; the ability to adapt subject matter to the level and needs of the clientele; an understanding

of the relationship between one's specialization and the overall curriculum; the extent and skill of participation in the general guidance and mentoring of students.

Excellence in teaching is also reflected in the publication of instructional materials, including textbooks, handbooks, course manuals, curricula/programs, and extension publications. Given the foundational role of scholarship in the Department's mission, teaching excellence will further be judged by candidates' ability to engage students' involvement in the research process and to contribute to students' accomplishments in research.

Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate their involvement in teaching and the quality and the effectiveness of their teaching. This must reflect growth and development over the probationary period and suggest a high likelihood that professional development with respect to teaching will continue.

Scholarship

Excellence in scholarship is reflected through the importance of the information and ideas revealed through research that advances knowledge in a discipline or facilitates improvement of practitioner performance including the creativity of the thought processes and the methods underlying the contributions. Excellence is also reflected through theoretical innovation, the development of improved empirical techniques, the creative application of existing concepts and empirical methods to problem solving, novel synthesis of existing information, or the invention of new technology.

Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate excellence in a program of scholarship which contributes to a body of knowledge embraced in the department's mission. It is important that the candidate clearly demonstrates progress toward achieving excellence in scholarship.

These contributions are reflected in the publication of scholarship in well respected national refereed journals in the field and/or discipline. Excellence is also reflected in the procurement of external funding to support one's research, particularly grants that are channeled through The Ohio State University Research Foundation and administered by the Department. Additional indicators of excellence include the publication of books and book chapters in the discipline, presentations of scholarly papers at professional meetings, and recognition of other scholars in the field/discipline. Candidates for promotion to Associate professor are expected to qualify for Category P membership in the University Graduate Faculty.

Service

Effective service is reflected through making skills and knowledge available to the profession and to units within the University, and professional skills and knowledge available to the larger community, in appropriate and effective ways. While there are many types of service contributions, they typically fall into three major categories: administrative service, professional service and public service.

Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate they have provided effective service and can be reasonably expected to continue a program of effective service consistent with the mission of the department.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Promotion to the rank of professor must be consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-02.html>).

Candidates must provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in areas central to their responsibilities. A mediocre performance in an area of primary responsibility is not counterbalanced by excellent performance in a secondary area of responsibility. Candidates for promotion to professor are to provide leadership to the department, the university, and the profession. Special attention will be given to the candidate's most recent record of accomplishments.

Teaching

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must provide evidence of a sustained record of excellence in teaching, as well as evidence of serving in a leadership role for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession.

A sustained record of teaching excellence is reflected through documenting continued teaching excellence since attaining the rank of associate professor with respect to the criteria noted in the Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure section. Serving in a leadership/mentorship role reflects leading or guiding others such that they benefit from, or attain, teaching excellence.

Scholarship

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in scholarship, as well as evidence of serving in a leadership/mentorship role for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession.

A sustained record of scholarship excellence is reflected through a significant body of scholarship which is recognized nationally or internationally. This body of scholarship must be consistent with the concept of scholarship as outlined in the Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure section. Serving in a leadership role reflects leading or guiding others such that they benefit from, or attain, excellence in scholarship.

Service

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in service, as well as evidence of serving in a leadership role for less senior faculty, for students/clientele and for the profession.

A sustained record of service excellence is reflected through a consistent record of service activities in leadership roles. This record of service excellence must be consistent with the concept of service as outlined in the Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure section. Serving in a leadership role reflects leading or guiding others such that they benefit from, or attain, excellence in service.

PROCEDURES

Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures for Tenure Track Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html>) provides the general framework underlying the review processes for promotion and tenure, and promotion. Specific department policies supplement this Faculty Rule.

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

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

For each candidate at least three members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must be eligible to vote. If there are not three eligible members in the department, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will develop a list of eligible faculty. This list will be forwarded to the department chair for the purpose of selecting nominees from the list to fill vacant positions. Outside member(s) will discuss and vote only on promotion/tenure cases for which they are needed to meet the minimum of three voting members.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will elect a chairperson from its membership of Professors each Autumn Quarter. The term of office shall go from Autumn Quarter through Summer Quarter. No individual shall serve as chair for more than two consecutive terms. The chair is responsible for calling Committee meetings, leading candidate reviews, drafting and forwarding the Committee's letters of candidate evaluations, working with the department chair to ensure a fair and efficient review process, and leading activities to develop and review departmental promotion and tenure procedures and policies.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will elect a Procedures Oversight Designee whose term will go from Autumn Quarter through Summer Quarter. No individual shall serve as Designee for more than two consecutive terms. While all members of the Committee must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias, the Designee has a specific responsibility for these assurances. The Designee assures that the 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 Designee, 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.

An additional responsibility for the Procedures Oversight Designee is insuring that the dossier is correctly prepared, does not include extraneous or inaccurate information, and that citations are verified before it is reviewed by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee.

VOTING AND EVALUATION

The Committee will conduct its evaluative process and vote following the policies and guidelines listed in this, and other relevant, documents. After deliberation and voting the committee will submit written recommendations to the department chair. This letter will include reasons for the recommendation, principal strengths and weaknesses, and the vote of the committee.

A majority of committee members voting must vote affirmative for a positive recommendation. Voting will be by secret ballot. Voting committee members must participate in a substantial portion of the Committee's discussion with respect to a given candidate. At least 75% of eligible committee members must be present and vote "yes or no" to recommend a candidate for promotion and/or tenure. (Abstentions do not count toward the 75%.) There is no absentee voting. If a committee member is unable to carry out his or her responsibilities and if this results in fewer than three members on the committee, the procedure outlined above will be used to bring the committee to three members.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee may not participate in the review of a candidate when he or she has a conflict of interest. When there is a question about potential conflicts of interest, open discussion and professional judgment are required in determining whether it is appropriate for the Committee member to excuse her/himself from the review of a particular candidate. A conflict of interest exists with respect to a Committee member's own review and for reviews where there is a familiar or comparable relationship between a Committee member and a candidate. The potential for a conflict of interest arises when there is a close professional relationship between a Committee member and a candidate such that the Committee member stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review of a candidate. For example, it may be difficult for a faculty member to objectively review a candidate when the faculty member is co-author on a significant portion of the candidate's published work or when the Committee member is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional services.

PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Peer evaluations of teaching are required and must include a formal departmental evaluation of classroom teaching, extension teaching and instructional materials.

For untenured faculty, the department chair in conjunction with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will initiate peer reviews the beginning of Autumn quarters, year three and year five (one year before submission of dossiers). For promotion of tenured faculty, formal peer evaluation of teaching will occur at least every four years as initiated by the department chair. Those desiring a more current evaluation for their dossier may request the department chair to initiate a peer evaluation Autumn Quarter, one year prior to submission of their dossier.

The peer evaluation team involves at least two tenured faculty members, with at least one representative of the department. Members of the candidate's mentoring committee may be a part of the review team, but the entire team should not be made up of the mentoring committee. The team will be selected by the department chair.

At the beginning of Autumn Quarter the department chair will meet with the candidate to select an appropriate course or a series of extension teaching activities to be evaluated. The peer evaluation team will then meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation procedure and to review the course/teaching activities documentation. Documentation should minimally include: (1) a statement of teaching philosophy, (2) syllabus/extension instructional plans, and (3) course/extension teaching materials.

Teaching documentation will be evaluated by each team member using a standardized list of criteria, "Points to Consider in the Evaluation of Teaching Materials" in the Supplemental Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

Classroom teaching will be observed by each review team member at least twice. Review team members do not need to observe on the same day and do not need to alert the candidate of their intended visit. The candidate should, however, advise team members as to times when observation would not be productive, such as days of exams, guest speakers, and so forth. Classroom observation should be evaluated using the standardized list of criteria, "Points to Consider in Evaluation of Classroom Teaching" in the Supplemental Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

After completion of the evaluation of materials and classroom teaching, the review team will meet with the candidate to review and clarify their evaluations. Each committee member then will write a letter summarizing his/her evaluation. These letters will be submitted to the department chair and be included in the dossier.

TIME FRAME

The department review of credentials is predicated on the assumption that materials are to be submitted to the Dean by November 1. This suggests that a dossier must be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for review by October 1. To meet this time frame, a candidate should have her/his materials to the department chair by September 1. Initial contacts with external evaluators should occur as early as possible, with evaluators being asked to submit letters by August 1.

DOSSIER

The candidate is primarily responsible for preparing the dossier with assistance from the department chair and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The department chair is responsible for insuring the accuracy of submitted materials (citations, teaching evaluations, grant support, etc.). The dossier must follow the most recent outline specified in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Review Guidelines, Procedures, and Dossier Outline (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/xi_ptannual.html).

When listing multiple author scholarly work in a dossier, a candidate should carefully describe the nature of her/his intellectual contribution to the work. This should include a clear description of the candidate's role and responsibility with respect to the work. The percentage of effort to

the work should not be stated since time effort may not reflect the importance of a candidate's contribution to a scholarly work.

If questions are raised about any aspect of a dossier during the review process, it is both appropriate and desirable for the Committee to seek answers to those questions during its review. However, the Committee may also render a negative recommendation, particularly in a case involving promotion only, when the candidate has presented documentation that is so inadequate as to make informed evaluation impossible.

The candidate also is responsible for assembling a departmental reading file of publications, papers, teaching materials, and any other relevant original materials he/she wants the P&T Committee to consider and, in consultation with the Chair, for putting together a packet of her/his scholarly work and a statement of research plans for distribution to the external evaluators.

LETTERS OF EVALUATION

The department chair requests all external letters of evaluation, regardless of nature or intent of the letter of evaluation. Only external letters solicited by, and sent to, the department chair are included in a dossier. The recommended process for soliciting external letters from distinguished persons is outlined in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Review Guidelines, Procedures, and Dossier Outline (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/xi_ptannual.html).

Required Letters

- **Letter from the Outside Evaluators.** The department chair is to request at least five letters from distinguished persons in the candidate's field who are either at peer or better universities or, if not in academia, are in a position which enables them to critically evaluate the candidate's scholarly work. No more than two of the letters may be from evaluators suggested by the candidate.
- **Letters of Peer Review.** Peer evaluation of teaching must be included. This is discussed in a separate section.
- **Letter from Promotion and Tenure Committee.** The Promotion and Tenure Committee's evaluation of a candidate is a detailed written assessment, addressed to the department chair, of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses based on Committee discussion in response to the candidate's submitted dossier, and a reporting of the numerical vote.
- **Letter from the Department Chair** The department chair makes an independent assessment of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses. In addition, where necessary the chair can provide commentary regarding the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair's letter, including any and all disagreements on the assessment of the candidate's dossier.

Optional Letters that may be solicited by the department chair include the following:

- In the case of a faculty member who collaborates extensively with the same individual(s), a letter(s) may be solicited by the department chair from the collaborator(s) describing the candidate's contributions to the jointly conducted work.
- Letters of evaluation requested by department chair from former students.
- Letters of evaluation related to service may be requested by department chair from committee chairs, committee members, appropriate administrators, and so forth.

COMMENTS PROCESS

As noted above, the Promotion and Tenure Committee submits a written recommendation to the department chair. The department chair reviews a candidate's dossier and makes an independent recommendation to be submitted with the Committee's recommendation to the dean. As soon as the Committee recommendation and the department chair's recommendation have been completed, the candidate is notified in writing of the completion of the departmental level review and the availability of these written recommendations. The candidate may request a copy of the recommendations and may provide the department chair written comments on the recommendations within ten calendar days of notification of the availability of the recommendations. The Committee and/or chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments. All comments become part of a candidate's dossier when it is forwarded to the dean.

REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

In the event that the candidate is the department chair, the Dean will assist in development of a dossier for review. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation will be submitted directly to the Dean.

DOCUMENTATION

Candidates must present documentation in the format, and according to the guidelines, provided in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Review Guidelines, Procedures, and Dossier Outline (http://oaa.osu.edu/Handbook/xi_ptannual.html). In general, the burden of proof is on the candidate to document the quality of her or his contributions. Care should be taken to maintain clear and complete records. In each area of activity, the candidate should focus on quality indicators as well as quantity in documenting the record.

TEACHING

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness. Peer review and formal student/clientele evaluations are required parts of the evaluation of teaching (see procedures section). Additional evidence of teaching excellence may include, but is not limited to: teaching support materials, instructor prepared teaching

materials such as course manuals, frequency of use/loan of Extension materials, efforts to improve the quality of teaching (including use of Office of Faculty and TA Development services such as classroom observation, videotaping, and workshops); teaching awards; textbooks and articles related to the teaching process; development of innovative courses/programs and curricula; formal courses and extension presentations -- when and to how many people; dissertations, theses, and honors projects supervised, graduate committee service, success of candidate's former students and post-docs, extent to which candidate's pedagogical materials have been adopted by other faculty, extent to which candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching.

Teaching evaluations that can be quantitatively analyzed are required. Resident faculty must submit results of the first ten items of The Ohio State University Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for every appropriate classroom course. When SEI evaluations are used, their use is to be considered in light of research done on SEI scores, including differences dependent on size of the class, and whether or not the class is required. Where the SEI is not appropriate (small classes of five or less), other forms of student evaluation can be used insofar as the evaluation process is under the direction of the department chair. Extension faculty must submit the results of The Ohio State University Extension Client Evaluation for at least three extension teaching activities per year. Efforts should be made to obtain such evaluations from the largest possible number of enrolled students or clientele. Additional forms of teaching evaluations (exit interviews of department majors, surveys of alumni, and evaluations of former graduate students) may be included as long as the evaluation process is under the direction of the department chair.

SCHOLARSHIP

Evidence of scholarship excellence includes, but is not limited to, the following sources: peer-reviewed journal articles and/or book chapters, published abstracts, scholarly books (other than textbooks), book reviews, peer-reviewed research presentations at national meetings, internal grants, external grants, prizes/awards in recognition of scholarship (e.g., outstanding article award, lifetime contribution award, research fellowship), national/international recognition for expertise in subject matter (e.g., invited keynote address at major national and international meetings, invited visiting scholar), and external grants and contracts related to expertise in scholarship.

External evaluations of scholarship are required. Letters requesting external evaluations must be requested by the department chair. External letters of evaluation play a central role in documenting the quality of scholarship. Those letters furnish independent sources of information which address the importance of the candidate's scholarly contribution to the field, the level of expertise, and the quality of thought reflected in the program of scholarship. In particular these letters are an important mechanism to document the extent to which a candidate's scholarly work has influenced the direction of the research of others; the candidate has creatively incorporated research findings into applications; and the extent to which the candidate has published multiple, benchmark refereed journal articles or chapters.

Other quality indicators also may be employed on a case-by-case basis. Candidates may include information such as the acceptance rate of journals, journal impact rankings, the referee process for presentations at national meetings, and the award rate for grants. Quality

documentation may also include an internal evaluation of the candidate's work, the frequency with which the candidate's work is cited by others, and evidence to support the fact that publication occurred in the primary or leading journals of the appropriate field. .

SERVICE

Evidence of service effectiveness includes, but is not limited to, the following: departmental, college, Extension or university committee service; department, college or university administrative service; external service to the profession including committee service, elected office, conference program chair, reviewer, editorial review board, and editor; presentations to community groups or other lay audiences; grant reviewer for major funding agency, and leadership role in developing community/industry partnerships; and application of professional expertise in service to the community. Community service not related to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to promotion and tenure reviews.

The quality of service at the university is reflected through appointments to committees, appointment as committee chair, election or appointment to other leadership roles, and awards. Depending on the nature of a candidate's service activities, it may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those who are in a position to evaluate specific contributions. As with other letters of evaluation, letters requesting evaluation of service must be requested by the department chair.

APPEALS

Section (A) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-05, Criteria and Procedures for Appeals of Negative Promotion and Tenure Decisions and Appointment Non-renewals and for Seventh Year Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-05.html>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05, Procedures Concerning Faculty Complaints About Promotion, Tenure and Renewal Decisions (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules5/ru5-05.html>).

Faculty members may appeal a negative decision if they believe they have been evaluated improperly. Improper evaluation includes violations of written procedures that could reasonably have affected the outcome of a review and failure to consider evidence material to a fair determination. In considering the evidence material to making a fair determination, members of review bodies and administrators are required to exercise professional judgment and there will be, on occasion, disagreements in professional judgment. Differences in or disagreements with professional judgments do not provide a valid basis for appeals.

Favorable annual reviews during the probationary period serve as a basis for a positive annual reappointment decision. They do not create a commitment to grant tenure and are not a basis for appeal of a decision to deny tenure and promotion. The review for tenure entails a much weightier decision than the annual review and entails assessment of both cumulative performance and promise for the future. Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of tenure.

SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

Section (B) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-05, Criteria and Procedures for Appeals of Negative Promotion and Tenure Decisions and Appointment Non-renewals and for Seventh Year Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-05.html>) specifies conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year review.

If, after fully considering all new information about a candidate's performance, and determining due reason, the department will petition the dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the chair of the department must approve this petition.

The petition must document substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. The petition must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment.

A faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by the department, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review.

APPENDIX—PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

This Appendix is not a part of the Promotion and Tenure document. The contents herein are intended to supplement the Promotion and Tenure procedures and documentation process. These guidelines and procedures may be modified by the Promotion and Tenure Committee to facilitate the development of high quality candidate dossiers; however, it is important that candidates be given reasonable notification of such changes.

The following criteria are to be used as guidelines for evaluating teaching materials. It should be recognized that not all items will apply to all situations. The peer review committee and candidate should select those items that are appropriate for a particular situation. A five-point rating scale may be used to help the reviewer evaluate materials. An overall score is not a part of the review process.

SYLLABUS

Completeness: Does it have each of the following?

- course information
- instructor information
- information on course readings
- goals and objectives of course
- policies on grading, academic misconduct, late work, absences,
- calendar of class activities
- description of assignments/due dates

Clarity of communication: Is syllabus clear? Are rights, responsibilities and consequences spelled out?

Appropriateness of tone: Does the syllabus further rapport and respect between instructor and students? Does it communicate a helpful positive motivational, non threatening but challenging attitude?

Appropriateness of Content: Is the content covered in the course reflective of the course objectives? Is the content covered in a logical order?

Currency of Content: Does the course content portray the current state of the field. Does it use readings that reflect the latest scholarship?

Level of challenge: Does the course require students to do an appropriate amount of reading and assignments at an appropriate level?

Pacing: Is the course calendar realistic? Has the instructor selected a reasonable amount of content for the time allotted? Are the dates for assignments distributed well?

Testing and Grading: Do the students receive frequent feedback? Are the grading policies fair and appropriate for the goals?

Student-centeredness: Do the office hours or other information portray that the instructor is accessible for help? Are other resources available for the student? Do the activities show a concern for active student engagement?

COURSE PACKET AND TEXTBOOK

- Match with goals of course
- Contain accurate content
- Most current source
- Present multiple viewpoints

Appropriate level of interest
 Appropriate reading level
 Visually attractive
 Appropriate amount of reading
 Clearly organized
 User friendly

COURSE HANDOUTS

Supplement course content
 Contain accurate content
 Appropriate reading level
 Adequate level of detail
 Demonstrate instructional skills
 Show creativity

MULTIMEDIA COURSE MATERIALS

Match with goals/objectives of course
 Accuracy of Content
 Currency of Content
 Production Quality
 Interest Level
 Attractiveness
 Appropriate Length
 Appropriate Level of Difficulty
 Clarity of Organization
 User Friendly
 Permit interactivity
 Permit self pacing
 Provide branching options
 Provide user feedback
 Provide for students with special needs

TESTS

Clarity of directions
 Test items match course objectives
 Legibility and Layout
 Appropriate length
 Clarity of test items
 Standards for grading clearly specified
 Appropriate level of challenge
 Inclusion of higher order thinking
 Organization of content

CLASS ASSIGNMENTS/EXERCISE SHEETS

Supplement course content
 Match objectives of course
 Provide clear directions
 Provide a meaningful learning experience
 Appropriate level of challenge
 Outline assessment method
 Clearly state purpose
 Demonstrate instructor creativity
 Promote student engagement (active learning)

Adequate time/resources for completion

OPEN ENDED EVALUATION OF MATERIALS

What aspects of the instructor's teaching materials clearly stood out as effective in facilitating student learning?

What recommendations do you have that might aid in improving the instructor's teaching materials?

EXTENSION PLAN

The audience is clearly identified

Examples of appropriate teaching situations are provided

Overall objectives are identified

Behavioral objectives are specified

Plan is practical

Limitations for use of materials are specified

Plan is arranged in logical order

Time line is practical

Plan is flexible

Complete list of resources needed - with educational materials is provided

If part of a larger program - relationship is explained

EXTENSION EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

Difficulty level of material is appropriate for audience

Topic is important

Content matches stated objectives

Content is accurate

Content is up-to-date

Presentation method fits audience

Content is sufficiently in depth

Appropriate balance between major points

Appropriate form or design of material for subject matter

Materials are appealing to eye/ear

Written/audio materials are clear and concise

Information is presented in logical order

Quality of materials is professional

"Non-original" material is appropriate for stated objectives

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

The following checklist and comment questions are guidelines to be used when evaluating classroom performance. Not all items will apply or be observed in every observation experience. These items are to be used as illustrations of good teaching behavior. A five-point rating scale may be used to help the reviewer evaluate materials. An overall score is not a part of the review process.

Instructor Organization

Arrives for class on time
 States relation of class to previous one or larger program
 Knows how to use technology as needed
 States or posts objectives
 Provides outline for class lesson
 Makes transitional statements between segments
 Conveys purpose of each class activity
 Summarizes periodically
 Completes topics scheduled for the class
 Remains focused on objectives

Keeps an appropriate pace

Presentation Skills

An effective speaker
 Employs appropriate rate of speech
 Uses classroom space well
 Enthusiastic about subject matter
 Command of English was adequate
 Voice is audible
 Varies tone/pitch of voice
 Avoids distracting mannerisms
 Maintains eye contact
 Avoids extensive reading from notes or texts
 Uses "note-taking" pace

Instructional Strategies

Uses more than one form of instruction
 Uses appropriate teaching techniques for stated goals
 Pauses after asking questions
 Prevents specific students from dominating discussion
 Draws nonparticipants into discussions
 Help students to extend their responses
 Mediates conflicts or differences of opinion
 Maps the direction of the discussion
 Provides opportunity for active learning
 Provides explicit directions for active learning tasks
 Specifies how active learning will be evaluated
 Allows enough time to complete active learning task
 Facilitates group work well
 Helps students learn from each other
 Helps students apply theory to solve problems
 Develops awareness of process used to gain new knowledge

Content Knowledge

Knowledgeable of subject matter
 Information is accurate
 Incorporates current research
 Identifies sources, authorities in the field
 Communicates reasoning process behind operations/concepts
 Confident in explaining subject matter
 Focuses on important content in the field
 Demonstrates curiosity toward new ideas or perspectives
 Incorporates diverse views (such as gender, culture, race, age)
 Corrects racist or sexist bias in assigned materials

Clarity

Explains subject matter clearly
 Logically organizes presentation
 Considers diverse learning styles by using multiple approaches, e.g. overheads, handouts, discussion, visuals
 Pitches instruction at an appropriate level
 Responds to questions clearly
 Emphasizes major points
 Relates material to practical situations/uses examples to explain
 Defines new terms or concepts
 Elaborates or repeats complex information
 Pauses to allow students to ask questions

Rapport with Students

Welcomes student participation
 Motivates Students
 Demonstrates sense of humor
 Uses effective classroom management techniques
 Flexible in responding to student concerns
 Welcomes multiple perspectives
 Treats students impartially
 Respects constructive criticism
 Able to help many kinds of students
 Sensitive to individual interests and abilities
 Does not express sexist or racist attitudes
 Addresses students by name
 Attends to student comprehension or puzzlement
 Uses positive reinforcement
 Incorporates student ideas into class

Instruction in Labs, Studios, or Field Settings

Experiments/exercises are well chosen and well organized
 Procedures/techniques are clearly explained/demonstrated
 Thoroughly familiar with experiments, exercises, equipment, tools
 Available for assistance during experiments/exercises
 Experiments/exercises are of appropriate level of difficulty
 Experiments/exercises develop important skills
 Experiments/exercises develop confidence in subject matter
 Safety is emphasized
 Criticism of procedures/techniques is constructive
 Provides aid with interpretation of data
 Clinical or field experiences are realistic

Open Ended Questions

Describe several strengths evident in the instructors teaching performance. What suggestions do you have that might aid in improving the instructors overall teaching effectiveness?