

Department of Human Sciences

*Appointments, Promotion, Tenure Criteria and Procedures**

*Reflects changes approved by Human Sciences Tenure Track faculty attending faculty meetings September 10, 2014; January 28, 2015; September 16, 2015; March 23, 2017; and October 31, 2018

OAA approved 1/16/2019

Table of Contents

1. Preamble	5
2. Department Mission.....	5
3. Definitions.....	6
3.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
3.1.1 Tenure-Track Faculty	6
3.1.2 Clinical Faculty	6
3.1.3 Conflict of Interest.....	6
3.1.4 Minimum Composition	6
3.1.5 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal	7
3.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	7
3.3 Quorum	7
3.4 Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	7
3.4.1 Appointment.....	7
4. Appointments.....	7
4.1 Criteria	7
4.1.1 Tenure-Track Faculty	7
4.1.2 Clinical Faculty	8
4.1.3 Associated Faculty	10
4.1.4 Courtesy Appointments.....	11
4.2 Search Procedures	11
4.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty	11
4.2.2 Clinical Faculty	14
4.2.3 Associated Faculty	14
4.2.4 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	14
5. Annual Review Procedures.....	15
5.1 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	16
5.2 Regional Campus Faculty	17
5.3 Fourth-Year Review.....	17
5.4 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	17
5.5 Tenure-Track Faculty.....	18

5.5.1	Regional Campus Faculty	18
5.6	Clinical Faculty	18
6.	Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	19
6.1	Criteria	19
6.2	Procedures	19
6.3	Documentation	20
6.3.1	Teaching	20
6.3.2	Research	22
6.3.3	Service	22
7.	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	23
7.1	Criteria	23
7.1.1	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	23
7.1.2	Promotion to Professor	26
7.1.3	Regional Campus Faculty	26
7.1.4	Clinical Faculty	27
7.2	Procedures	28
7.2.1	Candidate Responsibilities	28
7.2.2	Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	29
7.2.3	Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	30
7.2.4	The Procedures and Timeline for P&T Committee of Eligible Faculty	30
7.2.5	Department Chair Responsibilities	32
7.2.6	Regional Campus Faculty	33
7.2.7	External Evaluations	33
7.3	Documentation	34
7.3.1	Teaching	35
7.3.2	Research and Scholarship	36
7.3.3	Service	37
8.	Appeals	37
9.	Seventh-Year Reviews	37
10.	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	37
10.1	Student Evaluation of Teaching	37

10.2	Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	38
10.3	Procedure for Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	38
10.4	Peer Evaluation of Resident Teaching.....	41
10.5	Peer Evaluation of Extension Teaching.....	42
	Appendix I: OAA Handbook Reference.....	43
	Appendix II: Mentoring.....	44

1. Preamble

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

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

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

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

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

2. Department Mission

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

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

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

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

These values guide our mission, strategies, goals, and daily work as we adhere to the

democratic principles of equity and shared governance.

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

3. Definitions

3.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty

3.1.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department.

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointments, 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 department excluding the department chair, 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 department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

3.1.2 Clinical Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of clinical faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in the department and all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in the department. For 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 of clinical faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department and all non-probationary clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

3.1.3 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 (e.g. dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion or reappointment review of that candidate.

3.1.4 Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair will appoint a third

member from another department in the College.

3.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee

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

3.3 Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is over 2/3rds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

3.4 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.

3.4.1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

3.4.2 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 a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

4. Appointments

4.1 Criteria

4.1.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by

the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor: An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor: Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor or professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

4.1.1.1 *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.

4.1.2 **Clinical Faculty**

Appointment of clinical faculty entails a three-, four- or five-year contract. The initial contract in Human Sciences is a three to five year probationary appointment, with reappointment considered annually. The clinical faculty member will be notified at the end of each year of the probationary period whether he/she will be reappointed for the following year. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be

offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#) concerning clinical faculty.

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

Assistant Professor Human Sciences Clinical/of Practice: A PhD or a master's degree and/or appropriate credentials demonstrating relevant expertise in the field of study, and extensive experience in the workplace are minimum requirements for the rank of Assistant Professor of Professional/Clinical Practice. Evidence of potential for high quality teaching and high quality service to the profession is highly desirable. Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor of Clinical Practice is for an initial term of three years. By the end of the penultimate year of the contract, a review must take place and a decision made on a second appointment term.

4.1.2.1 ***Criteria for appointment as Human Sciences
Clinical/of Practice***

- An earned terminal degree and/or appropriate credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study.
- Evidence of current clinical experience appropriate to the teaching and service role expected within the department (minimum of five years).
- Evidence of current knowledge of research affecting practice with the field of study.

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

4.1.2.2 ***Criteria for appointment as Human Sciences
Clinical/of Practice:***

- An earned terminal degree in relevant field of study
- Current professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study (if appropriate).
- Evidence of current knowledge of research affecting practice with the field of study.
- Evidence of ongoing engagement with practitioners in relevant

- context.
- Evidence of sustained high-quality teaching.
- Evidence of high-quality and impactful service both within and outside of the university.

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

4.1.2.3 *Criteria for appointment as, Human Sciences Clinical/of Practice:*

- An earned Doctoral degree in relevant field of study
- Current professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study (if appropriate).
- Evidence of current knowledge of research affecting practice with the field of study.
- Evidence of ongoing engagement with practitioners in relevant context.
- Evidence of sustained high-quality teaching.
- Evidence of high-quality and impactful service both within and outside of the university.
- Evidence of high-quality and impactful service at a local, state, or national level.

4.1.3 Associated Faculty

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

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

Clinical Instructor of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor of Practice, Clinical Associate Professor of Practice, and Clinical Professor of Practice: Associated clinical appointments may be either compensated or uncompensated. Uncompensated appointments are given to individuals who volunteer uncompensated academic service to the department, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Associated clinical rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of clinical faculty. Associated clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of clinical faculty.

Lecturer: Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be

taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

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

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

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

4.1.4 Courtesy Appointments

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

4.2 Search Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for information on the following topics:

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

4.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be

approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through [the college with resources from the Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#).

4.2.1.1 *The search committee:*

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

interview. Online interviews may be used by the committee to prescreen candidates. On-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee, and the Associate Deans for Research and Academic Affairs or their designees. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship, and may be required to teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. A simple majority in favor of a candidate reflects the faculty's overall acceptance of the candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate to the department chair.

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

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the search committee ranks the candidates and provides this ranking to the department chair to indicate which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair in consultation with the dean.

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 department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

4.2.1.2 *Regional Campus*

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

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

negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

4.2.2 Clinical Faculty

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

4.2.3 Transfer from the Tenure-track

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

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

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

4.2.3 Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the department chair in consultation with the Human Sciences Chair's Council.

Appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal is considered at a faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty (a simple majority), the department chair extends an offer.

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

Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on an annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered. 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 department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

4.2.4 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or clinical faculty member from another Ohio State department.

A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty (via a simple majority positive vote), the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for renewal or nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a meeting.

5. Annual Review Procedures

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Faculty Annual Review Policy](#).

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

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

The annual reviews of every tenure-track faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. A face to face meeting between the faculty member and the department chair is required part of the annual review for every faculty member in the department.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. A template is provided which outlines the required components and provides the format. This material must be submitted to the department chair no later than January 31st. The document reports teaching, scholarship, and service performance covering the past calendar year through December 31. The review process including an interview with the chair, receipt of the chair's letter, and receipt of response from faculty member will be completed by the end of April each year.

The department chair prepares a culminating letter which must include a narrative evaluation addressing the purposes of the annual review described above. A perfunctory checklist lacking narrative or evaluative content does not meet this requirement. At a minimum the culminating letter or other written report must address the following (if applicable):

- Teaching and advising
- New course development

- Publications and presentations
- Research activities
- Funding and efforts to obtain funding
- Service and outreach activities
- Honors and awards

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

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

5.1 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually in spring by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. The dossier and all annual review letters are reviewed to ensure that the faculty member receives consistent information about their progress toward tenure.

The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance. Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

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

faculty member will be reappointed. This process is also described in the Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures section of this document. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the Dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

5.2 Regional Campus Faculty

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 department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

5.3 Fourth-Year Review

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

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

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

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

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

5.4 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track

faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

5.5 Tenured Faculty

The department chair will review all associate professors and professors annually. This will include a submission of a written review of performance completed by the faculty member (as outlined in Appendix I) and an independent assessment by the department chair. A formal face to face meeting between the chair and the faculty member will take place in which his or her performance and future plans and goals are discussed. A written evaluation is completed by the chair which distills the major accomplishments in these areas, summarizes goals and strategies, and provides focused action steps. There should be explicit agreement with each faculty member about the expected contribution focus or foci and the levels of achievement expected of him/her in a given year. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. All documents are included in the faculty member's permanent record.

5.5.1 Regional Campus Faculty

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 department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

5.6 Clinical Faculty

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

Every probationary clinical faculty member is reviewed annually in spring by the Eligible Faculty. The Chair's Council, with input from the Annual Review of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will make the determination of annual reappointment of probationary clinical faculty.

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

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

must be observed.

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

6 Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

6.1 Criteria

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Overall expectations of each of the faculty are in accordance with the following types of scholarship (adapted from Boyer, 1994; Kolb, 1980 with no priority order implied).

- **Discovery.** The pursuit of the unknown, the investigative advancement of knowledge.
- **Integration.** The interpretation and synthesis of new insights. Extending the knowledge of original research.
- Drawing together across disciplines and fitting specialized knowledge into larger intellectual patterns for broader, more comprehensive understanding.
- **Transformation.** The transformation of an individual or group through the extension and transmission of knowledge. Developing meaning and understanding within the learner.
- **Application.** The application of knowledge to consequential societal problems. Learning from practice.

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

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

6.2 Procedures

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

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

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

6.3 Documentation

The annual performance review of every tenure-track faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the department chair no later than January 31st. The annual performance review of every clinical faculty member requires that all documentation described below in the categories of teaching and service be submitted to the department chair no later than January 31st. The document reports information covering the past calendar year through December 31. The review process including an interview with the chair, receipt of the chair's letter, and receipt of response from faculty member will be completed by the end of April each year.

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

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

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review.

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 12 month calendar year January 1 – December 31.

6.3.1 Teaching

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

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

Teaching:

Courses taught, including classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus. Instruction offered by electronic technology including online programs or courses or other materials that are promulgated electronically through appropriate channels.

6.3.1.1 Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer

generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught or similar evaluation of extension instruction.

- 6.3.1.2 Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required annually for probationary tenure track faculty and as elected by a faculty member considering promotion at some time in the future. (Details of teaching reviews are provided in Section 10).
- 6.3.1.3 Evidence of efforts to improve the quality of teaching, for example through the [University Institute for Teaching and Learning](#) and the [University Center for the Advancement of Teaching](#) workshops and services.
- 6.3.1.4 Awards and formal recognition of teaching.
- 6.3.1.5 Other relevant documentation of teaching accomplishments, efforts to improve teaching, and of impact of teaching as appropriate.

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

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

Advising and mentoring students

- 6.3.1.8.1 Advising or mentoring undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral students.
- 6.3.1.9 Advising or mentoring honors students.
- 6.3.1.10 Involving undergraduate students in research opportunities.
- 6.3.1.10.1 Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations.
- 6.3.1.11 Service learning efforts with students and community groups.
- 6.3.1.11.1 Assessment of the success of current and former graduate students. Generating external funding
- 6.3.1.11.2 External grants such as training grants and other resources to support students and instruction.

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

- 6.3.1.11.3 Contributions to new course development or major course revision. Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the college, across the university or at other institutions in the development and implementation of teaching materials and

- 6.3.1.11.4 methods. Evidence of interdisciplinary work.
- 6.3.1.11.4 Development and use of new technologies in teaching, including digital technologies, e-learning and distance learning.
- 6.3.1.12 The extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State, in professional societies, or at other institutions.

6.3.2 Research

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

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

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

6.3.3 Service

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

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

- 6.3.3.1 Service on department, college and university committees including ad hoc committees.
- 6.3.3.2 Service as a mentor for faculty members.
- 6.3.3.3 Service as advisor to student groups and organizations or other efforts

contributing to student welfare.

6.3.3.4 Service on advisory boards and committees for professional organizations.

6.3.3.5 Service on review panels for journals or granting agencies.

6.3.3.6 Recognition or awards by professional organizations for service.

6.3.3.7 Service and consultation on advisory boards and committees for public organizations such as industry or community boards or governmental boards.

6.3.3.8 Developmental efforts in advancement of outreach.

6.3.3.9 Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department.

6.3.3.10 Contributions to departmental goodwill such as serving as a department leader on committees, mentoring junior faculty, regularly attending meetings and events.

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

7 Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

7.1 Criteria

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

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

7.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

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

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

The award of tenure is 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 department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

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

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

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

7.1.1.1 *Teaching*

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

- 7.1.1.1 up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- 7.1.1.2 the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- 7.1.1.3 creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- 7.1.1.4 active engagement of students in the learning process and encouragement of independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- 7.1.1.5 provision of appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- 7.1.1.6 respectful and courteous treatment of students
- 7.1.1.7 service as advisor to graduate students as feasible within the department, given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- 7.1.1.8 service as an advisor to honors students and as director of undergraduate research as appropriate and feasible within the department
- 7.1.1.9 engagement in documentable efforts to improve teaching, including but not limited to attendance at and participation in university, college, or department teaching workshops
- 7.1.1.10 curriculum improvement through revision of courses or development of new courses and/or academic programs including cross-university

- interdisciplinary programs and multi-university programs
- 7.1.1.11 published pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, digital programs and documentation of the extent to which these products have been adopted by other faculty at Ohio State and at other institutions
- 7.1.1.12 the extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State in professional societies and at other institutions.

7.1.1.2 **Research Scholarship**

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

- 7.1.1.13 Publication of a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and/or is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise shows evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - 7.1.1.13.1 quality, impact, quantity
 - 7.1.1.13.2 unique contribution to a line of inquiry
 - 7.1.1.13.3 rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues as appropriate within the field. Archival journal publications and monographs, including digital outlets, are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and original works more than edited works.
 - 7.1.1.13.4 empirical work broadly defined
 - 7.1.1.13.5 candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described.
- 7.1.1.14 A high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

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

- 7.1.1.15 An 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, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review.
- 7.1.1.16 A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and/or a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.

7.1.1.3 **Service**

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

may include demonstration of:

- 7.1.1.17 contributions to the orderly functioning of the department, college, and university
- 7.1.1.18 contributions to the profession
- 7.1.1.19 contributions to the community at large

7.1.2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html) (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.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 faculty, for students, and for the profession. As specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another.

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

In 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.

7.1.3 Regional Campus Faculty

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

Recognizing that the quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other

responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

7.1.4 Clinical Faculty

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

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

Contract renewal of probationary clinical faculty members requires a review and recommendation from the Human Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the approval of the department chair and the dean, who makes the final decision.

Contract renewal of non-probationary clinical faculty requires approval of the department chair and dean, except in cases where the candidate applies to be promoted in clinical rank. A recommendation to terminate a clinical faculty member's contract requires the concurrence of both the chair and the dean. Before

reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the department's recommendation the dean must consult with the college promotion and tenure committee.

Promotion to Assistant Professor Human Sciences Clinical/of Practice: For promotion to assistant professor of **Human Sciences Clinical/of Practice**, a faculty member must complete PhD or his/her master's degree and meet the required licensure/certification in his or her specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service.

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

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

7.2 Procedures

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

7.2.1 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.

To submit a copy of the APT under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department. The Chair of P&T committee will inform the candidate of these rights.

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

7.2.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- 7.2.2.1 To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- 7.2.2.2 To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the P&T committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A simple majority of the P&T committee members who are eligible to vote on the request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
- 7.2.2.3 The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (e.g. student and peer evaluations of teaching, documentation of publications). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335- 6-04](#) one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non- mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
 - A decision by the P&T committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
 - If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document other than the department's current APT document, the Promotion and Tenure Committee must inform the Human Sciences Committee of Eligible Faculty and make available to them a

copy of the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document to be used in that case. Although there may be candidates within Human Sciences using different Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure documents, the Department of Human Sciences needs only one Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Committee of Eligible Faculty is the same as defined elsewhere in this document. The Committee of Eligible Faculty must include a statement making it clear to all subsequent levels of review which Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document was used (if other than the one currently in effect.)

- To provide feedback to candidates on dossier preparation. Comments made in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to review the dossier to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- To consider annually, in Autumn semester, dossiers of probationary and tenured tenure-track faculty members as well as probationary and non-probationary clinical faculty as they seek promotion or promotion with tenure.

7.2.3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

7.2.3.1 To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

7.2.3.2 To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

7.2.4 The procedures and timeline for P&T Committee of Eligible Faculty

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

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will elect a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) from its membership each spring. The term of office shall run from Autumn through Summer. Typically, no individual shall serve as POD for more than two consecutive year-long terms. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines. The POD's duties include responsibility for verification of the items in the dossier. It is the responsibility of the POD to assure that the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee follows written procedures governing its reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in a

highly professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of under-represented groups that could bias their review. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review are brought to the attention of the Committee. If difficulties or concerns are not resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee, they are brought to the attention of the department chair. The department chair must investigate the matter and provide a response to the designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is not warranted.

Late Spring: The P&T Committee solicits names of external evaluators from the faculty and then suggests these names to the department chair for upcoming candidates.

Summer: The P&T committee chair and the chair's designees within the committee will 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.

The P&T chair will 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.

Early Autumn: The P&T chair appoints an individual from the P&T Committee to draft a summary analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to present to the P&T Committee for discussion at the time of the meeting in which the candidate's dossier will be reviewed. This summary serves to focus discussion at the meeting, and in no way relieves the other P&T committee members from their obligation to review the entire dossier of the candidate. The individual takes no position in presenting the analysis of the record. From this review meeting, the P&T committee drafts an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to present to the Eligible Faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.

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

Early Autumn: The committee of eligible faculty reviews each candidate's dossier thoroughly and objectively in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

The P&T Committee meets with the Committee of Eligible Faculty, and presents each case, providing the summary analysis prepared in their preliminary meeting. The eligible faculty participate in the discussion and vote on each case in a paper ballot.

After discussion and faculty vote, the P&T committee members revise the analysis of each case to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting, as they craft a letter. The draft letter

is labeled as draft including a watermark to that effect. The draft letter can be reviewed by the faculty electronically, or a copy may be housed in the chairperson's office, or a site on Carmen can be made available for use of the faculty. Input from the faculty will be solicited for revision of the letter. The completed written evaluation and recommendation of the faculty is signed by the P&T chair as representative of the entire committee of eligible faculty and is delivered to the department chair.

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

7.2.5 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows: Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

Late Spring Semester: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair 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 eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. If the department chair chooses to remove a member of the eligible faculty because of a perceived conflict of interest, the chair must provide that faculty member with a detailed written justification, and allow the faculty member to respond to the justification.

To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. The chair does not vote at these meetings.

Early Autumn: To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:

7.2.5.1 of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair

7.2.5.2 of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair

7.2.5.3 of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.

To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

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

7.2.6 Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

7.2.7 External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all adjunct 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. For special cases, as in Fourth-Year Review, external evaluations may be solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the review. This may occur when the candidate's research is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the research without outside input. For Fourth-Year reviews, only three external evaluations are required.

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

7.2.7.1 Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship

(or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation.

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

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

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs [suggested format](#) for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

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

The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted below, is forwarded

when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of scholarship and service noted below is for use during the department 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. Digital links may be provided for published materials which are available as digital media only, e.g. videos. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

7.3.1 Teaching

The time period for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years whichever is less to present. Examples of documentation of teaching may include, but is not limited to, both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the dissemination of knowledge including the following:

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

- 7.3.1.1 Courses taught, including classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus.
- 7.3.1.2 Instruction offered by electronic technology including online programs or courses or other materials that are promulgated electronically through appropriate channels.
- 7.3.1.3 Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught or similar evaluation of extension instruction.
- 7.3.1.4 Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required annually for probationary tenure track faculty and as elected by a faculty member considering promotion at some time in the future. (Details of teaching reviews are provided in Section 10).
- 7.3.1.5 Evidence of efforts to improve the quality of teaching, for example through University Center for the Advancement of Teaching workshops and services.
- 7.3.1.6 Awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - Other relevant documentation of teaching accomplishments, efforts to improve teaching, and of impact of teaching as appropriate.

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

- 7.3.1.7 Pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, digital programs or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. 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.

- 7.3.1.8 Presentations on pedagogy and teaching delivered at national and international conferences. The extent to which pedagogical materials, books, digital programs and other publications developed by the candidate have been adopted by other faculty at Ohio State and at other institutions.

Advising and mentoring students

- 7.3.1.9 Advising or mentoring undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral students

7.3.1.10 Advising or mentoring honors students.

7.3.1.11 Involving undergraduate students in research opportunities.

7.3.1.12 Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations.

7.3.1.13 Service learning efforts with students and community groups

7.3.1.14 Assessment of the success of current and former graduate

students Generating external funding

7.3.1.15 External grants such as training grants and other resources to support students and instruction.

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

7.3.1.16 Contributions to new course development or major course revision.

7.3.1.17 Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the college, across the university or at other institutions in the development and implementation of teaching materials and methods. Evidence of interdisciplinary work.

7.3.1.18 Development and use of new technologies in teaching, including digital technologies, e-learning and distance learning.

7.3.1.19 The extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State, in professional societies, or at other institutions.

7.3.2 Research and Scholarship

The time period for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present.

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

- Scholarly peer reviewed papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Impact of scholarly publications.

7.3.2.1 Grants and contracts applied for; grants and contracts received.

7.3.2.2 Creative endeavors including, but not limited to, commercialization activities such as inventions, disclosures, patents, options and licensing agreements or creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus.

7.3.2.3 Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (e.g. published

reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, news reports citing research).

7.3.2.4 Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the department, college or across the university and at other institutions in the development of knowledge.

7.3.2.5 Evidence of other creative endeavors that achieve the strategic goals of the university.

7.3.2.6 Prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.

7.3.3 Service

The time period for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation of service may include, but is not limited to, both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the service to institutional development and development of the profession including:

7.3.3.1 Service on department, college and university committees.

7.3.3.2 Service as a mentor for faculty members.

7.3.3.3 Service as advisor to student groups and organizations or other efforts contributing to student welfare.

7.3.3.4 Service on advisory boards and committees for professional organizations

7.3.3.5 Service on review panels for journals or granting agencies

7.3.3.6 Recognition or awards by professional organizations for service

7.3.3.7 Service and consultation on advisory boards and committees for public organizations such as industry or community boards or governmental boards.

7.3.3.8 Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department

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

8 Appeals

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

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

9 Seventh-Year Reviews

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

10 Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

10.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

week of the semester are sent a reminder e-mail. Faculty should inform students of the importance of completing the SEI. Faculty members may also consider sending an e-mail message to all students enrolled in the class encouraging them to complete the SEI.

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

10.2 Peer Evaluation of Teaching

OAA describes Peer review of teaching in (2.8.3.1.1 [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#)) as follows:

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

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

TIUs may select from among many modalities of peer review. See the [University Institute for Teaching and Learning's](#) and the [University Center for the Advancement of Teaching's](#) (UCAT) websites for links to on-line resources at Ohio State and at other institutions, as well as published sources that offer principles and methods for the formative and summative evaluation of teaching. TIUs must not only establish rules governing evaluation of instruction but also abide by those rules, applying them evenly and without prejudice. For further discussion see Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 1.4 of the Office of Academic Affairs handbook.

10.3 Procedure for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

The role and responsibilities of the Peer Reviewer: The peer reviewer serves to validate the accomplishments of the faculty member being reviewed as well as contribute to the

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

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

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

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

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

Curriculum Choice and Development

- Appropriateness for audience
- Specific course/workshop objectives
- Supporting materials, current and well chosen
- Rigor
- Assessment of syllabi, presentation, course packets and online media, tests,

assignments should be included. For extension faculty, assessment of educational materials such as handouts or interactive digital programs should be included.

How the Faculty Member Promotes Learning

- Learning objectives clearly stated and developed
- Teaching materials useful to learners in their own situations
- Provides class members with opportunities for participating
- Summarizes/clearly identifies key points
- Personal Characteristics: enthusiasm: genuine interest in student success; self confidence; ethical behavior
- Task oriented and/or businesslike behavior
- Answers questions clearly
- Approachable and accessible to participants
- For extension faculty, the ability to communicate effectively with outreach students and an understanding of the needs of outreach students.
- Faculty Member Preparedness
- Significant disciplinary knowledge; technically accurate
- Logical organization of class time and presentation
- Mastery of a variety of teaching methods
- Accommodates differences among learners
- Keeps the class members focused on the objectives

Strategies for Instruction

- Effective use of a variety of methods and materials
- Appropriate instructional materials selected for topic(s)
- Uses questioning to enable critical thinking by learners
- Quality of session materials such as handouts, audio-visual aids and web sites
- Uses class time effectively

Evaluation of Learning

- Evaluation materials appropriate to the objectives
- Appropriate and timely feedback on how activities/projects/assignments contribute to learning
- Documentation of learning outcomes by participants

Summary Comments

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

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

Teaching

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

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

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

Advising and mentoring students

- Assessment of success of students who have been mentored.
- Assessment of the success of current and former graduate students.

Generating external funding

- External grants such as training grants and other resources to support students and instruction.

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

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

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

10.4 Peer Evaluation of Resident Teaching

Peer review focuses on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as curricular choices given the goals of the course, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, appropriateness relative to current discipline knowledge, etc. These reviews should provide not only an assessment of the faculty member's teaching but also advice to improve a faculty member's teaching.

The peer review includes classroom visitation as well as reviews of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and examinations and any other items included in documentation of teaching in the annual review. The review will consist of at least one classroom observation. No more than one reviewer will attend a single class period. At the beginning of the semester, the peer reviewer will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because of examinations, guest speakers, or other atypical activities.

It is important for the peer evaluation of resident teaching to reflect the various types of courses a faculty member teaches. That is, it should reflect lower-division and upper-division undergraduate courses, graduate courses, survey courses, major courses, etc. depending on a given faculty member's teaching responsibilities. However, at the same time it is important to recognize that all courses are not conducive to peer evaluation. For example, independent/individual study courses, "experimental" courses, etc. should typically not be peer reviewed.

Probationary tenure track and probationary clinical faculty shall be reviewed annually. Associate professors shall be reviewed every other year. Professors shall be reviewed upon request or at the discretion of the chair.

10.5 Peer Evaluation of Extension Teaching

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

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

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

Appendix I: OAA Handbook Reference

Refer to The Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) in Volume 3, Promotion and Tenure, section 4.0 for the format for the annual report/dossier.

Appendix II: Mentoring

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

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

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

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

Mentoring committee members may be adjusted as needed. Although mentors can provide an important role in reaching promotion, the junior faculty member has ultimate responsibility for compiling a record of scholarship, teaching and service that merits promotion and tenure. Mentees must take responsibility for their own growth and success, be proactive in seeking out information and guidance, and be open to constructive feedback. Ultimately, the mentoring committee is one set of faculty members among many. Any advice a mentor provides must be considered only within the context of the mentee's goals and capabilities. The decisions and choices that untenured faculty make are ultimately their own. As part of the oversight process for tracking the mentee's progress and the mentoring committee activity, the mentee is required to generate a brief written summary of the content, action steps, and/or recommendations discussed at mentoring committee meetings to be shared with the members of the mentoring committee, Program Chair, and Department Chair.