

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENTS,  
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND SALARY ADJUSTMENTS\*

Department of Human Nutrition  
College of Human Ecology  
Ammended, February 5, 2004  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PREAMBLE	3
II.	DEPARTMENT MISSION	3
	Department mission statement	3
III.	APPOINTMENTS	4
	Criteria: Tenure track faculty	4
	Criteria: Auxiliary faculty	4
	Criteria: Courtesy appointments for regular faculty	5
	Procedures: Tenure track faculty	5
	Procedures: Auxiliary faculty	6
	Procedures: Courtesy appointments	6
IV.	ANNUAL REVIEWS	6
	Procedures: Probationary tenure track faculty	6
	<i>Probational faculty annual review process</i>	6
	<i>Extending the probationary period</i>	7
	<i>Non-renewal</i>	7
	Procedures: Performance reviews for tenured faculty	8
	<i>Purpose</i>	8
	<i>Annual performance review procedures</i>	8
V.	MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	9
	Procedures	9
	Documentation	9
VI.	REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION	9
	Criteria: Promotion to rank of associate professor with tenure	9
	<i>Teaching</i>	10
	<i>Scholarship</i>	10
	<i>Service</i>	11
	Criteria: Promotion to rank of professor	11
	<i>Teaching</i>	11
	<i>Scholarship</i>	11
	<i>Service</i>	11

FEB 12 2004

Procedures	12
<i>Promotion and tenure committee</i>	12
<i>Promotion and tenure committee member conflict of interest</i>	12
<i>Promotion and tenure committee voting and evaluation procedures</i>	13
<i>Promotion and tenure committee Chair</i>	13
<i>Procedures Oversight Designee</i>	13
<i>Candidate identification</i>	13
<i>Evaluation of teaching</i>	14
<i>Peer evaluation of teaching</i>	14
<i>Timetable of peer review process</i>	14
<i>Peer review team</i>	14
<i>Peer review procedure</i>	14
<i>Time frame</i>	15
<i>Dossier</i>	15
<i>Letters of evaluation</i>	
<i>Required letters</i>	15
<i>Optional letters</i>	16
<i>Soliciting letters of external evaluation</i>	16
<i>Comments process</i>	16
<i>Review of Department Chair</i>	16
Documentation	
<i>Teaching</i>	17
<i>Scholarship</i>	17
<i>External evaluations</i>	17
<i>Other quality indicators</i>	17
<i>Service</i>	18
VII. APPEALS	18
VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	19
IX. SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE	19
Letters of evaluation from distinguished persons	19
Peer evaluation of teaching	21
<i>Checklist 1</i>	22
<i>Checklist 2</i>	24

---

\*Approved by the Department Graduate Faculty, December 1, 2003

## **I. PREAMBLE**

This document is a supplement of Chapter 47 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the College and the University. Chapter 47 of the Rules of the University Faculty may be found at <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules47/ru47index.html>. Should those rules and policies change, the Department shall follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. This document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years.

The Dean of the College and the Provost of the University must approve this document before it can be implemented. It sets forth the Department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document the Dean and provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-47-01 (General considerations), pertaining to promotion, appointment and tenure. This rule reinforces the value, importance, and responsibility of peer faculty in the appointment, promotion and tenure process. It also specifies procedures for administration if its decision differs from that of peer faculty. It also specifies concurrence with university "equal opportunity" guidelines.

## **II. DEPARTMENT MISSION**

### **Department mission statement**

The Department of Human Nutrition at The Ohio State University has as its mission to generate, disseminate, and apply knowledge in the areas of human nutrition and dietetics to improve the quality of life for individuals, families, and associated organizational systems.

Each member of the Department faculty is expected to contribute to the mission of the Department, the College, and the University through teaching, research, and outreach. Contributions will be evaluated based on quality, quantity and relevance to the mission and programs of the Department, the College, and the University. The faculty member's work will be evaluated in comparison to his/her peers and in light of its value to the intended audience. Faculty should exhibit cooperation and teamwork in working toward the Department's mission.

## **III. APPOINTMENTS**

### **Criteria: Tenure track faculty**

This Section establishes criteria for appointment to the assistant professor rank in the

Department. Criteria for appointment to higher ranks are specified in the criteria for promotion to those ranks discussed later in this document (See Section 6: REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION).

The Department is bound by principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-47-02(A) (Criteria for appointment, re-appointment, and promotion and tenure), which may be located at <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules47/ru47index.html>.

Consistent with this rule, the minimum requirement for appointment to the assistant professor or higher in the Department is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a relevant field of study such as nutrition, nutritional biochemistry, dietetics, food science (not to be construed as all-inclusive). Appointment at the instructor level will only be made when the appointment offered is "assistant professor," but the desired appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment.

The Department is bound by principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-47-03 (Probationary Service, duration of appointments for regular faculty), (B)(1) (Length of probationary period), and (D) (Exclusion of time from probationary periods).

In the Department, appointment as professor or associate professor will normally be with tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be part of the appointment, as approved by the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment to assistant professor is always probationary. An assistant professor will be reviewed for promotion and tenure within the six year probationary period and informed by the end of the evaluation year whether or not promotion with tenure is granted at the beginning of the next academic year.

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

### **Criteria: Auxiliary faculty**

Two types of auxiliary positions are available for faculty desiring association with the Department in a non-tenure track arrangement (compensated or no-salary).

Compensated auxiliary faculty includes lecturers, senior lecturers, and temporary faculty. Visiting faculty appointments and temporary faculty, may not exceed three continuous years. Faculty appointments may be at the assistant, associate or professor rank. Criteria for appointment and performance as compensated auxiliary faculty, other than lecturers, will be the same as for appointment to regular tenure track faculty. The minimum requirement for appointment to the position of lecturer is an earned master's degree in a relevant field of study or equivalent field experience.

No-salary auxiliary faculty include adjunct faculty and faculty with regular titles at zero percent time and may include visiting faculty. Independent or collaborative teaching, research and/or service that enhance the Department mission are expected of each no-salary appointee.

The Visiting Scholar designation may be granted to faculty members from other universities or researchers from government or other institutions for the purpose of engaging in scholarly exchange with faculty in the Department. No-salary appointments are made only if the appointee is expected to contribute to the academic mission of the Department. A Department faculty member must agree to sponsor a candidate before Visiting Scholar status is granted.

Auxiliary appointments may be made for no more than one year at a time. Renewal is at the discretion of the Department Chair.

### **CRITERIA: Courtesy appointments for regular faculty**

A courtesy no-salary joint appointment in the Department is available to and reserved for *regular faculty from other tenure-initiating units at The Ohio State University*. Faculty granted this appointment are expected to participate in the Department's teaching, research and/or service program. This appointment does not require formal annual review. However, at the discretion of the Department Chair and no less than once each four years, appointments will be reviewed and continued only if it is determined that the appointee contributes to the Department mission.

### **Procedures: Tenure track faculty**

Upon receiving permission from the college to hire for a tenure track position, the Department Chair will appoint a search committee for the position. The committee will familiarize itself with and follow any college and university policies directing its activity. The committee will solicit and receive nominations from faculty and other interested parties or organizations.

A national search is required unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves an exception requested by the Department. Faculty will have opportunity to advise the search committee. The committee will solicit and review applications from desirable candidates and present a short list of the best candidates for Departmental approval as candidates for formal interview.

Following each interview the committee will solicit comments regarding each candidate from faculty and other interested persons. Subsequent to the completion of the interviews, the search committee will report its recommendation. The faculty will vote on the recommendation. The vote will be advisory to the Chair. The Chair will make a recommendation to the Dean. The Departmental Chair will make the formal offer to the selected candidate.

Offers of associate professor or professor rank, with or without tenure, and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Education.

### **Procedures: Auxiliary faculty**

Appointment of compensated or no-salary appointments in the Department require the Chair to consult with appropriate faculty and administrators before bringing a recommendation to the faculty for approval. The Chair or designated faculty will prepare and present the case for

appointment to the faculty. Salaried and adjunct appointments require the prior approval of college administrators and it is inappropriate for the Department to extend an offer before receiving the approval.

Auxiliary appointments must be evaluated and re-approved or terminated by a faculty vote at least once every four years.

#### **Procedures: Courtesy appointments**

Courtesy appointments will require a letter or request (solicited or unsolicited) from faculty requesting the appointment. The Department Chair will present the request at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting for discussion and approval or denial. Such appointment will be reviewed at least once each four years and the appointee will be informed of the continuation or termination of the appointment.

### **IV. ANNUAL REVIEWS**

There are two types of faculty reviews. Probationary Tenure Track Reviews relate to untenured faculty members and involve the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair. Annual Performance Reviews relate to all faculty members, tenured and untenured, and are conducted by the Department Chair. All faculty reviews are to be consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policies as described in the *Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook*, and with the Faculty Rules noted below.

#### **Procedures: Probationary tenure track faculty reviews**

The Department is bound by *Faculty Rule 3335-47-03 (C) (Probationary service, duration of appointments for regular faculty) and (D) (Exclusion of time from probationary periods)*, as well as by *Office of Academic Affairs policies described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook*. The Amended Rules of the University Faculty 3335-47-03 (C) (2) and (G) have been adopted in this section.

Faculty Rules may be found at <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules47/ru47index.html>.

**Probationary Faculty Annual Review Process.** All probationary faculty are annually reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair. Non-tenured faculty members submit a dossier, in conformance with current Office of Academic Affairs dossier guidelines, to the Department Chair by the **Second week of Winter Quarter**. The Department Chair alerts the Chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee when the dossiers are available for review. The Committee evaluates each probationary faculty member with respect to performance in teaching, scholarship and service, and evidence of continuing development. The Committee provides the Department Chair a written evaluation of each probationary faculty member no later than the **seventh week of Winter Quarter**. The Department Chair provides the probationary faculty member with a written evaluation no later than the **ninth week of Winter Quarter**. The annual review letter prepared by the Department Chair and the probationary

faculty member's dossier are to be forwarded to the Dean. The assessment should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. If the Chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final.

The fourth year review of probationary faculty follows the procedures noted in Section 6 for promotion to associate professor with tenure except that no outside letters of evaluation are received and the dossier and letters of evaluation are not forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs. A probationary faculty member's dossier and letters of evaluation are reviewed at the college level in conformance with college policies.

Probationary Faculty Annual Reviews are intended to help probationary faculty develop as faculty members. These reviews should be constructive and candid. The review process is a means to be supportive and helpful as well as a means to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance. In instances when the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair are in conflict with respect to the performance on a probationary faculty member, the Chair and the Committee must meet to resolve the differences. This meeting would be called by the Chair after reading the committee's report. This is to insure that probationary faculty members do not receive conflicting messages related to their development as faculty.

**Extending the Probationary Period.** The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair should encourage eligible faculty to extend the probationary period when the extension would be beneficial to the faculty member. Time that can be excluded from the probationary period is associated with factors beyond a faculty member's control that significantly interfered with productivity: birth or adoption of a child, personal illness, care for sick or injured person, etc. Such extensions must be consistent with University and College policies. No probationary faculty member can be forced to take an extension.

**Non-renewal.** Probationary faculty appointments should not be continued following any annual review in which it is apparent that the faculty member's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor. Renewal of faculty appointments is contingent upon fulfilling the responsibilities associated with an appointment; a continuing need for an individual's set of competencies, and the potential for adaptability to other essential roles in the Department's program.

If probationary faculty member's performances make non-renewal likely, the candidate should be so advised as soon as possible by the Department Chair. At any time other than fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a non-renewal decision must be based on a formal performance review conducted in accord with fourth year review procedures. Notification of non-renewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in rule 3335-47-08 of the Administrative Code. A recommendation from the Chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures and the Dean shall make the final decision in the matter. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. Prior to providing written notification of termination to a candidate, the Dean should consult with the Department Chair. The Dean of the

College gives written notification, with date of termination, to the probationary faculty member with copies to the Chair and the Provost. The letter should include reasons for non-renewal.

**Probationary appointments may be terminated for fiscal or programmatic reasons. When non-renewal is based on fiscal or programmatic reasons, the faculty member should be advised that such non-renewal is a possibility and formal notice of non-renewal should be provided as soon as possible after the need for non-renewal is established. Non-renewal of a probationary appointment for fiscal or programmatic reasons does not entail a performance review and requires the prior approval of the executive vice president and provost. Because hiring decisions should be based on informed assumptions regarding the future availability of resources and of programmatic needs, approval of such non-renewal will be based on the extent to which convincing evidence is provided that the fiscal or programmatic reasons for the non-renewal could not be anticipated when the appointment was made and are expected to be long lasting.**

#### **Procedures: Performance reviews for tenured faculty**

These reviews must be consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policies described in the *Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook* and with policies and procedures of the College of Human Ecology. A written review and a meeting between the Department Chair and a faculty member are required each year for all faculty in the Department. For probationary faculty, this review can be part of or be in addition to the annual review of probationary faculty members.

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

**Annual Performance Review Procedures.** Each faculty member will annually provide the Department Chair with an updated curricular vita, a written report of accomplishments in instruction, creative scholarly activities, and service for the period of time under review; and copies of teaching evaluations (SEI) for the period of time under review. In addition, a faculty member is to provide an indication of future goals and plans for the following year. This information is to be provided in formats specified by the Department Chair. Following the review with the Department Chair, each faculty member will review written feedback from the Chair regarding performance and future plans. Faculty members may submit a written response to the Chair's written feedback.

## **V. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS**

The Department's Patterns of Administration document gives the Department Chair responsibility for recommending salary increases (see the Department's Patterns of Administration). Salary adjustments and other performance-based rewards will be based entirely on merit, except when the College or University mandates an "across the board" or "minimum" flat or percentage salary adjustment.



In practice, the Department Chair uses information provided in the faculty annual review as a starting point for evaluating faculty. Scholarly performance in teaching, research and service will be judged according to the Department's mission and promotion and tenure criteria, with consideration given to a faculty member's specific balance of responsibilities. Performance evaluation will emphasize the previous year's performance. However, the Chair also may consider the past several years' performance and/or the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall record in making annual merit salary recommendations.

Salary determinations for faculty that are on leave will be considered on an individual basis.

If the Chair decides a faculty member has made little, no, or a negative contribution to the Department mission, damaged the welfare of the Department, has not made satisfactory progress toward agreed upon goals, or has submitted insufficient documentation to permit a well informed evaluation, the Chair may recommend no merit salary increase.

### **Procedures**

The Department Chair prior to making a salary recommendation to the Dean will evaluate annual reports submitted by each faculty member. The Chair will inform each faculty member in writing of the recommendation to the Dean.

### **Documentation**

The primary evidence for determining merit salary raises will be the annual report due from each faculty member. That report will document the faculty member's scholarly performance in teaching, research and service from the perspective of contribution to the stated mission of the Department and the faculty member's goals.

## **VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION**

The Department is bound by Faculty Rule 3335-47-02(D). This rule may be found at <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules47/ru47index.html>.

### **Criteria: Promotion to rank of associate professor with tenure**

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-47-02(C) and Faculty Rule 3335-47-02(B).

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

A candidate must demonstrate growth and improvement over the probationary period. In addition, a candidate's pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high

degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally. A candidate is held to a high standard of Departmental citizenship in the performance of teaching, research, and service. Poor Departmental citizenship at best imposes additional service burdens on other faculty and at worst may obstruct a Department's ability to function and may damage its reputation. Poor departmental citizenship is basis for a negative recommendation.

**Teaching.** Teaching excellence is reflected through command of the subject, ability to organize material and present it with logic and conviction, the capacity to awaken in the audience an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other field of knowledge, the capability to bring an audience to a high level of understanding, the creativity, spirit, and enthusiasm which vitalize learning; the skill of preparing materials for use by diverse audiences, the ability to arouse curiosity and stimulate advanced students to creative work, the ability to adapt subject matter to the level and needs of the clientele, an understanding of the relationship between one's specialization and the overall curriculum, the extent and skill of participation in the general guidance and mentoring of students.

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

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

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

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

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

**Criteria. Promotion to rank of professor**

Promotion to the rank of professor is governed by Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 (C). This rule may be located at <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules47/ru47index.html>.

Candidates must provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in areas central to their responsibilities. A mediocre performance in an area of primary responsibility is not counterbalanced by excellent performance in a secondary area of responsibility. In the case of candidates who have been in rank for more than five years, special attention will be given to the record established over the most recent five-year period.

A candidate is held to a high standard of sustained Departmental citizenship in the performance of teaching, research, and service. Poor Departmental citizenship at best imposes additional service burdens on other faculty and at worst may obstruct a Department's ability to function and may damage its reputation. Poor Departmental citizenship is basis for a negative recommendation.

**Teaching.** Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must provide evidence of a sustained record of excellence in teaching. A sustained record of teaching excellence is reflected through documenting continued teaching excellence since attaining the rank of associate professor with respect to the criteria noted in **Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure**. Serving as a role model reflects leading or guiding others such that they benefit from, or attain, teaching excellence.

**Scholarship.** Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in scholarship. A sustained record of scholarship excellence is reflected through a significant body of scholarship, which is recognized nationally or internationally. This body of scholarship must be consistent with the concept of scholarship as outlined in **Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure**. Serving as a role model reflects leading or guiding others such that they benefit from, or attain, excellence in scholarship.

**Service.** Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in service. A sustained record of service excellence is reflected through a consistent record of service activities in leadership roles. This record of Service excellence must be consistent with the concept of service as outlined in **Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure**. Serving as a role model reflects leading or guiding others such that they benefit from, or attain, excellence in service.

## **Procedures**

*Faculty Rule 3335-57-04 (Promotion and tenure review procedures)* provides the general framework underlying the review processes for promotion and tenure, and promotion. Rule 335-57-04 may be located at <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules47/ru47index.html>. Specific Department policies supplement this Faculty Rule.

**Promotion and Tenure Committee.** The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all tenured associate professors and professors holding a regular appointment in the

Department who are not administrators. Only faculty members with at least the rank to which a candidate seeks promotion may participate in discussion regarding, and vote on, the candidate.

For each candidate at least three members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must be eligible to vote. If there are not three eligible members in the Department, the promotion and tenure committee will develop a list of eligible faculty, consisting of three times as many names as positions available, from outside the Department. This list will be forwarded to the Department Chair, who will select nominees from the list to fill vacant positions. All regular voting faculty in the Department are eligible to vote for outside members of the Department promotion and tenure committee. The nominee(s) receiving a majority of votes will be deemed acceptable. The Department Chair may ask any of these acceptable nominees to serve as outside members of the promotion and tenure committee. Outside member(s) will discuss and vote only on promotion/tenure committee. Outside member(s) discuss and vote only on promotion/tenure cases for which they are needed to meet the minimum of three voting members.

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

**Promotion and Tenure Committee Voting and Evaluation Procedures.** The Committee will conduct its evaluative process and vote following the policies and guidelines listed in this, and other relevant, documents. After deliberation and voting the committee will submit written recommendations to the Department Chair. This letter will include reasons for the recommendation, principle strengths and weaknesses, and the vote of the committee.

A majority of the committee must vote affirmative for a positive recommendation. Voting will be by secret ballot. Voting Committee members must participate in a substantial portion of the Committee's discussion with respect to a given candidate. If a committee member is unable to carry out his or her responsibilities and if this results in fewer than three members on the committee, the procedure outlined about will be used to bring the committee to three members.

**Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair.** The Committee will elect its own Chairperson. Term of office shall go from April 1 through March 31. Therefore, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall elect a member of the committee each Winter Quarter as Chair. The Chair is responsible for calling Committee meetings, leading candidate reviews, drafting and forwarding the Committee's letters of candidate evaluations, working with the Department Chair to ensure a

fair and efficient review process, and leading activities to develop and review Departmental promotion and tenure procedures and policies.

**Procedures Oversight Designee.** In years where a promotion and/or tenure recommendation is made, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will elect a Procedures Oversight Designee whose term will go from Spring Quarter to Winter Quarter.

While all members of the Committee must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias, the Designee has a specific responsibility for these assurances. The Designee assures that the Committee follows written procedures governing its reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of under represented groups that could bias their review. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review are brought to the attention of the Committee. If difficulties or concerns are not resolved to the satisfaction of the designee, they are brought to the attention of the Department Chair. The Department Chair must investigate the matter and provide a response to the Designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is not warranted.

An additional responsibility for the Procedures Oversight Designee is insuring a dossier is correctly prepared and does not include extraneous or inaccurate information before sending it forward to subsequent levels of review.

**Candidate Identification.** The Department Chair will communicate to the Promotion and Tenure Committee the names of faculty members requiring mandatory review. For non-mandatory review, a faculty member will contact the Department Chair no later than the first week of the Spring Quarter preceding the Autumn Quarter in which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. The candidate should discuss with the Department Chair the appropriateness of submitting credentials for review. In this process, the Department Chair may ask the Promotion and Tenure Committee to screen a faculty member's materials. Candidates considered to be premature with respect to candidacy will not be reviewed; however no tenured faculty member can be denied consideration for promotion for more than three consecutive years.

**Evaluation of Teaching.** Teaching evaluations that can be quantitatively analyzed are required. Resident faculty must submit results of the first ten items of The Ohio State University Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for every available classroom course. For teaching evaluations prior to Winter Quarter 1998, the five common items of the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) form may be used. Where SEI is not appropriate (classes of 5 or less), other forms of student evaluation can be used insofar as the evaluation process is under the direction of the Department Chair. Extension faculty must submit the results of The Ohio State University Extension Client Evaluation for at least three extension teaching activities per year. To ensure objectivity, procedures for distribution and collection of all survey instruments are to be designated by the Department Chair. Efforts should be made to obtain such evaluations from the largest possible number of enrolled students or clientele. Additional forms of teaching evaluations (SET, exit interviews of Department majors, surveys of alumni, and evaluations of former graduate students) may be included as long as the evaluation process is under the

direction of the Department Chair. [Note: Sole use of the SEI and evaluation under the direction of the Department Chair is effective for courses taught beginning with Winter Quarter 1998.]

**Peer Evaluation of Teaching.** Peer evaluations are required for application for promotion and/or tenure and must include a formal Departmental evaluation of classroom teaching extension teaching and instructional materials.

*Timetable of peer review process.* For untenured faculty, the Department Chair will initiate peer reviews the beginning of Autumn Quarters, year three and year five (one year before submission of dossier is to occur.) For promotion of tenured faculty, formal peer evaluation of teaching will occur at least every four years as initiated by the Department Chair. Those desiring a more current evaluation for their dossier may request the Department Chair to initiate a peer evaluation autumn quarter, one year prior to submission of their dossier.

*Peer review team.* The Peer evaluation team involves two tenured faculty members. The Department Chair will select the team.

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

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

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

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

**Time Frame.** The Department review of credentials is predicated on the assumption that materials are to be submitted to the Dean by November 1. This suggests that a dossier must be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for review by October 1. To meet this time frame, a candidate should have her/his materials to the Department Chair by September 1. Initial

contacts with external evaluators should occur by April 15 with evaluators being asked to submit letters by August 1.

**Dossier.** The candidate is primarily responsible for preparing the Introduction and Core of the dossier with assistance from the Department Chair. The Department Chair is responsible for insuring the accuracy of submitted materials – citations teaching evaluations, grant support, etc. The dossier must follow instructions and outline specified by the Office of Academic Affairs.

When listing multiple author scholarly work in a dossier, a candidate should carefully describe the nature of her/his intellectual contribution to the work. This should include a clear description of the candidate's role and responsibility with respect to the work. The percentage of effort to the work should not be stated since time and effort may not reflect the importance of a candidate's contribution to the scholarly work.

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

### **Letters of Evaluation.**

*Required Letters:* The Department Chair is to request at least five letters from distinguished persons in the candidate's field who are either at peer or better universities or, if not in academia, are in a position to critically evaluate the candidate's scholarly work. No more than one-half of the letters are from evaluators suggested by the candidate. The recommended procedures for obtaining these letters are found in the **Supplemental Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.**

Peer evaluation of teaching must be included. This is discussed in a separate section.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee's evaluation of a candidate is a detailed written assessment addressed to the Department Chair of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses based on Committee discussion, and a reporting of the numerical vote. The letter is to explain to the candidate specific expectations against which a faculty member is assessed. Candidate specific expectations are to be consistent with the Department's mission and goals, and reflect a faculty member's annual reviews by the Department Chair. Expectations are communicated to the Committee by the Department Chair before a candidate's dossier is reviewed, and are to be shared annually for all non-tenured faculty. Expectations are to be shared with a candidate who is to be provided an opportunity to provide written comments with respect to the expectations.

The Department Chair makes an independent assessment of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses, which takes into account the faculty recommendation. If the Chair's assessment and/or recommendation differ from that of the faculty review body, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

*Optional Letters:* In the case of a faculty member who collaborates extensively with the same individual(s), a letter(s) solicited by the Department Chair from the collaborator(s) describing the candidate's contributions to the jointly conducted work.

Letters of evaluation requested by Department Chair from former students.

Letters of evaluation related to service requested by Department Chair from committee Chairs, committee members, appropriate administrators, etc.

**Soliciting Letters of External Evaluation.** The Department Chair requests all external evaluation letters, regardless of nature or intent of the letter of evaluation. Only external letters solicited by, and sent to, the Department Chair is included in a dossier. The process to solicit external letters from distinguished persons is outlined in the **Supplemental Guidelines and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.**

**Comments Process.** As noted above, the Promotion and Tenure Committee submits a written recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews a candidate's dossier and makes an independent recommendation to be submitted with the Committee's recommendation to the Dean. As soon as the Committee report and the Department Chair's letter are complete, the candidate is notified in writing of the completion of the Departmental level review and the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of the reports and may provide the Department Chair written comments on the review within ten calendar days of notification of the availability of the reports. The Committee and/or Chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments. All comments become part of a candidate's dossier when it is forwarded to the Dean.

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

## **Documentation**

Candidates must present documentation in the format, and according to the specifications, provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. In general, the burden of proof is on the candidate to document the quality of her or his contributions. Care should be taken to maintain clear and complete records. In each area of activity, the candidate should focus on quality indicators as well as quantity in documenting the record.

**Teaching.** It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness. Peer review and formal student/clientele evaluations are required parts of the evaluation of teaching (see procedures section). In addition evidence of teaching excellence may include, but is not limited to: teaching support materials, instructor prepared teaching materials such as course manuals, frequency of use/loan of Extension materials, efforts to improve the quality of teaching (including use of Office of Faculty and TA Development services such as classroom observation, videotaping, and workshops, though correspondence from that Office is not to be included in the dossier as evidence of improved teaching); teaching



awards; textbooks and articles related to the teaching process; development of innovative courses/programs and curricula; formal courses and extension presentations – when and to how many people; dissertations, thesis, and honors projects supervised, graduate committee service, success of candidate's former students and post-docs, extent to which candidate's pedagogical materials have been adopted by other faculty, extent to which candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching.

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

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

*Other quality indicators* are also important. On the dossier, after the list of publications, for some of the research articles on the dossier, candidates should include information such as the acceptance rate of journals, the referee process for presentations at national meetings, and the award rate for grants. Quality documentation could include an internal evaluation of the candidate's work, the frequency with which the candidate's work is cited by others, and evidence to support the fact that publication occurred in primary or leading journals of the relevant field. The significance of multi-year grants/contracts and grant/contract renewal should be noted.

**Service.** Evidence of service excellence include, but are not limited to the following: Departmental, College, Extension or University committee service; involvement with student events or organizations, Department, College or University administrative service; service to the profession including committee service, elected office, conference program chair, reviewer, editorial review board, and editor; presentations to community groups or other lay audiences; grant reviewer for major funding agency, and leadership role in developing community/industry partnerships; and application of professional expertise in service to the community. Community service not related to a candidate's professional expertise is not relevant to promotion and tenure.

The quality of service is generally known for college and Departmental service. The quality of service at the university is reflected through continuing appointments to committees and appointment as committee Chair. The quality of service external to the university is reflected through election or appointment to leadership roles, evidences that the candidate's services are

sought after rather than volunteered, and awards. Depending on the nature of a candidate's service activities, it may be appropriate to obtain written evaluations from those who are in a position to evaluate specific contributions. As with other letters of evaluation, the Department Chair must request letters requesting evaluation of service.

## **VII. APPEALS**

Faculty Rule 3335047095 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05. Faculty Rules may be found at <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules5/ru5-05.html>. Faculty members may appeal a negative decision if they believe they have been evaluated improperly. Improper evaluation includes violations of written procedures that could reasonably have affected the outcome of a review and failure to consider evidence material to a fair determination. In considering the evidence for making a fair determination, members of review bodies and administrators are required to exercise professional judgment and there will be, on occasion, disagreements in professional judgment. Differences in or disagreements on professional judgments do not provide a valid basis for appeals.

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

## **VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS**

The Department is bound by Faculty Rule 3335-47-05 (B), that specifies conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year review. Faculty Rules may be found at <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules47/ru47index.html>.

If, after fully considering all new information about a candidate's performance, and determining due reason, the Department will petition the Dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty and the Chair of the Department must approve this petition.

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

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

## **IX. SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE.**

The Supplemental Guidelines and Procedures for the Promotion and Tenure are not a part of the Promotion and Tenure documents. They are intended to supplement the Promotion and Tenure

procedures and documentation process. These guidelines and procedures may be modified by the Promotion and Tenure Committee to facilitate the development of high quality candidate dossiers; however, it is important the candidates be given reasonable notification of such changes.

### **Letters of Evaluation from Distinguished Persons.**

1. The Department Chair generates a significant list of potential evaluators. These should normally be faculty at peer institutions who are in a position to comment in an informed way both on the quality of the faculty member's scholarly work and on its significance to the broader field in which it resides. They should not be former advisers collaborators, close personal friends, or otherwise have a relationship with the faculty member that could reduce objectivity. Letters from collaborators may be appropriate as a means of determining a faculty member's contributions to joint work, but such persons should not be asked for a letter of evaluation.
2. The candidate should be shown this list and invited to augment it with names of several individuals meeting the criteria for objective, credible evaluators. Unless these individuals do not meet such criteria and the faculty member cannot offer acceptable alternatives, the Department should make every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from someone suggested by the candidate, with the other letters from people not suggested by the candidate.
3. The Department Chair is encouraged to seek comments on the tentative list of prospective evaluators for each candidate from the college Dean to minimize the risk that the selection of evaluators will subsequently be judged inappropriate.
4. At least 3 months (preferably more) before completed evaluations are needed, the Department Chair should send letters asking persons if they would be willing to write an evaluation. This letter of invitation should set forth expectations, anticipated due dates, and the realities of the Public Records Act. Those agreeing to write should then be sent all needed materials.
5. The Department Chair and candidate jointly identify three significant scholarly works for review by the distinguished peers. These works, plus a candidate's vita, are sent to evaluators. All evaluators are to receive the same set of materials.

The likelihood of obtaining a useful letter is greatly increased when the writer is given adequate time to review materials and write, and when the nature of the desired letter is explained carefully. Generally, letter writers should be asked only to provide a critical analysis of a faculty member's scholarly work (at least partly on the basis of provided materials) and should specifically be asked not to comment on other matters—including whether the person should be promoted and tenured here or would be promoted and tenured at their institution.

Departments may want to consider indicating that commentary in a letter beyond that requested may reduce the usefulness of the letter.

The following format is suggested when requesting letters of evaluation.

*The Department of Human Nutrition is considering Dr. [name of candidate] for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure [professor]. Dr. [name of candidate]'s performance in teaching research and service will be evaluated at the Department, college and University levels to determine whether promotion and tenure [promotion] will be granted. I am asking you only to provide a critical assessment of Dr. [name of candidate]'s scholarship.*

*Enclosed you will find a copy of Dr. [name of candidate]'s curriculum vitae and copies of the following papers:*

*[provide bibliographic citation of each paper].*

*Would you please comment in some detail on the significance of the overall research program as well on individual papers, including the scientific merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study? In addition, how would you compare Dr. to other researchers in this field at the same state of career development?*

*Please do not comment on whether Dr. [name of candidate] should be promoted and tenured [promoted] at Ohio State or would or would not be promoted and tenured [promoted] at your institution. We must make this assessment based on the total record, not just on research and on our own criteria and standards.*

*Under the Ohio Public Records Act all documents related to Promotion and Tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. Thus we cannot promise confidentiality.*

*Thank you for your time and effort in responding to this request. If for any reason you will not be able to evaluate this candidate or if you have any questions about this process, please contact me at [list telephone, FAX, and email] immediately. I would appreciate receiving your response by [date].*

### **Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

*Points to consider in the evaluation of teaching materials.* The criteria listed in **Checklist 1** are to be used as guidelines for evaluating teaching materials. It should be recognized that not all items will apply to all situations. The peer review committee and candidate should select those items that are appropriate for a particular situation. A five-point rating scale may be used to help the reviewer evaluate materials. An overall score is not a part of the review process.

*Points to consider in the observation of classroom teaching.* **Checklist 2** and comment questions are guidelines to be used when evaluating classroom performance. Not all items will apply or be observed in every observation experience. These items are to be used as illustrations of good teaching behavior. A five-point rating scale may be used to help the reviewer evaluate materials. An overall score is not a part of the review process.

**Checklist 1:**

\*\*\*\*\*

**SYLLABUS**

Completeness: Does it have each of the following?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**COURSE PACKET AND TEXTBOOK ASSESSMENT**

- Match with goals of course
- Contain accurate content
- Most current source
- Present multiple viewpoints
- Appropriate level of interest
- Appropriate reading level
- Visually attractive
- Appropriate amount of reading
- Clearly organized
- User friendly

**COURSE HANDOUTS**

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

**MULTIMEDIA COURSE MATERIALS**

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

**TESTS**

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

### **CLASS ASSIGNMENTS/EXERCISE SHEETS**

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

### **OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS ABOUT TEACHING MATERIALS**

What aspects of the instructor's teaching materials clearly stood out as effective in facilitating student learning?  
What recommendations do you have that might aid in improving the instructor's teaching materials?

### **EXTENSION PLAN**

The audience is clearly identified  
Examples of appropriate teaching situations are provided  
Overall objectives are identified  
Behavioral objectives are specified  
Plan is practical  
Limitations for use of materials are specified  
Plan is arranged in logical order  
Time line is practical  
Plan is flexible

Complete list of resources needed – with educational materials is provided  
If part of a larger program – relationship is explained

### **EXTENSION EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS**

Difficulty level of material is appropriate for audience  
Topic is important  
Content matches stated objectives  
Content is accurate  
Content is up-to-date  
Presentation method fits audience  
Content is sufficiently in depth  
Appropriate balance between major points  
Appropriate form or design of material for subject matter  
Materials are appealing to eye/ear  
Written/audio materials are clean and concise  
Information is presented in logical order  
Quality of materials is professional  
“Non-original” materials are appropriate for stated objectives

## Checklist 2:

\*\*\*\*\*

### INSTRUCTOR ORGANIZATION

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

### PRESENTATION SKILLS

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

### INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

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

### CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

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

### CLARITY

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

### RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

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

## **INSTRUCTION IN LABS, STUDIOS, OR FIELD SETTINGS**

Experiments/exercises are well chosen and well organized

Procedures/techniques are clearly explained/demonstrated

Thoroughly familiar with experiments, exercises, equipment, tools

Available for assistance during experiments/exercises

Experiments/exercises are of appropriate level of difficulty

Experiments/exercises develop important skills

Experiments/exercises develop confidence in subject matter

Safety is emphasized

Criticism of procedures/techniques is constructive

Provides aid with interpretation of data

Clinical or field experiences are realistic

## **OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS**

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