

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Criteria and Procedures
for

The Ohio State University

AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences

Summer 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE	2
II. Ohio State ATI Mission	2
III. Definitions	2
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	2
1 Tenure-track Faculty	2
2 Clinical Faculty	3
2. Conflict of Interest	3
3. Minimum Composition	3
B. Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	3
C. Quorum.....	4
D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty.....	4
1. Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal	4
IV. Appointments.....	4
A. Criteria	4
1. Tenure Track Faculty	4
2. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty.....	4
3. Associated Faculty	6
C. Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with less than a 50% Appointment with Ohio State ATI	6
D. Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor	6
E. Courtesy Appointments.....	6
F. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor .	6
B. Procedures	7
1. Tenure Track Faculty	7
Candidates who apply for positions that are advertised at the associate professor and professor ranks and who wish to be considered for a position at the rank of associate professor or professor, with tenure, will be required to provide a curriculum vita, and a one page description of the impact of their prior teaching and/or scholarly creativity. In addition, a minimum of five letters from external reviewers of the candidates case for appointment at the associate professor or professor rank with tenure is required as part of the documentation for assessing the candidate's promotion and tenure case. These documents will be accessible to all eligible faculty members of the Ohio State ATI faculty for a 10-day period and these faculty members will be supplied a ballot via paper mail or e-mail. A vote on senior rank shall occur at a meeting, at which a quorum of eligible faculty	

is needed for the vote to be valid. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.	8
2. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty.....	8
3. Transfer from the Tenure-track	8
3. Associated Faculty	8
4. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure Track Faculty	9
V. Annual Review Procedures	9
A. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	10
1. Fourth-Year Review	11
2. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	12
B. Tenured Faculty	12
C. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty.....	12
F. Associated Faculty.....	13
VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards.....	13
A. Criteria	13
B. Documentation.....	15
1. Teaching.....	15
2. Research	16
3. Service	17
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	17
A. Criteria	17
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	18
2. Promotion to Professor.....	20
3. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty.....	21
B. Procedures	21
1. Candidate Responsibilities	21
2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	21
3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	22
4. Institute Director Responsibilities	24
5. External Evaluations.....	25
C. Documentation	26
1. Teaching.....	26
2. Research Scholarship	27
3. Service	28
VIII. Appeals.....	28

IX. Seventh-Year Reviews	28
X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	28
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	28
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	29
1. Procedure for peer evaluation of teaching	29
C. Processes of Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	31
Appendix 1	32
Appendix 2	35
Appendix 3	37

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the rules of the university faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) Policy and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>); and other policies and procedures established by the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) and University to which the Ohio State University Agricultural Technical Institute (Ohio State ATI) and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, Ohio State ATI shall 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 4 years on the appointment or reappointment of the Ohio State ATI director.

This document must be approved by the vice president of agricultural administration and dean of CFAES and the OAA before it may be implemented. It sets forth the Ohio State ATI 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 CFAES dean and the OAA accept the mission and criteria of Ohio State ATI and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to institute mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and other standards specific to Ohio State ATI and CFAES; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted 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 (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

II. Ohio State ATI Mission

The mission of Ohio State ATI is to develop high quality technical competency through our educational endeavors in programs leading to associate degrees in agriculture, horticulture, environmental sciences, business, and engineering technology. We aspire to provide accessible, high-quality, applied educational experiences leading to associate of science and associate of applied science degrees and certificates with an emphasis on lifelong learning.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1 Tenure-track Faculty

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

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

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

2 Clinical Faculty

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

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

2. 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 review of that candidate.

3. Minimum Composition

In the event Ohio State ATI does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the promotion and tenure committee will develop a list of eligible faculty consisting of three times as many names of faculty within the university from outside of Ohio State ATI as the number of members needed to satisfy the minimum committee composition. This list will be forwarded to the Ohio State ATI director to select the committee members. The Ohio State ATI director will ask the selected nominees to serve as members of the committee of the eligible faculty.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

Ohio State ATI has a promotion and tenure committee that assists the committee of eligible faculty in managing the promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of three members elected by the eligible faculty and two members selected by the Ohio State ATI director with elections and new appointments occurring in the spring of each year. The two members selected by the director shall be chosen with consideration that underrepresented segments of the institute be represented on the Ohio State ATI promotion and tenure committee. The chair of the promotion and tenure committee will be elected by the committee members in the spring of each year. In addition to the chair, the committee elects a faculty member of the committee as

the “Procedures Oversight Designee” annually. The promotion and tenure committee members will serve 3 year terms with one or two eligible faculty rotating off each year.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions is two thirds 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 purpose of determining a quorum only if the director of Ohio State ATI has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining the quorum.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty

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

1. Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

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

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

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

1. Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty employed at Ohio State ATI shall have, at a minimum, a Master's degree with at least 3 years of industry or higher education experience, or an earned doctorate in a relevant discipline to the mission of Ohio State ATI. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet Ohio State ATI's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to 4 years is possible, on approval of the OAA, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment.

2. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty

Appointment of professional/clinical practice faculty entails a 3-, 4- or 5-year contract. The initial contract at Ohio State ATI will be a 3-year probationary appointment unless the appointee being considered has an outstanding previous record for scholarly creativity. The professional/clinical practice faculty member will be notified at the end of each year of the probationary period

whether he/she will be reappointed. Tenure is not granted to professional/clinical practice faculty. Annual reviews of performance comparable to those conducted with tenure track faculty are required. If Ohio State ATI wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. By the end of the penultimate year of the contract, the professional/clinical practice faculty member shall be notified whether a new contract will be offered. In the event that a new contract is not extended, the final year of the probationary contract is the terminal year of employment. There is no presumption that the contract will be extended. In addition, the terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7 concerning professional/clinical faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>).

Assistant Professor of Professional/Clinical Practice

A Ph.D. degree is required for the rank of professional/clinical practice assistant professor. Evidence of potential for high quality teaching and high quality service to the profession is highly desirable.

Criteria for appointment as Assistant Professor of Professional/Clinical Practice

- A Ph.D. degree and/or appropriate credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study
- Evidence of current professional/clinical practice experience appropriate to the teaching and service role expected within the unit of hire (minimum of 5 years)
- Evidence of current knowledge of research impacting practice with the field of study

Associate Professor of Professional/Clinical Practice

The awarding of the rank of associate professor of professional/clinical practice must be based on convincing evidence that the professional/clinical practice 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 (Modified from Faculty Rule 3335-6-01(C)).

Criteria for appointment as Associate Professor of Professional/Clinical Practice

- An earned Ph.D. degree in relevant field of study
- Current professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study (if appropriate)
- Evidence of current knowledge of research impacting practice in 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 Professional/Clinical Practice

The awarding of the rank of professor of professional/clinical practice must be based on convincing evidence that the professional/clinical practice faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching and has demonstrated leadership in service at the local and national level (Modified from Faculty Rule 335-6-03 (C)).

Criteria for appointment as, or promotion to, a professor of professional/clinical 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 impacting 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

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty shall have, at a minimum, a masters' degree with experience appropriate for the assigned courses or substantial equivalent experiences as a professional in the relevant field and a bachelors' degree. They shall be appointed on the basis of their potential for quality teaching and reappointed on the basis of demonstrated teaching excellence. Associated faculty appointments may be made for up to 3 years.

A. 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 or substantial equivalent experiences as a professional in the relevant field and a bachelors' degree. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure.

B. 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 5 years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

C. Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with less than a 50% Appointment with Ohio State ATI

Appointment of faculty to tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or less, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles on a less than 50% appointment are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.

D. Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, 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 ranks at which other individuals are appointed are 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.

E. Courtesy Appointments

Offer of a 0% FTE courtesy appointment for tenure track faculty in other Ohio State University Tenure Initiating Units will be provided to those who have substantial involvement at Ohio State ATI. Continuation of the appointment shall reflect ongoing significant contributions. Courtesy appointments require approval by the director after consulting with the relevant division faculty (both tenure track and professional/clinical practice track), and division chair.

F. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor

Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the Ohio State ATI, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for

promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.

B. Procedures

See the faculty policy on faculty recruitment and selection and the policy on faculty Appointments in the OAA policies and procedures handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) 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 30 April
- Appointment of foreign nationals
- Letters of offer

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 Vice President and Dean of CFAES and the OAA in advance of initiating a hiring process. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of a guide to effective searches (www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf).

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

The CFAES vice president and dean provides approval for the institute 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 addition of new tenure-track faculty members at Ohio State ATI will be determined based on priority needs in the institute. The process for determining priority needs for new faculty members will be established by the strategic planning and visioning processes of the institute. When vacancies occur, specific consideration will be given to voids that may have resulted in programs as a consequence of vacated positions. The Institute's Procedures and Guidelines for Filling Vacant Faculty Member Positions (Appendix 1) will be followed when filling faculty positions. The institute director shall appoint an Ad hoc search committee that will conduct searches through recruiting high quality candidates for all faculty positions when they are being filled, and appoint a tenured faculty member to chair the search committee. The search committee will further refine the position description based on inputs of faculty members and will subsequently provide the institute director the descriptive material that is to be used in advertising the position.

The search committee chair and the members of the search committee shall be tenure-track faculty members who, thus, are eligible to be tenured or hold tenure at Ohio State ATI. The search committee will determine whom to interview. Input regarding evaluation of candidates interviewed will be sought by the chair of the search committee from all Ohio State ATI faculty members, staff members, stakeholders and students who participate in the interview process to the extent that they have adequate knowledge to evaluate the applicant being interviewed. Faculty members will be asked to provide written feedback about their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses as an applicant for the position to which they applied. The search committee chair in consultation with other search committee members will supply the director a summary of the feedback regarding the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate leaving no doubt concerning the search committee's judgment of each candidate. The institute director, in consultation with the Ohio State ATI assistant director of academic affairs and relevant division chair, will determine whether the position should be offered and to which

applicant the offer should be made based on inputs supplied by the search committee and other inputs that are received from other sources.

Candidates who apply for positions that are advertised at the associate professor and professor ranks and who wish to be considered for a position at the rank of associate professor or professor, with tenure, will be required to provide a curriculum vita, and a one page description of the impact of their prior teaching and/or scholarly creativity. In addition, a minimum of five letters from external reviewers of the candidates case for appointment at the associate professor or professor rank with tenure is required as part of the documentation for assessing the candidate's promotion and tenure case. These documents will be accessible to all eligible faculty members of the Ohio State ATI faculty for a 10-day period and these faculty members will be supplied a ballot via paper mail or e-mail. A vote on senior rank shall occur at a meeting, at which a quorum of eligible faculty is needed for the vote to be valid. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

All offers at the associate professor and professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require a prior approval by the CFAES vice president and dean and the university Office of Academic Affairs.

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

2. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty

Searches for professional/clinical practice faculty generally proceed using the same procedures as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus-interview is on clinical/professional practice focused on teaching of students and the requirement for a national search may be waived with the approval of the dean.

3. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a professional/clinical appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the director, 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 professional/clinical appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Professional/clinical faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

3. Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the Ohio State ATI director in consultation with the institute director's advisory committee. Appointment of uncompensated associated or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the institute. The proposal is considered by the institute director's advisory committee, and institute director makes the decision as to whether to extend an offer.

Associated faculty appointments are generally made for a period of 1 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. Associated faculty 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.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure track faculty (see appointment criteria described previously in this document), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college if the Ohio State ATI director's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university if the CFAES vice president and dean's recommendation is negative.

4. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure Track Faculty

Any Ohio State ATI faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure track faculty member from another Ohio State academic unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the institute justifying the appointment is considered at a faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the Ohio State ATI tenure and professional/clinical practice faculty (via a simple majority positive vote), the institute director extends an offer of appointment. The institute director reviews all courtesy appointments every 3 years to determine whether these continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for renewal or nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a routine faculty meeting.

V. Annual Review Procedures

Ohio State ATI follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the faculty annual review policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>). The purpose of this meeting will be to describe expectations for being successful in promotion and tenure processes at Ohio State ATI. The Ohio State ATI chair of the promotion and tenure committee, division chair, assistant director of academic affairs, and director will meet with probationary faculty members within the first 6 months following the time they join the Ohio State ATI faculty.

The purposes of written performance annual performance reviews are as follows:

- Assists faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through professional development plans that meet the joint needs of the unit and the faculty member
- Establishes goals against which faculty performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future
- Documents faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals 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 institute's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities as defined in the institute's pattern of administration document; 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 Ohio State ATI director and the division chair is a required part of the annual review for every faculty member in the institute. Documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under merit salary increases later in this document. A description of documentation requested for the annual performance review is provided in Appendix 2. This material must be submitted to the director no later than 1 January of each year. The document should include elements related to teaching, scholarly creativity, and service performance, including collegial endeavors, and at least one impact statement for teaching and one for creative scholarly activity covering the past calendar year through 31 December. In addition, each faculty member shall provide an Individual Development Plan (IDP) of no more than 200 words and in subsequent annual reports provide documentation relative to IDP goals and objectives. This IDP shall include plans for teaching and scholarly creativity so as to remain current in subject matter taught, and teaching methodology that stimulates student learning and facilitates high quality instructor-student relationships. The director will draft the annual performance review letter to share and discuss with faculty members at the time of their face-to-face review. The review process, including a session with the director, and division chair, receipt of the director's letter, and receipt of response from faculty member will be completed by the end of March each year.

At a minimum the annual performance review documentation 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
- At least one impact statement each for teaching and scholarly creativity
- Honors and awards
- IDP

In addressing these activities, the director's annual performance review letter should communicate 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 achievements and progress toward achievements expected of him/her in a given year. The director is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually in the January through March timeframe by the Ohio State ATI promotion and tenure committee. The institute promotion and tenure committee prepares a summary review of the probationary faculty member's accomplishments and/or short falls with regard to being promoted and awarded tenure. The chair of the promotion and tenure committee forwards a written performance review to the institute director and division chair.

The institute director in consultation with the division chair and Ohio State ATI assistant director of academic affairs will develop a draft of an annual performance review letter during the first 3

months of the calendar year for each probationary faculty. The relevant division chair and institute director will have a “face-to-face” meeting with the probationary faculty member as required as part of the annual review for every faculty member in the institute. The letter of the institute promotion and tenure committee will be shared and discussed with the probationary faculty member during this meeting. If there is feedback on accuracy and content of the letter from the probationary faculty member during the face-to-face component of the annual performance review process, this will be considered by the director in developing the annual performance review letter that will become a part of the performance record for this faculty member. The performance of every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually and the faculty member will receive the letter from the promotion and tenure committee, and the institute director’s letter. The faculty member will have the opportunity to respond with comments, and is required to provide their signature on the director’s letter indicating their assessment of letter and agreement to the mutually agreed upon expectations that are a part of the letter from the institute director. If there are questions with regard to continuing the probationary appointment of the faculty member, the institute director will gain input from the promotion and tenure committee with regard to appointment renewal. If, after this consultation with the promotion and tenure committee, the director decides to recommend non-renewal of the appointment, university and CFAES processes will be followed with regard to this action, including using the fourth-year process listed below.

If the recommendation of the institute director is for renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The institute director's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year. If the recommendation is for non-renewal, the formal comments process (Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) is invoked. 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 CFAES vice president and dean makes the final decision on renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment.

1. 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 CFAES vice president and dean (not the institute director) makes the final decision regarding renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment. External evaluations are only solicited when either the institute director or the eligible faculty or the promotion and tenure committee determine that these are necessary to conduct the fourth-year review. This may occur when the candidate’s scholarly creativity is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. Because the solicitation and receipt of external review letters requires 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 spring with the solicitation and receipt of external letters of review.

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 institute director. The director 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 institute review, the formal comments process (Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [[11](http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

[rules.html](#)]) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the institute recommends renewal or non-renewal.

All materials in the dossier are then forwarded to the CFAES vice president and dean for review, according to the timeline announced at the beginning of each academic year.

2. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

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

B. Tenured Faculty

The institute director with input from the division chair will develop a draft of an annual performance review letter for all associate professors and professors annually. This will include a submission of written documentation of performance (i.e., annual report) completed by the faculty member (as outlined in Appendix 2) and a performance assessment by the director with input from the division chair. A formal face-to-face meeting between the director, division chair, and faculty member will take place in which his/her performance and accomplishments relative to the responsibilities of the position into which they are employed, mutually agreed upon expectations included as part of the previous year's annual performance review letter, and their individual development plan (see Appendix 2) are discussed. A written evaluation is completed by the director which distills the major accomplishments in these areas, summarizes goals and strategies with regard to future performance and the individual development plan, and provides mutually agreed upon expectations relative to performance, goals, and strategies. There should be explicit agreement with each faculty member about the expected contribution focus or foci and the 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.

C. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty

The annual review process for professional/clinical practice probationary and non-probationary faculty is similar to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty respectively. Oversight of the activities of the professional/clinical practice faculty is the responsibility of the institute director and relevant division chair.

Annual evaluations will take place at the same time as those for tenure-track faculty and will include a face-to-face meeting with the institute director and relevant division chair wherein performance and accomplishments relative to the responsibilities of the position into which they are employed, mutually agreed upon expectations included as part of the previous year's annual performance review letter, and their individual development plan (see Appendix 2) are discussed. A written evaluation is completed by the director which distills the major accomplishments, summarizes goals and strategies with regard to future performance and the individual development plan, and provides mutually agreed upon expectations relative to performance, goals, and strategies. There should be explicit agreement with each professional/clinical practice faculty member about the expected achievement and progress toward the mutually agreed upon expectations that are a part of the annual performance review letter. The professional/clinical practice faculty member may provide written comments on the review that will be attached to annual performance review letter. All documents are included in the professional/clinical practice faculty member's permanent record.

In the penultimate contract year of a professional/clinical practice faculty member's appointment, the relevant Ohio State ATI division chair, assistant director of academic affairs, and institute director must determine whether the position in which the faculty member is employed continues to be justified based on institute priorities. If the position is no longer a priority, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) must be observed.

If the position continues to be justified based on institute priorities, 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 using the same procedures as those for the fourth-year review of tenure track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

The director will seek input from the promotion and tenure committee in a similar manner as occurs for tenure-track faculty, and inform the probationary faculty member of his/her decision regarding appointment continuation. The director will advise the probationary faculty member, in writing with a copy to the appropriate division chair, with recommendations for strengthening his/her performance or reasons for termination.

F. Associated Faculty

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

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the director, or designee. The director, or designee, prepares a written evaluation that will include an assessment of SEI feedback and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the director will decide whether or not to reappoint. The director's recommendation on reappointment is final.

VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A. Criteria

Except when the university dictates any type of "across-the-board" salary increase, all 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 including collegiality are 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

The content of Appendix 3 of the CFAES Criteria and Procedures for Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure - CFAES Faculty Reward System Guidelines for Annual Performance Review, Promotion, and Tenure (Appendix 3) - are used to provide guidance at all levels of performance review and promotion and tenure assessment in the institute and college. The CFAES Faculty with high-quality performance in all four areas of endeavor (teaching, research, service, and collegiality) and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members 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 salary raise at a later time. All tenured faculty members shall utilize the research in view system as required by the college to record their performance for annual reviews and for salary determination. Faculty members are required to use the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline in providing documentation for annual reviews.

Assessment of performance in annual reviews will be an important consideration in annual salary compensation considerations. In addition, there will be equity considerations; market considerations – i.e., differential salaries that exist depending on discipline area of faculty expertise, relative to market demand for specific types of expertise; and potential retention issues of faculty that are important for programmatic excellence when annual salary compensations are determined.

Upon receipt of the university's guidelines for salary adjustments, the director will take input from the Ohio State ATI division chairs and assistant director of academic affairs with regard to faculty productivity and the director will consider inputs about faculty performance in determining salary increases for faculty members and equity/excellence increases for selected individuals. The director will submit the salary budget to the vice president and dean of the college for approval. The director will inform the individual faculty member of his/her salary increase for the next year.

Individuals who wish to make appeals regarding the equity of their salary should follow the process outlined in Section XII "appeals and grievances - faculty equity appeals process" of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook at: <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/tc.html>.

B. Documentation

The annual performance review of every tenure track faculty member requires that all documentation (Appendix 2) be submitted to the institute director by the 1 January each year. The document reports information covering the past calendar year through December. The review process, including the session with the director and division chair, receipt of director's letter, and receipt of response from faculty member will be completed by the 1 April each year.

Copies (reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form of the documents actual publication) included in the annual review materials should be provided as part of the documentation. Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review, however, they are encouraged to suggest to the institute director individual's names who might provide valuable input regarding their faculty productivity. The director will make the decision as to whether such input is valuable and if the director concurs with the faculty member they will seek inputs from the individual(s) suggested by the faculty member inquiring about specific aspects of the faculty member's productivity. The time period covered by the documentation subsequently described in this document is the previous 12 month calendar year 1 January to 31 December.

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 university rule 3335-6-02(A)). Documentation of teaching may include, but is not limited to, both qualitative and quantitative measures of contribution and impact in the dissemination of knowledge including the following:

- Courses taught, including classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus
- Instruction offered by electronic technology including online programs or courses or other materials that are promulgated electronically through appropriate channels
- Cumulative SEI reports (student evaluation of instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the office of the university registrar) for every class taught or similar evaluation of extension instruction
- 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 X of this document)
- 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

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

Consultation with and accomplishments of students

- Advising or mentoring undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral students
- Advising or mentoring honors students
- Involving undergraduate students in research opportunities
- Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations
- Service learning efforts with students and community groups
- Assessment of the success of current and former graduate students

Generating external funding

- External grants such as training grants and other resources to support students and instruction
- Developing instructional materials, courses and curricula for use in university and non-university settings
- Contributions to new course development or major course revision
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the college, across the university or at other institutions in the development and implementation of teaching materials and methods; Evidence of interdisciplinary research
- 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

2. Research

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

Documentation of research may include, but is not limited to qualitative and quantitative measure of contributions and impacts in development of knowledge including:

- Scholarly peer refereed 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 (e.g., journal impact factors, numbers of citations for papers authored)
- Grants and contracts applied for; grants and contracts received
- Creative endeavors including, but not limited to, commercialization activities such as inventions, disclosures, patents, options and licensing agreements or creative works pertinent to the candidate’s professional focus
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (e.g. published reviews including publications where one’s research findings is favorably cited, news reports citing research)
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the institute, college or across the university and at other institutions in the development of knowledge
- Prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work
- Evidence of other scholarly and creative endeavors that achieve the strategic goals of the university
- Developmental efforts in incubation of research advancement

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 (University definition 3335-6-02(A)). Collegiality is an extension of service and is exemplified through faculty members working with their peers and others of the institute and beyond to make the whole of the programmatic endeavors greater than the sum of the parts. Interdependent and symbiotic relationships among faculty, staff, students, and/or external stakeholders are important components of collegiality in conducting high quality programmatic endeavors. Documentation of service may include, but is not limited to qualitative and quantitative measure of contributions and impacts in the service to institutional development and development of the profession including:

- Substantive service on institute, college and university committees including ad hoc committees
- Substantive service as a mentor for faculty members
- Substantive focus on fostering interdependent relationships in enhancing collegiality at Ohio State ATI and beyond so as to improve productivity in programmatic endeavors
- Substantive service as advisor to student groups and organizations or other efforts contributing to student welfare
- Service on advisory boards and committees for professional organizations
- Service on review panels for journals or granting agencies
- Recognition or awards by professional organizations for service
- Service and consultation on advisory boards and committees for public organizations such as industry or community boards or governmental boards
- Developmental efforts in advancement of outreach
- Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or institute
- Contributions to institute goodwill such as serving as an institute leader on committees, mentoring junior faculty, regularly attending meetings and events
- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, service, and collegiality reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, greater commitments and responsibilities in one area against lesser 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 and tenure. 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.

The primary responsibility of Ohio State ATI faculty is to develop and conduct excellent teaching programs. Ohio State ATI faculty members are generally expected to teach so as

to satisfy the standards set forth in the Ohio State ATI workload document. They also have the responsibilities to conduct scholarly research and other creative endeavors. This is generally focused on applied research in the individual's discipline or within the broad context of teaching methodologies or subject matter delivery. Faculty members are encouraged to collaborate with professionals and practitioners in a variety of ways. This interaction is deemed to be very important because Ohio State ATI faculty have no graduate student education program and limited support and infrastructure to conduct research. Faculty members are encouraged to report their applied research findings in peer-refereed professional journals and presentations. The criteria and standards of evaluation of faculty performance that focuses on high quality teaching reflect the institute's mission.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) 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 Ohio State ATI mission.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University. The award of tenure is a commitment to continued employment at Ohio State ATI. It is, therefore, essential to evaluate and assess the probability that faculty, after being tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the institute's academic mission in significant ways for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance and collegiality. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the institute'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 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 are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' statement on professional ethics (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>).

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

Teaching

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

- Current content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- Ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- Creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment

- Active engagement of students in the learning process and encouragement of independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- Provision of appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- Respectful and courteous treatment of students
- Service as an advisor to honors students and as director of undergraduate research as appropriate and feasible within the institute
- Engagement in documentable efforts to improve teaching, including but not limited to attendance at and participation in university, college, or institute teaching workshops
- Curriculum improvement through revision of courses or development of new courses and/or academic programs including cross-university interdisciplinary programs and multi-university programs
- Published pedagogical papers, books, book chapters, digital programs and documentation of the extent to which these products have been adopted by other faculty at Ohio State and at other institutions
- Extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching at Ohio State in professional societies and at other institutions.

Research Scholarship

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

- Publication of a body of work in high-quality peer-refereed 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
- Consideration of the overall distribution of faculty member responsibilities shall be considered when the publication record for the case is being considered

The following attributes of the body of work are considered:

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

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

- An ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding; Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, because 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
- 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

Service

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

- Substantive focus on fostering interdependent relationships in enhancing collegiality at Ohio State ATI and beyond so as to improve productivity in programmatic endeavors
- Contributions to the orderly functioning of the institute, college, and university
- Contributions to the profession
- Contributions to the community at large

2. Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<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; has demonstrated leadership in service.

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, service, and collegiality 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 and international reputation in the field. When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship. Furthermore, a substantive focus on fostering interdependent relationships in enhancing collegiality at Ohio State ATI and beyond is an expectation so as to improve productivity in programmatic endeavors

Moreover, it is recognized that faculty "contribute to institutional development in a variety of ways which are consistent with the creation and dissemination of knowledge and contribution of service" (Alutto, 2010). 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 institute, 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.

3. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty

Evaluation of professional/clinical practice faculty is based on the quality of performance in 1) teaching (classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus as applicable); 2) oversight of practicum experiences; 3) advising and service to the institute, university, and /or community; 4) knowledge of research impacting practice within the field of study; and 5) extent of collegiality in fostering interdependent relationships that advance Ohio State ATI.

Promotion to Associate Professor of Professional/Clinical 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 great amount 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 institute. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate professor of clinical professional/clinical practice are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Research scholarship activity is not expected.

Promotion to Professor of Professional/Clinical Practice - For promotion to professor of professional/clinical 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 the institute and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

B. Procedures

The Ohio State ATI's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and the office academic affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty tracks in the institute.

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.

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible, at the request of the institute director, for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the institute director 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. If the candidate adds names, at least one of the names listed by the candidate will be requested to provide a letter. The institute director decides whether removal of names from the list is justified (also see external evaluations below).

2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

If there are not three faculty members at the professor rank to serve on the institute promotion and tenure committee for assessment of cases for promotion from associate professor to

professor, there will be additional members selected following the procedures previously described in this document.

The responsibilities of the promotion and tenure committee are as follows:

- Review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty
- Organize peer faculty teaching performance reviews for pre-tenure faculty members
- Consider annually, in the spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place; Only professors on the institute promotion and tenure committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor;
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's curriculum vitae 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) for 1 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 institute director 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 Ohio State ATI.
 - A decision by the promotion and tenure committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the institute director, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- To provide feedback to candidates on dossier preparation; Comments made in no way commits the eligible faculty, the institute director, 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 professional/clinical practice faculty members as they seek promotion or promotion with tenure

3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

The procedures and timeline to be followed by the Ohio State ATI promotion and tenure committee and the eligible faculty are as follows:

- **Spring:** The promotion and tenure committee will elect a chair from its membership each spring. The term of office shall extend for 1 year. Typically, no individual shall serve as chair for more than two consecutive year-long terms. The chair is responsible for calling committee meetings, leading candidate reviews, drafting and forwarding the committee's letters of candidate evaluations, working with the institute administrative

leaders to ensure a fair and efficient review process, and leading activities to develop and review the institute promotion and tenure procedures and policies. In addition, it is the responsibility of the chair to ensure a dossier is correctly prepared and does not include extraneous or inaccurate information before it is reviewed by the institute's promotion and tenure committee. The task of providing feedback to the candidate concerning the preparation of the dossier may be distributed among the five members of the promotion and tenure 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 extend for 1 year. Typically, no individual shall serve as POD for more than two consecutive year-long terms. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The POD's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines. It is the responsibility of the POD to assure that the institute's promotion and tenure committee follows written procedures governing its reviews, that the proceedings are conducted 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, these are brought to the attention of the institute director. The institute director must investigate the matter and provide a response to the designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is not warranted.
- **Late Spring:** The promotion and tenure committee solicits names of external evaluators from the faculty and then suggests these names to the institute director for upcoming candidates.
- **Summer:** The promotion and tenure 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 promotion and tenure 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 promotion and tenure committee chair appoints an individual from the committee to draft a summary analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research, service, and collegiality to present to the 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 promotion and tenure 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 promotion and tenure committee drafts an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarly creativity, service, and collegiality to present to the full committee of eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The promotion and tenure committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- 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 promotion and tenure committee meets with the eligible faculty, and presents each case, providing the summary analysis prepared in their preliminary meeting.
- After discussion and faculty vote, the promotion and tenure 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 maintained in the office of the promotion and tenure committee chair, 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 promotion and tenure chair as representative of the entire committee of eligible faculty and is delivered to the institute director.

- In the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another academic unit, the promotion and tenure committee reviews the dossier and provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the institute director. The committee of eligible faculty does not vote on these cases because the institute's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on the institute's cases.

4. Institute Director Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the institute director are as follows:

- Where relevant, 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 the institute.
- **Late Spring:** Solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the promotion and tenure committee, division chair and candidate (also see external evaluations as subsequently described in this document)
- Make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least 2 weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted
- 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
- Attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions during the meeting; the Ohio State ATI director does not vote on the candidate's case
- **Early Autumn:** Provide a written evaluation, along with the relevant division chair, considering inputs of the associate director, following receipt of the promotion and tenure committees completed evaluation and recommendation
- Inform each candidate in writing after completion of the institute review process of the:
 - Recommendations by eligible faculty and institute director
 - Provide to the candidate the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and institute director
 - Inform the candidate of the opportunity to submit written comments in response to the letter from eligible faculty and institute director, within 10 days from receipt of the letters, and include the response in the dossier; the letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the institute director, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments regarding the letter of the director that warrants a response; request a response from the eligible faculty regarding the letter from them that was commented on by the candidate; include any responses from the director or eligible faculty in the dossier

- Forward the completed dossier to the CFAES office by the college deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the institute director recommends against promotion; a negative recommendation by the director is final in such cases
- Receive the promotion and tenure committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and forward this material, along with the institute director's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the institute director of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested

5. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which creative scholarly research must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews. External evaluations are optional in other reviews and will be obtained as needed. When obtained, reviews should meet the criteria described below. For special cases, in fourth year review, external evaluations may be solicited when either the institute director 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.

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

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

Because the institute cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought as are required, and these are solicited no later than the end of the spring before the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first set of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the director, 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/universityrules.html>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters 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 institute requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The institute follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html> for letters requesting external evaluations. Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the institute director, 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 institute's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

C. Documentation

As noted above under candidate responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the 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 is forwarded when the review moves beyond the institute. The documentation of scholarship and service noted below is for use during the institute review only, unless this is specifically requested at the college and university.

- 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.

1. Teaching

For the time period since the last promotion or the last 5 years, whichever is less, 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:

- Courses taught, including classroom, independent study, studio, laboratory or clinical instruction, extension and continuing education, both on and off campus
- Instruction offered by electronic technology including online programs or courses or other materials that are promulgated electronically through appropriate channels
- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught or similar evaluation of extension instruction
- Two peer evaluation of teaching reports are 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 X)
- Five peer evaluation of teaching reports are required for promotion from associate professor to professor.
- 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

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

Advising and mentoring students

- Advising or mentoring undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral students
- Advising or mentoring honors students
- Involving undergraduate students in research opportunities
- Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations
- Service learning efforts with students and community groups
- Assessment of the success of current and former graduate students

Generating external funding

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

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

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

2. Research Scholarship

For the time period since the last promotion, documentation of research may include, but is not limited to qualitative and quantitative measure of contributions and impacts in the development of knowledge including:

- Scholarly peer refereed papers published or accepted for publication; Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed
- Impact of scholarly publications
- Grants and contracts applied for; grants and contracts received
- Creative endeavors including, but not limited to, commercialization activities such as inventions, disclosures, patents, options and licensing agreements or creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (e.g. published reviews including publications where one's scholarly endeavors is favorably cited, news reports citing research)

- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues within the institute, college or across the university and at other institutions in the development of knowledge
- Evidence of other creative endeavors that achieve the strategic goals of the university
- Prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

3. Service

For the time period since the last promotion, documentation of service may include, but is not limited to qualitative and quantitative measure of contributions and impacts in the service to institutional development and development of the profession including:

- Substantive focus on fostering interdependent relationships in enhancing collegiality at Ohio State ATI and beyond so as to improve productivity in programmatic endeavors
- Service on institute, college and university committees
- Service as a mentor for faculty members
- Service as advisor to student groups and organizations or other efforts contributing to student welfare
- Service on advisory boards and committees for professional organizations
- Service on review panels for journals or granting agencies
- Recognition or awards by professional organizations for service
- Service and consultation on advisory boards and committees for public organizations such as industry or community boards or governmental boards
- Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or institute
- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

VIII. Appeals

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>).

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

IX. Seventh-Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Electronic Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) is required for every institute course except independent studies, practicum, and internship courses. The eSEI is administered through the Registrar's Office. During a week late in the semester, students enrolled in a class receive an e-mail message from the eSEI Administrator asking them to complete the eSEI during last 2 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 eSEI. Faculty members may also consider sending an e-mail message to all students enrolled in the class encouraging them to complete the eSEI and/or giving students an opportunity to complete the evaluations during class using the mobile application for the instrument. The institute director will request

and receive copies of the SEI reports for all faculty and staff that teach classes at Ohio State ATI each semester of the academic year and use these in annual performance reviews.

B. 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. The Tenure Initiating Units (TIU) 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.

The TIU may select from among many modalities of peer review. See the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching's (UCAT) website (www.ucat.osu.edu/) 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. The TIU 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.

1. Procedure for peer evaluation of teaching

Responsibilities of the director, division chair, and promotion and tenure committee chair

At the beginning of the autumn semester, each year the Ohio State ATI director and chair of the promotion and tenure committee will assess the need for peer review of teaching, considering the needs of the untenured faculty, probationary professional clinical practice faculty and tenured or professional/clinical practice faculty who are or could be eligible in the future for promotion from associate professor to professor. The division chair will conduct a review of the teaching of all faculty members in the relevant division a minimum of one time each academic year. The chair of the promotion and tenure committee will assign peer reviewers every academic each year for probationary tenure-track and clinical- faculty and on alternate years for tenured or clinical professional/clinical practice faculty who are or could be eligible in the future for promotion from associate professor to professor. A reasonable effort will be made to distribute service among the tenured and professional clinical practice faculty. While it is desirable for a peer reviewer to be of equal or greater rank than the faculty member being reviewed, this is not required. There can be faculty who are selected to conducted peer teaching reviews from outside of Ohio State ATI.

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 at least once per year of the faculty members teaching who they agree to assess at all the levels of instruction; 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 institute director (as summarized in section VI.C.1 of this document)
- The peer evaluation of teaching is a narrative report in the form of a letter to the institute director. The letter by the evaluator should be sent to the institute director within 3 weeks after the observation or by the end of the term in the case of summative teaching reviews. The institute director will share the letter with the reviewed faculty member.

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

1. 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, and assignments should be included

2. How 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

3. 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

4. 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

5. 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

6. 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)

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.

C. Processes of Peer Evaluation of 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 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.

Appendix 1

Procedures and Guidelines for Filling Vacant Faculty Member Positions

1. Search Committee

- 1.1 An Ad hoc Search Committee (ASC) will be appointed by the institute director
- 1.2 The ASC will consist of four institute tenure-track faculty members
- 1.3 Each member of the ASC will serve a four-year term with appointments staggered, whereby one member rotates off the ASC each year
- 1.4 The Chair of the ASC will be the member in their fourth year of appointment

2. Overview of Duties of the ASC

- 2.1 The charge of the ASC will be determined by the institute director and will include that the members of the committee be highly proactive in recruiting applicants to apply for the position
- 2.2 Members of the ASC must attend an annual session for training in aspects of affirmative action and other statutes issued by the institute, college, and university regarding interviewing and hiring policies
- 2.3 The ASC will write each position announcement based on input from the faculty members, division chair and institute director
- 2.4 The ASC will provide, in consultation with the institute director, the final decision regarding candidates to be invited for interviews for each position
- 2.5 The ASC will plan and schedule interviews
- 2.6 Following interviews, the ASC will submit a final report to the institute director including:
 - 2.6.1 Summary of the search process and number of applicants
 - 2.6.2 Overview of applicants
 - 2.6.3 Summary of data provided by committee advisor members, faculty, staff, students, stakeholders, and others involved with the interviews
 - 2.6.4 Specific recommendations from the ASC leaving no doubt concerning the ASC's judgment of candidates
- 2.7 The ASC will report to faculty the progress of searches and interviews
- 2.8 When the position is filled, the chair of the ASC will send a letter to each applicant not invited for an interview, or who was invited for an interview but was not selected as the preferred candidate for the position

3. Advising Committee Members

- 3.1 The director may appoint an individual faculty member closely associated with the program area in which the search is being conducted to serve as a SCC committee advisory member that will have all rights as a regularly appointed SCC member
- 3.2 The appointment of an advising committee member to the SCC will occur if there is not a regularly appointed ASC committee member who is closely associated with the programmatic area in which the search is occurring

4. Overview of Duties of Advising Committee Members

- 4.1 Help identify and recruit potential candidates
- 4.2 Review applicants to make sure they are a good fit for the programmatic area in which the search is being conducted

5. Overview of Duties of the Institute Director

- 5.1 Responsible for hiring faculty
- 5.2 Determines the charge of ASC
- 5.3 Identifies the needs to be filled by each faculty position, after consultation with the CFAES associate dean and director of academic affairs, as well as Ohio State ATI assistant director of academic affairs, division chairs, and faculty members
- 5.4 Provides the ASC with institute office support to facilitate correspondence, scheduling interviews, and reimbursing expenses for candidate searches and interviews
- 5.5 Deals with issues related to partner during interviews
- 5.6 Following their interviews, provides all formal communication with applicants to be made an offer

6. Prior to Job Announcement Meeting

- 6.1 Charge of the ASC issued by the institute director
- 6.2 Members of the ASC write job announcement
- 6.3 Members of the ASC determine outlets for advertising the position
- 6.4 Members of the ASC define target deadlines for
 - 6.5.1 Application period
 - 6.5.2 Interviews
 - 6.5.3 Final report to institute director and faculty members

7. Applications

- 7.1 Job announcements should include a request for
 - 7.1.1 A statement of interest to accompany the application
 - 7.1.2 A list of three references including complete address, phone number, fax number and email address for each reference
 - 7.1.3 CV
- 7.2 Applications should be sent to and files maintained by the office staff member
- 7.3 After completion of the search, all application materials will be maintained in the office of the institute assistant director of administrative support for the required period for maintaining such materials
- 7.4 Staff person coordinating applications will maintain a current list of applicants

8. Review of Applications

- 8.1 Only completed files will be reviewed
- 8.2 Initial review of applications by ASC in institute office (i.e., copies not made for ASC)
- 8.3 First round of voting done for each applicant without prior discussion
 - 8.3.1 Applicants that receive at least two positive votes will be reviewed in the second round
 - 8.3.2 Applicants that receive no (0) positive votes will be removed from the pool
 - 8.3.3 Applicants that receive one positive vote, the individual voting positive will be allowed to discuss the merits of the applicant prior to a re-vote
 - 8.3.3.1 Applicants that receive at least two positive votes in the re-vote will be considered in the second round
 - 8.3.3.2 Applicants receiving less than two positive votes will be removed from the pool
- 8.4 Second round voting will be preceded by discussion of each remaining applicant
 - 8.4.1 Applicants receiving three or four positive votes:
 - 8.4.1.1 Remain in potential applicant pool to be reviewed in third round
 - 8.4.1.2 Three references will be contacted and comments relative to the

- applicant's suitability to specific job responsibilities requested
 - 8.4.2 Applicants receiving two or less positive votes will be removed from the pool
- 8.5 Third round review of applicants following receipt of letters of reference will result in a list of applicants to be invited for interviews
 - 8.5.1 Letters of reference remain in office staff member's file for review by ASC and advising committee members (if appointed)
 - 8.5.2 Third round review ends with a list of individuals to be invited for interviews
 - 8.5.3 The number of applicants to be invited for interviews will depend on the institute director's charge to the committee

9. Planning Interviews

- 9.1 Have office staff member schedule dates to hold for college-level meetings with applicants being interviewed as soon as possible
- 9.2 Reserve meeting rooms and hotel rooms as soon as possible
 - 9.2.1 Use the same hotels for all interviewees of a position
 - 9.2.2 Use the same meeting rooms for all interviewees of a position
- 9.3 Chair of the ASC extends invitations to interviewees via the telephone
 - 9.3.1 Invite strongest candidate first (allowing first choice of available dates)
 - 9.3.2 Do not invite spouses on first interviews
 - 9.3.3 Explain what resources will be mailed to the candidate prior to the visit
- 9.4 Mail interview schedule, travel arrangements, and hotel reservations when confirmations are secured. Include guidelines for the type of oral presentations (teaching, scholarly creativity)

10. Interviewing

- 10.1 Interviewees should arrive the evening before the interview begins. Allow the candidate to have the evening to rest and relax before commencing the interview process the next morning
- 10.2 All presentations by the applicant should be made near the beginning of the interview period
- 10.3 Breakfast with the ASC
 - 10.3.1 Explain the role of ASC and institute director
 - 10.3.2 Review any changes in the schedule that may have surfaced (avoid tough or hard sell discussion, keep discussion light)
 - 10.3.3 The job description, salary, teaching load, tenure, start-up packages, office assignments will be described by the institute director
 - 10.3.3 Have each member of the ASC prepared to ask a predetermined question
- 10.4 Schedule first agenda item a "meet and greet" with either the institute director
- 10.5 Allow the candidate 30 minutes before the morning presentation to shift attention toward the presentation
- 10.6 Schedule seminar, including questions, for 1 hour
- 10.7 Develop schedule where the candidate moves about the institute and does not remain in one room
- 10.8 Schedule one meal with untenured and recently hired faculty on campus
- 10.9 Schedule one meal with likely faculty collaborators on campus
- 10.10 Schedule a meeting with the director of OARDC or their designee in which potential collaborations and research opportunities will be discussed
- 10.11 Schedule a tour of the Ohio State ATI campus at the end of the first day of the interview
- 10.12 The candidate should conclude the first day of interviewing by staying at the

- same hotel as their arrival
- 10.13 Second day of interviewing begins with the candidate being transported to the Columbus campus by the institute director and chair of the ASC
- 10.14 Schedule a “meet and greet” with the either the academic unit leader on the Columbus campus with which the position aligns from a disciplinary perspective
- 10.15 Schedule one meal with faculty on the Columbus campus who teach in the same area as candidate
- 10.16 Schedule a meeting with the CFAES associate dean and director of academic affairs
- 10.17 Schedule a tour of the entire Columbus campus by the director of Ohio State ATI
- 10.18 Develop schedule where the candidate moves about the campus and does not stay in one room
- 10.19 Chair of the ASC will give the institute director an overview of the 2 days of interviewing, including possible issues or problems that might arise, immediately before the candidate’s exit interview
- 10.20 The last appointment is a 1 hour meeting with the institute director
- 10.21 Chair of the ASC drives the candidate to the airport immediately after exit meeting with the institute director
 - 10.21.1 Objective of this time is to assess the candidate’s impressions, questions, and concerns
 - 10.21.2 Try to avoid having dinner with the candidate as it may distract from the exit interview with the institute director
 - 10.21.3 Confirm that communications henceforth will be with the institute director and not the ASC

11. Progress Reports to Faculty

- 11.1 ASC has responsibility to report progress of the committee to tenure track faculty members
- 11.2 Report at each faculty meeting (begin with charge of the committee)
- 11.3 Memos should be sent to faculty members after the third round of applicant review
 - 11.3.1 Include number of applicants
 - 11.3.2 Announce candidates invited and interview schedules
- 11.4 Provide summary of interview evaluations

12. Evaluations

- 12.1 Evaluation forms will be distributed as soon as the candidate’s interview is completed
- 12.2 Evaluations will be summarized and the results reported in the progress report to faculty members after interviews have been completed

Appendix 2

Annual Performance Reviews

A primary responsibility of the Ohio State ATI director is to evaluate faculty member performance annually in accordance with university established criteria. In consultation under the leadership of the director, a responsibility of the division chair is to participate in annual performance reviews of division faculty. Every faculty member is responsible for providing the documentation for annual performance reviews as requested by the director before 1 January of each year. Documentation is to be reported for the present calendar year (e.g., for annual reviews conducted between 1 January and 1 April 2013, documentation for 2012 performance shall be reported).

Three paper copies of the dossier documentation shall be provided in the format of Research in View (<https://osu.researchinview.thomsonreuters.com/>), the institution-wide data management system developed by [Thomson-Reuters](#) in conjunction with the Ohio State OCIO Learning Technology group. This system provides Ohio State University users with the ability to record and collect teaching, research, and service accomplishments. From these data, individual user reports such as a CV, Dossier Report, or Annual Review can be created. University administrators are able to create administrative and strategic group reports that provide an overview of scholarly activities across Ohio State.

Furthermore Ohio State ATI faculty members are expected to provide an impact statement(s) regarding the programs for which they provide leadership that focuses on teaching. Faculty are also encouraged to provide an impact statement on scholarly creativity and/or outreach engagement programs in which they collaborate or provide leadership if they have active programmatic endeavors in these regards. Examples will be provided with the annual written request for annual performance review documentation as to how impact statements should be developed.

In addition, each faculty member shall provide an Individual Development Plan (IDP) of no more than 200 words. This IDP shall include plans for teaching and scholarly creativity so as to remain current in subject matter taught, and teaching methodology that stimulates student learning and facilitates high quality instructor-student relationships.

Appendix 3

COLLEGE OF FOOD, AGRICULTURAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Faculty Reward System Guidelines for Annual Performance Review, Promotion, and Tenure

(Addendum to College and Departmental Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Documents)

The College adopts the following value statements and definition of scholarly performance as the basis for its faculty reward, evaluation, promotion, and tenure processes and decisions. This applies to annual reviews of performance as well as decisions related to tenure and promotion in rank.

What We Value

As a college, we value (no order implied):

- High quality professional work
- Relevance to the goals of the College
- Impact of program efforts
- Diversity of scholarly responsibilities and contributions
- Equality of recognition for research, teaching, and outreach efforts
- Disciplinary and multidisciplinary efforts
- Individual and team contributions
- Peer review - both as validation of accomplishment and as a contribution to development of others

Scholarly Performance

We are committed to valuing and rewarding excellence in performance of assigned responsibilities. Important in identifying the role of every faculty member is the presence of appropriate evidence of scholarly productivity. The amount and nature of this scholarly productivity will vary according to the nature of the specific appointment. For every appointment sufficient scholarly productivity must be present.

We value a wide spectrum of types of scholarship. The faculty activities of teaching, research and/or creative work, outreach, and service are vital university functions and provide a framework around which faculty build their programs, based on their individual faculty appointments. Teaching, research and/or creative work, outreach, and service are not considered to be acts of scholarship, in and of themselves. We will reward excellent performance of these activities with salary increases. For tenure and promotion in rank, we require sufficient evidence of superior scholarship.

This College values and will recognize **an individual's contribution** to interdisciplinary and team-based scholarship, **based on the unique insights brought from his/her scholarly work**. Candidates must document the nature and extent of their individual contributions in the context

of the total team so that colleagues can accurately value their contribution to the outcome of the group.

Faculty efforts become a vehicle for demonstrating scholarship when: (1) they create something that did not exist before; (2) they are validated by peers and by external sources, and (3) they exemplify one or more of the forms of discovery, integration, transformation, or application (Weiser, 1995).

Assessment of scholarship emphasizes the importance of validation to ensure cogency and the importance of communication to broader audiences to ensure that results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others.

The following list represents the varying types of scholarship we value (adapted from Boyer, 1994; Kolb, 1980 - no 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.

The Role of the Annual Review of Faculty in Articulating Expectations and Evaluating Performance

Annual Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations

An annual set of faculty responsibilities and expectations, developed and agreed upon by the individual faculty member and the Department Chair/School Director, will be the basis for the annual evaluation of a faculty member's performance. These responsibilities and expectations shall also set the context against which promotion and tenure decisions will be made.

The statement outlining faculty responsibilities and expectations, developed annually by the faculty member and the department chair/school director, will serve to update and amend the position description created at the time of initial appointment.

This statement of responsibilities and expectations will be made available within the department so that all faculty are aware of the agreed-upon responsibilities, and that eligible faculty will have the necessary information available to them when making promotion and tenure decisions. The eligible faculty must judge performance against the original position description and the sequence of annual responsibilities and expectations statements.

The annual responsibilities and expectations statements will serve as an understanding between the individual faculty member, his/her department, and the College.

Evaluation of Performance

The annual statement of responsibilities and expectations will serve as the basis for evaluation in annual performance reviews as well as in promotion and tenure decisions. **(Note that all faculty are to be annually reviewed for performance of the agreed upon duties.)**

During the annual review process each faculty member will be responsible for reporting:

- Progress made toward goals established the previous year;
- Contributions they have made to the mission of the department/unit and to the vision and priority areas of the College, and
- Indicators of quality as well as quantity of accomplishments.

Each department will modify its annual faculty reporting form to provide for the inclusion of this information into the report.

The initial position description and all subsequent annual statements of responsibilities and expectations will be incorporated into each faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier.

The Annual Performance Review

The annual performance review between each faculty member and the department chair should provide the opportunity for documentation and discussion of accomplishments over the past 12 months as well as responsibilities, expectations, and objectives for the coming year.

Documentation of past accomplishments should focus (whenever possible) on BOTH what has been accomplished and the impact of a faculty member's efforts. This is true for individual accomplishment and for accomplishments made as a contributing member of a team.

The annual performance review process will provide the opportunity for clarification of expectations and accomplishments.

At What Level of Performance Should Activity Be Rewarded? - Performance Standards

Acceptable work is required of all; excellence work will be rewarded. All faculty are expected to demonstrate continued intellectual engagement. Foundational to this distinction is that criteria will be established which define minimum standards of performance in every area of faculty responsibility. Below are criteria adopted by the College against which to measure performance in teaching, research, and service.

General Overview of Expectations

All candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate clear excellence in teaching (degree granting or outreach), research and/or creative works, and service. The nature and extent of the contribution will be commensurate with assigned responsibilities, the amount of time allocated for each activity, and the extent to which they have resources available to support their assigned duties. Hence, the nature and scope of teaching and research output may vary.

Teaching

Excellence requires demonstrated high-level accomplishment for most of the following measures of teaching (both credit generating and outreach instruction):

- Mastery of the subject matter

- Continuous growth in subject matter knowledge
- Ability to organize and communicate class material with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- Objectivity
- Contributions to curricula or program development
- Creativity in course or program development, methods of presentation and incorporation of new materials and ideas
- Capacity to enhance students' awareness of the relationship between subjects studied, important problems, and other field of knowledge
- Advising undergraduates, graduate students, and Extension clientele
- Directing graduate and undergraduate research programs

Outputs of teaching effort that will be highly valued include:

- Students who exit courses or other educational experiences with a high level of competence, as validated by job or advanced study placement or growth in their own life
- Instructional products developed that are adopted by peers
- Pedagogical innovation adopted by peers
- Students who are able to sufficiently perform at a high level of proficiency in subsequent courses and experiences
- Exiting students who are sufficiently enlightened to make life altering decisions and commitments
- Curriculum that is accepted by peers and validated by employers and graduate and professional schools
- Prestigious awards received

In addition to the above, the following dimensions of teaching performance are expected of Extension teachers:

- An understanding of the needs for knowledge by outreach students/clients/users
- The ability to communicate effectively with outreach students
- The ability to anticipate the "teachable moment" regarding the needs of outreach students and to respond with appropriate educational activities

Performance in Extension teaching is also evaluated in terms of:

- The development and delivery of outreach educational programs which have a clear set of goals determined through needs assessments and active participation with the target audience
- Changed practices, policies or behavior from outreach education
- The extent to which it enables capacity building for individuals, communities, and institutions
- The development of teaching materials and curriculum
- Extension publications and peer reviewed presentations
- Ability to contribute to team and interdisciplinary efforts

Research and/or Creative Works

Excellence is indicated by the validation of candidates' work by their peers. Typical sources of such validation include:

- Publication in peer-reviewed journals

- Acceptance of peer reviewed papers and presentations
- Publication of scholarly books
- Publication of peer-reviewed Extension publications
- Awarding of peer-reviewed grants
- Invited presentations
- Patents awarded
- Prestigious awards received
- Other forms of demonstrated scholarly excellence that are less traditional. Examples include, but are not limited to:
 - computer assisted learning material or computer software that has been judged to be of high quality and has been adopted by others
 - development of products which break new intellectual ground and enjoy substantial adoption
 - new efforts in distance education which are used by peer institutions, etc.

Additional measures to be used to indicate excellence are:

- Relevance of research or scholarly work to the field
- The cutting edge nature of the research or scholarly work in the case of the scholarship of discovery
- Impact measures (who needs and who uses results)
- Productivity and/or efficiency of research and creative works
- Level of risk taking (e.g., new direction from dissertation research or prior fields of accomplishment)

It is incumbent on the candidate and his/her tenure-initiating unit to document the minimum quality indicators of such contributions.

Service

All faculty members are expected to contribute actively to the governance of their TIU, the College, and the University. Service activities include:

- Serving on committees in response to assignments by the Chair, Dean, Provost, or President, and as a result of faculty election;
- Serving in supportive administrative roles, such as program director or Extension county chair, when asked,
- Serving the profession through such activities as service as an officer on the board of a professional organization or journal (including editor roles), and/or participation in organizing a symposium;
- Representing the University in service to the non-academic community;
- Serving in special roles in the community by Extension or other personnel such as with commodity groups, community development groups, youth support groups, etc.

When a candidate shows special ability in service, it should be part of the consideration during tenure review, but such special ability will not relieve the candidate of demonstrating excellence in the scholarship of teaching and research.

Tenure-Initiating Unit Guidelines

Each tenure-initiating unit will clearly outline minimal scholarly expectations on which to base annual faculty assessments and decisions regarding tenure and advancement in rank.

Depending on the position description and the time as well as resources made available to the individual, the amount and character of the outcomes will differ. Expectations detailed in the faculty position description will serve to clearly outline minimum thresholds.

How are These Procedures to be used in Annual Review and Promotion and Tenure Decisions?

It is critical to note that reward in terms of annual increase is not synonymous with reward in terms of promotion and tenure.

Within the parameter of these recommendations, those individuals and/or groups charged with evaluating faculty performance (either for annual increases or for promotion and tenure decisions) are to:

- 1) be clear regarding expectations agreed upon by the candidate and chair as a basis for appraisal;
- 2) examine the record of accomplishments to ascertain:
 - a) whether the person has completed the agreed-upon assignment, and
 - b) the level of quantity and quality of the accomplishments. For performance in teaching (credit bearing and Extension) quality must be demonstrated by student or client evaluation as well as peer reviews. The record of scholarship must adequately describe "the creative intellectual work" that has been completed, how it has been validated by peers and how it has been communicated.

Using the new definition of scholarship articulated earlier in this document, evaluators have more flexible parameters. There will be no single measure (viz. number and quality of refined journal articles). Rather, evaluators will assess evidence of discovery, integration, transformation, and application (as earlier defined).

REFERENCES:

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate. Special report. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984.

C. J. Weiser. (1995). The Value System of a University - Rethinking Scholarship. Draft. Approved by the OSU Office of Academic Affairs February 8, 2000
2/8/2000