

**FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR THE OHIO STATE
UNIVERSITY AT NEWARK**

Table of Contents

1. Preamble	2
2. Campus Mission	2
3. Appointments	2
3.1. Criteria	2
3.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty	2
3.1.2. Associated Faculty	3
3.2. Procedures	3
3.2.1. Tenure-Track Faculty	3
3.2.2. Associated Faculty	5
4. Annual Reviews	5
4.1. Procedures	5
4.2. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	6
4.2.1. Fourth-Year Review	6
4.2.2. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	7
4.3. Tenured Faculty	7
5. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	7
5.1. Compensation Principles	7
5.2. Criteria	9
5.3. Procedures	10
5.4. Documentation	11
6. Reviews for Promotion and Tenure	12
6.1. Criteria	12
6.1.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	12
6.1.2. Promotion to Professor	13
6.1.3. Teaching	14
6.1.4. Service	16
6.1.5. Scholarship	16
6.2. Procedures	16
6.2.1. The Promotion and Tenure Committee	16
6.2.2. Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee	18
6.2.3. Responsibilities of the Candidate	18
6.2.4. The Subcommittee	19
6.2.5. The Deliberating Committee	21
6.2.6. Structure of the Letter	23
6.3. Documentation	27
6.3.1. Teaching	28
6.3.2. Service	28
Appendix	29

1 Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Tenure Track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure), the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, the governance documents of tenure-initiating units, and other policies and procedures of the university to which Ohio State Newark and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, Ohio State Newark 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 five years on appointment or reappointment of the dean/director.

This document must receive the approval of the dean/director of Ohio State Newark and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the campus's mission and, in the context of that mission and the mission of the university, the campus's criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean/director of Ohio State Newark and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the campus and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01.

2 Campus Mission

Ohio State Newark provides access to the university by extending Ohio State courses, programs, research, and service to a wide range of Ohio communities.

3 Appointments

3.1 Criteria

3.1.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

Each tenure-initiating unit (TIU) at Ohio State defines a set of criteria, including research and scholarly activity for hiring tenure-track faculty at Ohio State's regional campuses. In addition, Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 D.1 notes that "the relative weight of teaching and service is ordinarily greater on regional campuses." Ohio State Newark adds to those criteria the following requirements:

- A commitment to the campus's role as a point of entry into higher education. Faculty will generally teach some introductory courses to fulfill this commitment.
- A commitment to using assessment to guide instruction.
- A commitment to campus service and to outreach and engagement in the local community and beyond.

3.1.2 Associated Faculty

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. Consistent with university policy, Ohio State Newark shall use the titles of lecturer and senior lecturer for all compensated instructional appointments where other titles are not appropriate. The associate dean will follow criteria established by TIUs in determining whether a candidate is qualified for a lecturer appointment. Lecturer appointments are generally annual appointments and may in no case be made for more than a three year term, subject to renewal on the basis of performance review and continued need for the position.

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

3.2 Procedures

3.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the Ohio State Newark dean/director, TIU head, and TIU representatives. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the TIU head and the dean/director. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the TIU head and the dean/director.

Decisions to create new positions and fill vacant positions are the responsibility of the dean/director. The Academic Affairs Committee, a standing committee of the Faculty Assembly, is charged with advising the dean/director on such decisions. The dean/director and the chair of the search committee have primary responsibilities for determining

the position description for a tenure track faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with the TIU head to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The search committee must include at least one representative from the TIU.

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 requested in advance from the Office of Academic Affairs. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of A Guide to Effective Searches, and in the Newark campus's most recent update of the Faculty Search Guide, available at the campus's HR website.

Should the dean/director think that the applicant pool or the final group of candidates is insufficiently diverse, he/she may propose that the search be extended, postponed to a later date, or cancelled. Should the search be extended, additional efforts will be made to increase the diversity of the pool by advertising the position in additional venues or other acceptable means necessary to achieve a diverse pool.

The dean/director, in consultation with the head of the TIU, will appoint an ad hoc search committee to identify candidates for the position. The committee will include at least one Columbus campus member of the TIU unless the TIU head declines to recommend such an appointment. The committee will also solicit applications, strive to cultivate a diverse applicant pool, and invite applicants to visit both the Newark campus and the Columbus campus. The TIU is responsible for determining what the candidate will do during the visit to the Columbus campus. At the Newark campus, the candidate will deliver a teaching demonstration, submit to questions from the search committee, and receive personal interviews with the dean/director, the associate dean, and appropriate faculty. The interview process at the Newark campus may also include a group meeting with students, and may include presentations delivered by way of video-conferencing technology to other campuses. The interview at the Newark campus may include a research presentation that includes auditors from multiple campuses, including the Columbus campus.

The committee will deliver a recommendation to the head of the TIU and the dean/director indicating which candidates are acceptable, in order from most acceptable to least acceptable. The TIU head will follow the TIU's procedures for selecting a candidate for an offer. According to University Rules, hiring can go forward only when the dean/director and the TIU head reach agreement. Upon such agreement, the dean/director can begin negotiations with a candidate.

The dean/director shall consult with the TIU head in determining negotiation parameters. Letters of offer must present the signature of the dean/director and the TIU head, and in some cases, the dean of the college. The offer letter will specify that the candidate has two weeks to reach a decision.

In addition to these guidelines, all searches should also conform to the requirements of the APT documents of the appropriate TIUs and colleges. Any exceptions to this process require OAA approval.

3.2.2 Associated Faculty

Lecturers. The associate dean, in consultation with the dean/director, the TIU head, program coordinators and other relevant faculty members, appoints lecturers to teach specific courses. Part-time lecturers work on one-semester contracts. Full-time lecturers (including senior lecturers) typically work on two-semester, temporary contracts, but may be offered contracts of up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Review of all associated faculty, except visiting faculty, is the responsibility of the associate dean.

The appointment and reappointment of all visiting faculty members is decided by the dean/director in consultation with the associate dean, TIU head, and relevant faculty members. Review of visiting faculty members is the responsibility of the dean/director.

4 Annual Reviews

Focusing primarily on teaching and service and secondarily on research, the dean/director conducts an annual review of all tenure-track and visiting faculty members. TIU's must also conduct annual reviews for tenure-track faculty, and the faculty member bears the responsibility of finding out what documentation the TIU requires.

4.1 Procedures

Ohio State Newark follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>) in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). The annual review covers a faculty member's performance over the previous calendar year in relation to expected performance in teaching, research, and service (as set forth in the Ohio State Newark Policy on Faculty Duties and Responsibilities), any

additional assignments and goals specific to the individual, and progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of all tenure-track faculty is described under “Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards” below. In conducting each annual review, the dean/director reviews the faculty member’s Core Dossier. By January 15 of the year following the year to be reviewed, faculty must submit an up-to-date, electronic copy of the Core Dossier according to instructions from the dean/director. Faculty must also submit copies (in electronic format, if possible) of pedagogical papers, books or other teaching-related or service-related materials published or accepted for publication. The dean/director retrieves additional data on teaching performance (e.g. peer evaluations, SEI reports, summaries of students’ discursive evaluations, etc.) from the faculty member’s personnel file or from other university offices.

All faculty members have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

4.2 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

The dean/director meets with each probationary faculty member to discuss the faculty member’s performance and then prepares a written evaluation that includes a statement regarding the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure. The dean/director sends the original letter to the faculty member and a copy of the letter to the TIU head. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the dean/director and the TIU, the TIU head discusses the matter with the dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. The dean/director has the authority to make the final decision in the case of a difference of opinion regarding a specific performance rating.

4.2.1 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, a faculty member undergoes a fourth-year review that follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review with the exception that the external review letters are not required. The chair of the Ohio State Newark Promotion and Tenure Committee conducts a review of the faculty member according to section 6.2. The chair sends the committee’s evaluation letter to the dean/director, who, after completing an independent review of the faculty member’s record and reviewing the letter from the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, sends both her or his own letter and the committee’s letter to the faculty

member's TIU head. The letter from the dean/director includes a recommendation regarding whether or not to renew the faculty member's appointment for an additional probationary year. The review then moves to the TIU and then to the faculty member's college. The college dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

During the fourth year, the dean/director conducts an annual review as described in section 4.1. Thus, at the Newark campus, a faculty member in his or her fourth year undergoes the typical annual review as well as the fourth-year review. At the level of the TIU, however, the fourth-year review might also serve as the annual review.

4.2.2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period, including for such reasons as birth of a child, adoption, and adverse events. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, www.oaa.osu.edu/handbook.

4.3 Tenured Faculty

The review process for tenured faculty members is identical to that for tenure-track probationary faculty. The dean/director prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance. For each associate professor, the evaluation includes a statement regarding progress toward promotion. The dean/director sends the evaluation to the faculty member and sends a copy to the faculty member's TIU head. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the dean/director and the TIU, the TIU head and the dean/director discuss the matter in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. The dean/director has the authority to make the final decision in case of a difference of opinion regarding a specific performance rating.

5 Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

5.1 Compensation Principles

In accordance with OAA policy and with Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 D.1, the campus's standard weight scheme for salary adjustments emphasizes teaching. The standard weights are 0.45 for teaching, 0.40 for research, and 0.15 for service. Because it is crucial that faculty establish themselves as scholars over the probationary period, the minimum research weight for

assistant professors is 0.40. For tenured faculty members, whose contributions to the campus's mission often vary to meet different campus demands, the minimum research weight is 0.25. To ensure that the campus maintains its emphasis on teaching, the minimum weight for teaching is 0.30 for all faculty. Because all faculty need to contribute service to the campus, the minimum service weight is 0.10. Faculty members on dean/director-approved leaves (including Faculty Professional Leaves), special assignments, or special appointments are exempt from the weight minimums. Weights for teaching cannot be increased without an increase in teaching load. Whenever a faculty member's annual teaching load is 21 contact hours (excluding teaching for which he or she receives supplemental compensation), his or her teaching weight will be 0.525. Whenever annual contact hours are 24 hours (excluding teaching that comes with supplemental compensation), the teaching weight will be 0.60.

Although all faculty are normally expected to be involved in on-going research and scholarly activity, faculty may shift the relative emphasis they place on their teaching, research, and service contributions. This variation is normal, often occurs over the course of a faculty member's career, and often helps the campus advance its mission.

During his or her annual performance review, a faculty member may ask the dean/director to adjust his or her salary weights for the year following the year under review. In considering such requests, the dean/director will consult with the faculty member's TIU head and must consider the needs of the Ohio State Newark and adhere to the following principles:

1. The principal objectives of the Ohio State University remunerative model are to attract, reward and retain excellent faculty.
2. The provost provides baseline compensation rates and guidelines. The dean/director will provide incentives and constructive feedback to encourage proficiency in all three areas. In the case of counter offers, resolutions adhere to OAA guidelines, Volume 1, Chapter 4, Section 8.0-8.3.
3. Faculty with similar charges and rank should receive comparable salaries, but compensation should vary with the credentials and performance of the individuals. That is, both equity and merit should be considered, with compensation geared to limiting the degree of both salary compression and salary disparity among the various ranks.
4. Any distribution of salary increases must occur in a way that allows the maximum number of faculty to receive appropriate compensation, and adjustments are made in accordance with section 5.3.
5. Compensation guidelines for Ohio State Newark should be consistent with objectives of the university. Central administration has maintained that salary increases based on dollars rather than percentages provide for "flexibility in addressing market considerations and equity." The

administration has also pointed out, however, that the method by which units reduce the growth of salary disparity may be to implement dollar-increment raises or “to write guidelines which slow the growth of salaries for those above market, and increase the growth of salaries for those below market, with performance being equal.” These objectives are applied to regular salary increases as well as to extraordinary compensation, such as one-time equity pay and counter-offers.

6. With the goal of attaining salary parity, Ohio State Newark works to diminish and inhibit compensatory inequities between faculty who are similar in terms of rank, experience, and performance.
7. To facilitate awareness of the correspondence between the evaluative and the compensatory processes, the dean/director will provide each faculty member’s ratings in research, teaching, and service in the annual salary-adjustment letter.

5.2 Criteria

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, the campus directs all funds for annual salary increases toward rewarding meritorious performance and, to the extent that financial constraints allow, toward addressing market and internal inequities.

Occasionally, the campus may make one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/rewards may be administered throughout the year.

In accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions, the dean/director assesses meritorious performance in teaching and service; the dean/director assesses performance in research in consultation with the TIU head. In rating a faculty member’s performance in each area, the dean/director will give greatest priority to performance during the previous year. Because teaching, service, or research activities sometimes profoundly affect each other, the dean/director may also consider performance over the past several years or over the entire record.

To be eligible for market adjustments, faculty must have established a record of meeting or exceeding expectations in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service (e.g., 2.0 or higher).

The dean/director works with TIU heads to develop a salary target that matches each faculty member’s market value. If an equity pool is available, the dean/director will note the target salary in his or her annual salary letter if the faculty member is eligible for an equity raise and is below market.

The dean/director provides equity adjustments to fully close substantial market gaps (typically greater than 5%) before addressing smaller gaps (typically less than 5%).

While major market adjustments would typically come from funds other than the Ohio State Newark merit salary pool, a maximum of 20% of the merit salary pool may be used by the dean/director for equity raises. Any funds beyond the merit salary pool that the dean/director receives authorization to distribute may be allocated using either equity considerations or the salary formula.

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

5.3 Procedures

The dean/director formulates salary increases for meritorious annual performance by rating each faculty member’s performance in teaching and service; the dean/director formulates salary increases for meritorious annual research performance by rating each faculty member in consultation with the TIU head. The scale below is applied in each area.

- 0 Well below expectations
- 1 Somewhat below expectations
- 2 Meets expectations
- 3 Somewhat above expectations
- 4 Well above expectations

The dean/director will use the following method to balance the interests of performance, equity, market considerations, and an appropriate salary differential among ranks.

Faculty with salaries both below the campus average and at or below market and faculty with salaries both at or above the campus average and above market will receive salary adjustments on a dollar basis using the following formula:

$$\text{adjustment} = (\text{composite rating ratio}) \left(\frac{\text{salary pool}}{\text{number of eligible faculty members}} \right) (\text{balance factor})$$

In the above formula, “salary pool” is operationalized by multiplying the annual percentage increase approved by the Provost by the sum of all 9-month tenure-track faculty salaries, where “number of eligible faculty members” is defined as the total number of 9-month tenure-track faculty

members. The term “(salary pool/number eligible of faculty)” equals the average dollar raise. So that 45% of the merit salary adjustment is based on the teaching rating, 40% on the research rating and 15% on the service rating, the composite rating ratio is calculated as follows:

$$\text{composite rating ratio} = 0.45 \left(\frac{\text{teaching rating}}{\text{average teaching rating}} \right) + 0.40 \left(\frac{\text{research rating}}{\text{average research rating}} \right) + 0.15 \left(\frac{\text{service rating}}{\text{average service rating}} \right)$$

The composite rating ratio is one for a faculty member who is average in all three areas. For faculty with weights other than 45%/40%/15%, the composite rating ratio is calculated using appropriate weights in the above formula.

Faculty with salaries both at or above the campus average and at or below market and faculty with salaries both below the campus average and above market will receive salary adjustments on a percent basis using the following formula:

$$\text{adjustment} = (\text{composite rating ratio}) \left(\frac{\text{salary pool}}{\text{sum of all salaries}} \right) (\text{member's salary}) (\text{balance factor})$$

The term “(salary pool/sum of all salaries)” equals the average percent raise. The “balance factor,” which is the same in both formulas, is a number typically slightly less than one that is chosen so that the sum of all raises equals the salary pool. The balance factor is calculated from the formula:

$$\text{balance factor} = \frac{\text{salary pool}}{\text{sum of salary adjustments calculated with balance factor of one}}$$

Salary increases related to retention offers, counteroffers, or major market adjustments must come from a pool other than the pool for annual salary adjustments. The dean/director follows guidelines from the Office of Academic Affairs in requesting approval for such increases. Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the dean/director should utilize the OAA process of appeals, Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 2.0-3.0.

5.4 Documentation

In addition to updating Research in View, faculty members must submit directly to the dean/director copies of pedagogical papers, books or other teaching-related or service-related materials published or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions

needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review. In cases where there is evidence that a faculty member is not meeting teaching expectations (e.g., low eSEI's, poor discursive evaluations, and/or poor peer evaluations), the dean/director may also review the faculty member's grade distributions and drop rates to assess teaching performance.

Faculty members must also check with their TIU to determine what documents to submit in addition to those found in Research in View.

6 Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion

6.1 Criteria

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure-and-promotion reviews:

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

6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

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

The award of tenure is a commitment to offer lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute

to the campus's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the University. Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the campus's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be teaching a specific set of courses, then excellence in that area of teaching is required. Mediocre performance in that area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another area or in other areas that occupy a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Graduate teaching in Columbus constitutes contributions to the faculty member's TIU. Because such courses do not constitute contributions to teaching at Ohio State Newark, the dean/director and the Newark P&T Committee will not evaluate them.

Excellence in teaching, research, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching 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.

6.1.2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

For promotion to professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these responsibilities required. The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to

professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation that the faculty member has sustained productivity in all job responsibilities for a substantial period of time since receiving an appointment at the rank of associate professor.

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.

6.1.3 Teaching

Faculty at Ohio State Newark must consistently provide excellent teaching. In delivering lectures and course materials, faculty must demonstrate a command of substantive knowledge and be organized and logical. They must also contribute to curricula development as needed, continually pursue the most effective methods of instruction, and incorporate new materials and ideas consistent with developments in their fields.

In evaluating performance in teaching, documented evidence regarding course and instructor evaluation will be considered. In this regard, student opinions and judgments, appropriately documented and accompanied by interpretive information, are essential. Every student in every classroom course must be provided an opportunity to complete a confidential evaluation of the instruction and the instructor. Beginning autumn 2009, the standard instrument for all courses at Ohio State Newark is the university's eSEI. During the transition period from SEIs to eSEIs, the dean/director will consider the fact that means, standard deviations, and response rates may change. The dean/director will consider discursive comments from the eSEIs if they are collected. For courses delivered via distance-education technology, the dean/director may permit exceptions to the standard form.

Specific criteria that must be documented include the following:

- A clear and complete syllabus incorporating sound, current subject knowledge and establishing explicit outcomes for student learning, for each course taught
- A clear statement of philosophy regarding teaching and learning that indicates a commitment to delivering instruction sensitive to the situations of Newark campus students
- A statement regarding teaching strategies and goals that demonstrates commitment to the following:

- Use of techniques and approaches for learning, teaching and assessment that are appropriate for the mission of the university
- Creativity and innovation in the design and planning of learning activities
- Evaluation of innovative approaches to learning and teaching and adoption of those of value
- Use of formative feedback to nurture learning in all students
- Promotion of high standards of achievement
- Recognition of student diversity and development strategies to work effectively with students with diverse characteristics
- Ability to relate to students at different levels
- A self-assessment of student evaluations and peer evaluations
- A description of steps taken to improve teaching
- SEI ratings that in most cases fall close to the mean for the campus or the faculty member's college or TIU, and that demonstrate excellence in the following:
 - Communication of subject matter
 - Interest in helping students
 - Intellectual stimulation of students
 - Fostering independent thinking
 - Approachability
 - Organization
 - Preparation
- Peer evaluations showing evidence of excellent teaching
- Supplemental student evaluations (if used) showing consistent evidence of a high degree of student satisfaction with instruction
- Self-evaluations of one's performance against stated outcomes
- Evidence of student learning
- Use of student performance data as a guide for decision making

Teaching activities that go beyond instruction may constitute evidence of exceeding campus teaching standards only if a faculty member consistently attains excellence in delivering instruction at the campus. Such activities include but are not limited to advising and mentoring graduate students; producing textbooks, chapters in books used as texts or readers, literature reviews, position papers, or other publications designed primarily for classroom and other instructional settings; generating external funding and/or other resources for instruction, course creation or development, or learning opportunities for students; developing instructional materials, courses, and curricula for use in university and non-university settings; and recognition or awards for distinguished teaching.

The dean/director or TIU head will arrange for peer evaluations of classroom teaching, which may include review of syllabi, exams, instructional materials, text books, contributions to curriculum, and classroom observation. The designated peer evaluator(s) will submit to the TIU head or dean/director a signed report of evaluation(s) and also provide a copy to the candidate.

6.1.4 Service

University rules require faculty members to demonstrate leadership and effective contributions in their service activities. During a faculty member's probationary period, his or her annual service record should show increasing evidence of leadership and effective contributions to the campus. Examples of evidence of leadership include responsible service as a committee or subcommittee chair, organization of special events or groups, and creation of student groups. If a faculty member is engaged in an appropriate amount of service to the campus or university, then service to the discipline and outreach to the community are also recognized.

Regular attendance at Faculty Assembly meetings is expected of all faculty members. All faculty members who are eligible to serve on the campus's P&T Committee are expected to attend all P&T Committee meetings. Attending to university business (e.g., teaching a course, attending a conference) are legitimate excuses for missing a Faculty Assembly meeting, but faculty missing a meeting must inform the dean/director's office of their excuse.

6.1.5 Scholarship

Evaluation of scholarship is the responsibility of the TIU. The dean/director and the campus's P&T Committee do not evaluate scholarship for fourth-year reviews or for reviews for promotion and tenure.

6.2 Procedures

This section describes only the process of review by The Ohio State University Newark P&T Committee and is written to supplement the official university guidelines on promotion and tenure. In the event of conflict, university guidelines and procedures have precedence.

6.2.1 The Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee at Ohio State Newark consists of all tenured associate professors and tenured professors with

primary assignments at Ohio State Newark. The dean/director and associate deans shall not be active members of the campus's P&T Committee.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have a chair and a vice chair, both of whom are professors.

The chair and vice chair shall be determined from the Committee-Chair Roster, an ordered list of professors: The chair is the professor at the top of the roster, and the vice chair is next. After serving as chair for one year, on April 1 the chair's name is moved to the bottom of the roster, the vice chair becomes chair and the professor next on the roster becomes vice chair. Newly appointed professors go to the bottom of the roster, and those with the same date of appointment are listed alphabetically.

The chair must maintain the Committee-Chair Roster, which includes the names of all professors, the most recent dates of service as chair and the projected dates of service for each professor's next term.

Each summer the dean/director provides a Tenure-Track Faculty Roster that includes the names of all tenure-track faculty, the year of appointment, the number of years, if any, to be excluded from the tenure clock, expected year or actual year of fourth-year review, expected year of tenure review and the college in which each faculty member is appointed.

If the chair is unable to perform his or her duties for four months or less, the vice chair becomes Acting Chair and the next professor on the Committee-Chair Roster becomes Acting Vice Chair until the chair is able to resume his or her duties. If the chair is unable to perform his or her duties for more than four months, the vice chair will become chair and the professor next on the roster becomes vice chair. The chair who is unable to perform his or her duties for more than four months is placed second from the top of the roster, below the current chair and above the vice chair. On April 1, the chair's name is moved the bottom of the roster, the person who was unable to serve as chair the previous year becomes chair and the person who was vice chair continues to serve as vice chair for a second year.

At the end of the term, the chair shall submit to the dean/director and all members of the Ohio State Newark P&T committee a report detailing the activities of the chair's term. On or before April 1, the chair must give the following rosters to all members of the Ohio State Newark P&T committee:

- Roster 1: Associate Professor and Professor Deliberating Committee
- Roster 2: Professor Deliberating Committee
- Committee-Chair Roster
- Tenure-Track Faculty Roster

On or before April 1, the chair must give the Committee-Chair Roster to the dean/director, who will archive the roster and notify the new chair of any changes resulting from the hiring or departure of Ohio State Newark faculty.

6.2.2 Responsibilities of the Ohio State Newark Promotion and Tenure Committee

Under auspices of its chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have the following responsibilities in regard to the P&T process:

- To maintain up-to-date information on the Ohio State Newark Promotion and Tenure Committee's role in the P&T process and to have that information available to P&T candidates and other people involved in the process
- To act as the contact point for individual faculty members and administrative officers in initiating P&T reviews
- To maintain accurate, up-to-date rosters for use in forming subcommittees to consider individual cases of promotion and tenure
- To appoint subcommittees and charge them with their duties
- To schedule meetings for the Deliberating Committees to hear reports of subcommittees, to vote and to review letters of recommendation for individual P&T cases
- To assure that letters of review are completed, signed and forwarded to the appropriate official(s). The P&T chair must maintain a copy of the letter until the review has been completed within the university; the Deliberating Committee copy is then destroyed
- To continually review the P&T process, generally supervise it, resolve contentious matters and make recommendations for change

6.2.3 Responsibilities of the Candidate

The candidate uploads the core dossier to the campus portal. The administration makes the core dossier available to the members of the Deliberating Committee. Additional materials for the review process are outlined in Section 6.3.

The candidate is expected to cooperate with the subcommittee undertaking the review, to provide materials and information when requested to do so and to meet with the Subcommittee to discuss the case in general. The candidate shall be given full opportunity to make his or her case for promotion, tenure or both and to explain any matters that he or she feels appropriate.

A faculty member must consult with his or her TIU to determine the TIU's procedures for fourth-year reviews and reviews for promotion and tenure.

6.2.4 The Subcommittee

Subcommittees are appointed by the P&T chair on notification by an appropriate academic officer, usually the dean/director.

Subcommittees shall ordinarily consist of three tenured faculty drawn from the appropriate roster described below. Subcommittees shall be appointed in order by date of official notification to the P&T chair that a subcommittee is to be formed. Candidates with the same date of notification will be arranged in chronological order beginning with the candidate whose letter is due first. Candidates with letters due on the same date will be arranged in alphabetical order.

To appoint a subcommittee, names are selected from the roster of the appropriate Deliberating Committee. The membership of each Deliberating Committee shall be ordered using length of time since last service, with faculty who have served most recently rotated to the bottom, and alphabetically for those with equal time since last service. New members to the Deliberating Committee are added at the bottom of the roster. Prior to appointing a subcommittee, the P&T chair will put the appropriate roster into current order. The faculty member highest on the roster, who is in the same college (or, in the case of the ASC, the same division) as the candidate will be moved to the top of the roster. The three faculty at the top of the roster will then constitute the subcommittee with one possible exception: any faculty to be on official leave during the tenure of the subcommittee are excused. Ordinarily, official leave is the only recognized excuse for release from subcommittee service.

The chair of the Ohio State Newark P&T committee will not serve on a subcommittee unless her/his failure to serve would require bringing in a full professor from a different campus. The names of faculty excused will move up each roster just as all other names do. If a subcommittee is appointed and the review is not conducted, the

names of the subcommittee members will be returned to the top of the roster in alphabetical order. If fewer than three names are available from the roster, then additions will be made as described below.

Two rosters are maintained, consisting of the following:

- **Roster 1:** The Associate Professor and Professor Deliberating Committee for all tenure reviews and for promotion to any rank other than professor. All tenured faculty at the ranks of associate professor and professor are listed. The roster must include the names of all tenured associate professors and professors, the faculty member's college, rank, date of promotion to current rank and date of most recent service on a subcommittee as a member of Roster 1.
- **Roster 2:** The Professor Deliberating Committee for promotion to professor. All tenured faculty at the rank of professor are listed. The roster must include the names of all tenured professors, the faculty member's college, date of promotion to professor and date of most recent service on a subcommittee as a member of Roster 2.

If there are fewer than three faculty available in the appropriate Deliberating Committee, appropriately qualified faculty will be selected from other regional campuses or from the Columbus campus. The outside subcommittee candidate(s) will be selected by the P&T chair in consultation with the dean/director and, perhaps, the chair of the candidate's TIU. Outside faculty selected to serve on a subcommittee may participate in the entire tenure and promotion process at Ohio State Newark as if their primary assignment were there.

The chair of the subcommittee is the senior faculty member on the subcommittee, determined first by rank and then by date of appointment to present rank. The chair of the subcommittee is responsible for calling meetings of the subcommittee and making sure that the work of the subcommittee is completed on time. The chair of the subcommittee acts as a point of contact on all subcommittee matters.

The subcommittee is charged with the following tasks:

- contacting the candidate and receiving appropriate information regarding the P&T case
- meeting with the candidate to review the case itself

- meeting with the dean/director to discuss the candidate's qualifications
- undertaking any other investigations the subcommittee believes important in making a recommendation
- arriving at a recommendation for the assembled Deliberating Committee when it considers the case
- leading the discussion of the case at the meetings of the Deliberating Committee
- writing the letter of recommendation on behalf of the Deliberating Committee

6.2.5 The Deliberating Committee

The Deliberating Committee for the case under review will be defined to be those members comprising the appropriate roster for the case as previously discussed.

A P&T Committee Editor will be appointed by the chair of the P&T Committee to edit grammar and punctuation in P&T letters. The editor has the option of declining to serve on subcommittees, but his or her name will move up the roster(s) as subcommittees are appointed and will then remain at the top if he or she declines to serve.

Each P&T case will typically be heard at one meeting that must be attended by a quorum consisting of at least two-thirds of the Deliberating Committee. (A faculty member who is officially on leave may participate fully in the promotion and tenure process, but, for purposes of determining how many faculty constitute a quorum, the faculty member will not be counted unless he or she is attending the meeting.) At least six weeks prior to the beginning of the academic year, in so far as possible, the chair of the P&T Committee will announce the dates of all P&T meetings to be held during the academic year.

At the meeting, each subcommittee will distribute to every faculty member a hard copy of the draft of the letter in which the subcommittee presents its findings and recommendations regarding the case. A copy of the draft letter will be displayed on a screen, and, as the letter is read paragraph by paragraph, members of the Deliberating Committee will discuss its contents, raise questions and make general suggestions for modifying the letter.

Each faculty member is also encouraged to make written suggestions on his or her hard copy of the draft letter. A discussion will follow the

reading of the draft letter. At the end of each subcommittee's presentation, all hard copies will be collected and used by the subcommittee in revising the first draft. Each subcommittee's presentation should last about 30 minutes.

Voting will take place by secret unmarked sealed ballots that will be distributed at the meeting. Faculty members who are not present cannot vote *in absentia* unless they participate by conference call or video link. All ballots must be returned to the subcommittee chair by noon the day following the meeting. The chair of the Subcommittee and the P&T chair (vice chair if the chair also is chairing the subcommittee) shall jointly open the ballots and tally the votes. Sixty percent or more of all votes cast is required for a positive recommendation.

The subcommittee will meet and revise the letter using comments and suggestions from the meeting. The vote must be included in the letter. At the discretion of the P&T chair, the letter will then be given to the P&T editor, who will edit the grammar and punctuation without materially changing the intent of the letter. A copy of the edited letter shall be distributed to subcommittee members for review.

If the vote is not consistent with the original recommendation of the subcommittee, or if the chair of the P&T Committee and chair of the subcommittee agree that the entire Deliberating Committee should be consulted before the letter is sent, a second meeting will be called. At least two days' notice must be given, and a quorum is not required.

Any faculty member who is not able to attend a P&T meeting must notify the chair at least two days prior to the meeting and provide a reason for not attending. Typically the only excuse for not attending a meeting is illness or scheduled class. A member so excluded from deliberations is not counted as part of the quorum.

For a meeting scheduled more than six weeks in advance, conflict with other university meetings, a doctor's appointment, etc. are not acceptable excuses. For each meeting, the chair of the P&T Committee will take attendance, listing each member as present (P), notification received that faculty member will not attend (NA), on leave (L) or unexcused (U). Each faculty member recorded as "not attending (NA)" will have his or her excuse listed for the meeting. Except in the case of an unforeseen emergency or sudden illness, faculty will not be listed as "not attending (NA)" after the fact. The chair of the P&T Committee will provide P&T attendance records annually to the dean/director prior to the date when annual reviews are due, thus assisting the dean/director in evaluating the service record of faculty

on the Deliberating Committee. If a quorum is not achieved for a P&T meeting, within one day the chair of the P&T Committee will send an e-mail to all tenured faculty, all tenure-track faculty and the dean/director stating that a quorum was not achieved and listing the attendance status for each tenured faculty member and all reasons for nonattendance.

6.2.6 Structure of the Letter

The letter shall include an opening paragraph with the vote followed by a thorough discussion of the candidate's teaching and service record as well as a summary paragraph that includes a recommendation.

Opening Paragraphs

September 30, 2006

Dr. William MacDonald
Dean and Director
The Ohio State University Newark
1179 University Drive
Newark, OH 43055-1797

Dear Dean MacDonald,

(Fourth-Year)

The Deliberating Committee of The Ohio State University at Newark, consisting of all tenured associate professors and professors, has reviewed the work and progress of Dr. (candidate's name), Assistant Professor of (candidate's department). A report was prepared by a subcommittee that carefully reviewed the pertinent material. By a vote of (number) in favor and (number) opposed, the Deliberating Committee finds that Dr. (candidate's name) (very strong) record of teaching and service warrants renewal of his/her contract for another probationary year.

(Tenure and Promotion)

The Deliberating Committee of The Ohio State University at Newark, consisting of all tenured associate professors and professors, has reviewed the work and progress of Dr. (candidate's name), Assistant Professor of (candidate's department). A report was prepared by a subcommittee that carefully reviewed the pertinent material. By a vote of (number) in favor and (number) opposed, the Deliberating Committee (strongly) recommends that Dr. (candidate's name) be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure.

(Promotion to Professor)

The Deliberating Committee of the Ohio State University at Newark, consisting of all professors, has reviewed the work and progress of (name), Associate Professor of (department). A report was prepared by a Subcommittee that carefully reviewed the pertinent materials. By a vote of (number) in favor and (number) opposed, the Deliberating Committee (very strongly, enthusiastically) recommends that (name) be promoted to the rank of Professor.

Sample Teaching Paragraphs

(Courses Taught)

Dr. (candidate's name) has taught (number) separate preparations of undergraduate, graduate and professional courses.

(Methods for Evaluation of Teaching)

The evaluations of these teaching efforts and activities consist of SEI summaries, independently-summarized, open-ended student comments, and peer reviews.

(SEIs)

Student evaluations consistently rank above College, University and Unit means on core items. His/Her Overall Rating scores range from (number) to (number) with a mean of (number).

(Numerical Summary)

Overall Rating scores were above the College mean in all but one case where (name)'s (number) tied the College mean. They were above the University mean in every case, and above the Unit mean in all but one case where the (number) was only 0.1 below the Unit mean.

(Best and Worst Areas)

The higher-item summaries tend to be related to his/her interest in teaching, encouragement of independent thinking, and desire to help students; however, there are a number of item summaries below (number). These refer primarily to students' perceptions of (name) as being "intellectually stimulating" and "learning greatly" from his/her instruction.

(Are There Trends?)

As his/her teaching developed, (name)'s academic-year averages on the Overall Rating improved from (number) in 2004-2005 to (number) and (number) in 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 respectively.

(Independently-Summarized, Open-Ended Student Comments)

The summarized discursive evaluations support (or mitigate?) the SEIs for (class/es). Representative student comments included (quotations).

(Peer Reviews)

His/Her dossier includes (number) reviews from colleagues in the Department of (name of department) who visited some of his/her classes. All (number) of the reviews are positive. According to one, (name) developed "a sense of community in his/her classroom," connected theory and practice in his/her teaching, and revealed himself /herself to be "an effective instructor with a deep knowledge of his/her materials and ways to foster student learning." The reviewer wrote, "It was a pleasure to be in his/her class." The most recent reviewers concluded that they "observed a well-conducted class session that was part of a well-designed course that had been implemented in an outstanding manner." Another wrote, "Students related very positively to him/her." The final reviewer wrote, "I found spending an hour in his/her class allowed me to see the range of instructional strategies he/she employs." However, it should be noted that this reviewer also suggested replacing outdated course materials with more current ones and enhancing information on specific topics that was deemed "insufficient."

(Activities to Enhance Teaching)

(Name) has worked with OSU's University Center for the Advancement of Teaching to help improve his/her teaching by designing more authentic learning experiences for his/her students. He/she has indicated that he/she plans to continue working with this office. With such efforts, (name) has the potential to become a much more effective teacher.

(Teaching Awards)

List and discuss significance of teaching awards.

Sample Service Paragraphs

Dr. (name) has documented an exceptional level of service to the campus, his/her department, the University, and his/her profession.

(Service to Campus)

In terms of his/her service to the campus and students, he/she has served as chair of the (name) Committee, has been an active member on the (names of committees) and has served on (number) search committees.

(List of Accomplishments)

He/She organized a day-long orientation for new faculty in (year), administered the annual Faculty Well-Being Survey and arranged a presentation to Ohio State Newark Faculty by (name and/or title of presenter).

(Service to Department)

In service to his/her department and the University, he/she was a member of the Denman Judging Committee (date) and has served on the (name of committee).

(List of Accomplishments)

(Service to the University)

(List of Accomplishments)

(Service to Profession)

In service to his/her profession, (name) is co-editor of (name of journal) (term of service), an Editorial Board Member for (name of journal) and (name of journal) and has served as a manuscript reviewer for three journals (name of journals).

(List of Accomplishments)

(Service to the Community)

(List of Accomplishments)

(Service Awards)

List and discuss significance of service awards.

Sample Summary Paragraphs

(Fourth-year Review)

This significant record of service and teaching persuades us that (name) is an asset to The Ohio State University, a talented and dedicated professor who has made excellent progress toward achieving the benchmarks needed for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Based on the evaluation of his/her teaching and service, the Deliberating Committee (very strongly) supports renewing his/her contract for another probationary year.

On behalf of the Ohio State Newark Promotion and Tenure Committee,

(Name of Chair)

Professor of (Department)
Chair, Ohio State Newark P&T Committee

(Promotion and Tenure)
In summary, (name's) service contributions to Ohio State Newark are outstanding, and he/she is a very good teacher who is continuing to improve. We are pleased to (unanimously and enthusiastically) support (name) for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

On behalf of the Ohio State Newark Promotion and Tenure Committee,

(Name of Chair)
Professor of (Department)
Chair, Ohio State Newark P&T Committee

(Promotion to Professor)

In summary, (name) is an outstanding teacher with an excellent record of service to Ohio State Newark, to his/her department, to the university and to his/her profession. The Deliberating Committee (unanimously, very strongly, enthusiastically) supports (name) for promotion to professor.

On behalf of the Deliberating Committee,

(Name of Chair)
Professor of (Department)
Chair, Ohio State Newark P&T Committee

6.3 Documentation

As noted above under Responsibilities of the Candidate, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the P&T subcommittee 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 candidate must also submit separate documentation to his or her TIU according to the guidelines in the TIU's appointments, promotion, and tenure document.

The campus review typically excludes the evaluation of research otherwise evaluated by the TIU. Thus, in most situations, the candidate does not submit research publications for review by the Ohio State Newark P&T Committee. However, pedagogical research related to one's teaching at the college level may constitute a teaching contribution. The P&T Committee will consider

publications from such research as part of its evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

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

6.3.1 Teaching

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

- Cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class
- Summaries of any evaluative student discursive feedback that was solicited according to the campus's protocol for gathering such feedback for performance reviews
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the campus's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix)
- Copies of published textbooks, readers, pedagogical articles or books, or other materials
- Material accepted for publication but not yet published. (Such material must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.)
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

6.3.2 Service

For the time period since the last promotion:

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

APPENDIX: PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the electronic Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) form is required in every course offered on this campus. The candidate should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation. ESEI results completed by fewer than five students will not be processed. The use of electronic SEIs has created the potential for anomalous results for an individual instructor and for an overall mean. The P&T subcommittee and dean/director will consider this potential in evaluating teaching. Student evaluation of teaching using discursive comments will be considered if they are submitted either by eSEIs, departmental instruments, or the discursive options available through the Ohio State Newark Student Discursive Feedback Instrument at <http://www.newark.osu.edu/facultystaff/facultyhandbook/Pages/SDFSurvey.aspx>

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The dean/director oversees the campus's peer evaluation of teaching process. Reviews conducted upon the request of the dean/director or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the dean/director, the TIU, or faculty member.

Peer teaching evaluation is comprehensive and may include classroom visits and review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, SEIs, summaries of student discursive forms, or exams. Classroom visit protocol includes completing a form approved by the dean/director and/or submitting a narrative evaluation in the form of a letter or memo to the dean/director. The instructor receives a copy of the evaluation from the evaluator. Classroom visits may be unannounced.

Peer reviews focus particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (e.g., a survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge.

Faculty members must receive evaluations from other faculty members at Ohio State Newark. For assistant professors, during their probationary period, the Newark campus provides at least three peer evaluations, two of which must occur before the fourth-year review. For associate professors, the campus conducts peer evaluations at least twice every seven years. For full professors, the campus conducts peer evaluations at least twice every ten years. Assistant professors receive evaluations from associate or full professors. Associate and full professors receive evaluations from full professors. When no full professors are available to evaluate an associate professor, another associate professor is appointed as the evaluator.

Faculty may receive more reviews if required by the TIU, and the TIU is responsible for arranging any reviews that it requires beyond those conducted by the Newark campus.