

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EVOLUTION, ECOLOGY AND ORGANISMAL BIOLOGY

I	Preamble	1
II	Department Mission.....	1
III	Definitions	2
	A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	2
	1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty	2
	2 Regular Research Track Faculty	2
	3 Conflict of Interest	3
	4 Minimum Composition.....	3
	B Quorum	3
	C Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	3
	1 Appointment	3
	2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal.....	3
IV	Appointments.....	4
	A Criteria	4
	1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty	4
	2 Regular Tenure Track—Regional Campus.....	4
	3 Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments.....	5
	4 Regular Research Track Faculty	5
	5 Auxiliary Faculty	6
	6 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	6
	B Procedures.....	6
	1 Tenure Track Faculty	6
	2 Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus	8
	3 Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments.....	8
	4 Regular Research Track Faculty	9
	5 Transfer of Track	9
	6 Auxiliary Faculty	9
	7 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	10
	8 Emeritus Appointments for Regular Faculty	10
V	Annual Reviews—Procedures	10

A	Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	10
1	Probationary Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus.....	11
2	Probationary Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments .	11
3	Fourth-Year Review.....	11
4	Exclusion of Time From the Probationary Period	12
B	Tenured Faculty	12
1	Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus.....	12
2	Tenured Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments	12
C	Regular Research Track Faculty	12
VI	Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	13
A	Criteria	13
B	Procedures.....	13
C	Documentation	14
D	Regional Campus Faculty	14
E	Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments	14
VII	Promotional and Tenure and Promotional Reviews.....	14
A	Criteria	14
1	Promotion to Associate Professor With Tenure.....	15
2	Promotion to Professor	17
3	Regional Campus Faculty	17
4	Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments	18
5	Regular Research Track Faculty	18
6	Auxiliary Faculty	18
B	Procedures.....	18
1	Candidate Responsibilities.....	19
2	Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	20
3	Department Chair Responsibilities	21
4	Procedures For Regional Campus Faculty.....	23
5	Procedures For Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments	23
6	External Evaluations	23
C	Documentation.....	24
VIII	Appeals	24
IX	Seventh-Year Reviews.....	24
X	Appendix 1.EEOB Peer Evaluation of Teaching: Policy and Procedures.....	26-30

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Tenure track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure), <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>; the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Book 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>; and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01, <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, and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

The policies and guidelines in this document were approved by the Faculty of the Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology on 27 October 2010, and by the Office of Academic Affairs on 29 August 2011.

II Department Mission

The mission of the Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology is to provide high quality, comprehensive programs in undergraduate and graduate instruction, to generate and disseminate knowledge gained through original research, and to provide service to the University and professional and public sectors. As a department within the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department contributes to the mission of the College in the areas of teaching, research and service in Evolutionary Biology, Organismal Biology, and Ecology.

In keeping with the University's mission, the department is committed to the goal of promoting diversity. As necessary components of this mission, the Department is committed to continuous improvement through regular scrutiny of the undergraduate and graduate curricula; the hiring of tenure-track faculty and other personnel who enhance or have the strong potential to enhance the Department's quality in the areas of teaching, research, and service; the recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce and student body; the creation of a welcoming climate in regard to diversity; and the development and maintenance of a physical and intellectual environment that fosters those activities.

Formal classroom courses and original research cover a broad spectrum of topics. The Department is particularly focused on understanding basic processes that affect the evolution, physiology, behavior, and population biology of organisms, as well as species interactions and ecosystem function. The faculty, staff, and students study fundamental concepts and theory at levels of organization ranging from molecular to global.

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty

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

The eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of regular tenure track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

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

2 Regular Research Track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of regular research track faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in the department, and all regular research track faculty whose primary appointment is in the department.

The eligible faculty for reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of regular research track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department, and all nonprobationary research track faculty whose primary appointment is in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

3 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 (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.

4 Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

B Quorum

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

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

C Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1 Appointment

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

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

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

IV Appointments

A Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. 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 the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty

Assistant Professor. The minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a relevant area of the biological sciences or related discipline, teaching or equivalent experience, evidence of having brought research through to completion as publications in peer reviewed outlets, and the potential to obtain extramural funding in support of a productive research program. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department'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 four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank or tenure, if appropriate, but the university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

2 Regular Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality. Nevertheless, faculty also are expected to conduct an active research program.

3 Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

The criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty holding less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB are the same as those for other regular tenure track faculty.

4 Regular Research Track Faculty

Appointment of regular research track faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to regular research track faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. For contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

5 Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary appointments are made for no more than one year at a time.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are never compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty. In the event that the department wishes to compensate an adjunct faculty member for work other than the voluntary service for which the adjunct title is provided, a concurrent appointment of limited duration (lecturer, workshop leader) may be added for that purpose.

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

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

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

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 a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non regular faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular 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.

6 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

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

B Procedures

See the Policy on Faculty Appointments,
<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>

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 requested 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](http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf),
<http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and setup funds.

Discussions concerning the nature of new positions in the Department will include all interested parties from among the regular, auxiliary, and courtesy faculty, the College

administration, members of the Graduate Faculty, the Department staff, and the Graduate Students in Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology (GEES). However, only members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the appointed representative of GEES will vote on decisions regarding the filling of new positions. The Chair of the Department will appoint a search committee whose charge is to identify candidates for the new position. The committee's makeup is described in detail in Section VII D.1 of the Departmental Pattern of Administration.

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (<http://www.hr.osu.edu/>) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, or salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated print journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being). All members of the Department's regular faculty will have the opportunity to review all of the candidates' files. Graduate students may view the candidates' files, but not the letters of recommendation because of confidentiality concerns.

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the GEES representative meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, to vote on the acceptability of each candidate, and to rank those candidates judged acceptable. Attendance at meetings and voting via video conference link is permitted. The position will be offered to the candidates in the order indicated by the ranking of acceptable candidates and approval by the Dean.

If the offer involves senior rank, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit requested by the candidate, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty vote on the appropriateness of such credit. In both instances, a majority of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty must vote yes or no, and of those votes a majority must be positive for the senior rank or prior service credit to be approved.

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The department will therefore be vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

2 Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. The committee will arrange for visits to the department, organize a research seminar to be given to the Department, arrange personal interviews as appropriate with faculty colleagues and administrators, and make a recommendation to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. At the end of the evaluation process, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will vote to establish suitability of candidates and then to rank those judged to be suitable. The outcome of this voting will constitute a recommendation to the Department Chair and the Regional Campus Dean/Director. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

3 Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

In the case of a tenure track position with less than a 100% FTE appointment in EEOB some of the appointment procedures vary from those for other tenure track positions. The search committee will be made up of members of both EEOB and the joint hiring unit, the position description must be approved by both EEOB and the joint hiring unit, and both units must approve the candidates to be interviewed and any to be offered the position. The details of the appointment, including identification of the tenure initiating unit, the allocation of resources to salary and setup costs, the recovery of indirect costs and student enrollment credit hours generated by the faculty member, provision of space and administrative support, faculty rights and responsibilities, evaluation, and problem resolution will be spelled out in a memorandum of understanding to be approved and signed by both hiring units. Joint appointments require close coordination with the college(s) involved, as well as final approval by the Office of Academic Affairs.

4 Regular Research Track Faculty

Searches for regular research track faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure track faculty, with the exception that exceptions to a national search only requires approval by the college dean.

5 Transfer of Track

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

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. Transfers from the regular research track to the tenure track are not permitted. Regular research track faculty members may apply for tenure track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

6 Auxiliary Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated auxiliary faculty or uncompensated visiting faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with the department Advisory Committee.

Auxiliary appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All auxiliary appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a term by term basis.

Auxiliary faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for regular faculty (see Appointment Criteria above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is

negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a regular faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments annually to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

8 Emeritus Appointments for Regular Faculty

Retiring faculty initiate emeritus appointment requests using the Request for Emeritus Status Form (Form 207), found at: http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/Form207_001.pdf. Approval by the Chair requires a majority vote of approval by the eligible regular faculty. The request is then forwarded to the Dean and then to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The request for emeritus status must be received by the BOT prior to the date of retirement if the prerequisites of emeritus status are to become effective by that date.

V Annual Reviews—Procedures

The department 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>

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. The department chair 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) 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 by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (all members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty). On completion of the review, the faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. In order for the vote to be valid, a majority of all faculty members eligible to vote must vote either yes or no. Abstentions are not votes. In order for the recommendation

to be considered positive, a majority of the yes or no votes must be positive. Participation in P&T committee meetings and voting via video link is permitted.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and, as appropriate, future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-604, <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 dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

Annual peer evaluations of teaching will be conducted for all probationary faculty. See Appendix 1 of this document for peer evaluation guidelines.

1 Probationary Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work, but will consider all aspects of his/her record. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

2 Probationary Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Probationary faculty with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB will be evaluated in the same fashion as other probationary faculty, with any exceptions to this rule detailed in the approved memorandum of understanding for their appointment.

3 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are

not requested and a seminar is optional. However, at the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal. The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

4 Exclusion of Time From The 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, www.oaa.osu.edu/handbook/.

B Tenured Faculty

Associate and full professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The review process requires a face-to-face meeting with the department chair. On completion of the review, the department chair prepares a written assessment on the faculty member's performance, progress towards promotion, and future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Annual peer evaluations of teaching will be conducted for all tenured faculty. See Appendix 1 of this document for peer evaluation guidelines.

1 Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus

Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

2 Tenured Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Faculty tenured in EEOB with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB will be evaluated in the same fashion as other tenured faculty except as modified in the approved memorandum of understanding for their appointment.

C Regular Research Track Faculty

The annual review process for regular research track probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty. In the penultimate contract year of a regular research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal

year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html> must be observed. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review follows the review procedures for promotion of regular research track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A Criteria

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past calendar year, but with attention to multi-year patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas may receive minimal or no salary increases. Faculty members contribute to the Department's mission in different ways, and their contributions in each of the areas likely vary over time. The Chair will weigh these factors and determine each faculty member's merit salary increase accordingly.

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

B Procedures

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides a faculty member's research, teaching, and service contributions into five groups based on continuing productivity (greatly exceeds expectations, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations, much below expectations) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

C Documentation

All regular and auxiliary faculty must file an annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR). A copy of this report is maintained in the Department office and a copy is sent to the College office. The FAR is the primary source of information used by the Department Chair for determining merit salary increases. Merit salary increases will be denied to faculty who submit documentation insufficient for the Department Chair to make an informed evaluation of their performance. Thus, careful and accurate documentation of a faculty member's activities in the areas of teaching, research, and service is essential. At this time, the Department does not have a Department-specific, agreed-upon instrument for student assessment of teaching. Until such an instrument is in place, all instructors in formal EEOB or Introductory Biology courses are required to use the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI <http://www.ureg.ohio-state.edu/ourweb/scansurvey/sei/handbookpartialedits.pdf>) instrument each time they teach a course. For 800-level courses where student evaluations are expected to relate more to the latter stages of professional training narrative evaluations may be substituted for the SEI.

D Regional Campus Faculty

Salary decisions for regional campus faculty are made by each regional campus Dean/Director and are paid out of regional campus funds. Regional campus Deans/Directors consult with the Chair regarding salary recommendations for regional campus faculty.

E Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Salary decisions for faculty with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB will be made in the same fashion as other faculty except as modified in the approved memorandum of understanding for their appointment.

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, 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.

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 mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

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

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. 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,

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>

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

Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic,

conviction, and enthusiasm

- demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- treated students with respect and courtesy
- improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs
- served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- engaged in documentable efforts to improve their teaching

Research

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - quality, impact, quantity: probationary faculty on the Columbus campus should show evidence of a sustained publication record that averages 2-3 publications per year over the course of the probationary period in journals that are appropriate to the field as determined by the PTC.
 - unique contribution to a line of inquiry.
 - Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues. Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
 - While collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.

- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Probationary faculty on the Columbus campus are normally expected to secure at least one competitive, peer-reviewed grant prior to their sixth year 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 a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications.
- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- made contributions to the business of the department, college, or the university in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others.
- demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession.

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; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these required responsibilities. The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Outstanding performance in the sum and balance of these three criteria will serve as the basis for the assessment. A record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and international reputation in the field is expected. Evidence of international reputation can be in the form of speaking invitations at prestigious international institutions or meetings, international research collaborations, or outside evaluation by eminent international scholars.

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 Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and a limited amount of graduate instruction, and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will therefore ordinarily be greater. The Department expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high quality scholarship and publication, similar to that of faculty on the Columbus campus. The Department recognizes that the greater teaching and service commitment of regional campus faculty requires a different set of expectations. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets Departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching expectation, and more limited access to research resources.

4 Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Criteria for tenure and/or promotion of faculty members with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB are the same as for other faculty.

5 Regular Research Track Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

6 Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary faculty cannot attain tenure, but they can be promoted in rank. The criteria for the promotion of an auxiliary faculty member are identical to those for a regular faculty member of the same rank.

B Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully

consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html> and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, <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 department.

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.

All probationary faculty in the Department are required to present a departmental seminar prior to their sixth year review. The faculty member should check with the departmental Seminar Committee well in advance to schedule this seminar.

The candidate and the Department Chair prepare separate lists of potential outside evaluators. In addition, the candidate prepares a list of persons who she/he believes should not be contacted for outside evaluations because of conflicts of interest or other adverse conditions. Letters from the candidate's collaborators may be appropriate as a means of determining a candidate's contributions to joint work, but such persons should not be included in these outside evaluator lists. Because a packet must be sent to outside reviewers, the candidate should supply the Chair with copies of her/his CV, selected reprints or preprints, and a 3-5 page narrative describing her/his past, current, and planned research. From the two lists of potential outside evaluators, the Chair will choose 9-12 names with a goal of two-thirds representation from the Chair's list and one-third representation from the candidate's list. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

A timeline of candidate responsibilities is as follows:

- Late winter/early spring; present department seminar.
- Late May/early June: prepare research narrative and list of potential outside evaluators.
- Late September: complete dossier and submit to PTC.
- The timeline for the 4th year review may vary from the above. The candidate should check regularly with the PTC.

Sources of Help and Information During the Tenure Process

Untenured Assistant Professors must, in a relatively short period of time, establish themselves as productive members of the Department and the University if they are to be tenured and promoted. It is essential that these faculty members understand clearly the criteria for tenure and promotion within the Department and their progress towards meeting these criteria. Assistant Professors having questions regarding the criteria or their progress

towards meeting such criteria are urged to seek assistance via one or more of the following mechanisms.

Each Assistant Professor will meet with the PTC on an annual basis to discuss his/her progress in the Department. Should the need arise at other times during the academic year, Assistant Professors can request additional conferences with individual members of the PTC.

The Department Chair prepares a recommendation for tenure and promotion independent of that prepared by the PTC. Probationary faculty are urged to discuss their progress with the Chair at regular intervals.

Each new faculty member in the Department is assigned a mentor by the Department Chair. Mutual agreement of all parties involved is required before such an assignment is made. The mentor will follow the progress of the new faculty member in meeting the criteria for promotion and tenure, and provide advice when necessary.

Assistant Professors are encouraged to talk with their colleagues in the Department or in other departments of the University. Of course, the ultimate responsibility of meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion lies with the untenured faculty member.

Sources of Help and Information for Promotion to Full Professor

Associate professors should discuss their progress towards promotion to full professor at some length with the department chair each year during their annual evaluation and face-to-face meeting. The PTC chair and other full professors in the department also can provide useful advice.

2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The makeup of the Promotion and Tenure Committee making recommendations on the tenure or promotion of tenure track faculty consists of all Committee of the Eligible Faculty members. The department chair may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

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

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote. A quorum must be present for the vote to be valid.
- To consider annually, in spring term, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A majority of those

eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member who requests and is denied a promotion review for three consecutive years must be granted the review in the fourth year per Faculty Rule 3335-604, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>. If the three denials are based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the fourth year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the committee, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn term, to support the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
 - **Early Summer:** Select from among its members following nomination by the PTC chair a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
 - **Late Summer:** Inform department of PTC meeting dates and when dossier materials are due from candidates.
 - **Early Autumn:** 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.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier.
 - Prepare an evaluation of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service for the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The evaluation will include the committee vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the committee meeting. The committee chair will forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department.

3 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure may not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Late Spring Term:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. A conflict of interest exists when a Promotion and Tenure Committee 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 (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 published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.
- **Mid-Autumn Term:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the Promotion and Tenure Committee to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Promotion and

Tenure Committee and department chair

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

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

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

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

4 Procedures For Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

5 Procedures for Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Review for tenure and/or promotion of faculty with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB follows the same procedure as other faculty except as modified in the approved memorandum of understanding for their appointment.

6 External Evaluations

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all regular research track contract renewal and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations are optional in other reviews and will be obtained as needed. When obtained, they should meet the criteria described below.

A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A target of 6-8 is desirable. A credible and useful evaluation:

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the department chair, 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/university-rules.html> requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.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 department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

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 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.

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.

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. Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal.

IX Seventh-Year Reviews

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

Appendix 1.

EEOB Peer Evaluation of Teaching Policy and Procedures

I. Preamble

University Policy on Peer Evaluation of Teaching.

From the OSU OAA Handbook (section IV) <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>:

“Periodic peer evaluation is required for both probationary and tenured faculty (at all ranks). Peer review of instruction is “the responsibility of the faculty of the TIU, not the individual faculty member being reviewed. The faculty must determine the methods of peer review that work best for the particular department, and apply them consistently. Peer evaluation should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot validly assess, such as appropriateness of curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with highest standards of disciplinary knowledge. Literature on the evaluation of instruction suggests that there is no single best instructional method. Peer evaluation should have clear goals, be informed by student opinion, and be grounded in a department culture that values good teaching. Classroom observations should not serve as the sole method for peer assessment of teaching effectiveness.”

The Ohio State University Committee on Peer Review of Teaching (CPRT), an Ad Hoc Committee of the University Senate, articulated the following principles for peer review (November 7, 2000):

- Evaluation of the quality of university teaching is a complex, multifaceted process that should include student, peer, administrative and self-evaluation;
- Both the criteria and the appropriate procedures for judging the quality of teaching must be embedded in disciplinary cultures and informed by departmental missions;
- Development and implementation of specific criteria and procedures is a faculty role and responsibility; and
- Models of effective and responsible evaluation plans, both within OSU and in peer and benchmark institutions exist; research on these practices and a scholarly awareness of these models and this body of research can assist Ohio State in designing effective programs of peer review.

Definitions:

Formative Evaluation: designed to contribute to the development of teaching. The purpose of formative evaluation is to validate or ensure that the goals of the instruction are being achieved and to improve the instruction, if necessary, by means of identification and subsequent remediation of problematic aspects. Formative evaluations **are not** included in promotion dossiers or personnel files.

Summative Evaluation: evaluation whose goal is to assess the quality of teaching performance/effectiveness. A summative review results in documentation that can be

reviewed by others. Summative evaluations **are** included in promotion dossiers and hence are part of a faculty member's permanent record.

II. Probationary Faculty

a. Formative Review

With the completion of the annual activity report, EEOB probationary faculty members shall select one option from the list below to complete during the following calendar year. The Department Chair may give feedback and input regarding the selections, and some options are required during specific years of the probationary period.

Upon completion of these activities, and with the submission of the following year's annual activity report, the faculty member shall provide evidence that these activities were completed and a written narrative that provides evidence of changes to teaching practice, course content, or other teaching-related endeavors based on the activities, thereby "closing the loop." Unless otherwise specified, evidence provided should be in the form of a brief (one-two paragraph) narrative summary.

The same categories may be selected each year, or faculty may alternate activities. This method will allow faculty to choose peer review that is most relevant and appropriate to their developmental needs. The evidence required in formative reviews is primarily in the form of self-reflective narratives with documentation of changes made as a result of the process. This method will allow faculty to choose peer review options *and peer reviewers* that have the greatest potential to maximize professional development. **One of the formative review options 5, 6, or 7 must be chosen at least once prior to submission of the 4th year review dossier.**

Faculty members are responsible for completing the required peer review of instruction process. Faculty members determine (with consultation, as noted) who will engage with them in the process of peer review. To initiate #7, a faculty member must request, in writing to the Chair, that s/he has selected this option as part of the annual peer review and would like the Chair to select an EEOB faculty peer reviewer.

Options for formative review (must select 1 each calendar year during the probationary period)

1. Attend workshop on some aspect of teaching (either within the university or at a professional society) and demonstrate changes or new ideas that have been/will be incorporated into teaching based on the ideas presented in the workshop.
 - a. Evidence required: Date, topic, and sponsor of the workshop. Summary of aspects of teaching learned at the workshop and how they have been/will be incorporated into teaching.
2. Review of course materials. When materials (e.g., grading rubrics, assignments, projects) have been developed for a course, these can be reviewed by inter-professional or intra-professional faculty peers. This review also can be done with a

- consultation from the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT). Whenever possible, this review should occur face-to-face and provide specific and concrete feedback to the faculty member being evaluated. *Note:* when an off-campus reviewer is selected, the selection of the reviewer must be done in conjunction with the faculty member's EEOB faculty mentor.
- a. Evidence required: Name, rank, institution, and subject area of reviewer. Summary and analysis of strengths identified, areas for improvement, and changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the review.
 3. Development/refinement of philosophy of pedagogy.
 - a. Evidence required: Report of activities engaged in (e.g., workshops attended, books or articles read, consultations with experts) to support the process, reflections on how the experience enhanced the philosophy of teaching, and the completed product.
 4. Observe an expert teacher. Make arrangements to watch another faculty member teach a class. The faculty member should be selected either because s/he has received distinction for teaching or because s/he has more experience in instruction. Make arrangements to meet with that faculty member prior to the class period to gain an understanding of the goals, purposes, and proposed teaching methods. Meet again after the completion of the class for debriefing.
 - a. Evidence required: Name, rank, institution, and subject area of expert teacher. Summary and analysis of what was learned and what changes were made/will be made as a result, and reflections on the process.
 5. Videotape yourself teaching. Make arrangements to have a class period videotaped. Identify a faculty peer or professional from UCAT to watch the videotape with, and use both self-reflection and the process of watching with another, to identify strengths and areas for growth.
 - a. Evidence required: Name, rank, institution, and subject area of selected peer. Date, course number, and topic of selected class period. Summary and analysis of strengths identified, areas for improvement, and changes made as a result and reflections on the process.
 6. Classroom observation by professional from UCAT.
 - a. Evidence required: Name of UCAT professional, course observed, date. Summary of changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the observation.
 7. Classroom observation by an EEOB faculty peer. Current EEOB policy regarding process of this review should be utilized. This includes (at a minimum):
 - a. Peer evaluations of teaching should be detailed and should provide an analysis of the candidate's instructional skills.
 - b. Reports of observations should specify which courses were observed and at what point in the term the observations took place.

- c. The peer-observer should provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and should meet with the faculty member to review the evaluation.
- d. The peer-observers should be selected by the Department Chair
- e. Evidence required: Name of reviewer, course observed, date. Summary of changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the observation.

b. Summative Review

Separate summative reviews must be included in the fourth year and the tenure review dossiers. The summative review consists of a capstone narrative (no more than 1-2 pages) that provides an overall summary of the candidate's professional development as an instructor during his/her status as a faculty member at The Ohio State University. This narrative should include, at a minimum, a description and reflection on the following:

- What have you learned about yourself as an instructor?
- How have you changed as an instructor, including responses to peer and student evaluations?
- What new teaching skills and pedagogical strategies have you developed?
- In what ways have you enhanced the courses you have taught?
- In what ways have you promoted student engagement?
- What are your plans for future professional development as an instructor?

III. Post-Tenure Faculty

a. Formative Review

As noted in the OSU OAA handbook, periodic peer evaluation is required for tenured faculty at all ranks. In accordance with this mandate, and in recognition of the necessity of on-going personal and professional development in the area of instruction, all EEOB faculty engage in annual peer evaluation of instruction activities. Each year, every tenured EEOB faculty member shall select one (1) of the options presented above and shall complete the activities described. The EEOB faculty recognize that engagement in instructional enhancement of any type can improve instruction. Thus, *in addition to* the choices listed above, tenured EEOB faculty also may select from the following options, each of which represents a service role to one of the earlier options (shown in parentheses):

- 8. Review the course materials of another faculty member (serves #2).
- 9. Be observed by another faculty member (serves #4).
- 10. Watch a videotape of another faculty member's teaching and provide input and reflections (serves #5).
- 11. Observe another faculty members teaching and engage in the process of peer observation of instruction (serves #7).

Tenured faculty members should provide as evidence, to be included with their annual Faculty Activity Report, a brief description of the activity engaged in, with identifying dates, names, and courses, and a brief narrative of how the activity enhanced their own instruction.

b. Summative Review

At least one summative review must be included in the dossier for promotion to full professor. This review should reflect recent activities and must have been written no earlier than two years prior to the promotion review. The format is identical to that for pre-tenure faculty.

Addendum: What Is Good Teaching?

Ramsden (1992) identified 13 characteristics of good teaching from an individual instructor's point of view:

1. a desire to share your love of the subject
2. an ability to make the material stimulating and interesting
3. a facility for engaging with students at their level of understanding
4. a capacity to explain the material plainly and helpfully
5. a commitment to making it absolutely clear what has to be understood, at what level, and why
6. demonstration of concern and respect for students
7. a commitment to encouraging student independence and experiment
8. an ability to improvise and adapt to new demands
9. use of teaching methods and academic tasks that require students to learn actively, responsibly, and through cooperative endeavor
10. use of valid and fair assessment methods
11. a focus on key concepts and students' current and future understanding of them, rather than just covering the ground
12. a commitment to give high quality feedback on students' work
13. a desire to learn from students and others about the effects of your teaching and how it can be improved

[This document was significantly informed by the PAES Peer Review of Teaching Document.]