

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK
Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Document

Updated December, 2009

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. PREAMBLE	1
II. COLLEGE MISSION	1
III. APPOINTMENTS	
A. Criteria	
1. Tenure Track Faculty	2
a) Assistant Professor	2
b) Associate or Full Professor without Tenure	3
c) Instructor	3
2. Auxiliary Faculty	3
a) Compensated Auxiliary Faculty	
b) Uncompensated Auxiliary Faculty	
3. Zero FTE Appointments	4
4. Emeritus Faculty	4
B. Procedures	
1. Tenure Track Faculty	4
2. Auxiliary Faculty	5
3. Zero FTE Appointments	6
4. Emeritus Faculty	6
IV. ANNUAL REVIEWS	
A. Procedures	
1. Probationary Faculty	6
a. Fourth year Review	8
b. Exclusion Of Time From Probationary Period	8
2. Tenured Faculty	8
V. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	
A. Criteria	9
B. Procedures	12
C. Documentation	13
VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	
A. Criteria	14
1) Promotion to associate professor with tenure	14
2) Promotion to professor	14
B. Procedures	15
C. Documentation	19
VII. APPEALS	25
VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEW	26
IX. APPENDICES	26

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to the Rules of the University Faculty, (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-02.html> <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html>) the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the College and the University (See OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook at <http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/tc.html> and also Rules of the University Faculty at <http://trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>. Should those rules and policies change, the College shall follow those 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.

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College and the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University before it can be implemented. This document sets forth the College's mission and in the context of the mission of the University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document the Dean and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the College 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.

Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure. Peers are those faculty members who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance--normally colleges within an individual's tenure-initiating unit. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes, to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html> and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, or promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reasons that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence.

In accordance with a policy of equality of opportunity, decisions concerning appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure shall be free of discrimination as to race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, age, disablement, gender identity and expression, and Vietnam-era veteran status.

II. COLLEGE MISSION

The mission of the College of Social Work at The Ohio State University is to educate students for the profession and discipline of social work, to develop and disseminate knowledge through productive scholarship and teaching, and to utilize its scholarly resources in service to the profession, the university, and the wider community. To this end, the College provides learning opportunities for students, promotes a spirit of continued inquiry, and encourages both students and faculty to engage in sound research and scholarship.

The College mission, as expressed through the BSSW, MSW, Ph.D., and continuing education programs and through the scholarly and service activities of faculty, staff, and students, is grounded in the core values and traditions of the social work profession, including promotion of personal growth, collective well-being, and social justice. The College acknowledges a special obligation to focus attention on the needs of individuals and groups denied opportunities through the historical, institutional, and societal barriers of prejudice, discrimination, poverty, and inequality.

The College of Social Work functions as an integral part of The Ohio State University. As part of a premier land grant institution, the College's commitment to scholarship, service, teaching, and practice extends beyond the boundaries of the College into Columbus, the State of Ohio, the nation, and the world. Because social problems are complex and multi-faceted, the College endeavors to foster collaboration among disciplines and organizations.

In pursuit of the College mission, faculty, students, and staff aim to create a College in which excellence can be realized in teaching, scholarship, service, and professional practice.

Implementing the College mission

The Ohio State University's College of Social Work seeks to further its mission of providing leadership in both the academic discipline and the professional practice of social work through its policies and procedures related to recruitment, appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, as well as its system of faculty review and rewards. Faculty excellence in teaching, research, and facilitates both the growth and development of the social work profession and the reputation of the College. The teaching, research, and community service of College faculty contributes to the development of more just and humane social policy, programs, and practices. The College of Social Work desires faculty who contribute to the creation of social work knowledge, including the fostering of applied knowledge and advanced practice techniques.

Social work is a collaborative profession. As social workers, College faculty are catalysts in the development of social networks and leaders in bringing together other disciplines to address social problems through applied research and application of community-based practice techniques. The reputation of the College and the profession is furthered by faculty who engage in collegial interdisciplinary collaboration at the University, community, state, national, and international levels.

III. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

This section establishes the criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, as well as the criteria for appointment at higher ranks. These criteria are consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks discussed later in this document.

The Ohio State University has as its stated mission "the attainment of international distinction in education, scholarship, and public service." The College of Social Work commits itself to appointing to the faculty only those persons who will enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the College and advance its mission as stated above in Section II. Criteria for appointment shall follow Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html> Criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure.

1. Tenure track faculty

Appointment decisions for regular tenure track faculty positions, as defined in Rule 3335-6-02 of the Administrative Code, are based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-02.html>

(a) Assistant Professor. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in social work or related fields. Probationary periods of appointment for tenure track faculty will be in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 Probationary service, duration of appointment for regular faculty. <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html>

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years,

including prior service credit except under circumstances outlined in this document. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

(b) Associate or Full Professors Without Tenure. An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the College. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the Provost. Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure if appropriate, but the University cannot legally grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/ii_foreignnatl.html

(c) Instructor. Appointments at the rank of instructor will normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit will be granted for time spent as an instructor unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of the promotion that he or she does not wish such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs through the Dean of the College so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.

2. Auxiliary faculty

This section establishes criteria for appointment and reappointment of compensated and uncompensated auxiliary faculty.

Auxiliary faculty are persons with adjunct titles, clinical titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles; also professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than fifty percent service to the university. Persons with regular faculty titles may not hold auxiliary titles. Persons holding auxiliary titles are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

The criteria for appointment of auxiliary faculty with modified faculty titles (such as "visiting") are comparable to the criteria for appointment at the regular faculty ranks. These criteria also serve as a basis for evaluating the occasional auxiliary faculty member who desires promotion. Auxiliary appointments are usually made on a course-by-course basis, but for no more than one year at a time, and thus require formal review at least annually if they are to be continued. The categories of auxiliary faculty that apply within the College include: Adjunct Faculty (Uncompensated); Lecturer and Senior Lecturer (Compensated), and Visiting Faculty (Compensated or Uncompensated).

(a) Compensated Auxiliary Faculty. Compensated auxiliary faculty include lecturers and senior lecturers. The titles of lecturer and senior lecturer shall be used for all compensated instructional appointments where other titles are not appropriate. Lecturers' responsibilities shall be limited to formal course instruction. (3335-5-19)(D)(4). <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules5/ru5-19.html>

This category may also include faculty with regular titles who have below a 50 percent time appointment and visiting faculty. Visiting faculty, whose appointment must be made for one year at a time not to exceed three continuous years, include individuals on leave from other academic institutions and temporary faculty.

(b) Uncompensated Auxiliary Faculty. Uncompensated auxiliary faculty includes the titles of adjunct professor, adjunct associate professor, adjunct assistant professor, and adjunct instructor. Such titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to regular faculty of equivalent rank, who provide significant, uncompensated service to the instructional and/or research programs of the university, and who need a faculty title to perform that service. Significant service would include teaching the equivalent of one or more courses, advising graduate students or serving on graduate committees, and serving as a co-investigator on a research project. Such individuals may be either non-university employees or university employees compensated on a non-instructional budget. Adjunct appointments are made for the period in which the uncompensated service is provided not to exceed one year; renewal is contingent upon continued significant contributions. Procedures for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as for promotion of regular faculty. (3335-5-19(D)(1) <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules5/ru5-19.html>)

Uncompensated auxiliary faculty also includes faculty with regular titles at zero percent time. They may also include visiting faculty. Criteria for non-compensated appointments should include expectations for contributions to the College. Uncompensated appointments are not warranted unless they are accompanied by substantial involvement in the academic work of the College.

(1). Zero FTE Appointments

In achieving its mission of interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship the College may choose to create zero FTE appointments. Eligible candidates consist of individuals with an academic appointment as a clinical, research, or tenure track faculty member at another Ohio State University Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU).

Faculty members appointed in this category are eligible to teach, engage in research, conduct independent studies, and to serve on dissertation, thesis and general exam committees. They are not eligible to chair student committees. Faculty members may serve as a voting member, but not chair, curriculum committees. The member is not eligible to participate in promotion and tenure review or voting, nor is the member eligible to vote on matters of faculty governance. Zero FTE appointments will typically not come with resources such as an office or computer, unless specified in writing by the Dean.

3. Emeritus faculty

Emeritus faculty have uncompensated appointments in the College. Appointments as emeritus faculty are made only for retired faculty of the University who have made a request to the College for emeritus status. (Emeritus faculty do not require formal annual review.)

Emeritus faculty may not vote in the governance of the College or participate in promotion and tenure decisions. Office and other facilities may be provided to emeritus faculty members, depending on the available resources and the stated needs of the retired individual. The Dean makes all decisions regarding the use of facilities. Use of College resources will be evaluated yearly by the Dean of the College.

B. Procedures

1. Tenure Track Faculty

For each prospective tenure track faculty position, the Dean will appoint a search committee composed of five College faculty. The Dean will appoint one of the members of the search committee to serve as committee chair. As required by the College Governance Document, the College Advisory Council (which consists of elected faculty representatives, as well as College administrative staff) must ratify decisions on the

membership of and the charge given to the search committee.

All search procedures for tenure track faculty will be in accordance with University procedures as outlined in the bulletin *A Guide to Effective Searches published by the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Academic Affairs*. <http://hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf> The position will be advertised in an appropriate manner to attract national and international attention to the opening. Vigorous efforts will be taken to attract a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. The committee will select one of its members to serve as affirmative action designee, this individual becomes a member of the College's Diversity Committee for that academic year. Complete records will be kept of the manner in which the search is conducted and of all contacts with prospective candidates. Following the open application period, members of the search committee will carefully review the files of all applicants and seek relevant information from other sources as appropriate. The criteria used in evaluation of the candidates and all records of the search process will be documented. Based on their own careful evaluation of applicants' materials, and in consultation with the Dean, the search committee will make a recommendation regarding the appropriateness of candidates for campus interviews. The selection of these candidates will be based solely on valid academic experience and achievement.

The Dean and search committee chairperson will together arrange for and conduct campus interviews of the final candidates. Interview procedures will include a visit to the Columbus campus, presentation of a formal seminar, visits with appropriate administrators of the College, and the opportunity for each member of the College community to visit with each candidate either privately or in small groups of faculty. Application files of candidates invited for a campus visit will be kept in a secure location, but made accessible to all College faculty for their review. The College community will be encouraged to review the files of each candidate to be interviewed. After each candidate's visit, the search committee will solicit written feedback and recommendations from faculty, students, and others who have met with the candidate, participated in the candidate's formal seminar presentation, and/or examined the candidate's application file. Based on the solicited feedback concerning the candidate interviews, seminar, and dossier, the search committee will forward to the Dean a recommendation regarding the candidate or candidates acceptable to the faculty. This recommendation should come in the form of a written report. The narrative report should include a summary of people brought to campus, their strengths and weaknesses and summary of feedback from faculty and other members of the college community. The report will conclude with a statement as to whether or not each candidate would be an acceptable hire at the College of Social Work. The final decision to offer a position to a candidate belongs solely to the Dean of the College.

All offers at the rank of associate professor or professor, with or without tenure, and all offers involving the acceptance of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs

2. Auxiliary Faculty

The University Faculty Rule provides for the categories "compensated" and "no salary" auxiliary faculty. The College has occasion to hire lecturers from the professional community on a contract basis for an individual course based on that individual's area of expertise; the College also has provision for visiting faculty.

Lecturers are appointed on a course-by-course basis by the Dean in consultation with the appropriate program director (i.e. directors of the BSSW, MSW programs, and PhD programs), with input from the relevant Curriculum Area Group including the chair of the Curriculum Area Group. The Chair of the relevant Curriculum Area Group has the task of orienting the lecturer regarding procedures for organizing the learning environment of the classroom as well as procedures for student evaluation of teaching. Lecturers are evaluated by their students using the same evaluation procedure as do regular faculty, with the exception that computer results are forwarded to the relevant program director. Contract faculty whose student evaluations are poor are generally not recommended for future appointments.

Visiting faculty usually come to the College as a result of an association with an individual member of the faculty and plan to work for a defined period of time while they are on leave from their own institution. Appointments of visiting faculty are made by approval of the Dean. Arrangements are made for an individual faculty member to serve as host/mentor during the period that the scholar is visiting the College.

(a). Zero FTE Appointments

When such an arrangement is perceived to be of merit to the College, the Dean will submit to the P&T Subcommittee the c.v. of the candidate along with a written rationale for the appointment that describes the intended benefit of the appointment to the College academic community. Faculty approval for the appointment shall be obtained with a majority vote of the current P&T subcommittee.

Candidates are appointed at the rank associated with that earned through their Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU). In five year increments the Dean will submit to the current P&T subcommittee a summary of the contributions of the jointly appointed faculty member and a recommendation for the continuation or termination of the appointment. A majority vote of current P&T subcommittee members is required to continue the joint appointment.

3. Emeritus Faculty

Request for appointment as an emeritus faculty member must originate with the retired or retiring faculty member. Typically, the request is made in a letter to the Dean either before or after the retirement date. No annual reappointment is necessary.

IV. ANNUAL REVIEWS

A. Procedures

1. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

These procedures are consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html> as well as with Office of Academic Affairs policies (See OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook at <http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/tc.html>). Below is relevant material from the Faculty Rules regarding annual reviews for probationary faculty and the specific procedures adopted by the College of Social Work to implement the faculty rules.

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing College and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. These documents should include a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments. http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.html. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

During a probationary period, a faculty member shall be reviewed annually in accordance with the University rule and with other policies of the College and University. In the College of Social Work, the annual review for both probationary and tenured faculty occurs each year during the spring term. The annual review encompasses the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and. External evaluations for the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the Dean of the College 3335-6-03 (C).

(a) Procedures for regular annual review involve two steps:

(1) During the fall quarter of the first year of the probationary period the faculty member in consultation with

his or her assigned mentor, will develop a work plan for that academic year. Every spring term, each probationary faculty member must submit to the Dean a copy of his or her updated *curriculum vitae* and a written dossier reporting and documenting his or her academic performance in teaching, research and service since the date of appointment and/or the last annual review. In reporting activities, this dossier shall follow the most current OAA approved outline.

(2) After submission of the documentation, the probationary faculty member shall meet individually with the Dean of the College to review the faculty member's performance and accomplishments since time of appointment and/or the previous year's review. Both the faculty member and the Dean may provide evidence that will be used to evaluate the performance and quality of completed work. The faculty member may invite one colleague (faculty member) to be present, voluntarily, at the scheduled conference with the Dean.

In addition to the aforementioned dossier, based on guidelines adopted by Social Work faculty, the Program Directors (Directors of the BSSW, MSW, and PhD programs) are invited by the Dean, on a wholly voluntary basis, to provide written input with respect to their observations of probationary faculty performance in relation to the program for which they have responsibility.

At the completion of the review, the Dean of the College shall provide the faculty member with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance. The report will clearly address progress toward the goal of promotion and/or tenure, and a qualitative assessment of the contribution of the faculty member to the College, the University, the profession, and the wider community. The assessment will include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. The assessment will also include feedback to assist the candidate in remaining on track toward the goal of promotion and tenure. If the Dean's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. The College is committed to not renewing a probationary appointment following any annual review in which it is apparent that the candidate's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor. Non renewal of probationary appointment must follow the full procedure used for the fourth year review.

A recommendation from the Dean not to reappoint the faculty member to another year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures. Accordingly, the Dean shall anticipate any instance of possible non-renewal by alerting the tenure committee of the necessity for conducting the more extended process as part of the yearly review. Since the College of Social Work is a tenure initiating unit (without departments), the Provost must make the final decision on non-renewal of appointment. Appeals on a non-renewal decision follow specific guidelines for appeal in the Faculty Rule. (3335-5-05) <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules5/ru5-05.html>.

All annual review letters, including fourth year review letters, shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. Both the faculty member and Dean sign and date the written statement. The faculty member's signature indicates he/she has read the document but does not necessarily indicate agreement. The probationary faculty member has the same right as the tenured faculty member to disagree with the written statement of evaluation and to append to the signed document a statement of his/her position. The appended statement shall be forwarded within ten days to the Dean, who shall take this disagreement into account when preparing the final salary recommendation.

It is the policy of the College to ensure that reviews are constructive and candid. The Dean and the College faculty are committed to using the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to untenured faculty as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to make acceptable progress. Faculty duties and responsibility in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service for the subsequent year are determined between the faculty member and the Dean within one month of the faculty member's annual review.

According to Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 (C) (8), "(at) the time of their initial appointment and when they receive their annual review faculty members shall be given notice of their right to review their personnel file maintained by their tenure initiating unit....A member of the faculty may place in his or her primary personnel file a response to any evaluation, comment, or other material contained in the file." Note: This rule applies for probationary and tenured faculty. <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules3/ru3-35.html>

- (a) Fourth Year Review. The fourth year review of probationary faculty shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion with one exception: solicitation of external letters of evaluation by the promotion and tenure committee is not required. Since the College of Social Work is a tenure initiating unit (without departments), the Provost must make the final decision on appointments for the fifth year. <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html>
- (b) Exclusion of time from probationary period. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (C) provides for time to be excluded from the probationary period for birth or adoption of a child, personal illness, care of sick or injured person, or other factors beyond a faculty member's control that significantly interfered with productivity. While individuals may apply for consideration of an exclusion at any time within the limits of the rule, the College may wish to consider during the annual review process whether to recommend application for an exclusion. However, the College may not require a faculty member to apply for excluded time. <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-03.html>

2. Regular Tenured Faculty

Each year during the spring quarter each faculty member must submit to the Dean a copy of his or her updated *curriculum vitae* and a written dossier reporting and documenting his or her academic performance in teaching, research, and service for the period covering the spring quarter of the previous year and the summer, autumn, and winter quarters of the present academic year. In reporting activities, this dossier shall follow the most current OAA approved outline. The College performance review for each faculty member shall be completed by April 30 of each year. In addition, the program directors are invited by the Dean, on a wholly voluntary basis, to provide written input regarding observations of faculty performance in relation to the program for which they have responsibility.

Each faculty member shall meet individually with the Dean of the College to review the faculty member's performance and accomplishments since the previous year's review. Both the faculty member and the Dean have the right and responsibility to provide evidence that will be used to evaluate the performance and quality of work done. This is also an opportunity, if not done at another time, for the Dean and faculty member to consider professional development needs to assure that faculty remain productive in ways of value to the college. The faculty member may invite one colleague (faculty member) to be present, voluntarily, at the scheduled conference with the Dean.

Following their meeting, the Dean must submit to the faculty member a copy of the review with completed performance evaluation. Feedback should clearly address progress toward the goal of promotion and/or tenure, and a qualitative assessment of the contribution of the faculty member to the College, the University, the profession, and the wider community. Additional feedback regarding performance should be provided as needed, to assist the faculty member in remaining productive. Both the faculty member and Dean sign and date the review. The faculty member's signature indicates that he/she has read the document but does not necessarily indicate agreement. If there is disagreement, the faculty member has the right to append to the signed document a statement of his/her position and to forward it, within ten days, to the Dean, who shall take this disagreement into account when preparing the final salary recommendation.

Copies of all annual reviews for an individual and substantive supporting documents related to the annual reviews will be maintained in the Dean's office.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. Criteria

Annual salary increases will be given to faculty based on merit and performance, and linked to the procedure for annual performance review adopted in the College, except in cases when a "cost of living" increase for all employees is mandated by the University. In addition to the annual performance review of each faculty member, the Dean of the College shall conduct an annual review of overall salary equity within the College and factor results of this review into salary considerations.

In determining merit, major consideration will be given to performance during the previous four quarters. Such performance is considered in relation to the individual's overall record of accomplishments, and the achievement of yearly goals and objectives as approved by both faculty member and Dean at the beginning of the current academic year.

Faculty performance will be evaluated in light of individual contributions made to advancement of the College's mission, as stated herein in Section III. The roles and responsibilities of individual faculty with regard to components of the College mission vary considerably and are reflected by their appointment.

The system is based on four levels of performance: Extra Merit, Merit, Partial Merit, and No Merit, and establishes baseline expectations for each category. The Extra Merit category recognizes those who perform above the expected levels in teaching, scholarship, or service. The partial merit category is given for performance that falls between full merit and no merit.

These criteria are based on principles of management which suggest that criteria for performance evaluations and rewards should be: (a) as specific and objective as possible, (b) applied fairly across comparable faculty positions, (c) known well in advance of a decision affecting employment status, including salary, and (d) offer a menu of equivalents for achieving baseline while, at the same time, respecting faculty diversity of interests and talents.

Criteria for Merit and Extra Merit are operationalized in the following way:

Teaching

Every faculty member is expected to teach five, six, or seven courses or the equivalent every academic year, i.e., Autumn through Spring, depending on their scholarly activities. Summer courses are in addition to this load unless otherwise negotiated with the Dean. Faculty who submit two articles or equivalents will teach five (5) courses per year; those who submit one (1) article or equivalent will have a teaching load of six (6) courses per year; those who have the research requirement waived will have a teaching load of seven (7) courses per year. In order to determine teaching load faculty must provide evidence that research products have been submitted.

With regard to credit for a three, four, or five credit hour course, CAC recommended that the criterion of classroom contact hours be employed as the measure of effort in order to equalize assignments to faculty to three and five credit hour courses such that:

- a) A five credit hour Ph.D. course which meets for three hours will be treated as a three credit hour course;
- b) A five credit hour course which meets for three hours of lecture and two hours of lab assisted by GTAs will be treated as a three hour course.

Some possible ways a faculty member can qualify for merit for teaching are the following:

- a) Achieve student evaluation of teaching evaluations at or above the College mean for the majority of their courses.
- b) Complete field visits for all assigned students no later than the conclusion of the quarter preceding a

- student's final quarter in field.
- c) Make telephone contact with field instructors each quarter.
 - d) Serve as thesis, general examination or dissertation advisor, or supervise undergraduate honors papers.
 - e) Serve as faculty advisor for 15 to 17 students as assigned.

Some possible ways a faculty member can qualify for extra merit for teaching are the following:

- a) Write a textbook that is published by a nationally recognized publisher;
- b) Develop new courses, or alternative course delivery format;
- c) Receive teaching evaluations significantly above the University mean on standardized University approved instruments or the equivalent;
- d) Receive funding for a training grant or grants related to teaching or curriculum development;
- e) Receive special recognition and/or awards for teaching;
- f) Participate on dissertations, general exam committees, thesis, or undergraduate honors papers that require an extraordinary amount of time and effort as documented by the faculty member.
- g) Faculty who believe their work with independent studies justifies consideration for extra merit may elect to document the student's product, and the faculty members work in terms of student contact.

Scholarly Activity: Research and Knowledge Building

To meet the criteria for merit faculty must do the following:

Annual merit for scholarship is determined by a faculty member's scholarly accomplishments during the review period. The table below describes the general approach to assigning merit for the most common scholarly activities. Faculty members are always welcome to make a case to the dean for differential consideration of their unique scholarly accomplishments in any given period. However, the guiding principle of our merit system is to reward accomplishment, as evidenced by the acceptance for publication or funding of one's scholarly endeavors.

Consistent with the College of Social Work's strategic emphasis on increasing grant funding, a faculty member may earn merit when they submit a grant that has been approved by the College administration prior to submission. This is the only scholarly activity for which merit can be earned by submission only. With regards to grants, in every case, extra merit can only be earned by obtaining funding. Seed grants awarded by the College of Social Work are not included in the determination of merit. Grants with a scholarly product earn merit for scholarship, those related to teaching activities earn merit under that category. Faculty members will earn extra-merit for each funded year of their awarded grants.

Conference papers are refereed only and require the submission of a product (PowerPoint, etc) at the time of annual review. These are typically international or national conferences. Other types of conferences will be considered when the faculty member makes the case for scholarly impact.

As described in the merit table, each row represents an equivalent. A faculty member must accomplish an activity in a single cell to earn merit at that level. Extra merit can be obtained in three different ways (2 articles or 1 book or 1 funded grant) but in every case extra merit can only be obtained with an acceptance or funding.

	Accepted Article/Book Chapter	Book Contract	Book Published	Grant Funded	Grant Submitted	Presented Conference Paper
Extra Merit	2	-	1	1	-	-
Merit	1	1	-	-	1	2
Partial Merit	-	-	-	-	-	1
No Merit	-	-	-	-	-	-

College and University Service

To meet the criteria for merit faculty must do the following:

- a) Serve as a member of at least one Curriculum Area Group, regularly attend meetings and participate in the work of the committee.
- b) Regularly attend scheduled faculty meetings
- c) Attend student and faculty recruitment events
- d) Promptly review student application materials as assigned.
- e) Maintain regular office hours and respond to student telephone and e-mail inquiries.
- f) Serve in the community in ways related to their academic expertise and professional identification. It is anticipated that untenured faculty members will provide less service to the College, the University and the community than faculty members who are tenured.

Some possible ways to meet the criteria for extra merit for service include performing activities that require a significant or extraordinary amount of time as documented by the faculty member, including:

- a) Serve as an officer of local, state, national, or international organization/committee .
- b) Chair a University committee
- c) Serve as an active member of an editorial board of a refereed journal, or as editor-in-chief of a refereed journal.
- d) Provide exceptional service to the College such as serving on ad hoc committees, university committees, etc.
- e) Service in the community in significant leadership roles

Program Director Duties and Responsibilities

Based on descriptions contained in this document, Program Directors and the Associate Dean will be reviewed for merit in an additional category so that their performance in these administrative capacities are reflected in their annual merit review.

Work Sheet For Merit Review

The Merit Review system is based on four levels of performance: Extra Merit, Merit, Partial Merit and No Merit. The system is based on a point system with each faculty member being rated in the area of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty can receive 0, 1, 2 or 3 points per category based on their performance over the year. As a result, merit

scores can range from 0 to 9 with those receiving more points being eligible for greater salary increases. To receive an overall "Merit" rating one must obtain Merit in all three categories. To be eligible for an overall "Extra Merit" rating faculty must achieve Merit in all three categories and exceed the Merit expectations in at least one of the categories. Judgments are to be made for each area of performance on the following scale:

Merit Level	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Extra Merit	3	3	3
Merit	2	2	2
Partial Merit	1	1	1
No Merit	0	0	0

Faculty who are on professional leave, serving as visiting professors, or participating professionally in approved off-campus assignments will not be penalized by loss of a salary increase while away from the College. In these cases, the faculty member will provide to the Dean a timely progress report of his/her activities containing sufficient information for review.

Faculty Course Buyout Policy

The usual teaching load for faculty is five 3 credit hour courses and two submissions of manuscripts (journal articles, book chapters, or grant proposals) for review for publications per year (six courses with one submission and seven courses with zero submissions) plus field liaison. When faculty obtain external grant funding they often need to be released from some teaching duties to have time to work on the grant. To obtain this release time faculty can use grant funds to "buy out" their time from teaching courses. The Ohio State University College of Social Work faculty can buy out up to the equivalent of four 3 credit hour courses per year; this means they must teach the equivalent of at least one 3 credit hour course per year. The amount of money required to buy out a course is 12 percent of the faculty member's salary. The Dean may allow a faculty member to buy out more than four courses if the faculty member makes a formal request to the Dean and is able to document that the grant requires more of the faculty member's time. Faculty members remain responsible for committee service, advising and field liaison when they have bought out of teaching responsibilities.

B. Procedures

Among the most important decisions made by the Dean are those concerned with recommendations for annual salary increases. The Dean will stay abreast of activities of all faculty members by keeping thorough records, by frequent consultation with each faculty member, by holding meetings of the entire faculty, and by any other communication needed to stay in touch with faculty progress. Information obtained from written documents submitted by each faculty member prior to each review will be weighed carefully when evaluating faculty performance. Consideration is given to accomplishments in all areas of faculty responsibility, that is, teaching, scholarship, and service. Judgments on performance should be based on the criteria for Merit and Extra Merit.

As noted in the previous table Extra Merit for the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service will receive 3 points each; Merit for teaching, scholarship, and service will receive 2 point each; Partial Merit will receive 1 point each, and No Merit will receive 0 points for any of the three categories for which the faculty member did not meet criteria for Merit.

The "numerical" component of the evaluation provides a measure of objectivity that helps enhance a sense of fairness and impartiality so critical to the review process. However, by definition, numerical equivalents are summary

statements and thus afford only limited detail. It should be noted that numerical equivalents do not replace the careful consideration of the Dean in gathering the necessary documentation and formulating a judgment on performance, nor does it replace the necessity for the Dean to provide in writing a qualitative description of his or her judgment of the faculty member's achievements and progress.

The Dean's written comments provide the more in-depth qualitative component of evaluation to complement the objective, quantitative element. In particular, the Dean's commentary is critical to documenting progress (or lack of progress) toward tenure and/or promotion. At minimum, comments should clearly provide the Dean's assessment of the following: (a) whether the faculty member is "on track" toward tenure and/or promotion (along with a documentation of the objective basis of that assessment); (b) what the faculty member needs to do in order to remain on track toward tenure and/or promotion ; (c) what steps the faculty member may need to take in order to strengthen his or her record, especially in areas that may become problematic for tenure and/or promotion. Specificity in this report is crucial in reducing ambiguity about status and progress toward the goals of tenure and/or promotion. The Dean's comments must address all three areas (i.e. teaching, scholarship, and service) in detail. For all faculty, the Dean's commentary should provide a qualitative assessment of the contribution of the faculty member to the College and to the professional and scholarly communities.

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

In particularly meritorious cases, applications will be made for special excellence equity raises if supplementary funds for such are available in a given year. Faculty who are promoted will also receive a promotional raise in addition to their annual supplement. A decision to recommend no salary increase is an option that will be considered in cases that are particularly non-meritorious. Results of salary decisions will be communicated to each faculty member in writing, usually in July, when final approvals and actual dollar amounts are available.

Allocation of College resources for use by individual faculty in the conduct of their specific research, teaching, and/or extension programs will be based on their need for these resources, the availability of the resources within the College, and the record of the faculty member in productive use of College resources. Decisions regarding allocation and reallocation of College resources to individual faculty will be made by the Dean on the basis of merit using the same criteria specified above for merit salary increases.

Each year, as soon as possible after the figures are established and made public, the Dean will make available information concerning the OAA Annual Salary Guidelines to all regular faculty and staff employed by the College whose salary increases are or may be affected by these guidelines.

C. Documentation

Documentation of performance should be sufficient to permit an informed evaluation of a faculty member's accomplishments. Insufficient documentation could be a cause for denial of merit increase. Documentation of performance should follow the current OAA core dossier (Appendix A) and must include:

1. Teaching

- a) Student evaluation of instructional activity for all courses taught during the period of spring quarter through winter quarter. Data should be presented in both raw and summarized form. The College of Social Work uses the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) as its primary mechanism for student evaluation.
- b) Report from the College's annual Peer Review of Instruction.
- c) Course syllabi with attention paid to content on women and minorities of color in all classes, provide

documentation on having this content appear in each course syllabus and the student evaluation of this content.

- d) Report regarding involvement in dissertations, MSW thesis, BSSW honors thesis.
- e) Formal and informal mentoring activities with junior faculty.
- f) Student advising.
- g) Field liaison activities (include liaison activity report).
- h) Community education workshops/continuing education activities.
- i) Training grants submitted or funded.
- j) New course development or development of alternative form of course delivery.

2. Scholarship

- a) Scholarly submissions, including letters of submittal. (articles, book chapters, grant proposals, books, edited books, bulletins and technical reports, papers in proceedings).
- b) Letters of acceptance for previously submitted scholarly work (articles, book chapters, grant proposals, books, edited books, bulletins and technical reports, papers in proceedings).
- c) Funding notices (include period of funding, source and amount of funding and whether grant or contract).
- d) Conference papers.
- e) Works in progress (articles, book chapters, grant proposals, books, edited books, bulletins and technical reports, papers in proceedings).
- f) Ongoing grants (include period of funding, source and amount of funding and whether grant or contract).

3. Service

- a) College committees including adhoc committees.
- b) University committees.
- c) Activities in the local community.
- d) National and state boards of directors.
- e) Editorial boards and ad hoc review activity.
- f) External reviews for other universities.
- g) Consultation.

4. Prizes and awards received for teaching, research and or service,

VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION

A. Criteria

1. Rank of Associate With Tenure

The College has established and exercises very high standards for the awarding of tenure since a positive tenure decision has a powerful impact on the quality and future of the College. Although criteria will vary both according to the College mission and the particular responsibilities of each faculty member, every candidate is held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

Candidates should be held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas that are central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching should be required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a much smaller part of the individual's responsibilities. A candidate should also be held to a high standard of College citizenship. Poor College citizenship at best imposes

additional service burdens on other faculty and at worst may obstruct a department's ability to function and may damage its reputation. Poor departmental citizenship is an acceptable basis for a negative recommendation as long as the department has established good citizenship as a criterion for promotion and tenure.

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C): 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. <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-02.html>

Further, according to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (B): Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor.

2. Rank of Professor

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C): 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.

The College should expect an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. While the individual seeking promotion should be assessed in relation to assigned responsibilities, exceptional performance in these responsibilities should be required.

B. Procedures

The College's procedures for conducting reviews of candidates for reappointment and promotion and tenure have been developed in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-04: <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html>

In consultation with the rules committee or its designee, the Office of Academic Affairs develops and promulgates procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews to supplement rules of the University faculty. These guidelines include a dossier outline updated annually to be used for the documentation of accomplishments by all candidates to be reviewed for promotion and tenure and for all probationary faculty for annual reviews. The guidelines also include general information about the review process at the College and University level, information about any legal considerations affecting promotion and tenure evaluations, and other information intended to assist academic units in carrying out reviews. Other key aspects of this rule are provided below in this section.

The review for tenure during the final year of a probationary period is mandatory and must take place. A faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the tenure promotion and tenure committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The promotion and tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion for more than three consecutive years.

Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Dean in writing. The Dean shall inform the Provost of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.

All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed by the eligible voting faculty and the Dean. Candidates will also be reviewed at the University level. The Dean is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the Provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the board of trustees (if positive).

The Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline serves as a basic standard for documentation, but the College is prepared to consider additional types of criteria. It may also weight forms of documentation differentially as appropriate to its mission and to the responsibilities of the candidate.

1. Eligible Voting Faculty and Promotion and Tenure Committee

Eligible voting faculty shall make up a promotion and tenure committee for reviewing candidates. Eligible voting faculty are tenured faculty of the College of Social Work of higher rank than the candidate excluding the Dean. This means that the composition of the promotion and tenure committee of the College shall be configured differently for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and for candidates seeking promotion to full professor. For tenure reviews of probationary faculty, eligible faculty are tenured professors excluding the Dean. For faculty seeking promotion to full professor, eligible faculty include all faculty at the rank of full professor excluding the Dean. It shall be the work of this committee to carefully review the record of candidates, comment on that record, and vote on a recommendation regarding reappointment, tenure and promotion, and promotion.

2. Promotion and Tenure Sub-committee

Membership of sub-committee for candidates seeking promotion to associate professor. Five members from the promotion and tenure committee of eligible voting faculty shall be constituted as a sub-committee to facilitate the task of the full promotion and tenure committee. The members of the sub-committee shall be determined in alphabetical order. Sub-committee members shall serve for a term of one year. The subcommittee members shall select a chair from among its membership. To provide continuity, each outgoing chair shall serve as a consultant to the committee formed for the following year. The consultant shall have a voice but no vote. Newly tenured associate professors shall have their names placed alphabetically in the roster the year following their tenure appointment. A roster listing members eligible to serve on the sub-committee, in the order of service, shall be a public document and shall be made available to all faculty by the Dean's office each year.

Sub-committee for candidates seeking promotion to full professor. The promotion and tenure committee comprised of all full professors shall assume the facilitating functions of the sub-committee as described below. There shall be no sub-committee in regard to the candidacy of faculty seeking promotion to full professor.. The committee as a whole will complete all tasks.

Each candidate will be assigned a liaison from the membership of the sub-committee. The liaison role is limited largely to the provision of information and guidance in the preparation of the dossier according to OAA guidelines. The liaison may also provide suggestions on how the candidate might present his/her documentation in the most favorable manner. The liaison does not adopt an advocacy role for the candidate, and there is no assumption that the liaison necessarily supports the candidacy of the individual. Responsibility for the content and presentation of the dossier document rests solely with the candidate.

The work of the promotion and tenure sub-committee has serious implications for the professional career of the candidate being considered and for the professional climate and scholarly reputation of the College and the University. Membership as a voting faculty and service on the sub-committee that facilitates the promotion and tenure process is, therefore, a grave responsibility; it is expected that members shall exercise their responsibility in serving when it is their turn to do so. Members shall be excused only for serious reason, and only if such serious reason also serves to excuse that person from other College or University duties at the same time except for those times when they can be excused because of potential conflict of interest (see section below on conflict of interest).

a). The Functions of the Promotion and Tenure Sub-committee

The promotion and tenure subcommittee facilitates the compilation of each candidate's dossier so it is in compliance with College and University guidelines. The candidate, however, shall have primary

responsibility for preparing, according to Office of Academic Affairs guidelines, a dossier documenting his or her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.

The promotion and tenure sub-committee makes available to the eligible voting faculty the candidate's complete and core dossier. The eligible voting faculty shall review and evaluate the candidate's dossier. After a prescribed length of time for eligible voting faculty to review the candidate's dossier, the promotion and tenure sub-committee will then survey the eligible voting faculty to obtain their vote regarding the candidate's record (see section #4 below).

b). Role of the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Sub-Committee

The chair of the promotion and tenure committee shall be responsible for gathering internal evidence of the quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service from students and peers, as appropriate, within the promotion and tenure committee structure. The chair of the promotion and tenure committee shall also be responsible for obtaining letters from external evaluators and from other units at this University in which the candidate has appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not.

3. External Letters of Evaluation

Letters from persons outside the University are essential to provide an informed assessment of the quality of a candidate's professional activities and contributions. Persons asked to provide letters of evaluation should be advised that their letters must be analytical, carefully weighing the strengths and weaknesses in the case, and assessing the importance of the candidate's work with particular emphasis on originality and impact on the field.

Some of the external evaluators should be suggested by the candidate and some by the Dean and the promotion and tenure sub-committee; no more than one half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the above authorized persons may not be included in the dossier.

Letters from persons outside the College are not a substitute for a thorough evaluation of the candidate's work by the College colleagues. Also, while many individuals remain willing to write candid letters of evaluation despite Ohio's Public Records Act, there is evidence that others do not. Review bodies must weigh the content of letters of evaluation carefully in the context of other evidence.

The Ohio Public Records Act requires that public records be made available on request. Documents generated for promotion and tenure reviews are public records. Candidates and others may request access to these documents and departments must provide them with the following considerations: 1) Offices are not obligated to disrupt their normal activities to respond to public records request. A good faith effort should be made to respond to requests in a timely way. 2) The Public Records Act does not require offices to create documents. If a request is made for information that is not in a document form (written or electronic), the information does not have to be provided.

The chair of the promotion and tenure sub-committee requests the external letters of evaluation. Under no circumstances should the candidate solicit letters of evaluation. The request to potential evaluators must specify our need for a letter of analysis and assessment as indicated above, not a letter of support. The most useful letters result when writers are provided with representative examples of the candidate's work (when the work is in an easily transmittable form) and are asked to respond to a set of questions regarding that work.

External reviewers will be provided with the following materials:

- a) Representative examples of the candidates written materials.

- b) The candidate's full statement regarding research, teaching, and service.
- c) A copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae.

Co-authored pieces may or may not be wholly representative of the candidate's work in substance and effort. When multiple authored items are submitted for review by external reviewers the candidate's record must contain a statement describing the nature and extent of the candidate's contribution to the work. Estimates of a percentage of contribution do not satisfy this requirement. Single authored articles are presumed to directly reflect the candidate's effort, abilities, and potential impact. This step will help protect the candidate from the suggestion at any step of the tenure review process that the work being evaluated by external reviewers does not substantially reflect his or her own effort and abilities.

Writers' opinions as to whether a candidate would be tenured or promoted at their own institution or merit tenure or promotion at Ohio State University are not useful in our review process. Writers rarely have sufficient information about either the candidate or Ohio State University's standards to offer an informed opinion.

Although external evaluators are most often asked only to provide an evaluation of the candidate's research, scholarly or creative activity, these evaluators may also be asked to assess any aspect of the candidate's performance, provided sufficient information is given on which to base an informed assessment. It is inappropriate, for example, to ask external evaluators to comment on the quality of the faculty member's teaching unless samples of teaching materials and other information are provided.

4. Voting Process

In this section "promotion and tenure committee" will refer to both the committee of all eligible voting faculty considering candidates for reappointment and tenure and promotion to associate professor AND the committee consisting of all full professors considering candidates for promotion to full professor. The following procedures apply to candidates seeking reappointment or tenure as well as to those seeking promotion to full professor.

(a) Conflict of Interest. At a minimum, faculty members with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate should not participate in the review of that candidate. In addition, a close professional relationship may give rise to a conflict of interest. For example, it may be difficult for a faculty member to objectively review a candidate when the faculty member is co-author on a significant portion of the candidate's publications or when the faculty member is dependent in some way on the candidate's professional services.

(b) Process and time line. The candidates must submit their completed dossiers to the promotion and tenure subcommittee no later than the last working day of September. By the first working day of October the promotion and tenure subcommittee will place copies of a candidate's core dossier and supporting documentation in the Dean's office for review by all eligible voting faculty. Eligible voting faculty will sign out a candidate's supporting documentation from the Dean's office that they will then read and review only in their College of Social Work offices. The supporting documentation of the dossiers will be checked out for no longer than two hours at a time and none of this supporting documentation is to be taken from the premises of the College of Social Work.

In addition, the P & T sub-committee will prepare a written, balanced summary of each case. This document is to be viewed as a working draft only. The draft will not contain a recommendation on the candidate's case. Copies of this document will be distributed to eligible faculty as a confidential memo at least one week in advance of the meeting of the full faculty.

The process of reviewing the candidate's record and voting will be done in two phases:

Phase I. During the first two weeks of October eligible voting faculty will review the candidate's dossier and the preliminary draft prepared by the P & T sub-committee. During the third week of October, the promotion and tenure subcommittee will schedule a meeting of all eligible voting faculty. At this meeting members of the eligible faculty will have the opportunity to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record.

Each candidate will be invited to attend a portion of this meeting to answer questions and to provide clarification. The candidate's liaison to the P&T sub-committee may be helpful in preparing the candidate for this meeting specifically suggesting areas of ambiguity in the record, so that the candidate can adequately prepare to respond to the committee's questions. The chair of the P & T sub-committee will facilitate exchange of questions and responses. Neither the eligible faculty present nor the candidate will engage in discussions or debates on the merits of the case during this portion of the meeting.

Following the candidate interview, final discussion will focus on how to revise the preliminary working draft so that it reflects the faculty deliberation. If proposed revisions are substantial, the eligible faculty will set a time for a second meeting to approve a final draft. If recommendations and revisions are not substantial, the faculty may agree to approve the draft pending individual (eligible) faculty review of the final draft and written commentary and pending results of the mailed ballot process.

The P & T sub-committee will prepare the revised draft based on the deliberations from the meeting of the voting faculty and have it available to the eligible members of the faculty within seven days, for their written commentary or for their deliberation at a final meeting (if scheduled).

Phase II. Each voting faculty member will be given one ballot for each candidate. The College's process for conducting confidential voting will be followed. The time frame for completing the balloting and voting phase will be three (3) weeks from the first meeting of the eligible faculty. This period provides sufficient time for the faculty to further review the dossier and the draft report; it also provides time to conduct a final meeting of the eligible faculty if necessary. The vote shall be to recommend ("yes") or to not recommend ("no") regarding the applicant's candidacy for tenure or reappointment and for promotion. Only "yes" and "no" are votes. Consistent with *Robert's Rules of Order*, the Office of Academic Affairs does not consider abstentions to be votes and they may not be counted in determining whether the unit's recommendation on a case is positive or negative. A two-thirds majority recommendation of the eligible voting faculty who return ballots is necessary for the faculty recommendation to be considered positive.

Voting faculty will return their completed ballots along with a signed statement that they have read the candidate's dossier to the Dean's office in sealed envelope. These envelopes will remain sealed until the three-week voting period ends. At the end of the voting period, the promotion and tenure subcommittee will count the votes and report the results to the eligible voting faculty and Dean of the College of Social Work.

5. Statement of Assessment

After results of the voting process are made known to the eligible voting faculty and to the Dean, the promotion and tenure subcommittee will finalize the draft report on the candidate. The final report will contain the elements approved by the faculty as well as the results of the voting process. Results of the vote shall be reported as the percentage of eligible faculty who return ballots (excluding blanks and abstentions) who vote to recommend. As noted, this report shall contain a thorough analysis and assessment of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses in each of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service). The report shall not contain a recommendation regarding the candidate. This report, along with the candidate's dossier including all internal and external evaluations and the candidate's comments, must be submitted to the Dean by no later than December 1st. In keeping with the University's promotion and tenure policies, this summary report will be included in the candidate's dossier.

6. Dean's Report

The Dean shall write a report and make a recommendation to the Provost regarding the candidate's reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. The report shall present a thorough and independent analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. This report shall also include the percentage of eligible faculty who return ballots (excluding blanks and abstentions) who vote to recommend. This will be done according to a

time line established by the Provost's office.

After completing and submitting the report, the Dean notifies the candidate in writing of the completion of the tenure review, of the Dean's recommendation, and of the availability of tenure process records, including results from the voting process and the sub-committee final report. The candidate has ten days from the time of written notification by the Dean to provide written comments to include in the dossier.

C. Documentation

The following pages outline the general criteria to be employed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee members in evaluating the performance of a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. These criteria provide illustrations and evidence to be considered in the major functional areas of teaching, research or other creative work, and service to the instructional unit, the college, and the university and public service related to academic expertise.

Decisions by the individual committee members are necessarily subjective. It is the state of the art in the academic environment that we must deal more with qualitative measures rather than with quantitative measures. There are, nevertheless, certain guidelines that can be employed in making judgments on the quality of a candidate's performance.

In each area, a variety of types of evidence will be described, and candidates may present as many different types as they can document. It is important to keep in mind that no single set of satisfactory measures can be prescribed in any of the three general areas of evaluation, as University rules make note <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-04.html>.

The College sanctions a broad-based approach to the process of documenting performance for tenure and for promotion. The Office of Academic Affairs core dossier as updated annually serves as the basic standard and organizing framework for documentation, and all forms of documentation required by OAA are also required by the College. Within this organizing framework and set of requirements, selection of specific forms of documentation and the weight assigned to specific elements may vary according to the specific areas of expertise of the candidate and the College mission.

(1) Teaching

Teaching, broadly defined, is one of the primary functions of the University. When effectively accomplished, teaching makes a significant contribution to creative development, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge. Accordingly, the demonstration of consistently effective teaching is a necessary condition for promotion and for tenure. Broadly stated, such demonstration is made by the accumulation of a consistent record of excellence in individual classes. The College embraces the view that responsible faculty members will be engaged in an ongoing effort to improve their teaching performance through improvements in the presentations of individual courses, through modernization of the curricula of those courses and teaching methods for them, and through the introduction of appropriate new courses.

Effective teaching requires a process of continual curricular modification and innovation. While the overall contribution of this process to the quality of instruction is decidedly positive, the process inevitably involves occasional missteps and corrections. Thus, it is normal and expected that the teaching record of any faculty member will include a small percentage of outliers, representing relatively unsuccessful efforts. Such outliers, when viewed against a backdrop of effective teaching created by the overall record, are not causes for concern.

Illustrations of Teaching Activities

Illustrations of teaching include, but are not limited to, the following activities (not rank-ordered):

- 1) Classroom teaching in programs leading to academic degrees.
- 2) Teaching in university-related continuing education programs and comparable programs developed for professional organizations.
- 3) Directing undergraduate or graduate courses or projects, including theses and dissertations, that carry

academic credit.

- 4) Working with students outside the classroom on course materials and counseling students on course selection, career choices, and related matters of student concern.
- 5) Serving as a member of a committee advising a student on a thesis, dissertation, or honors paper.
- 6) Preparing teaching materials such as textbooks, books of readings, cases, course syllabi, bibliographies, video tapes, and computer programs.
- 7) Developing a course, sequence of courses, curriculum changes, or new and effective techniques of instruction for academic programs, university-related continuing education programs, and educational programs of professional organizations.
- 8) Publications or the presentation of papers at seminars on teaching.
- 9) Field liaison roles in the human services provider community.
- 10) Specialized orientation courses for instructors in the field.
- 11) Institutes and seminars in continuing education.

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness.

While promotion and tenure decisions represent perhaps the most important faculty reviews, all faculty members are subject to ongoing review of their teaching activity throughout their careers. This section provides a framework for evaluating teaching effectiveness. This list is not exhaustive; it may be common for additional measures to be used based on the individual nature of faculty teaching activities. However, the measures presented here form a base common to all teaching evaluations. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness must include the assessment of students, other faculty, and the candidate's self-evaluation.

(a) Student Evaluations.

Student evaluations of individual courses are required and must be available for every regular classroom course taught. OAA policy requires that faculty use one consistent instrument across comparable classroom settings. OAA also requires that the instrument used be handed out and collected by someone other than the faculty member. In the College of Social Work, the normal mechanism across classroom-based courses is the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). Faculty are expected to use supplementary instruments and procedures for obtaining performance feedback as needed to monitor and improve their classroom performance, which may include instruments developed by the instructor to evaluate the effectiveness of new teaching methods or delivery of specific content (for example content on women and minorities).

Efforts should be made to obtain evaluations from the largest possible number of enrolled students. When there is a large discrepancy between the number of students enrolled and the number providing evaluations, the evaluations cannot be assumed to represent student opinion accurately. Because student evaluations are useful only when viewed in significant numbers, student evaluations must be obtained for every course (with the exception of courses in which the instructor has primarily an organizational role, e.g., graduate seminar courses), except in rare circumstances.

A portfolio of student evaluations, each of which is well above College norms for courses with similar characteristics, is strong evidence of outstanding classroom performance. At the same time, a portfolio in which the evaluations are consistently at the bottom of results for the College is cause for concern. The College expects that most portfolios will contain a balance of some relatively high and some relatively low results. Because many factors outside the instructor's control, such as class size and grades anticipated by students, can have a systematic and significant effect on student evaluation ratings, responsible interpretation of them must consider these factors.

(b) Peer Evaluations.

Although peer review and feedback may be especially important to the new faculty member, it is a critical element throughout a faculty member's career. The contribution of peer review is greatest when peer observations are done

systematically and are conducted with the goal of offering constructive suggestions. The Office of Academic Affairs requires that dossiers of faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion contain, as part of the record, documentation of peer reviews of teaching. The College of Social Work employs two approaches to peer review.

1) Syllabi review. During the winter term, each faculty member will forward to the promotion and tenure sub-committee chair all syllabi for courses taught spring term through winter term, course outlines (if separate from the syllabi), and criteria for student evaluation. Faculty members may include a statement to the committee clarifying any issues in their materials that they believe could be subject to misinterpretation. These instructional items are reviewed with respect to the following: (a) inclusion of content on minorities and women (keeping in mind that the manner of inclusion will vary depending on curriculum area--e.g. inclusion may look different for a statistics course than for a practice course); (b) clarity of evaluative criteria; (c) relevancy of texts and assigned readings.

Each faculty member will receive his or her report in writing by the conclusion of the winter quarter. The faculty member may add an addendum if he or she feels that clarification is called for. If the faculty member believes it would be helpful, he or she may request to meet with the committee. Given the importance of academic freedom in the context of the classroom, it is up to each faculty member to decide which recommendations he or she finds most useful.

2) Peer Observation. Untenured faculty will have $n - 1$ peer reviewed classroom visitation per academic year (where $n =$ the number of years of service). Faculty with tenure will receive a peer reviewed classroom visit every three years. A minimum of one peer reviewed classroom visitation is required as part of any promotion or tenure review. Any faculty member may request a peer review classroom visit at any time. Faculty with tenure are responsible for monitoring the three year review cycle and contacting the P&T chair in years when a review is required.

All tenured faculty are eligible to serve as peer reviewers. No faculty member is obligated to conduct a review. Faculty members serving as current promotion and tenure liaisons are not eligible to conduct classroom visits with persons for whom they serve as liaison. Conducting peer reviews counts as service to the College of Social Work during annual merit reviews.

During its initial meeting, the P&T committee will establish a timeline to determine peer reviewers for all untenured faculty, and those tenured faculty scheduled for review during that year, and notify faculty in writing of this timeline. Each faculty member receiving a visit will provide the P&T committee a list of three potential reviewers (excluding their P&T liaison) by a deadline established by the P&T committee. The P&T committee will consult with potential reviewers, determine the reviewer for each candidate and communicate that decision to the candidate and reviewer.

Once the reviewer is determined it is the responsibility of the candidate to contact their assigned reviewer and schedule the pre-conference and classroom visitation. The faculty members receiving and conducting the review will meet to agree upon a schedule for the peer review. During this meeting, the faculty member receiving a visit will identify a course and session for visitation. Selection criteria should emphasize courses and sessions that the faculty member being reviewed believes will allow the best opportunity for providing an accurate representation of their teaching. It is generally not recommended that classroom observation occur for courses a faculty member is teaching for the first time.

The peer review activity consists of four components (1) a pre-observation conference, (2) a classroom visit, (3) a post-observation conferences and (4) a written summary to the P&T committee and the candidate within two weeks of completing the classroom visitation. Specific procedures for classroom visitation are described in the Peer Review of Classroom Instruction policy adopted by College of Social Work faculty in May of 2005.

c) Candidate's Self-Evaluation Of Teaching.

Self-evaluation of teaching is critical to any future improvement. Faculty should spend time evaluating the successes and failures of their courses, as well as the feedback provided by the student evaluations. The candidate's evaluation of his or her teaching must include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching; self-assessment; and description of specific strategies for the candidate's further development as a teacher. A suggested model for the reports includes the faculty member's summary of his or her efforts in improvement, innovation, updating, along with an evaluation of what was effective, and how the course could be improved in the future. These reports should be included as part of the material available to peer evaluation of teaching as well as in the promotion packet, should promotion eventually be recommended by the College. The candidate's efforts with respect to graduate student advising should be described and discussed.

d) Other Evaluative Components

Candidates may draw on many other resources to demonstrate their teaching excellence. These may include (but are not limited to):

- 1) Exit interviews of College students, surveys of alumni, and College solicited evaluations of former students, particularly graduates who have achieved notable professional success.
- 2) Evaluations of courses taught in university-related continuing education programs and in comparable programs for professional organizations.
- 3) Training grants obtained for special programs or courses or for the training of special groups.
- 4) Publication of textbooks, casebooks, readings, books, videotapes, or other instructional materials, particularly when they are adopted at other colleges and universities.
- 5) Recognitions or awards for distinguished teaching.
- 6) Publications on teaching in respected journals devoted to pedagogy.
- 7) Presentations on teaching at other universities.
- 8) The number and quality of students attracted to the University by the faculty member's repute as a scholar.
- 9) The nature and content of dissertations, theses, and individual or group special studies completed under the faculty member's supervision.

In preparation for yearly evaluation, the faculty member will submit to the Dean a copy of the peer review reports with any addendum; SEI results (and results from additional instruments used to elicit student feedback); and items related to the development of courses, curriculum, or programs. These items become the basis for a full discussion with the Dean regarding teaching performance.

(2) Scholarship

High quality creative research and scholarly production has long been an integral part of academic disciplines and has been an increasingly important activity in professional schools. It is essential for the survival of any academic discipline and professional area, and it enhances the reputation of the researcher and his or her academic unit, college, and university. Its benefits accrue to the researcher, his or her students, academic and professional colleagues, and the larger society. Faculty members should show superior intellectual attainment, productivity, and creativity in their writings, including evidence of continuous and effective research.

a). Working Definition of Research and Scholarship

Research is the creative development and advancement of knowledge. It may involve:

- Creating or empirically validating ideas and theories.
- Expanding, analyzing, or creatively synthesizing ideas and theories.
- Innovatively applying knowledge within the professional field.

b). Illustrations and Evidence of Research and Scholarly Production

For social work scholars, scholarship is reflected primarily in the form of research, publications, and presentations for audiences of academic peers in social work and related disciplines, social work professionals, and students of the profession. Documentation should provide evidence of the quantity, quality and significance of scholarship, along with continuity of effort. Accordingly the following forms of documentation may be presented in support of the candidate's record regarding scholarship, as appropriate:

- 1) Documentation of the candidate's scholarly contribution to the discipline through scholarly outlets including: articles in peer reviewed professional journals, articles in non-refereed journals, books, edited books, monographs, chapters in edited books, bulletins and technical reports, reviews and abstracts, papers in proceedings and unpublished scholarly presentations. Candidates should document whether the scholarly product was peer reviewed. With multiple authorship, the candidate should provide a narrative description of the nature and extent of their contribution in relation to the total effort. Quantitative descriptions of contribution do not satisfy this requirement
- 2) Documentation of the candidate's scholarly contribution to the discipline through research and knowledge-building including: funded research as principle investigator, funded research as co-investigator, and proposals for research that have not been funded. In the case of multiple investigators, it would be useful for the candidate to document the nature and extent of their involvement in producing the proposal, in conducting the research, in developing the final report, and in disseminating the findings.
- 3) Documentation of any prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.
- 4) Reference to proxy indicators for quality and significance of scholarly work including citations by other scholars, professional ranking/reputation of journal or publisher, and acceptance rates of journals in which work is published. (Note: we recognize that the terms quality and significance with regard to a scholar's work are much broader concepts than can be described in terms of sheer quantity or percentages, hence the understanding that such indicators provide approximate indications only and must be supplemented by other documentation such as external letters of review.)
- 5) External letters of evaluation solicited by the chair of the promotion and tenure committee or other authorized person. External letters provide documentation regarding the quality, clarity, significance, and potential significance of the candidate's scholarly work to the profession nationally or internationally..
- 6) Appraisals of publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature also provide important testimony of peer judgment.
- 7) Other evaluations of scholarly products solicited by the promotion and tenure committee.

(3) Service

Effective service is indispensable in achieving the administrative and academic objectives of the College and the University and in responding to pressing issues and concerns of the larger community. Community is understood to be defined at many levels -- professional, local, state, national and international. Faculty members are expected by the University and the public-at-large to make available their professional knowledge and expertise in service beyond that provided through teaching and research.

Illustrations of Service Activities

Illustrations of service include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

- (a) Within the University. Making a distinguished contribution as a chairperson, administrator, or facilitator for any academic or otherwise university-sanctioned group organized at the teaching unit, college, or university levels--appointed or elected; serving as a leader or member of university and college task forces or committees providing service to any academic or otherwise university-sanctioned group; contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as adviser to student organizations; and serving as chairperson of a curriculum area and/or as administrator of an educational program.
- (b) Within the Larger Community. The diversity of external needs as well as faculty education and professional experience lead to many different forms of public service. The following activities are examples of how faculty members, through their academic and professional expertise, can contribute to the public good while directly addressing real-world problems, issues, interests, or concerns: serve in leadership roles within professional and scholarly associations (elected or appointed); serve as editor or on review panel for professional and scholarly journals; serve as a reviewer for a funding source; conduct social welfare policy analysis for local, state, national, or international governmental agencies; test concepts and processes in real-world situations; act as expert witnesses; address the public in their area of expertise; provide extension education; evaluate programs, policies, or personnel for agencies; engage in informational activities (seminars, conferences, institutes) that address public interest problems, issues, and concerns in the candidate's areas of expertise; participate in governmental meetings or on federal review panels; engage in economic and community development activities; participate in collaborative endeavors with schools, social, and community agencies; testify before legislative or congressional committees; consult with public and private sector social agencies; engage in community development activities (provided that such services are supportive of the faculty member's total commitment and not in conflict with that commitment); and so on. Applied research with direct implications for professional practice, public policy, or human welfare generally can be considered evidence of service as well as research.

Evaluating Service Effectiveness

For purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, well-stated cases should be based on the overall public service activities, not on a single instance of public service. Community service not germane to a faculty member's professional expertise is not relevant to promotion and tenure reviews. Candidates should make the case for how their service activities have contributed to and enhanced the College, University, and larger community.

In making the case regarding service activities, candidates might consider the following as indicators of quality: a beneficial impact attributable at least in part to the application of relevant and up-to-date knowledge to the real-world problems, issues, or concerns addressed by the public service community (examples: favorable effects upon public policy or upon professional practice); honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition such as commendations that have been received in the execution of public service; election to office or undertaking important service to professional associations and learning societies, including editorial work or peer reviewing for a national or international organization, as related to public service; selection for special public service activities outside the state and invitations to give talks within the faculty member's field; election or appointment to departmental or institutional governance bodies or to academic policy or procedure development committees related to public service; leadership and/or significant participation in professional or scientific associations and meetings; evidence that the candidate's services are sought after rather than volunteered.

All faculty members have service obligations and committee work as a normal function and expectation of an academic institution. The mere membership on committees, therefore, is not in itself a criterion for tenure or promotion. The test of service effectiveness requires evidence of productivity, creativity, or leadership in the illustrations provided. When service activities are offered as evidence of performance, letters or other documentation of this productivity or creativity may be requested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Such requests may be made of those who are in a position to evaluate specific contributions -- i.e. persons at various levels within the University, other universities, other organizations, or representatives of public groups who are the recipients of the service. These persons include: a)

immediate superiors or persons in other senior positions; b) peers in areas of service; c) members or leaders of recipient public groups or organizations; d) chairpersons of committees or task forces.

Modification of process and procedures

As the need arises, the above mentioned procedures and process for reviewing dossiers and voting on reappointment and promotion and tenure can be modified, i.e., change of deadline date for placing completed dossiers in the Dean's office, by a majority vote of voting faculty eligible to vote for candidates for reappointment or tenure and promotion to associate professor. For candidates for promotion to full professor, the voting procedures and process can be modified by a majority vote of the voting full professors in the College.

VII. APPEALS

It is the policy of The Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in these rules, supplemented by additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and colleges. If a candidate believes that a non-renewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 provides further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation.

<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules5/ru5-05.html>

VIII. 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 review. <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6-05.html>. Every effort is made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, a promotion and tenure committee may petition the Dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the unit and the Dean must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular University review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the Dean concurs with the promotion and tenure committee's petition, the Dean shall in turn petition the Provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the Provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the non-renewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by his or her tenure initiating unit, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review, because the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review.

Procedure for Timely and Accurate Modification of this Document

At the conclusion of faculty meetings when any action is taken to impact the Patterns of Administration and/or the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure document it will be the responsibility of the Executive Assistant to the Dean in

consultation with the Associate Dean to insure that this document is updated within 30 days of the approved changes. The updated document will be distributed to all faculty electronically and made available on the College of Social Work internal website.

IX. APPENDICES

CORE DOSSIER OUTLINE

The *Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank-Tenure-Reappointment* ("Cover Sheet") gives administrators' recommendations with their signatures along with basic information on the faculty member's appointment and the review. It is placed **FIRST** and should be **IMMEDIATELY VISIBLE** when the folder is opened. Please do not place anything on top of the "Cover Sheet."

[Record of Review \(PDF\)](#) or [Record of Review \(.doc\)](#)

The *Dossier Checklist* is placed SECOND, immediately beneath the "Cover Sheet."

[Dossier Checklist \(PDF\)](#)

A single checklist is used to ensure that every dossier meets all requirements before moving to the next level of review. In four stages the candidate, the TIU-level Procedures Oversight Designee*, the college-level Procedures Oversight Designee, and a designated staff member in the college office will use the same checklist to examine the dossier and to ascertain its accuracy and completeness. The college will serve as the final guarantor of the integrity of every dossier before it is forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for the completion of the review process.

*In colleges without departments (i.e., colleges that serve as the tenure initiating unit for their faculty), the Procedures Oversight Designee will fulfill the role of the TIU-level designee. For further information on dossier presentation, see [Dossier Submission](#).

I. Introduction—Biographical statement and **III. Core Dossier** are primarily the responsibility of the **candidate**.

Record of Review ("Cover Sheet"); **Dossier Checklist**; and **II. Evaluation** are primarily the responsibility of the **TIU and college**.

I. INTRODUCTION

Include a biographical statement listing degrees and professional positions held with dates for each. This statement replaces the traditional *curriculum vitae* appended in the past.

II. EVALUATION

- Only letters solicited by the chair, P & T committee chair, or other authorized persons may be considered in the review process and/or included in the dossier.
- All items in this section should be placed *in the order listed* to ensure that necessary items are included and may be easily located during the review process.
- **Every item in Part II.A. should be preceded by a plain-colored page noting the item that follows.**

II. A. INTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION

Expectations of the unit against which the candidate is being assessed must be explained in either **1.1)** or **1.2)** and **1)** or **2)** below.

1.1) Regional campus faculty deliberative body's detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.

1.2) Regional campus dean's detailed assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and service along with recommendations based solely on these aspects of the record.

1) Tenure initiating unit (TIU)—faculty deliberative body's detailed assessment, to include:

- Thorough assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, regarding both strengths and weaknesses.
- Report of the discussion by the faculty deliberative body.
- **Numerical vote** of the full faculty deliberative body.

2) TIU head (or dean in colleges without departments)—independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses.

This assessment should take into account the faculty deliberative body's recommendation. If the TIU head's assessment and/or recommendation differs from that of the faculty, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

3) Head of any unit in which the candidate holds a joint (split FTE) academic appointment—independent assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. Such a letter is optional only when the joint appointment is both **0 percent FTE** and entails very little interaction between the candidate and the unit.

3.1) TIU-level comments process—any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments

4) College promotion and tenure committee (in colleges with departments)—independent assessment including the committee's **numerical vote** and recommendation to the dean. If the college committee's assessment is contrary to the TIU-level assessment, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

5) College dean (in colleges with departments)—independent assessment and recommendation to the provost.

If the dean's assessment and/or recommendation differs from any of the prior assessments or recommendations, bases for differing judgments should be addressed.

5.1) College-level comments process—any letters generated or a notation that the candidate declined to provide comments

The Office of Academic Affairs has required written annual evaluations of all regular faculty since 1993. If annual review letters are lacking for any of the years specified below, a written explanation is required.

6) Annual review letters.

Untenured candidates: all annual review letters since year of hire.

Tenured candidates: all annual review letters since last Ohio State promotion or year of hire with tenure, not to exceed the most recent five years.

6.1) Written comments on the annual reviews by untenured and tenured candidates shall be included if the candidate requests.

7) Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching (letters, reports, etc). Peer review is required. The material in this section must match requirements set forth in the TIU's appointments, promotion and tenure (A, P & T) document.

ADDITIONS

Departments and colleges may add to the above list any evaluations that are required in their A, P & T documents. For example, in some TIUs that have sections or divisions, a letter from the section or division head is required by the unit.

II.B. EXTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION

- **External evaluation letters must be submitted by regular mail on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator's signature. Such a letter submitted via fax is acceptable when timing is critical, but must be followed by a mailed original.**
- **Evaluations submitted by e-mail are unacceptable.**
- Individuals who are former mentors or who have a close personal or familial relationship with the candidate should not be contacted for an evaluation.

REQUIRED FOR TENURE TRACK AND RESEARCH TRACK: At least **five (5)** letters from distinguished persons in the candidate's field who are in a position to critically evaluate the candidate's scholarly work and to comment on its significance in the discipline. Section B(3) of [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) requires that **no more than one-half** of these letters be from persons suggested by the candidate.

In order to meet this requirement, more letters should be solicited from persons NOT suggested by the candidate than from persons suggested by the candidate. So as not to exhaust the pool of potential evaluators, it is also best that the number of evaluators suggested by the candidate be limited to three or four.

- *All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves their removal from the review process.*

See the following two topics below, under REVIEW PROCEDURES II, on obtaining meaningful external evaluations. It is essential that external evaluators meet the criteria set forth. If the dean or provost determines that criteria for external evaluators have not been met, the TIU will be required to seek additional letters during the review process.

- Guidelines for Obtaining Meaningful External Evaluations.
- Sample Letter Directed to an External Evaluator.

OPTIONAL: In the case of a candidate who collaborates extensively, a department may wish to ask the collaborators to describe the candidate's contributions to jointly conducted work.

Collaborators must not be asked to write an external evaluation. They cannot be arms-length since they would be, in part, evaluating their own work. A different request letter from the one sent to regular external evaluators must be sent to research collaborators. Under REVIEW PROCEDURES II see:

- Sample Letter Directed to a Research Collaborator

1) Summary sheet listing (summary form for respondents):

- Name and institution of all persons from whom letters were solicited.
- Name of person who suggested each evaluator.
- The relationship of the evaluator to the candidate (expert in the field, collaborator, etc.)

2) Persons who were asked to write, but did not, must be listed on a second summary sheet (summary form for non-respondents. Cover pages, however, should **not** be included for these persons. (See *Item 3* below.)

3) A single representative example of the letters sent to the evaluators *if these letters were identical*. If different letters, or different sets of material for review, were sent, an example of each must be included along with an explanation of why evaluators were treated differently. If the letter does not list the materials sent to the evaluators, provide this information separately.

4) External letters preceded by a cover page ([External Evaluator PDF](#) or [External Evaluator Word](#)) for each letter received, containing the following information:

- Name, title (rank if in the academy), and institutional affiliation.
- Concise summary of the person's qualifications as an evaluator of the candidate. Sufficient information must be provided to establish the credibility of the evaluator; simply to note that the evaluator is a professor at

University X or does research in the candidate's area is insufficient. **Do not, however, include the full CV of each evaluator when forwarding the dossiers to the Office of Academic Affairs.**

- Name of person who recommended the evaluator (candidate, chair, or other [specified]).
- Evaluator's relationship to the candidate (expert in the field, collaborator, etc.). This information must be accurate.

III. CORE DOSSIER

Instructions for the Candidate

Please number pages consecutively within the Core Dossier as outlined below. Page 1 will be the first item in the Core Dossier Outline.

In Parts I and II, described above, required materials should be placed in sequence following the outline, but do not have to be paginated.

You must include every item in the Core Dossier Outline in your dossier. If a particular item is not applicable to you, note "N/A" for the item. Do not omit the item.

You should not look at dossiers from the past (including your own) for examples of how to present material, since guidelines change and past formats may no longer be acceptable. If you are unsure about the content needed for a particular item, ask your TIU head or P & T committee chair for assistance.

Present your accomplishments as succinctly as possible and in outline form to the extent possible. Some explanation is valuable but lengthy narrative and explanation may obscure important accomplishments rather than highlight them.

Avoid self-evaluation except when it is requested. Assessment of the quality and importance of your accomplishments is most appropriately offered by others.

Item 6 below should contain only SUMMARY TABLES of SEI (Student Evaluation of Instruction) data. Directions for obtaining **Cumulative SEI Reports** from the Office of the University Registrar are provided under *Item 6*. Individual course fixed-response student evaluation reports should be placed in the **Appendix**, as explained at the end of the Core Dossier outline.

TIME FRAME

In the review process, attention is paid both to productivity since the date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent) and accomplishments over one's entire career. In the outline below, some items specifically state the time frame for the requested information. When no time frame is specified, you may provide information for the entire career if it is germane to the evaluation. However, you should supply dates for all listed activities and accomplishments, making it possible for reviewers to identify clearly those that took place since the date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent).

CORE DOSSIER OUTLINE

1) Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Courses Taught Since Date of Hire or Past Five Years (whichever is more recent)

List each course taught and clinical instruction (see [Courses/Clinical Instruction form \[.doc\]](#)), including the following information:

- Courses taught in chronological order by quarter (AU, WI, SP, SU) and year.
- Course number, title, and number of credit hours.
- Official final course enrollment.
- Percentage of course taught by candidate based on proportion of total student contact hours in course.
- Brief explanation of your role, if you were not solely responsible for course, including GTA supervision, course management, team teaching, etc.
- Indication of whether formal course evaluations were completed by students or others by placing a check mark in the appropriate column.

If you have not obtained student evaluations in every regular classroom course, explain why you have not done so. Such evaluation is required by Section (C) (14) of [Faculty Rule 3335-3-35](#). Do not include in this list extension, continuing education, or other non-credit courses.

2) Involvement in Graduate/Professional Exams, Theses, and Dissertations

a) Graduate student programs: give number completed and number current.
Doctoral Students (dissertation advisor).

For advisees who have graduated, list name of student, year of graduation, and title of dissertation. Also provide the current position of the former student, if known.

Master's Students Plan A (thesis advisor).

For advisees who have graduated, list name of student, year of graduation, and title of thesis.

Also provide the current position of the former student, if known.

Master's Students Plan B (advisor).

Doctoral Students (dissertation committee member).

Doctoral Students (general examination committee chair).

Doctoral Students (general examination committee member).

Do not include service as a Graduate School representative.

Master's Students (thesis committee member).

Master's Students (examination committee member).

b) Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of graduate students for whom you have been the advisor of record, for example, publications during or emanating from graduate program, awards for graduate work, prestigious post-docs or first post-graduate positions.

c) Senior Honor Theses: give name of student, title of thesis, quarter of graduation, and noteworthy outcomes of this mentorship such as publications, presentations, honors or student awards.

d) Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of undergraduate students, in particular related to research, for whom you have been the advisor of record. For example, publications, posters, honors or student awards.

3) Extension and Continuing Education Instruction

Summarize briefly the major instructional activities (workshops, non-credit courses, etc.) which you have conducted. Identify your role in the instruction and the number of participants.

4) Curriculum Development Since Date of Hire or Last Promotion (whichever is more recent)

Give specific examples of your involvement in curriculum development; e.g., role in the design and implementation of new or revised courses; development of new teaching methods or materials (undergraduate, graduate, or professional); creation of new programs.

5) Brief description of your approach to and goals in teaching, major accomplishments, plans for the future in teaching.

6) Evaluation of Teaching Since Date of Hire or Last Five Years (whichever is more recent)

Describe the variety of ways in which the quality of your teaching has been evaluated; e.g., student evaluation of teaching, peer review, departmental surveys. Describe how you have used the evaluation information to improve the quality of instruction.

Student Evaluation Data Summaries

a) Fixed-Response Survey. For all courses in which you used a type of fixed-response survey (the SEI, SET or comparable department form) to obtain student evaluations, provide a SUMMARY TABLE. Complete documentation as set forth below is required.

If you have not obtained or retained student evaluations for all or most courses taught during the relevant time frame, and review at this time is not mandatory, the review should be postponed until you have accumulated the required documentation.

Results for every quarter the course was taught are presented horizontally across the page in the SUMMARY TABLE (see examples at [Summary Teaching Eval PDF](#) or [Summary Teaching Eval Word](#)). The table should not simply list item numbers, but should clearly describe the item to which students were responding, i.e., the table should be self-explanatory to anyone who reviews it.

To obtain a **Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Report** that meets Office of Academic Affairs guidelines:

- Go to <http://www.ureg.ohio-state.edu/ourweb/online.html> for a menu of the Registrar's online services.
- FACULTY/STAFF INFORMATION SERVICES is at the top right of the menu. Under this topic, the second subtopic is EMAIL ROSTER & GRADES PROCESSING.
- The last item under the subtopic EMAIL ROSTER & GRADES...is the link for **Instructor's Cumulative SEIs**.
- Entering OSU username (name.number) and password gives access to the cumulative summary.

The Core Dossier proper contains only SUMMARY TABLES, not individual fixed-response student evaluation REPORTS. Reports that tally the results for an entire class of students in a given course (one evaluation form per course per quarter, not one form per student per course per quarter) are placed in the **Appendix**, as explained at the end of the Core Dossier outline. Only in individualized teaching situations for relatively small groups, such as grand rounds or clinical teaching, may individual evaluations (one per student) be included in the **Appendix**. These responses too might be summarized on a single form for each clinical teaching group, since numbers are small, but Academic Affairs has never insisted on this.

b) Open-Ended (Narrative) Evaluation. For all courses in which you used open-ended evaluation instruments as the primary means of collecting student input, someone other than you must summarize the comments on a course by course basis for inclusion in this section of the dossier. Ask your TIU head to assign this task to someone, and make the request well in advance of the deadline for completion of your dossier. State in the dossier the name and role (such as faculty member or staff member) of the person who wrote the summaries. Any faculty member or qualified staff member may fulfill this task.

For both fixed-response or open-ended evaluation instruments, state on each course summary:

- The role (student, faculty member, or staff member) of the person who handed out and collected the evaluation instrument.
- The number of students in the course and the number of these who completed evaluations.

7) Awards and Formal Recognition for Teaching

List awards you have received for excellence in teaching. Nominations for such awards should not be listed. These awards may include citations from academic or professional units (department, college, university, professional associations) which have formal procedures and stated criteria for awards for outstanding teaching performance. To the extent possible, describe how awardees are selected and the extent of competitiveness of the award.

8) Academic Advising

Identify number and level of advisees seen on a regular basis since date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent). Describe specific responsibilities in advising, e.g., direct enrollment, coordinating advisor, career advisor.

9) Advisor to Student Groups and Organizations

Identify name of group or organization and specific responsibilities as advisor.

10) Student Affairs Committees, Task Forces and Other Student Services

Summarize participation in student affairs programs such as fireside discussions, lectures to student groups outside your department, addresses or participation at student orientation. List student affairs committees or task forces on which you have served as a member or chair. Identify contributions to any other student services not covered in the above categories.

11) Student Services Awards or Formal Recognition

List awards you have received as recognition for your contributions to student affairs.

12) Chronological List of Books, Articles, and Other Published Papers

Only papers and other scholarly works that have been formally accepted without qualification for publication or presentation, or have actually been published or presented, should be listed in *Items a-g* below.

Works under review must be listed separately in *Item j*.

Use the standard citation style for your discipline with authors listed exactly as they are listed on the publication. You must list yourself even if you are the only author.

In cases of multiple authorship for *Items 12 a-e*, a narrative description of your intellectual contribution is required. Examples of appropriate formats for this information include:

I designed the experiment (which was carried out by the graduate student co-authors), and wrote the article.

I identified the patients for the study, administered the drug regimen, reported results to the consortium and reviewed the draft manuscript.

I completed and wrote the literature review for the paper, shared equally with the co-author in the analysis and interpretation of the data, and reviewed the complete draft manuscript.

Statements such as the following are NOT acceptable: "All authors contributed equally"; "50% effort." Do not refer to past dossiers for models of how to write the required description, since they occasionally include unacceptable statements such as these.

You may provide the approximate percentage of your contribution in relation to the total intellectual effort involved in the work if your department or college requires this information. This information is *not required by the Office of Academic Affairs and under no circumstances is it an acceptable substitute for the required narrative description.*

For *Items f-j*: the above information is not needed unless your department requires it. Include as separate categories:

a) Books (other than edited volumes) and monographs.

- b) Edited books.
- c) Chapters in edited books.
- d) Bulletins and technical reports.
- e) Peer-reviewed journal articles.
- f) Editor-reviewed journal articles.
- g) Reviews and abstracts (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- h) Papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- i) Unpublished scholarly presentations (indicate whether peer reviewed).
- j) Potential publications under review (indicate authorship, date of submission, and to what journal or publisher the work has been submitted).

13) Chronological list of creative works pertinent to your professional focus, e.g., inventions; dramatic, dance, or musical performances; or exhibits of your art

14) Brief description of the focus of your research, scholarly or creative work, major accomplishments, and plans for the future.

15) Description of quality indicators of your research, scholarly or creative work such as citations, publication outlet quality indicators such as acceptance rates, ranking or impact factors of journal or publisher, etc. Individual departments should determine what kinds of information could be described here, if any.

16) Research funding

In cases of multiple authorship for *Items 16 a-b*, a narrative description (of the type described above for Item 12) of your intellectual contribution is required.List the author or authors in the order in which they appear on the grant proposal.

Statements such as the following are NOT acceptable: "All authors contributed equally"; "50% effort." Do not refer to past dossiers for models of how to write the required description, since they occasionally include unacceptable statements such as these.

You may provide the approximate percentage of your contribution in relation to the total intellectual effort involved in the grant proposal if your department or college requires this information. This information is *not required by the Office of Academic Affairs and under no circumstances is it an acceptable substitute for the required narrative description.*

- Funded research on which you are or have been the *principal investigator*.
- Period of funding
- Source and amount of funding

- Whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant

b) Funded research on which you are or have been a *co-investigator*.

- Period of funding
- Source and amount of funding
- Whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant

c) Proposals for research funding that were submitted but not funded.

- Date of submission
- Title of project
- Authors in the order listed on the proposal
- Agency to which proposal was submitted
- Priority score received by proposal, if applicable

d) Funded training grants on which you are or have been the equivalent of the *principal investigator*.

- Source and amount of funding
- Whether funding is in the form of a contract or grant

e) Proposals for training grants that were submitted but not funded.

- Date of submission
- Title of project
- Authors in the order listed on the proposal
- Agency to which proposal was submitted
- Priority score received by proposal, if applicable

f) Any other funding received for your academic work.

Provide the type of information requested above as appropriate.

17) List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly or creative work.

18) List of editorships or service as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications.

19) List of offices held and other service to professional societies. List organization in which office was held or service performed. Describe nature of organization, i.e., open or elected membership, honorary.

20) List of consultation activity (industry, education, government). Give time period in which consultation was provided and other information as appropriate.

21) Clinical services. State specific clinical assignments.

22) Other professional/public service such as reviewer of proposals or external examiner, *if not listed elsewhere.*

23) Administrative service. Give dates and description of responsibility.

a) Departmental committees

b) College or University committees

c) Affirmative action and mentoring activities

d) Administrative positions held

e) Other administrative services to/for the University

24) Brief examples of the impact of service to your unit, the college, the university or profession if not covered elsewhere.

25) Major Academic/Professional Awards and Commendations, if not listed elsewhere.

APPENDIX FOR FIXED-RESPONSE STUDENT EVALUATION DATA

Copies of individual course fixed-response student evaluation reports should be placed here. *Item 6* of the Core Dossier proper should include only the SUMMARY TABLES of these reports.

a) If you used SEI or SET instruments, include all individual course reports.

b) If you used another type of fixed-response survey instrument, include here one page per course/quarter taught, listing:

- Actual statements to which students responded.
- Full rating scale of possible responses.
- For each statement, number of students that selected each response choice.

[End of Dossier Outline]