

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

Approved September 9, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Preamble.....	1
2. Department Mission.....	1
3. Appointments.....	2
3.1. Criteria	2
3.1.1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty.....	2
3.1.2. Regular Research Track Faculty.....	2
3.1.3. Auxiliary Faculty.....	3
3.1.4. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty.....	4
3.2. Procedures	4
3.2.1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty.....	4
3.2.2. Regular Research Track Faculty.....	6
3.2.3. Auxiliary Faculty.....	6
3.2.4. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty.....	6
4. Annual Reviews.....	7
4.1. Procedures.....	7
4.1.1. Reviews of Probationary Track Faculty.....	7
4.1.1.1. Annual Performance Review by Department Chair.....	7
4.1.1.2. First, Second, Third and Fifth Year Review by P&T Committee..	7
4.1.1.3. Fourth Year Review by P&T Committee.....	8
4.1.1.4. Exclusion of Time from the Probationary Period.....	8
4.1.2. Regular Tenured Faculty.....	8
4.1.3. Regular Research Track Faculty.....	8
5. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards.....	9
5.1. Criteria	9
5.2. Procedures.....	9
5.3. Documentation for Annual Reviews.....	9
6. Promotion & Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	10
6.1. Criteria.....	10
6.1.1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty.....	10
6.1.1.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	10
6.1.1.2. Promotion to Professor.....	13
6.1.2. Regular Research Track Faculty.....	13
6.1.2.1. Promotion to Research Associate Professor	13
6.1.2.2. Promotion to Research Professor	14
6.2. Procedures.....	14
6.2.1. Candidate Responsibilities.....	14
6.2.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities.....	14
6.2.3. Department Chair Responsibilities.....	15
6.2.4. External Evaluations.....	17
6.3. Documentation.....	18
7. Appeals.....	19
8. Seventh Year Reviews	20
Appendix: Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	21

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF FOOD SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

September 1, 2009

1. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the OSU Board of Trustees Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Tenure Track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure) <http://trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>; the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Book 3 of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php; and other policies and procedures of the college and University to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

2. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The department strategic vision is to become “a global leader in food science and technology education, research and outreach.” In response to the 21st century environment, OSU's Department of Food Science and Technology will lead collaborative innovation focused on discovering and applying knowledge in food safety and public health, value-added food processing, ingredient technology, and health-promoting foods; developing professionals and leaders who advance industry, academia, and government both locally and globally and continue to grow professionally over the course of their careers and improving human health via the

effective dissemination of the collective knowledge of the department to our stakeholders across the university, Ohio and the national and international community.

3. APPOINTMENTS

3.1. Criteria

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

3.1.1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate (or equivalent) is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high quality instruction, and high quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in instruction, scholarly activity, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank (Professor) normally includes tenure. Appointment at Associate Professor rank normally entails a probationary period. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e. terminal year of employment is offered.

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.

3.1.2. Regular Research Track Faculty

Appointment of regular research track faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to regular research track faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a

formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. See Faculty Rule 3335-7 for more information.

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

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

3.1.3. Auxiliary Faculty

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

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are never compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the department. Examples of significant service are outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-5-19. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty. In the event that the department wishes to compensate an adjunct faculty member for work other than the voluntary service for which the adjunct title is provided, a concurrent appointment of limited duration for lecturer or other appropriate job title may be added for that purpose.

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

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

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

3.1.4. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the department by a regular faculty member from another department at OSU warrants the offer of a courtesy appointment. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching part or all of a course, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current OSU rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

3.2. Procedures

See Book 1 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook on the following topics:

- recruitment of regular tenure track, clinical track and research track faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after april 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

3.2.1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be requested from the Office of Academic Affairs. Search procedures must be consistent with the University policies set forth in the most recent update of *A Guide to Effective Searches* published by OSU Office of Human Resources.

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more regular faculty members from the department. Additional auxiliary faculty members from within the department or regular faculty members from outside the department may be appointed to provide additional expertise to the committee. Regular faculty members of the department will always make up the majority of the committee, although exceptions may occur if a search is joint with other departments. A student may be appointed to the committee, but will not vote. The department chair appoints the chair of the search committee who must be a regular faculty member of the department. The department chair appoints an Affirmative Action Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants

The search committee:

- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the University Personnel Postings (formerly known as the "green sheet") through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary, etc. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The University cannot legally grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor (DOL) guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated print journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the department chair a summary of those applicants (usually 5-10) judged worthy of interview. The second screening step is usually a telephone interview. Telephone interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office staff. After completion of the telephone interviews, the search committee recommends 2-3 applicants for further consideration. The department chair completes an independent assessment of each candidate and makes a recommendation to the dean. If the dean agrees, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office.

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation in an open meeting on their scholarly activity, and teach a class (if teaching is part of the position responsibilities). The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the search committee meets with eligible voting faculty to determine the acceptability of each candidate. At least two-thirds of all faculty eligible to vote must indicate whether a candidate is acceptable or unacceptable. Acceptability is determined by majority vote. If more than one candidate is acceptable, the faculty may rank the candidates. The search committee forwards the recommendation of the faculty to the department chair. The department chair makes a recommendation to the dean who has final authority on hiring decisions. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair in consultation with the dean. If none of the candidates are acceptable to the

search committee, department chair or the dean, the department chair consults with the dean on whether to resume, postpone or terminate the search.

3.2.2. Regular Research Track Faculty

Searches for regular research track faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure track faculty. Highly qualified regular research track candidates may occasionally be considered for appointment without a national search, only when there is a reasonable likelihood that a national search would not result in finding more highly qualified and/or more diverse candidates. The faculty must first approve the decision to interview a candidate without a national search. From that point, the on-campus interview and decision making processes are identical to those following a national search. The department chair determines the details of the offer, including the length of the initial contract.

3.2.3. Auxiliary Faculty

Individuals may be hired as lecturers or senior lecturers for the purpose of meeting temporary classroom needs at the discretion of the department chair or a committee formed by the department chair.

Compensated or uncompensated visiting faculty (assistant, associate or full professor) appointments require prior approval by majority vote of the faculty. The recommendation is forwarded to the department chair.

Appointment of adjunct faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. A proposal that describes the qualifications of the individual and the planned uncompensated academic service justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If approved by majority vote of the faculty, the recommendation is forwarded to the department chair.

Auxiliary appointments are made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All auxiliary appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. A continuing appointment is made by the department chair on consultation with faculty. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years.

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

3.2.4. Courtesy Appointments For Regular Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a courtesy appointment for a regular faculty member from another OSU department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by majority vote of the faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments annually to determine

whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

4. ANNUAL REVIEWS

4.1. Procedures

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook.

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in instruction, scholarly activity and service as set forth in the department's Pattern of Administration; on assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under MERIT SALARY INCREASES below.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

4.1.1. Reviews of Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

4.1.1.1. Annual Performance Review by Department Chair

All regular probationary faculty members are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

4.1.1.2. First, Second, Third, and Fifth Year Review by P&T Committee

All probationary faculty are also reviewed annually by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (all tenured faculty of higher rank than the faculty member under review). During the first, second, third and fifth year of the probationary period for assistant professors, the review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review (Section 6.3), with the exception that external evaluations are not sought and the department chair makes the final recommendation regarding renewal of the appointment for an additional year, if the recommendation is favorable.

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

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

4.1.1.3. *Fourth Year Review by P&T Committee*

During the fourth year of the probationary period the probationary review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review (Section 6.2), with the exception that external evaluations are not sought and the dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

4.1.1.4. *Exclusion of Time from the Probationary Period*

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook.

4.1.2. Regular Tenured Faculty

All regular tenured faculty members are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

4.1.3. Regular Research Track Faculty

The annual review process for regular research track faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty. In the penultimate contract year of a regular research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review follows the review procedures for promotion of regular research track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

5. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

5.1. Criteria

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarly activity and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high quality performance in all areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

5.2. Procedures

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

5.3. Documentation for Annual Reviews

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below be submitted to the department chair at a date to be determined annually, but usually around February 1. The time period covered by the review is the previous annual year. Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review, as such solicitation produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.

Documentation will include:

- Updated *Curriculum Vitae*.
- College required reports in OSU:Pro format.
- An updated position description highlighting any suggested changes from the current description
- Statement of faculty goals and activities for the coming year
- A copy of all OSU Extension evaluations
- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix to this document).

6. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

6.1. Criteria

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

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

6.1.1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

6.1.1.1. *Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure (or Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor)*

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) provides the following general criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

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

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor.

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

professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the University.

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

Excellence in teaching, scholarly activity, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>. The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity and service are expected of faculty for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. In the evaluation of untenured Associate Professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

Teaching (Includes both for-credit instruction and extension instruction)

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Provided current and relevant content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.
- Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm.
- Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment.
- Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process.
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process.
- Treated students with respect and courtesy.
- Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and academic or extension programs.
- Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.

- Served as an effective advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio, the faculty member's area(s) of expertise and position responsibilities.
- Served as an effective advisor to an appropriate number of undergraduate students as dictated by position responsibilities.
- Extension teachers are expected to demonstrate changed practices, policies or behavior from outreach education.

Scholarly Activity (Includes scholarly activity in teaching, research and extension)

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Published a body of work in high quality peer reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is being favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - Quality, impact, quantity.
 - Unique contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work.
 - Rigor of the peer review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues. Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
 - Empirical work, demonstrating the candidate's ability to conduct such work and to mentor future researchers, is preferred to synthetic work at this stage of career.
 - While collaborative work is encouraged and valued, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain program funding. Competitive peer reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Funding of scholarly activity is a means to an end; funding that has not led to scholarly productivity is disregarded in the review.
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the scholarly activity

contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.

- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of scholarly activity, including but not limited to full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.
- Faculty with extension expectations must demonstrate effective knowledge transfer by external validation.

Service

For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department, college, or university in a collegial manner that facilitates positive contributions by others.
- Demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession.

6.1.1.2. *Promotion to Professor (or Tenure at the Rank of Professor)*

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

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

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for other faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these responsibilities required. The specific criteria in teaching, scholarly activity, and service for promotion to Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and international reputation in the field.

In the evaluation of **untenured Professors for tenure**, the same criteria apply along, with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

6.1.2. Regular Research Track Faculty

6.1.2.1. *Promotion to Research Associate Professor*

For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high quality peer reviewed venues and be judged by

external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

6.1.2.2. *Promotion to Research Professor*

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

6.2. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews. The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty tracks in the department. All faculty under review must use the updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline.

6.2.1. Candidate Responsibilities

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline, including but not limited to those highlighted on the Checklist.
- To review, upon request by the department chair, the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. The candidate may add no more than four additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.)

6.2.2. Promotion And Tenure Committee Responsibilities

Except as noted below, the Promotion and Tenure Committee pertinent to making recommendations on the:

- tenure or promotion of **tenure track faculty** consists of all tenured regular faculty of higher rank than the candidate.
- reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion of **regular research track faculty** consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate.

The department chair, college dean, college associate and assistant deans, vice provosts, provost, and president may not be members of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The department chair may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

The department chair appoints the P&T Chair and the Procedures Oversight Designee annually. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

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

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote. Only eligible faculty members present at the meeting or participating in the meeting by discussing the case by teleconference may vote. A minimum of two-thirds of the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must vote yes or no on a case for the vote to be valid. Abstentions are not votes. Two-thirds of votes must be yes for a vote to be considered positive. Absentee voting is not permitted.
- To provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. (This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.)
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case prepared by the Chair of the P&T Committee, to include the committee vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The full Promotion and Tenure Committee does not vote on these cases since the

department's recommendation must be provided to the other TIU substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

6.2.3. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a nonmandatory review for tenure, and tenure may not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- Prepare a memo reminding the candidates of their eligibility for promotion or tenure, including a list of important deadlines which must be met during the process.
- To solicit external evaluations following procedures described below.
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. A conflict of interest exists when a Promotion and Tenure Committee member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty who have collaborated with a candidate on more than one-third of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.
- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the Promotion and Tenure Committee to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the Committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and department chair.

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

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

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

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

6.2.4. External Evaluations

External evaluations are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarly activity must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all regular research track contract renewal and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews.

External evaluations are optional in other reviews and will be obtained as needed. When obtained, they should meet the criteria described below.

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

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

A list of six potential evaluators is assembled by the department chair in consultation with the chair of the P&T Committee. A second list of four names is assembled by the candidate.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least two of those persons. Section B(3) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many reviewers are identified as are required. If fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests (two letters from candidate recommendations and three from department recommendations), additional requests are made to achieve five credible references.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted, e.g., requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier. It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

6.3. Documentation

As noted above under CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of scholarly activity and service noted below is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and University levels specifically request it.

- Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

Teaching

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

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class or client evaluations for extension courses.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports (details provided in the Appendix to this document) for classroom or extension teaching.
- Documentation of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate. For extension, this might include evidence that outreach materials were adopted by others.

Scholarship

For the time period since the last promotion:

- Documentation of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received.
- Other relevant documentation of scholarly activity as appropriate, e.g. published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted, validation of technology transfer or impacts of scholarly activities.

Service

For the time period since the last promotion:

- Documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

7. APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

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

8. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

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

APPENDIX

PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in this department. SEI forms may be completed in class or accessed electronically. If given in class, faculty should choose a day late in the quarter when attendance is likely to be high to distribute the form. A staff member assigned by the department chair should administer the evaluation forms to the class and return them to the Office of the University Registrar as instructed. This individual should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the department chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee for each faculty member undergoing review. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the faculty to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching.

The responsibilities of each Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure track faculty at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the probationary period.
- To review the teaching of tenured Associate Professors at least every other year.
- To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations (SEI scores falling below 4.0) or other evidence of the need for assistance in improving teaching.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Peer review focuses on instructional quality and methods, goals of instruction, curricular choices, and appropriateness of instructional approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge.

It is expected that each peer reviewer will individually discuss their observations and suggestions directly with the faculty undergoing review. In addition, the Committee submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the Committee may respond in writing to those comments if it

wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier.

Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative. Reviews should provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching.