

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SCHOOL OF EARTH SCIENCES**

OAA Approved 10/8/2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE.....	2
II. SCHOOL MISSION.....	2
III DEFINITIONS.....	3
IV. APPOINTMENTS.....	5
A CRITERIA.....	5
B PROCEDURES.....	8
V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	12
A PROBATIONARY FACULTY.....	13
B TENURED FACULTY.....	15
C ASSOCIATED FACULTY	16
VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS.....	16
A CRITERIA.....	16
B PROCEDURES.....	17
C DOCUMENTATION.....	17
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	19
A CRITERIA.....	19
B PROCEDURES.....	22
C DOCUMENTATION.....	28
VIII. APPEALS.....	30
IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS.....	30
X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	30
A STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING	30
B PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	31
XI. APPENDIX I MENTOR RESPONSIBILITY GUIDELINES	32

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SCHOOL OF EARTH SCIENCES

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the school and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the School 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 School Director.

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 School'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 executive dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the School and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to the School's mission and criteria.

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

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal opportunity (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

The Director of the School will generally consult with the Advisory and/or Administrative Committee on any changes to this document pertaining to appointments, merit review and promotion. The composition of the Advisory Committee and Administrative Committee is described in the School's Pattern of Administration (POA) document.

II. SCHOOL MISSION

The School aims to be a globally preeminent program in Earth Sciences at the forefront

of knowledge creation and dissemination, education, and training focused on humanity's greatest problems.

Our mission is to:

- To advance our understanding of Earth as a dynamic and complex system, its past and present evolution, and its resources and vulnerabilities
- To assess human impact on the Earth system, and the implications of global change for the biosphere, society, and regional and global economies.
- To educate the next generation of scientists, researchers, teachers, policy makers, entrepreneurs, and environmental professionals.
- To promote a better informed populace within the state of Ohio, our nation, and worldwide.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1. Tenure-track Faculty

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

The eligible faculty for senior new appointments and for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal rank to or higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the School excluding the School Director, the Executive Dean, the divisional deans and assistant and associate deans of the college, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the School excluding the School Director, the Executive Dean, the divisional deans and assistant and associate deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

2. Research Faculty

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

The eligible faculty for senior rank new appointments, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal rank to or higher rank than the candidate whose position resides in the School, and all non-probationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate whose primary

appointment is in the School excluding the School Director, the Executive Dean, the divisional deans, and assistant and associate deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

3. Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion or appointment review of that candidate.

4. Minimum Composition

In the event that the School does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the School Director, after consulting with the divisional dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another unit within the college for the review so that the minimum number of three can be reached.

B. Annual Review Mentors Subcommittees

A subset of the Committee of Eligible Faculty comprises the Annual Review Mentors Subcommittees. Prior to autumn semester each year the P&T Chair will be appointed by the Director, and the P&T Chair will designate separate mentor subcommittees of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to review the performance of each assistant and associate professor. Each mentor subcommittee will consist of two Professors. The membership of this subcommittee will ideally be maintained throughout the promotion and/or tenure process, but substitutions will be allowed due to availability of faculty members in any given year. The mentor responsibility guidelines are described in Appendix 1.

C. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee

A subset of the Committee of Eligible Faculty comprises the Promotion and Tenure subcommittee. This subcommittee is responsible for organizing faculty promotion and tenure reviews, and working with mentor subcommittees who will be presenting each case to the entire Committee of Eligible Faculty. The Promotion and Tenure subcommittee will be composed of the following members: the Committee Chair: this is a professor appointed by the director; a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD): this professor is assigned to ensure the review procedure is properly executed, including considerations of Affirmative Action issues.

D. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. This includes faculty who are able to participate in faculty meeting discussion through teleconferencing and/or videoconferencing. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the School Director has approved an off-campus assignment.

Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum. The School director is also not counted in computing quorum.

E. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted. Faculty who participate in meetings via teleconferencing and/or videoconferencing can vote by emailing in their decision to the School Director.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

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

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when 60% of the votes cast are positive.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

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

1. Tenure Track Faculty

i. Instructor. Appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the doctoral degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The School will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the Instructor level is limited to three years. When an Instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the School's eligible faculty, the Director, the Executive Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service cannot be revoked once granted. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

ii. Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the School and to the profession is required.

Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 and the provisions of paragraphs (F), (G), and (H) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (both Rules available at <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>). The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

iii. Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the School's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the Professor level is with tenure and appointments at the Associate Professor level can be with or without tenure. A probationary appointment at the Associate Professor level is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e. terminal year of employment is offered. It is expected at the time of appointment to the rank of Associate Professor that the individual has strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank, but the university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International

Affairs.

2. Tenure Track Faculty – Regional Campus

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

3. Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts that are not eligible for tenure. Research faculty members are engaged in research related to the mission and duties of the School. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the School wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-7-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-clinical-faculty-appointment-reappointment-and-nonreappointment-and-promotion.html>.

In establishing the title, the Board of Trustees restricted the duties and responsibilities of research faculty (Faculty Rules 3335-7, <http://trustees.osu.edu>): primary emphasis on research, limited teaching (with approval of the department), supervision of graduate students (with approval of the Graduate School), limited service, with the exclusion of university governance.

i. 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 indicates the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program. This research program is expected to substantially fund the salary and benefits of the faculty member.

ii. 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 School's research criteria for promotion to these ranks. Expectations for publications and research funding are appropriately greater than outlined above for the Research Assistant Professor.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments can be made for no more than three years at a time in accordance with University Rule 3335-6-08 (D) (<https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>). Associated faculty may be reappointed.

i. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.

Adjunct appointments are compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give considerable academic service to the School, such as teaching a course, or mentoring students, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.

ii. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. Appointment as a lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate for the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of or potential for high quality instructional ability is required. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure. Appointment as a senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate or terminal degree in a field appropriate for 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 documented high quality performance. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure.

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

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

5. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the School by a tenure-track or research faculty member from another academic unit at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this School. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. These must be reappointed every 5 years (usually in May for the coming academic year). Continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing contributions. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual review.

B. Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook

(<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure track and research 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

The letter of offer should contain a clause that defines the duration that the offer is valid.

1. Tenure Track Faculty – Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyrecruitment.pdf>).

Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

In the case of Columbus campus-based faculty, the Executive Dean of the college, in consultation with the divisional deans, will authorize a TIU to undertake a search. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The School Director appoints a search committee consisting of five tenure-track faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as complementary fields within the School. There will be a member from all divisions within the School on the search committee.

Prior to commencing the search, all committee members must attend an inclusive hiring practices training session offered by the college in consultation with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (<https://odi.osu.edu/>). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity (<http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/>).

The search committee shall:

- Appoint a Diversity Representative whose responsibility is to ensure as broad an applicant pool as possible consistent with School needs and standards and to review procedures to ensure that they are fair.
- Develop a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Job Postings (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the School Director's and divisional dean's approvals. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search. 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.

- Develop and implement 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 advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally prominent professional journal.
- Screen applications and letters of recommendation and present to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview.
- At least one of the candidates invited to campus must contribute to increasing the diversity of the unit broadly defined. The Diversity Representative will explain at a meeting of the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the TIU, the search committee chair will describe the pool of applicants and the pool of finalists before asking the faculty to vote on inviting the finalists to campus for an interview. Vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates that includes members of underrepresented groups are required. The university remains strongly committed to diversifying its faculty. Units that lack women and minority faculty must make every possible effort to recruit qualified faculty in these groups.
- Present the proposed slate of on-campus interviewees for approval by the divisional dean for natural and mathematical sciences through the Arts and Sciences Faculty Search Diversity Recruitment Report (<https://ascintranet.osu.edu/faculty/recruitment-hiring>). On-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the School's administration manager.

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee, graduate students, and the School Director, and the divisional dean or designee. In addition, all candidates must make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research and provide evidence of their ability to teach. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

After the on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meets to discuss perceptions and preferences and to vote on each candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate to the director. In the event that more than one candidate achieves the 2/3 level of support required to extend an offer, the School Director decides which candidate to approach first based on vote totals. At that time, the School Director will discuss the hire, including salary and other features of the recruitment with the candidate; the divisional dean must be consulted at this time. If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the

offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. All offers at the associate professor and professor ranks and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. After the School deliberations have been concluded, the director will then contact the divisional dean to provide a summary of the interviews and recommendation for hiring.

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

Centers and institutes within the College are expected to participate in the hiring of faculty who might be affiliated with those centers. TIUs are encouraged to invite representatives from the center to participate in all aspects of the search process, including membership on the search committee. During the recruiting process, candidates who might become affiliates of the center or institute should meet with the director and other relevant faculty.

2. Tenure Track Faculty – Regional Campus

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

Candidates are interviewed by the regional campus dean, School director, School committee of the interested faculty, and regional campus search committee, and the Arts and Sciences Columbus campus Executive Dean, divisional dean or their designee. The candidate will also interview on main campus in the School of Earth Sciences (SES). The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the School director and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin. Letters of offer must be signed by the School Director and the regional campus Dean.

3. Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure track faculty, with the exception that during the on-campus interview only the candidate's research credentials are evaluated for appointment consideration, and exception to a national search only requires approval by the executive dean of the college.

4. Transfer

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the Director of the

School, the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed.

Transfers from a research appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

5. Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the School Director in consultation with the School's Advisory Committee.

Appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the School. The proposal is considered at a regular faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty, the School Director extends an offer.

Associated appointments are generally made for a period of five years, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three years. Lecturer course appointments are usually made on a semester by semester basis.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see APPOINTMENT CRITERIA above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the School Director's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty

Any School faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or research faculty member from another Ohio State school, department or college. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to SES justifying the appointment is considered by the Advisory Committee. If the proposal is approved by the Advisory Committee, the School Director extends an offer of appointment. The School Director reviews all courtesy appointments every five years at time of reappointment (or earlier if necessary) to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting. Appointments are for 5 years and must be renewed by faculty vote every 5 years.

Note that a courtesy appointment is not necessary to serve as a co-advisor or committee member of a School of Earth Sciences graduate student.

V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

The School follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>). The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in research, teaching, and service as set forth in the School's *Distribution of Faculty Duties and Responsibilities* listed in the School's Pattern of Administration, on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual, and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the School Director by a date specified by the Director, usually in February of each year.

The School Director is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-3-administration.html>) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-5-faculty-governance-and-committees.html>) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

Each year each tenure-track and tenured faculty member, research faculty, and compensated associated faculty member will provide the Director of the School with a current curriculum vita, a completed Annual Activity Report Form listing recent research, teaching (including evidence of teaching effectiveness, which includes student evaluations for all faculty and, in the case of Assistant and Associate Professors faculty, peer reviews by Professors), and service activities. Where applicable, evaluation of teaching of Professors may also be requested. The School Director will review these documents and other evidence as may be required, including consultation, as necessary, with appropriate faculty, Mentor Subcommittees, and the SES Faculty Annual Evaluation Committee. The Director will use all of this information as the basis for an annual performance review of each faculty. The Director will provide each faculty member with written feedback regarding his or her performance and future plans. This review will enable the Director to highlight performance problems where they exist and to assist faculty, researchers, and compensated affiliated faculty in carrying out their professional plans. The Director must offer each faculty member a scheduled opportunity to discuss the review, and the faculty member may respond in writing to the performance evaluation.

A. Probationary Faculty

1. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually by their assigned Mentor Subcommittee, by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in the spring semester, and by the SES Faculty Annual Evaluation Committee (See Merit Salary Increases below). Each probationary faculty member must receive a written evaluation of her or his performance from the School Director, with sufficient detail for meaningful feedback.

i. First, Second, Third and Fifth Year Review

Following the reviews conducted during the first, second, third and fifth years, the Director of the School will notify the divisional dean and Executive Dean of the decision to renew or not renew the appointment. If the recommendation is against renewal, the Executive Dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, will make the final decision about the appointment on the basis of the TIU's assessment of the candidate's research, teaching, and service, using the fourth-year review procedures listed below (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>). A probationary faculty member must be informed in writing of a decision for nonrenewal according to standards of notice set forth in University Rule 3335-6-08 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>), and in keeping with instructions from the Office of Academic Affairs. Non-renewal letters must be approved by the Executive Dean in advance of being sent.

ii. Fourth Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that the external evaluations are optional and the Executive Dean (not the School Director) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

The Committee of the Eligible Faculty conducts a review of the candidate, and the P&T Chair forwards a record of the vote of the Committee of Eligible Faculty and a written performance review to the School Director on behalf of the eligible faculty. The School Director conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The review thus results in two letters of evaluation – one from the P&T Chair and a separate letter from the Director of the School.

At the conclusion of the School review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the School Director recommends renewal or nonrenewal. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean, who serves as the Executive Dean's designee for the review. In cases where the divisional dean concurs with the School's recommendations to approve the renewal of the appointment, review by the Arts and Sciences divisional Promotion and Tenure review panel is optional and at the divisional dean's discretion. The divisional review panel, however, must review negative reappointment recommendations. The Executive Dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, will make the final decision on non-reappointment.

2. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty – Regional Campus

Annual review and 4th year review of the probationary faculty member are first conducted

on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the Columbus campus and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the School, the School Director discusses the matter with the regional campus Dean/Director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

3. Exclusion of Time from the Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D), <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>, sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs *Policies and Procedures Handbook*, https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook_.

B. Tenured Faculty

1. Tenured Faculty – Columbus Campus

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the department. The Mentor Subcommittees submit a written performance review to the School director along with comments on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The School director conducts an independent assessment; 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.

Professors are reviewed annually by the School Director. The School Director provides an opportunity for each 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.

2. Tenured Faculty – Regional Campus

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

3. Research Faculty

The annual review process for research probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, except that non-probationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank.

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the School Director 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, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

C. Associated Faculty

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

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the School Director, or designee. The School Director, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint, if the associated faculty position is eligible for reappointment. The School Director's recommendation on reappointment is final.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. Criteria

In adopting a process for the distribution of merit salary and other rewards, the School recognizes the importance of qualitative rather than mere quantitative contributions in each of the three areas of faculty activity.

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Expectations for faculty are defined in the *Distribution of Faculty Duties and Responsibilities* listed in the School's Pattern of Administration. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past two calendar years for research, teaching, and service, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high quality performance in all three areas and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty whose performance is below expectations 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.

B. Procedures

The School Director recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the divisional dean, who may modify these recommendations. In formulating recommendations, the School Director consults with the School Faculty Annual Evaluation Committee which provides an initial assessment of faculty productivity relative to expectations listed in the *Distribution of Faculty Duties and Responsibilities* of the POA. This Committee has a member from each of the School's four divisions. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the School Director consults with the Faculty Annual Evaluation Committee to divide faculty into about four groups based on continuing productivity and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The number of faculty in each grouping does not have to be equal (i.e., these groupings are not defined as 'quartiles'). In fact, it is anticipated that most faculty will meet or exceed expectations in research, teaching, and service.

Equity and excellence raises will be used (i) to redress inequities in the salary of individuals or groups of faculty when these are discovered relative to peer groups, or (ii) to retain outstanding faculty members.

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

C. Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the School Director each February.

- Updated *Curriculum Vitae*, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place.

- Annual Activity Report (AAR), detailing contributions to research, teaching, and service over the previous two calendar years. This detailed AAR can be supplemented by a one-page summary of the faculty member's past year's accomplishments.

In all cases it is the responsibility of the faculty member to see that professional achievements are brought to the attention of the School. Faculty members may also, at any time, supply additional documentation of their activities to be included in their personnel file and to be available for evaluation in merit increase determinations.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.

1. Research

- Awards and recognition of research achievement
- Documentation of all scholarly papers published, including those published online first. Papers accepted for publication but not published, should not be included. Copies of all scholarly papers may be requested.
- Documentation of active grants, contracts, and fellowships, and proposals submitted but not funded. List students and postdocs supported on grants.
- List professional meetings attended, number of abstracts presented, and any invited or professional talks given.
- Provide Google Scholar h-index and screenshot showing Google Citations and h-index information.

2. Teaching

- Teaching awards and other significant recognition of teaching excellence
- List of courses taught, number of students per class, and SEI score for each class.
- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught. As both high and low SEI scores may reflect more than the quality of the instruction for a given course, student comments provide context to these scores. Taken in aggregate, student qualitative feedback is a useful tool to interpret the SEI scores and help the instructor and their mentor committee to evaluate and focus teaching development. Therefore, all professors should seek and retain written feedback from students through the SEI system and, where applicable, mid-course instructor-generated written feedback forms.

- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the School's peer evaluation of teaching program for Assistant and Associate Professors and for Professors for whom an annual teaching evaluation was performed.
- Student mentoring: List of all postdocs, graduate and undergraduate students advised as principle advisor, committee member, or supervisor. List graduated student and postdocs. List any awards or accomplishments by students advised.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

3. Service

- Service awards and other significant recognition of service excellence
- List service activities, role in those activities and contributions, to the department, college, university (including interdisciplinary centers or institutes), public, and profession
- Professors also list their mentees and document their mentoring activities
- List any other additional service activities and any role in the operation and maintenance of general facilities and/or non-student salaried personnel

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A. Criteria

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

Promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both scholarship and teaching, where scholarship is defined as research, scholarly and/or creative work. Excellence in Research and Teaching are as defined in the *Distribution of Faculty Duties and Responsibilities* of the POA. Additional research criteria for promotion to associate professor include the development of a national reputation in the candidate's field as evinced 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 published research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences. External evaluation of a faculty member by his/her peers at the time of consideration for promotion with tenure must show that the faculty member's research has made a positive impact in the area of his/her expertise and has the potential to continue to advance the body of knowledge significantly. The promise of excellence in service is desirable. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

The substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship and/or creative activity and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

Excellence in teaching, research, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics, <http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>.

The accomplishments expected for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure are listed in the *Distribution of Faculty Duties and Responsibilities* of the POA. In the evaluation of untenured Associate Professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time the senior rank appointment without

tenure was offered.

2. Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for junior 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 research, teaching, 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 scholarly contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and/or international reputation in the field, as well as leadership in service. This includes membership on prestigious national and international scientific/ agency committees, editorships and associate editorships of international journals, and leadership roles within the School, College and University.

In the area of research, the faculty member being considered for promotion to professor must have demonstrated continued publication of peer-reviewed scholarly work at the same rate or greater than is expected of assistant professors. The external evaluations at the time of consideration for promotion must demonstrate that the faculty member has made a solid and significant positive impact in the area(s) of his/her expertise and that there is a continuing expectation of advancing the body of knowledge with national and/or international recognition. External research funding must be well established and have the potential to support a long-range research program. Under certain conditions, a faculty member could be considered for promotion with an exceptional teaching and service record combined with a less extensive, though excellent record, of research. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to the university, the public, and the profession.

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. External hires at the associate or professor level with tenure will demonstrate the same accomplishments in scholarship and/or creative activity, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university. For all, the substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship and/or creative activity and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

Alternative Path to Promotion to Professor

In reviewing promotion from associate professor to professor, the school will be receptive to cases in which the faculty member has demonstrated excellence in teaching or in areas of scholarship outside traditional research. Correspondingly, less weight will be placed on original research. For a faculty member to be promoted under such circumstances, the contributions in other areas must be substantial and of high quality, as demonstrated by recognition at local and national levels. External letters documenting the quality of this work will be sought.

3. Regional Campus Faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the School will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to research. Recognizing that the character and quantity of research by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus Campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the School nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high quality scholarly activity in the form of peer-reviewed publications or other evidence of scholarly contributions. Rather than also emphasizing quantity (as in the rate of publication), the School nevertheless expects the same quality of research productivity.

4. Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor requires 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 that is also capable of generating his/her salary and benefits, along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

Promotion to Research Professor requires excellence in scholarship with recognition at the national and international level, an extensive body of high quality publications with demonstrated impact on the field, and a record of continuous peer reviewed funding capable of generating his/her salary and benefits, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

External hires at the associate or professor level will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research and service as persons promoted within the university.

B Procedures

The School's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>

and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook> The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty appointments in the School.

1. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline, including but not limited to those highlighted on the Checklist.

Candidates are responsible for submitting a copy of the School's APT Document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the School's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, the School's current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, dates from more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the School.

If external evaluations are required see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS criteria below.

2. Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) Responsibilities

The TIU is the School of Earth Sciences. The School Director may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote. The P & T Chair is appointed by the School Director with the advice of the Advisory Committee.

Senior-rank faculty under consideration, regardless of type (tenure-track, research, associated) may be reviewed only by faculty of the rank at or above consideration (associate and professor for associate, and professor for professor). The responsibilities of the CEF are as follows:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in Spring Semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. The CEF is constituted separately for each candidate under review. A 60% majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

- The Committee bases its decision on an assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (e.g., student and peer evaluations of teaching, annual evaluation letters). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>) for one year. If the denial is based on the lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for nonmandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the School Director that an untenured faculty member seeking nonmandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (i.e. has a "green card"). Faculty lacking citizenship or permanent residency can be promoted but not awarded tenure until permanent residency is received.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the CEF, the School Director, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- Annually, in late Spring through early Autumn Semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - Late Spring: Provide a recommendation to the School Director from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines at https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/links_files/PODDuties.pdf.
 - Late Spring: Candidate's Mentors, P & T Chair, and the School Director, in consultation with the CEF, compile a list of names of possible external evaluators according to the procedures outlined in the EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS section below.

- Early Autumn: Candidates' Mentors and the P&T Chair, in consultation with the CEF, will review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- 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.)
- The candidate's Mentors draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to provide to the full CEF with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- The P & T Chair drafts a letter summarizing the CEF faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting and reporting the vote. The draft is circulated to the CEF for comments and revisions. The revised final written evaluation and recommendation is forwarded to the School Director by the P & T Chair. This also applies to joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another school or department.
- The P & T Chair, in consultation with the CEF, provides a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- P & T Chair appoints a representative among the faculty whose function is to review a candidate's dossier from a critical, arm's-length viewpoint and point out both strengths and weaknesses of the case.
- To attend all CEF meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote. Voting procedures are delineated in Section III.

3. School Director Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the School Director 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 School.
- Early Summer Semester: Have the P&T Chair solicit external evaluations according to procedures outlined in the EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS section below.)

- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the CEF at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted. Electronic forms of the dossier can be made available to facilitate faculty participation from distant locations.
- To remove any member of the CEF 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 CEF 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.
- **Mid Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the CEF's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the CEF to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the Committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the School review process:
 - of the recommendations by the CEF and School Director.
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the CEF and School Director.
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the School Director, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the School Director, 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 associated faculty for whom the School Director recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the School Director is final in such cases.
- To receive the CEF's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the School Director's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other TIU by the date requested.

4. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

The regional campus Dean/Director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the School Director, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

5. External Evaluations

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, and all research 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 research (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an “arms’ length” evaluation of the research record and 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. Evaluators are typically Professors, but requests can be made for other highly ranked individuals to serve as evaluators in some cases (i.e., Research Professors, Associate Professors). Evaluations from associate professors should be a minority of the total and are typically requested only for promotion to associate professor reviews.
- provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the School cannot control who agrees to write and/or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the CEF. A target of 10 names is desirable. The candidate is allowed to review the list of evaluators, strike two, and add three of their own. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria

for credibility, a letter is typically requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335- 6-04, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> requires that no more than one-half of the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. For example, if 5 letters are obtained, only 2 can be from evaluators 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 School requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. The School follows the College of Arts and Sciences' suggested format, provided at <https://ascintranet.osu.edu/Promotion-Tenure>, 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 School Director and the P&T 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 or permit it). It is in the candidate's self-interest to ensure 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 School's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

C Documentation

As noted above under CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the CEF 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 School. The documentation of research and service noted below is for use during the School 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 a candidate under review solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

1. Research

For the time period since the date of hire for probationary faculty or since the last promotion for non-probationary faculty:

- Copies 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 including notice of awards where applicable.
- Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses, creative works including multimedia, curated exhibits, and websites.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (e.g., grants and contract proposals that have been submitted but not funded, list of conference abstracts, list of invited talks and seminars, list of research recognition such as awards by the faculty member or their graduate and undergraduate students)
- list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

2. Teaching

For the time period since the date of hire for probationary faculty or since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, for non-probationary faculty:

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class. All professors should seek and retain written feedback from students through the SEI system and, where applicable, mid-course instructor-generated written feedback forms..
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the School's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in Section X of this document).
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences

- adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

3. Service

For the time period since the date of hire for probationary faculty or since the last promotion for non-probationary faculty:

- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.
- service activities as listed in the core dossier including:
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - review of grant proposals at federal funding agencies
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
 - administrative service to the School, college, and university, including the Office of Student Life
 - advising to student groups and organizations
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department

VIII. APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-5-faculty-governance-and-committees.html>. Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>, sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in the School. Faculty should continue to mention to their students that the SEI form should be filled out on-line or through the mobile application. The faculty member 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.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels.

Probationary faculty (i.e., Assistant Professors) and tenured Associate Professors and Probationary Associate Professors should be evaluated annually. Assistant professors must have a minimum of five reviews at the time of their promotion review, and associate professors must have a minimum of three. Tenured professors should be evaluated once every four years. All evaluations should follow the format described below.

On occasion, it may be necessary for the Director to evaluate the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. For example, reviews of Professors are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching. Reviews are done by using a formal Teaching Consultation coordinated through the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (<https://ucat.osu.edu/consultations/>) at the discretion of the Director in consultation with the SES Administrative Committee.

Reviews can also occur at the request of faculty members. These are considered formative only. The School Director is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching, <http://ucat.osu.edu>.

1. Peer Evaluation Procedure

The School Director and the P&T Chair oversee the School's peer evaluation of teaching process, which is generally implemented through individual faculty Mentor Committees and in some cases, an ad hoc Evaluation Committee. **The full responsibilities of Mentor Subcommittees and their peer-evaluation of Mentees are outlined in the *Mentor Responsibilities Guidelines in Appendix I*.** The role of the Mentee in responding to peer-evaluations is also outlined in the *Mentor Responsibilities Guidelines*. The Annual Mentor Report Form and the Teaching Evaluation Form are included in the *Mentor Responsibilities Guidelines in Appendix I*.

XI. APPENDIX I

MENTOR RESPONSIBILITIES GUIDELINES

The minimum responsibilities of the individual Mentor Committees are as follows:

- 1- Two peer-evaluations of assistant and associate professor teaching each year (i.e., one per mentor for each class observed using the Teaching Evaluation Form below). The evaluating Mentor meets with the Mentee to discuss the evaluation. Both the evaluating Mentor and the Mentee sign the Teaching Evaluation Form, then submit it to the Director, P&T Chair, the Mentee, and the Administrative Manager of SES. The Mentee may provide written comments on this report and the Committee may respond in writing to those comments if he/she wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period according to the College of Arts and Sciences APT document section X, sub-section B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.
- 2- Annual meeting with Mentees to evaluate progress, set goals, and address shortcomings towards tenure and/or promotion. It is strongly encouraged that this meeting includes both the Mentors and the Mentee. Both the Mentee's Annual Report and updated CV should be reviewed as part of this meeting.
- 3- Submit an annual report (see Annual Mentor Report Form below) by 15 February for Mentees undergoing 4th year review, by 15 March for Mentees going up for promotion that fall semester, and by 15 April for all other Mentees. This annual report should be based on findings from the annual meeting in item #2. Both the Mentors and the Mentee sign the Annual Mentor Report Form prior to submitting it to the Director of SES, the P&T Chair, the Mentee, and the Administrative Manager of SES.
- 4- Present the Mentee case(s) each year during the review of Assistant and Associate faculty, including promotion and tenure years.

In consultation with the Mentee, the P&T Chair recommends, and the Director appoints, a two-person Mentor Committee annually for each of the Assistant and Associate Professors. Mentors are Professors. The term of service is one year, with the same Mentors commonly reappointed. The purpose of having two Mentors is to provide the Mentee with a range of feedback and expertise to help guide him/her through the tenure and promotion process. While these guidelines define the minimum expectations, Mentors are encouraged to meet more often with Mentees.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching Goals

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels.

Probationary faculty (i.e., Assistant Professors) and tenured Associate Professors should be evaluated annually. Tenured professors should be evaluated once every four years. On occasion, it may be necessary for the Director to evaluate the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Reviews can also occur at the request of faculty members.

Peer Evaluation Procedure

The School Director and the P&T Chair oversee the School's peer evaluation of teaching process, which is generally implemented through individual faculty Mentor Subcommittees and in some cases, ad hoc Evaluation Committees. **The full responsibilities of Mentor Subcommittees are outlined in the Mentor Responsibilities Guidelines.**

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Mentor Subcommittees will focus particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (e.g., survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge.

Classroom visitation is conducted by each Mentor annually. At the beginning of the semester, the Mentor Subcommittee will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because exams are being given, guest speakers are scheduled, etc. At the conclusion of the evaluation, **the Mentor Subcommittee submits a written report to the P&T Chair and the School Director, which has been reviewed and signed by the Mentee, using the Teaching Evaluation Form.** The Mentee may provide written comments on this report and the Mentor may respond in writing to those comments if he/she wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier. In addition to preparing a written report for the faculty member's file, the Mentors should meet with the faculty member following the classroom visitation for a more informal consultation about his or her teaching effectiveness and to review the teaching evaluation. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period.

Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative (i.e., they provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews, and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching).

Teaching Evaluation Form: School of Earth Sciences

Mentee Name: _____ **Mentor Name:** _____

Observation Date: ___/___/___ (MM/DD/YYYY)

Course Name: _____ **Course Number:** _____

Number of Students: _____

Student composition: UG, G, Majors, Non-Majors, Other (circle all that apply)

For each category below, please provide the requested information. Please also provide any additional information that is germane to the evaluation within each category.

Overview:

- type of course (i.e., didactic, lab, field, etc...)
- instructor's performance
- syllabus
- student assessments
- student behavior/response during instruction

Strengths:

- knowledge of material, voice projection, enthusiasm
- presentation: style, content, organization, clarity, etc...
- student engagement
- innovative or new approaches

Suggestions for improvement on any aspect of teaching including presentation materials, lecture pace/style, assignments, student engagement, etc...

Implementation of Suggestions from Prior Year's Suggestions

Mentor Name: _____

Signature: _____

Mentee has seen this report. Name: _____

Signature: _____

Annual Mentor Report Form: School of Earth Sciences

Mentee Name: _____ **Rank:** Assistant/Associate/Professor **Years at Rank:** _____

Appointment: ___% School of Earth Sciences, ___% _____

Date: ___/___/___ (MM/DD/YYYY) **Report Calendar Year:** _____

Mentor #1 Name: _____ **Mentor #2 Name:** _____

Extenuating Circumstances: _____ (e.g., FMLA, other)

This report was shared with, the Mentee on ___/___/___ (MM/DD/YYYY)

For each category below, please provide the following information:

- overall statement of the research /teaching and mentoring /service activities
- evidence of response to suggestions for improving his/her research /teaching and mentoring/ service activity since the last evaluation
- recommendations and goals for further improving research / teaching and mentoring/ service during the following calendar year
- progress towards tenure and/or promotion

Research activity:

Teaching activity:

Service activity:

Mentor #1 Name: _____

Signature: _____

Mentor #2 Name: _____

Signature: _____

Mentee has seen this report. Name: _____

Signature: _____