

APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
Criteria and Procedures

Department of History

Division of Arts & Humanities

College of Arts and Sciences

The Ohio State University

Pages 27-29 Only

Revised: December 18, 2013

would take place during the University review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

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

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

X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

- The Department expects its instructors to adhere to all university guidelines regarding student evaluation of instruction, especially the rule that students in every course must have an opportunity to evaluate their instructor. Instructors in the Department are expected to administer the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form consistent with University protocols. SEI data must be included in promotion dossiers. SEI reports must also be appended by faculty members to Annual Activity Reports.
- Instructors are encouraged to consider using supplementary (i.e., discursive) student evaluations of their instruction. A faculty member may or may not include such data in his or her promotion dossier. However, if any such data is included the promotion dossier, all data collected by such means of supplemental evaluation must be included. Summaries of such data for the dossier will be composed by members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

- The Department Chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process, in consultation with the Undergraduate Teaching Committee (which fulfills College expectations for a Peer Review of Teaching Committee). Each member of the faculty bears responsibility for requesting peer reviews of teaching and for ensuring that an

adequate number of peer reviews is conducted for promotion review and other purposes. Each faculty member seeking promotion should view peer reviews as instruments useful in demonstrating that he or she has met the Department's standards for excellence in teaching.

- The Undergraduate Teaching Committee (UTC) bears primary responsibility for assigning and conducting peer reviews of teaching. The UTC chair solicits requests for reviews during the first week of each semester and arranges reviews in response to those requests. The UTC Chair should assign reviews to members of the UTC and, if necessary to meet demand, to other faculty.
- Peer reviews of teaching may be conducted on an informal or a formal basis. Each request for a peer review should specify whether an informal or formal review is desired. Informal reviews may be requested in any course. Reports resulting from informal reviews are not filed as part of the promotion dossier or personnel file. Formal reviews result in reports that become part of a faculty member's promotion dossier and permanent personnel file.
- Formal peer reviews should take the form of letters addressed to the Chair and should include data about the course (instructor, course name and number, semester, date and time of class visitation, number of students enrolled and attending). Such reviews should be based upon class visitation and upon examination of the syllabus and other course material (including reading and writing assignments, handouts, examinations, class web site, and other technology-based teaching material). Such reviews should assess the instructor's style of pedagogy, quality of organization, command of material, clarity of presentation, and other relevant topics. The faculty member being reviewed will decide if classroom visitation should be scheduled or unannounced and this choice should be recorded in the review.
- Senior lecturers and visiting faculty are expected to arrange at least one peer review per year of appointment.
- Tenure-eligible faculty members are expected to arrange at least one peer review per semester during the probationary period. Generally, such reviews should be distributed across a wide range of undergraduate courses, and must include General Education courses.
- Tenured associate professors should arrange at least one peer review per academic year. Generally, such reviews should be distributed across a wide range of undergraduate courses, and must include at least one General Education course.
- Full professors should be evaluated once every four years.
- Senior lecturers and assistant professors must be peer reviewed by faculty at higher ranks. Associate professors may be reviewed by associate or full professors,

although at least 50 percent of formal reviews must be written by full professors. Full professors should be evaluated by other full professors.

- Peer review of regional campus faculty should follow the expectations set at the regional campus. The Department encourages tenure-eligible faculty to secure a minimum of six peer reviews during the probationary period and tenured associate professors to secure three reviews in the three years preceding a promotion review.
- If peer reviews reveal problems or under-performance, the Chair should meet with the instructor and suggest steps to improve teaching performance. The Chair may require additional peer reviews in excess of the minimum numbers provided for in this policy. The Chair may also require peer reviews of full professors whose teaching records reveal problems or under-performance.