

APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE  
Criteria and Procedures

Department of History

Division of Arts & Humanities

College of Arts and Sciences

The Ohio State University

Revised: December 18, 2013

# **APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

## **Criteria and Procedures for the Department of History**

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. PREAMBLE**
- II. DEPARTMENT MISSION**
- III. DEFINITIONS**
  - A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty**
  - B. Promotion & Tenure Committee**
  - C. Quorum**
  - D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty**
- IV. APPOINTMENTS**
  - A. Criteria**
  - B. Procedures**
- V. ANNUAL REVIEWS PROCEDURES**
  - A. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty**
  - B. Tenured Faculty**
  - C. Tenured Faculty – Regional Campus**
  - D. Associated Faculty**
- VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS**
  - A. Criteria**
  - B. Procedures**
  - C. Documentation**
- VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION**
  - A. Criteria**
  - B. Procedures**
  - C. Documentation for Promotion and Tenure, and for Promotion**
- VIII. APPEALS**
- IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS**
- X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**
  - A. Student Evaluation of Teaching**
  - B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

## **I. PREAMBLE**

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (“Additional Rules Concerning Tenure Track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure”), the Office of Academic Affairs’ procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the College and the University. Should University or College rules and policies change, the Department shall follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

## **II. DEPARTMENT MISSION**

The History Department at the Ohio State University aspires to distinction in scholarship, teaching, and service. As a top-tier department in an eminent public university, we seek to advance the highest standards of our discipline. Because we believe that research inspires great teaching, our mission is to promote the finest historical scholarship, and to offer both graduate and undergraduate students the most rigorous and intellectually challenging education. Espousing the values of a diverse and collegial community of historians, we explore connections across areas, eras, and themes. We strive to provide comprehensive and challenging understandings of the complexity of the human past to audiences across the state, the nation, and the world at large.

## **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 department.

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

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

## **2) CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

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

## **3) MINIMUM COMPOSITION**

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

## **B. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of four professors and two associate professors. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. It is desirable that one half of the Committee members at each level be replaced each year. The Chair shall also appoint a regional campus faculty member of the appropriate rank as the seventh member of the Committee to serve when the Committee is dealing with regional campus faculty.

## **C. QUORUM**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is more than 35 percent of the eligible faculty from all campuses not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

## **D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY**

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

**1) APPOINTMENT**

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

**2) PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION**

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

**IV. APPOINTMENTS**

The Department of History expects that its senior members will be distinguished scholars within the historical profession and that its junior members will be persons who have reasonable promise of achieving this status. Meritorious research is therefore a necessary condition for appointment or promotion to any continuing position.

**A. CRITERIA**

**1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

**a. Instructor**

Appointments at the rank of instructor should normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be qualified for promotion to assistant professor by the end of the third year or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

**b. Assistant Professor**

To be eligible for appointment as an assistant professor, including promotion from instructor to assistant professor, the candidate should have the Ph.D. degree or its

equivalent and should have demonstrated potential for significant published contributions to research in his/her field and ability as an effective teacher of history.

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years of service, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and is informed by the end of the sixth year whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

**c. Professor or Associate Professor**

An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the Department and College. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the Provost.

**2) ASSOCIATED FACULTY**

The Department may extend associated appointments to faculty who provide significant teaching and service. These are not tenured or tenure-track appointments and may or may not have a salary. Associated appointments are made by the Chair, who, when appropriate, will consult with the faculty. An individual with an associated appointment may not vote at any level of Departmental governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. In the Department of History, associated appointments include:

**a. Senior Lecturers**

To be eligible for appointment as a senior lecturer, the candidate should have the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent and should have demonstrated ability as an effective teacher of history and potential for significant research. Senior lecturers will teach introductory-level courses only. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and by the Chair or his/her designee. Senior Lecturers may be reappointed only if their teaching is effective and the Department has a continuing need for their services. Senior Lecturers are compensated.

**b. Lecturers**

To be eligible for appointment as a lecturer, the candidate must have completed the

Ph.D. general examination in history, though not necessarily the doctoral dissertation. Lecturers will teach introductory-level courses only. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and by the Chair or his/her designee. Lecturers may be reappointed only if their teaching is effective and the Department has a continuing need for their services. Lecturers are compensated.

**c. Visiting Faculty**

To be eligible for appointment as a visiting assistant, associate, or full professor, the candidate must have credentials as a teacher and scholar similar to those of a tenure-track or tenured faculty member at the same rank, as stated elsewhere in this document. The appointment of a visiting faculty member may not exceed three continuous years. Visiting faculty are eligible to teach at every level of the curriculum, as appropriate to their professional standing as scholars. Visiting faculty are compensated.

**d. Adjunct Faculty**

To be eligible for appointment as an adjunct assistant, associate, or full professor, the candidate must have credentials as a teacher and scholar comparable to those of a tenure-track or tenured faculty member of the same rank. Adjunct faculty are appointed for a one-three year terms, which are renewable. Appointment as an adjunct faculty member is appropriate for those who do not have an appointment at The Ohio State University in another tenure-initiating unit. Adjunct appointments carry an expectation of substantial involvement with and contributions to the academic work of the Department, such as by teaching, or advising, or service on committees. Adjunct faculty may be compensated.

**3) COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

For an individual to hold a courtesy appointment in the Department of History, he/she must have a Ph.D. in history (or a related field) and hold a tenure-track appointment in another unit at The Ohio State University. An individual with a courtesy appointment may not participate in Department meetings, be appointed to Department committees, or serve as the sole advisor of doctoral students. However, he or she may hold graduate faculty status, if the Graduate Studies Committee agrees, and in that capacity may direct master's theses and serve as co-adviser to doctoral students and as a representative of an outside field. It is expected that those holding courtesy appointments will be available for such service and may also collaborate with faculty in undergraduate courses, in graduate instruction, in program development, and/or in common research endeavors. The Department of History

typically grants courtesy appointments when it seeks to advance these purposes, and terminates such appointments when the same purposes are no longer served.

## **B. PROCEDURES**

### **1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. After consultation with the faculty in meeting and an affirmative vote on the job description, and after approval by the Dean, the Chair shall appoint a committee to conduct a search for any tenure-track or tenured appointment. The Committee shall include, in addition to faculty members, one graduate student member who shall have the right to vote on all committee recommendations. The committee shall solicit applications broadly and by a variety of means, including but not limited to advertisements in appropriate professional journals, letters to leading scholars asking for nominations, and invitations asking persons to apply for the position. After conducting a thorough national search, including the possibility of personal interviews at appropriate professional meetings, the committee may, with the consent of the faculty, invite top candidates to an on-campus interview, at least one of whom should be an individual who can contribute to the diversity of the unit. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute in this way, it will explain to the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and 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. At the end of the search process, the committee will recommend to the faculty its choice or choices for the appointment. In a meeting the faculty will vote to make a recommendation to the Chair, who will negotiate the terms of the appointment in consultation with the Dean of the College.

### **2) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, REGIONAL CAMPUSES**

In the case of a tenure-track or tenured position on a regional campus, the regional campus Dean/Director has the responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description but should consult with and seek agreement with the Chair. The Chair and the regional campus Dean/Director will agree on a single search committee consisting of members of both units. The committee shall solicit applications broadly and by a variety of means, including but not limited to advertisements in appropriate professional journals, letters to leading scholars asking for nominations, and invitations asking persons to apply for the position. After



conducting a thorough national search, including the possibility of personal interviews at appropriate professional meetings, the committee may, with the consent of the faculty, invite top candidates to an on-campus interview, at least one of whom should be an individual who can contribute to the diversity of the unit. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute in this way, it will explain to the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and 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. Candidates should be interviewed by the regional campus Dean/Director, Chair, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. At the end of the evaluation process, the faculty will make a recommendation to the Chair and the regional campus Dean/Director. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the Chair and of the regional campus Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such an agreement, and a letter of offer must be signed by the Chair and the Dean/Director of the regional campus.

### 3) PROSPECTIVE SPOUSAL/PARTNER HIRES

#### a. Procedures

The Department recognizes that partner appointments fall into one of three hiring categories:

**Internal:** when the individual being considered is the partner of an individual whom the History Department is actively trying to recruit.

**Retention:** when the individual being considered is the partner of a current colleague whom the department is actively trying to retain.

**External:** when the individual being considered is the partner of an individual whom a different unit is actively trying to recruit.

All requests for partner appointments begin with the Chair. Upon receiving a request to consider a partner appointment from another university unit (an **External** case), the Chair shall distribute the candidate's c.v. to faculty in the relevant field(s) and elicit feedback. If the Chair finds that the case clearly lacks merit, then the Chair should decline to move forward with the request for a partner appointment.

For all **Internal** and **Retention** cases, and for **External** cases where the Chair finds that the individual in question may merit further scrutiny, the Chair shall convene a screening committee consisting of three faculty members (ideally two representatives of the relevant field(s) and one of the tenured elected members of the Chair's Advisory Committee) and one non-voting graduate student representative of the

graduate students. This screening committee shall analyze the full dossier of the candidate, consult carefully with representatives of the relevant field(s), and take into consideration a range of criteria detailed below). If faculty members from within the relevant fields are away from campus, the screening committee shall make a concerted effort to elicit feedback from them using electronic means.

The screening committee shall report its conclusions to the Advisory Committee. The case will then be treated in one of three ways. In each of these, the seven elected members of the Advisory Committee will determine a recommended course of action by a simple majority vote. Given that time is of the essence in such matters, the Advisory Committee action may be completed by electronic means.

- (1) If the Advisory Committee finds that the case clearly has sufficient merit to move forward, then the screening committee shall take the case before the department with a recommendation to vote in favor of bringing the candidate to campus for a full interview and job talk.
- (2) If the Advisory Committee finds that the case clearly lacks sufficient merit to justify moving forward, then the case shall be dropped with no further action.
- (3) If the screening committee's recommendation lacks clarity or the Advisory Committee is in need of additional information before issuing a decision, the Chair will assign the case to the further consideration of the seven elected members of the Advisory Committee.

After the candidate completes the interview, the screening committee will elicit feedback from the department regarding the candidate's suitability for a position in History. The Chair shall then convene a meeting of the department at which the screening committee will present its summary report and the faculty will hold a full and open discussion to assess the candidate's qualifications, with reference to the criteria outlined below. At this meeting the department will determine by vote whether to offer appointment. This vote will require two-thirds majority for an affirmative outcome.

**b. Criteria:**

In considering partner appointments in all of the above categories, the department shall carefully consider the following interrelated criteria (listed alphabetically).

- (1) **Departmental Need:** in the context of both field(s) and constellations.
- (2) **Diversity:** in reference to race, ethnicity, gender, and other characteristics that contribute to establishing a more diverse departmental composition.

- (3) **Dossier:** referring to all issues that pertain to scholarly merit in training, experience, publication record and the quality of publications, national or international reputation, teaching experience, and evidence of effectiveness in the classroom.
- (4) **Potential:** referring to evidence that suggests that the individual will contribute to the department's scholarly profile and department life in terms of research, teaching (at both the undergraduate and graduate levels) and service.

For a partner hire to be deemed sufficiently advantageous to justify offering an appointment in either a tenured or tenure-track position, an open analysis must show compelling affirmative evidence of a combination of these factors.

#### **4) ASSOCIATED FACULTY**

##### **a. Senior Lecturers**

Senior Lecturers will be appointed when the Department needs additional, qualified staff to teach its undergraduate courses. A search committee appointed by the Chair will identify potential candidates and will recommend a ranked list of these candidates to the Chair, who will negotiate the terms of appointment. A senior lecturer's appointment may be renewed, provided that the teaching has been effective and the Department has a continuing need for such services.

##### **b. Lecturers**

Lecturers will be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Department's Vice Chair, Director of Graduate Studies, and Academic Program Coordinator.

##### **c. Visiting Faculty**

A Visiting Faculty member is normally appointed for one year by the Chair after consultation with the faculty. A Visiting Faculty member can be appointed for up to three years.

##### **d. Adjunct Faculty**

Adjunct Faculty will be appointed by the Chair after consultation with the faculty in a meeting. Appointment of an Adjunct Faculty member will be at a rank which is equivalent to that which such a person would have as a member of the faculty.

#### **4) COURTESY FACULTY**

Courtesy appointments in the Department of History are made by the Chair after consultation with the faculty.

### **V. ANNUAL REVIEWS PROCEDURES**

#### **A. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing Department, College, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

The Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review all untenured faculty in each year of their probationary service. Faculty shall be reviewed in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and must give evidence of continuing development in each area. The Department Chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment and in a timely fashion each year thereafter when the annual review will take place, and provide a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be used by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. The annual review enables the Department to communicate its performance expectations to probationary faculty, to evaluate progress towards those expectations, and to avoid reappointment in cases where the candidate is not likely to earn promotion and tenure.

Faculty under review are responsible for providing an appropriate statement and appropriate professional materials for review to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Such materials are described below in Section VI. J. "Documentation", and in the Office of Academic Affairs' current version of Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>). The faculty will submit materials in the format prescribed by the OAA outline, and the materials will constitute the faculty member's dossier. The Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee may include additional information which they consider relevant for inclusion in the notebook.

At the completion of each annual review, the Department Chair shall provide the faculty member and the Dean of the College a copy of the committee's review as well as the Chair's own written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development, and an indication as to whether the faculty member should be reappointed for an additional year. The Chair's assessment, which may take the form of an addendum to the committee review, will be based on the committee review, the probationary faculty member's current vita and annual activity report, and any other pertinent information that he/she has received in

performing the duties of Chair. The Chair's assessment will constitute the annual performance review of the probationary faculty member and should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. Probationary faculty members will meet annually with the Chair to discuss their annual reviews and future plans. If they choose, they may respond in writing to the review of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the Chair's performance review.

In the case of a negative review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee or in the case of a negative recommendation from the Chair in the candidate's first, second, third, or fifth year, the case will be reviewed by the eligible faculty consistent with fourth-year review procedures. The eligible faculty will prepare a report for the Chair in the same manner as would be the case for a fourth-year review. The Chair will provide an independent written review of the case and recommendation. The candidate may request a copy of both documents and may provide written comments on the faculty report and/or the Chair's letter for inclusion in the official dossier within ten calendar days of receipt of the review letter(s). The eligible faculty and/or Chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the Departmental level review is permitted. On completion of the process, the case will be forwarded to the Dean for college level review. The Dean shall make the final decision on the case.

Should the Chair's recommendation differ from that of the faculty, he or she will explain his/her disagreement with them before informing the candidate of the review's results or, in the case of a recommendation not to renew the appointment, forwarding the case to the Dean.

#### **1) REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY**

Probationary faculty on regional campuses will be reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean/Director and by the Chair. The regional campus review, which focuses mainly on teaching and service, should take place first. The Dean/Director's report on that review and a copy of the faculty member's annual report will be forwarded to the Chair with a copy to the Dean of the College. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work and on the appropriateness of course content and course standards, but will consider all aspects of his/her record. The Chair should give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean/Director.

A tenured member of the regional History faculty will serve on the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee when it deals with probationary faculty on the regional campuses. It is important that the Chair and the Regional Campus Dean/Director be alert to any developing discrepancy for the probationary faculty

member between the quality of teaching and service on the one hand and the quality and quantity of scholarly work on the other, in order to minimize the possibility that the regional campus and the Department may disagree on a tenure recommendation.

## **2) FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW**

Procedures in the fourth-year review and the sixth-year review are the same, except that external letters are not solicited in the fourth year. Each review results in two letters of evaluation, one from the eligible faculty, as drafted by the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee or his/her designee, and a separate letter from the Chair. The Promotion and Tenure Committee may ask the candidate to provide additional materials or ask the candidate questions on aspects of the dossier. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the executive dean of the college.

## **3) EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM PROBATIONARY PERIODS**

Probationary faculty at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor may exclude time from the probationary period under Faculty Rule 3335-6-03. Probationary faculty will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period, unless their absence from campus during an excluded period makes the conduct of such a review impractical.

## **B. TENURED FACULTY**

Each year, each member of the tenured faculty will provide the Chair with an updated c.v. and an Annual Activity Report summarizing accomplishments in research, teaching, and service for the year preceding the annual review. The Chair will review these and other documents as appropriate, will seek the advice of colleagues as necessary, and will use this information as the basis for an annual performance review. Following a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting between the Chair (or his/her designee) and each faculty member, the Chair will provide each faculty member with written feedback regarding his/her performance and future plans. That review will enable the Chair to highlight performance problems where they exist and to assist faculty in carrying out their professional plans. A tenured member of the Department may respond in writing to the Chair's performance evaluations.

## **C. TENURED FACULTY—REGIONAL CAMPUS**

Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as

described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

#### **D. ASSOCIATED FACULTY**

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

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee. The department chair, 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. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

### **VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS**

#### **A. CRITERIA**

Unless the President, Provost, or Dean directs otherwise, all money made available to the Department for annual increments is distributed on the basis of merit in the categories of research, teaching, and service. Merit will be determined by such quantitative indicators as the number of publications, courses taught, graduate students directed, and committees on which the faculty member has served, and by such qualitative indicators as professional awards and prizes for research, teaching, or service, the standing of the press, journals, and professional conferences that served as outlets for research, faculty visibility as editors, members of editorial boards, or leaders in professional societies, and excellent service on particularly demanding Departmental committees. In making salary recommendations to the Dean, the Chair will normally consider the previous year's performance of individual faculty, recognizing that publication of a major research monograph merits reward over three consecutive years. The chair may take into account the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall performance over several years.

#### **B. PROCEDURES**

The annual performance evaluations will serve as the basis for the Chair's annual salary recommendations, which may be included in the written evaluation which the Chair shall provide to each Department member. In making salary recommendations, the Chair will be

advised by a Salary Advisory Committee consisting of the Vice Chair and three elected members of the Advisory Committee from the Columbus campus. The Dean shall determine the amount of incremental money made available to the Department, and the Chair shall discuss salary recommendations with the Dean. When they have agreed on the salary recommendations the Dean will forward his/her recommendations to the Provost's office for concurrence. Final responsibility for all salary rests with the Board of Trustees.

### **C. DOCUMENTATION**

Annual merit evaluations will be based on each faculty member's Annual Activity Report and updated c.v. The Annual Activity Report must follow the template provided by the Department and it should cover the calendar year. The c.v. should be updated to reflect achievements through the end of the calendar year. Data from student evaluations of teaching must be included in the Annual Activity Report. The Annual Activity Report and the c.v. must be submitted to the department chair by February 1 of each year. 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.

## **VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION**

### **A. CRITERIA**

#### **1) PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE**

To be eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure, the candidate must publish a significant body of research in his/her field showing that he/she is capable of sustained original work and significant achievements in research. In the discipline of history, a candidate for promotion with tenure at major research institutions is typically expected to have at least one book published or under final board-approved contract and in production, and to show other evidence of scholarly productivity in the form of conference papers and refereed journal articles and/or book chapters. There must also be evidence that he/she will continue to make original and significant scholarly contributions in the future. In addition, he/she should have demonstrated excellence as a teacher of history on his or her campus, and must have an excellent record of service as a member of the Department, University, and scholarly communities. The documentation for evaluating performance are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.



## **2) PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

To be eligible for promotion to professor, a faculty member must have made significant scholarly contributions that have secured him/her a national or international reputation for superior intellectual attainment in his/her field. While the total body of a scholar's work will be considered, it is expected that the faculty member will have published a second body of original and significant research since promotion to the associate professor rank. In the discipline of history, a second body of research usually means a second scholarly monograph published or under final board-approved contract and in production, as well as other evidence of scholarly productivity, such as conference papers, edited work, refereed journal articles, book chapters, grants, and book reviews beyond those contributed at the time of promotion to associate professor with tenure, and the mastery of new languages or disciplines. A second body of research may also include, however, a set of several refereed journal articles or book chapters that make a substantial contribution to the field, an interpretive or theoretical book that reshapes thinking about a subject of concern to a wide range of scholars and/or the public, or a pioneering textbook in a new field of inquiry. Publications and other scholarly accomplishments must demonstrate that the faculty member has been continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. In addition, the faculty member must have demonstrated continued excellence as a teacher of history at all levels of the department's curriculum on his or her campus, and must have an excellent record of service to the Department, University, and scholarly communities.

## **3) REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY**

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

## **B. PROCEDURES**

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty tracks in the department.

### **1) CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

The candidate is responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

### **2) REVIEW GROUP RESPONSIBILITIES**

A review group will consider annually, in spring semester, requests from associate professors seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. The review group will consist of the full professors on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, a full professor elected to the Advisory Committee, another full professor selected by the Chair (preferably drawn from the candidate's field of expertise), and a full professor selected by the candidate. The Chair shall consult with these full professors in meeting to determine if the associate professor will be considered during the following year for promotion to professor. Members of the review group will conduct a preliminary review of the associate professor's research, teaching, and service. A positive two-thirds vote by this group on a motion to consider an associate professor for promotion will constitute an affirmative recommendation to the Chair. In the event of a negative vote by the review group, the Chair should consult all full professors in meeting on the case. A positive vote of two thirds by the larger group will overturn the negative vote of the smaller group and constitute a positive recommendation to the chair.

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's c.v. and on a determination of the

availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) for one year. If the denial is based on 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.

A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

### 3) PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

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

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
  - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair or his/her designee.
  - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
  - If deemed necessary, meet with each candidate for clarification and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Record in writing the deliberations of the committee of the eligible faculty, including the numerical vote on the candidate and the faculty's assessment of the quantity, quality, effectiveness, and significance of the candidate's record in research, teaching, and service; to read aloud the notes on the discussion (after the vote); to offer a chance to amend the notes; and to seek a voice vote approving the notes.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

#### **4) ELIGIBLE FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES**

To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from assistant professors seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. The eligible faculty will conduct a preliminary review of the assistant professor's research, teaching, and service. A positive two-thirds vote by on a motion to consider an assistant professor for promotion with tenure will constitute an affirmative recommendation to the Chair.

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's c.v. and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a “green card”). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

The responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are as follows:

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate’s dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate’s case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one’s control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

#### 5) DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate’s residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are not considered for promotion.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of each candidate’s dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
  - Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

## 5) PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

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

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and

recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

## **6) EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS**

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews.

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 scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from full professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-04.html>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided

at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampleddocuments.html>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

### **C. DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION**

Documentation of every promotion and tenure or promotion case will, where appropriate, include evidence of the following:

#### **1) TEACHING**

Excellence as a teacher. An effective teacher of history is one who

- (1) meets the formal classroom obligations of a teacher in the Department of History of The Ohio State University;
- (2) demonstrates an interest in students;
- (3) stimulates students' interest in his/her subject;
- (4) succeeds in conveying knowledge of history and historical method to his/her students;
- (5) demands standards of intellectual performance suitable for a history department in a major American university, including clear and effective writing;
- (6) reflects up-to-date scholarship in his/her teaching.

Evaluation of a candidate's performance as a teacher will be based on the widest possible range of evidence. It will include (1) evidence gathered by the Chair or by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and (2) evidence offered by the candidate.



Evidence submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee regarding teaching will normally include the following:

i) Student evaluations for all courses for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, student evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion or in the last five years, whichever is more recent. The standard SEI forms must be used, and may be supplemented by other forms. Consistent with University guidelines, someone other than the instructor being reviewed must administer any instrument of evaluation.

ii) Summaries of SEIs prepared by the Undergraduate Teaching Committee or another appropriate University authority.

iii) Syllabi, exams, and assignments for all courses for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, for all courses taught since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent.

iv) A brief written statement by the candidate of his/her teaching objectives, methods, and accomplishments. This document must include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching, a self-assessment, and a description of specific strategies for improvement of teaching.

v) Detailed written evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations by colleagues. These evaluations should follow the guidelines laid out in the Department's "Policy on Enhancing Teaching and Teaching Evaluation."

vi) Other data that the Department Chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, or the candidate may judge pertinent to an evaluation of the candidate's performance in the area of teaching. This additional data might include:

--Explanations or demonstrations of especially successful or innovative teaching techniques;

--Explanations of special teaching accomplishments, awards, and the like;

--Information regarding the candidate's publication of teaching materials and articles on teaching techniques.

## 2) SCHOLARSHIP

Excellence as a scholar. Scholarly excellence entails significant and original contributions to published scholarship in the candidate's field of specialization. Such contributions include the following: new knowledge; information that aids colleagues in the field in carrying forward their own research; empirical evaluations of new or traditional hypotheses to determine their validity; application of historical concepts to other disciplines; and the application of concepts from other disciplines to history in ways that generally advance knowledge.

The usual media for scholarly contributions are evaluated or published book manuscripts, articles in recognized, refereed journals, and presentations at scholarly meetings.

The candidate's achievements and the likelihood of further long-term scholarly accomplishments will be evaluated on the basis of the widest possible range of evidence, including evidence offered by the candidate and that gathered by the Chair and by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Such evidence will normally include:

i) Letters from external evaluators. External evaluations are intended to aid the independent professional judgment of faculty involved in tenure and promotion decisions, and are not to substitute for that judgment.

ii) Publications. In evaluating publications and manuscripts, considerations of quality will take precedence over those of quantity, although the pace of publication will be given serious consideration. The eligible faculty will consider the nature of each publication. Although intrinsic quality is the primary criterion, the type of refereeing and reputation of a publisher or journal can be important considerations. Ordinarily, the Committee will consider monographic or interpretive publications based upon original research as providing primary evidence of scholarly development rather than textbooks or source books conceived primarily for undergraduate instruction. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee may also seek out--and the candidate may present--published reviews from scholars in the field, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will make its own assessment of the candidate's publications.

iii) Scholarly activity at professional meetings. The quality of the contributions will be the primary consideration in evaluating this activity.

Papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, and participation in colloquia will be evaluated. Again the Promotion and Tenure Committee may seek and the candidate may present evaluations from scholars in the field.

iv) Reviews of scholarly works for journals. The scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear will be appraised.

v) Scholarly recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions, or to serve on program committees for such meetings.

vi) Recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation.

vii) Any other evidence which the candidate, the Chair or the Promotion and Tenure Committee believe pertinent to his/her development as a scholar. The candidate may include in his/her dossier any manuscripts of articles or papers, whether they have been published or not.

### **3) SERVICE**

Excellence in Service. A member of the Department of History at the Ohio State University has an obligation to use his/her talents to collaborate effectively with colleagues for the betterment of the Department, the University, and the larger community. A faculty member's profile of service may vary over time. The Promotion and Tenure Committee may gather any information that the candidate, the Chair, or the committee considers pertinent to a full evaluation of the candidate's ability to render effective service to these communities, including evidence relating to the quality and the quantity of such service. The information may include the number of committee meetings attended, specific projects undertaken, administrative responsibilities assumed, and individual, community or professional contributions. The Department Chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee or the candidate may solicit written assessments of a candidate's service from those who are in a position to provide them. Other information may include:

i) Service on Department, College, and University committees.

ii) Service as an adviser to graduate and undergraduate students.

iii) Presentations made in the classes of others, contributions to University publications, lectures to the Departmental faculty, and similar activities.

iv) Activities in the University community and in the community outside the University based on and related to one's professional training and professional concerns.

v) Activity in the national/international scholarly community and its institutions.

vi) Service rendered to public or private agencies, foundations, and boards appropriate for an academician and promoting history and its public impact.

### **VIII. APPEALS**

It is the policy of the Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in the Faculty Rules, supplemented by additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and colleges. If a candidate believes that a non-renewal decision, negative promotion and tenure decision, or denial of a request to be considered for promotion has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in rule 3335-47-05 of the "Additional Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure".

### **IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS**

In mandatory promotion and tenure reviews, every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, the Department may petition the Dean to conduct a seventh-year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the Department and the Chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh-year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh-year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh-year review, if approved,

would take place during the 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.